



HAL
open science

Semantic study of phrasal verbs Is the meaning of verb particle construction completely arbitrary? Focus on "out"

Carole Fournier

► **To cite this version:**

Carole Fournier. Semantic study of phrasal verbs Is the meaning of verb particle construction completely arbitrary? Focus on "out". Humanities and Social Sciences. 2017. dumas-03394577

HAL Id: dumas-03394577

<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-03394577>

Submitted on 22 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Université Clermont Auvergne
U.F.R Langues, Culture et Communication
Département d'Anglais

Semantic study of phrasal verbs
Is the meaning of verb-particle construction completely
arbitrary ?
Focus on “out”

Présenté en vue de l'obtention du grade de
Master 2 de Langues et Cultures Étrangères, Études Anglophones
Soutenu le 29 Septembre 2017
par Carole Fournier

Sous la direction de : Philippe Rapatel.

Année universitaire 2016-2017

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my research supervisor, Philippe Rapatel, who has encouraged me and supported me during these past two years. Also, I would like to thank him for his comprehension and for his ability to adapt his way of working to mine.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this “mémoire” to my grandmother, Simone Scandolo, who brutally left us three years ago and who would have been proud of my educational path as difficult as it has been.

Contents

Preface

Introduction

1. A first approach to phrasal verbs	2	
1.1 Definition	2	
1.2 A wide range of possibilities	2	1.3
The polysemy of phrasal verbs	3	
1.4 The complexity of phrasal verbs	4	
1.4.1 The notions of transitivity and intransitivity	4	
1.4.2 The status of the “second element” : the particle	5	
1.4.3 Separable and inseparable phrasal verbs	6	
1.5 Conclusion	7	
2. Compositionality and summativity	8	
3. Differentiating particles from prepositions : a syntactic and semantic approach	15	
3.1 Fraser, <i>The Verb-Particle Combination</i> (1976)	15	
3.2 O'Dowd : a three way classification of particles	21	
3.3 21st century : Jackendoff (2002), Cappelle (2004)	24	
3.3.1 Tests for “particlehood”	24	
3.3.2 Particles as intransitive prepositions	29	
4. The uses of prepositions explained	32	
4.1 A bipart classification of prepositions ?	33	
4.2 Towards a four-class classification of “prepositions”	34	
5. The characteristics of particles	37	
5.1 Directional particles	37	
5.2 The notion of aspect : preliminary work to aspectual and semi-aspectual particles	41	
5.2.1 Definition	41	
5.2.2 Situation types and aspectual features	42	
5.2.3 Notions related to the aspectual meaning of particles	44	5.3
Aspectual particles	47	
5.3.1 Aspectual “about” and “around”	47	
5.3.2 Aspectual “along”	48	
5.3.3 Aspectual “away”	50	
5.3.4 Aspectual “on”	51	
5.3.5 Aspectual “out”	54	
5.3.6 Aspectual “through”	55	
5.3.7 Aspectual “up”	56	
5.4 Semi-aspectual particles	59	
5.4.1 Semi-aspectual “away”	59	
5.4.2 Semi-aspectual “back”	60	
5.4.3 Semi-aspectual “down”	60	
5.4.4 Semi-aspectual “off”	62	
5.4.5 Semi-aspectual “out”	62	

5.4.6 Semi-aspectual “over”	63
6. A division among the category of particles	64
6.1 Bas Aarts'A-verbs and B-verbs	64
6.2 Fraser's verb-adverbial combination	69
7. The importance of the context and other elements	72
7.1 The notion of telicity and the type of direct object	72
7.2 Pragmatic approach to phrasal verbs : types of context	74
7.2.1 Presentation of the types of context	74
7.2.2 Analysis of phrasal verbs in context	76
8. Focus on the particle “out”	78
9. Conclusion	82

Preface

Before exposing the purpose of this study, I would like to explain the reasons why I decided to focus on phrasal verbs. Indeed, at the beginning, I wished to devote myself to prepositions but then, I understood that it would be difficult to find a new specific way to tackle them. Then, I remembered a lecture during which I discovered that it was possible to have the following structure : verb + particle + preposition, and I remembered that I had been fascinated by it so I decided to focus on prepositional verbs and phrasal verbs. I give this explanation in order to point out the fact that phrasal verbs were not my first choice at the beginning but then I realised that this subject was really interesting and that it would be a great opportunity for me to work on it. Actually, what I find very interesting is the possibility to transform the meaning of a simplex verb only with the addition of a particle or two (i.e, a preposition or an adverb). Therefore, it is then possible to use the same verb with different particles in order to obtain different meanings. As a first argument, this gives a great power to the particle which is not just a word added to the verb in order to create a link with another word or group of words, but it is a small item which permits to assign a new meaning or add a precision to a simple verb, other words, it has a real semantic impact on the verb to which it is associated and therefore to the whole sentence. Secondly, another difficulty is that several meanings can be attributed to the same phrasal verb. In short, this means there are many possibilities of combination but also that it is possible to have several definitions for the same phrasal verb depending on the way it is used (as it is the case of simplex verbs or words in general) and on the context. Consequently, the complexity of those constructions and their polysemy make them particularly interesting. Finally, the last argument is the opportunity for me to learn more about the English language. I am well aware that every study enables students to learn something new but today, verb-particle constructions are more and more used in everyday life conversations in English and it is difficult to remember all of them and to understand them especially for nonnative speakers of English.

Introduction

The present work concerns phrasal verbs generally speaking but essentially phrasal verbs

in a more specific definition therefore prepositional verbs are mentioned but there are not at the core of the project. Indeed, the purpose of this work is to analyze phrasal verbs (i.e. verb-particle constructions composed of a verb and an adverbial particle) especially from a semantic point of view even though all the aspects concerning phrasal verbs will be developed in this work. The first part of this study will be devoted to the definition of phrasal verbs, generally speaking and more specifically. Indeed, within this first explanation of phrasal verbs, their complexity will be underlined and explained and we will see that this complexity depends on the element associated to form verb-particle constructions and also on the semantic aspect of these elements, especially the particle. As a consequence, the notion of compositionality will be presented and described more in detail, indeed, it is important to understand which part of the construction contributes to the meaning of the whole combination and how it does so. Next, since phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs are separated into two different categories and are still today, quite difficult to clearly categorized into two clearly distinct classes, a part of this work will be devoted to the differences existing between and within these two categories. In order to give relevant elements, the syntactic aspect of particles and prepositions will be developed in detail. Next, after the differentiation of particles from prepositions, these two categories will be exposed with closer attention. Indeed, particles will be presented and developed in detail and the notion of aspect will be introduced as a preliminary work to the complete presentation of particles. After this, we will see that even though particles and prepositions can be identified quite efficiently, there exists a division among the category of particles which will be presented and explained. Then of course, it will be necessary to recognize that other elements than the particle and the verb itself have an impact on the meaning of phrasal verbs. Moreover, we will also analyse elements which cannot be found in an intra-linguistic context and therefore we will take the notion of pragmatics. Finally, a brief but important comment on the particle “out” will be exposed before ending this study of phrasal verbs.

1. A first approach to phrasal verbs

1.1 Definition

Before anything, it is necessary to define phrasal verbs. To begin and to make it simple, no distinction will be made between “prepositional verbs” and “phrasal verbs” and they will both be named “phrasal verbs” simply as they are designated in *The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary for*

Learners of English (2006) which will be often used for the need of this study and thus shortly referred to as *The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary* (2006). Moreover, I would like to give a simple definition of this term even though we will see later that the complexity of those constructions goes far beyond the simplicity of a short definition. According to the website Cambridge Dictionaries Online a phrasal verb is “a phrase that consists of a verb with a preposition or adverb or both. The meaning of which is different from the meaning of its separate parts”. Furthermore, another definition taken from the same website permits to give further explanations :

Multi-word verbs are verbs which consist of a verb and one or two particles or prepositions (e.g up, over, in, down). There are three types of multi-word verbs: phrasal verbs, prepositional verbs and phrasal prepositional verbs. Sometimes, the name 'phrasal verb' is used to refer to all three types. (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/fr/dictionnaire/anglais/phrasal-verb> accessed 19 June 2016)

1.2 A wide range of possibilities

The definition given above enables us to understand that it is possible to modify the meaning of a simplex verb only with the addition of a particle or two (i.e. a preposition or an adverb). Thus, it is possible to use the same simplex verb with different particles in order to obtain different meanings, we can take the example of the verb “make” as in “make off” (hurry or rush away), “make out” (survive in a particular situation), or “make up” (invent something) and we can notice that the meaning of the whole construction is different for each of these phrasal verbs.

Moreover as explained in the definition given above, those verbs can also be used with a second particle which gives them another new meaning as for example, to continue with the same verb, “make up for” (do or provide something good to balance or reduce the effect of something bad) which can be called a “phrasal-prepositional verb”. Indeed, a “phrasal-prepositional verb” is a phrasal verb (i.e. a simplex verb and an adverbial particle) followed by a preposition.

To make it short, the meaning of a simplex verb can be modified by the addition of a particle (i.e. an adverb or a preposition) which gives a great power to the particle in question which is not just a word added to the verb in order to create a link with another word or group of words, but it is a small item which permits to assign a new meaning (“make out”, “make up”) or add a precision (“put up”, “put down”) to a simplex verb.

1.3 The polysemy of phrasal verbs

We understand now that phrasal verbs are made of two or three words and that their meaning depends on the association of these words which implies a wide range of possibilities. In addition, another element has to be taken into account. Indeed, what can be seen as a difficulty is the fact that the same phrasal verb can have several meanings as it is the case of the phrasal verb “make up”. As an illustration, in *The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary* (2006), we can count eight definitions for this phrasal verb including “put make up on to make sb/yourself attractive”, “end an argument or a disagreement with sb” and “invent something, often in order to trick sb”. This means that the meaning of a simplex verb can be modified by the addition of a particle or two but also that several definitions can be linked to the same phrasal verb depending on the situation (as it is the case of verbs or words in general) or in other words, on the context. Consequently, the complexity of the attribution of particles to simplex verbs and the polysemy of those particles and of the phrasal verbs themselves make them particularly interesting :

In particular [for] nonnative speaker of English who, in my experience, find prepositions and particles (i.e. P-forms in particular) among the most difficult, but also the most intriguing, forms that they have to master in learning the English language. (O'Dowd 1998 : 6)

Indeed, it is sometimes difficult to understand why a specific meaning is attributed to a specific verb-particle construction since their association is not always logical or obvious. Sometimes the meaning of the simplex verb and the meaning of the particle seem to have no relationship with each other or with the meaning given to their association. Their complexity is probably what makes them so interesting, they are not just transparent words which are easy to understand, it is sometimes necessary to look further in order to find a semantic explanation.

We understand that phrasal verbs are very complex constructions and this is the reason why they have been named with several terms over the years. Actually, such a construction can be labeled with various names including : “phrasal verbs, polyverb, compound-verb, two-word verb, group verb, discontinuous verb, prepositional phrase, prepositional verb, conjunct, adjunct, disjunct, adverbial phrase” (O'Dowd 1998 : 9). This fact underlines the complexity of phrasal verbs and the difficulty for linguists to define them and to answer the numerous questions raised by those constructions. Indeed, over the years, phrasal verbs have interested many linguists who have been working on them, giving several answers, solutions or leads in order to solve the problem of the

comprehension of phrasal verbs and “suggest[ing] several lines of inquiry for further research” (O'Dowd 1998 : 11).

1.4 The complexity of phrasal verbs

1.4.1 The notions of transitivity and intransitivity

The definition given above enables us to have a better comprehension of what a phrasal verb is. Next, a few comments were made about their semantic aspect and now, the syntactic aspect of these constructions will be presented and developed more in detail. Indeed, concerning this aspect, phrasal verb can be separated into two categories, as it is often the case in dictionaries or grammar books, this means that there is an opposition between “**transitive** phrasal verbs” and “**intransitive** phrasal verbs”. According to *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar* (1994), “transitive” means “of a verb: that takes a direct object” and “intransitive” is the opposite : “of a verb: not taking a direct object”. Of course, the problem is a bit more complicated than that since it is difficult to know whether a verb is transitive or intransitive, indeed, according to the definition of *The English Reference Dictionary* (1996), a transitive verb is a verb “that takes a direct object (**whether expressed or implied**)” which means that the direct object is not always obvious therefore determining the transitivity or intransitivity of a verb is not always an easy task. It is clear that since the notions of transitivity and intransitivity apply to simplex verbs, they also apply to phrasal verbs. Moreover, and as it is clearly explained in *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar* (1994), a verb can be both transitive and intransitive :

Even verbs that seem to be strongly transitive (e.g. *He made a cake/a mistake/a good job of it*) can have intransitive uses (e.g. *She made toward the river*), and similarly an intransitive verb such as *live* can be used transitively (e.g. *She lived a good life*). For so many verbs it is more accurate to talk of transitive and intransitive use.

1.4.2 The status of the “second element” : the particle

Among many linguists, this transitivity or intransitivity is partially linked to the status of the second element. What I call the “second element” is the particle which can be a preposition or an adverbial particle (which can be simply referred to as a particle). According to the definition given in dictionaries, phrasal verbs are usually separated into two categories, **prepositional verbs** and

phrasal verbs as already mentioned earlier in this work. As a starting point and to make it easily understandable, a definition will be given for each category.

First of all, if the phrasal verb is a prepositional verb, it is a verb followed by a preposition thus the verb is necessarily transitive since a preposition is : “a word governing (and usu. Preceding) a nouns or pronoun and **expressing a relation to another word or element**, as in : 'the man on the platform', 'came after dinner', 'what did you do it for?'" (*The Oxford English Reference dictionary*, 1996). Indeed, a transitive verb is followed by an object and the role of a preposition is to “express a relation to another word or element” as in “wait for”, we cannot say “*I am waiting for”, the preposition “for” has to be followed by an object as in the following sentences : “Wait for me!” or “We're waiting for the rain to stop before we go out” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006).

Next, if the construction is a phrasal verb that is to say if the second element is a particle (i.e. an adverbial particle) then it is quite likely that the verb is intransitive since a particle is : “an accented item that does not take an object and that usually **has a fairly close bond with the verb**, whence such terms as 'phrasal verb', 'particle verb', verb particle combination', 'separable complex verb', etc.” (Cappelle 2004 : 1) as for example the phrasal verb “give in” meaning “accept that you have been defeated or persuaded by sb” which does not take an object as in “I give in – you'll have to tell me the answer” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006). However, this does not mean that all phrasal verbs are intransitive, as developed above, a verb can be both transitive and intransitive and if a verb is not followed by a preposition but by an adverbial particle, it does not mean that it is necessarily intransitive as illustrated with the verb “give off” meaning “produce sth such as heat, light, smoke, etc.” which is transitive and thus has to be followed by an object as in “burning apple wood gives off a pleasing smell” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary*, 2006), the phrasal verb “give off” has to be followed by a complement, here, “a pleasing smell”. Indeed, the phrasal verb “give off” functions as a single unit and could be replaced by a simplex verb, thus its transitivity is linked to the construction as a whole, not because of the status of the second element.

These two facts can also explain the necessity to use a preposition after a phrasal verb, indeed, if we use the phrasal verb “make out” with the meaning of “survive in a particular situation”, the example given within the definition “make out” in *The Oxford Phrasal Verb dictionary* (2006) is the following one :

(1) How are you making out in your new home?

Here, the phrasal verb is “making out” and it is used as a single unit, that is the reason

why I underlined “has a fairly close bond with the verb” in Cappelle's quotation above. Again, this means that the phrasal verb could eventually be replaced by a simplex verb as already mentioned two paragraphs before. In the example (1), the preposition “in” is used to create a link between the verb and the noun phrase “your new home” thus forming the prepositional phrase (PP) “in your new home”. This example highlights the difference between a preposition and a particle with a very simple demonstration.

1.4.3 Separable and inseparable phrasal verbs

In the same way phrasal verbs can be transitive or intransitive, they can also be “separable” and “inseparable”, which will be developed in this paragraph. As explained previously, a phrasal verb (i.e. prepositional and phrasal verbs included) can be followed by an object which makes it a transitive phrasal verb and within this category there are “separable phrasal verbs” on the one hand and “inseparable phrasal verbs” on the other hand.

When the phrasal verb is “separable”, the particle (i.e. the second element generally speaking) does not have to appear right after the verb to which it is linked and right before the direct object, in other words, “when the verb is transitive, the particle can appear on either side of the object” (Jackendoff, 2002 : 69) which means that it can be seen on left hand position or on right hand position as it is illustrated with the following examples (2a) and (2b) taken from Jackendoff's examples also extracted from examples (2a) and (2b) in his article entitled *English Particle Constructions, the Lexicon and the Autonomy of Syntax* (Jackendoff 2002 : 69) :

- (2) a. Cathy brought in the cat (left hand position)
- b. Cathy brought the cat in (right hand position)

These examples illustrate what has been said before, we can see that the particule can be “on either side of the direct object” and the sentence is still grammatical.

However, when a verb is “inseparable”, this means that the particle must follow the verb and precedes the object, and inversion of the particle (P) and of the noun phrase (NP) is not possible as illustrated in the examples (3a) and (3b) both corresponding to Jackendoff's examples given in (3a) (Jackendoff 2002 : 70) :

- (3) a. Bill ran up the street
- b. *Bill ran the street up

Here, the phrasal verb “run up” is “inseparable”, if we separate the particle from the verb as it is the case in example (3b), then the sentence is ungrammatical, “up” must appear right after “run” as in example (3a) which shows that both elements constitute a single word, or at least, that the whole construction functions as a single word.

1.5 Conclusion

Phrasal verbs, prepositional verbs and therefore phrasal-prepositional verbs are labeled differently for a good reason, what really matters in these constructions is not the verb itself but it is the particle which is added to it, of course, the simplex verb can contribute to the meaning of the complete construction and it has to be taken into consideration since it also has an impact on the meaning and on the syntactic properties of the phrasal verb but the particle appears as more problematic when it comes to analyze verb-particle constructions. Indeed, the semantic and syntactic distinctions which can be found within the various categories are the result of the second element status and also of the meaning of it. Starting from this point, many questions need to be answered : Is the particle (i.e. the second element generally speaking) an adverbial particle or a preposition ? Why is it necessary to differentiate them and to find an efficient way to categorize them ? Actually, even though prepositions and particles do not semantically or syntactically operate the same way, it does not mean that identifying them is an easy task, as a matter of fact, it is one of the most problematic questions concerning phrasal verbs. A part of this work will be devoted to this question from a syntactic point of view, the aim will be to analyze the various arguments which have been given over the years and to gather much information in order to try to find a solution to the problem of the dichotomy between prepositions and particles. Of course, in addition to the syntactic aspect and to the presentation of many notions, the whole study will be led from a semantic point of view, the semantic aspect will be the central thread of this work.

Since the definition given above underlines the fact that phrasal verbs (i.e. generally speaking) are made of a verb and a particle, it is necessary when it comes to analyze verb-particle constructions to determine which element contributes to the meaning of the whole construction and how it does so which is the subject of the next part of this study.

2. Compositionality and summativity

As it was explained before, phrasal verbs are quite complex. They are also called “verb particle constructions” or “verb-particle combinations”, we can notice that the words “construction” and “combination” underline the fact that phrasal verbs are made of several words, usually two but sometimes three as it was mentioned in the definition given at the beginning of this work. Starting from this point, it is important to define the role of each word in these constructions. In order to do so, we will tackle the notion of “computational linguistics”. Even though this is not the subject of this work, it can be very useful to borrow some of the tools used in this linguistic field.

Before anything, it is necessary to explain what the term “computational linguistics” means. According to *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar* (1994), it concerns : “Linguistics that uses computers in the gathering, analysis, and manipulation of linguistic data (including speech synthesis, machine translation, and aspects of artificial intelligence).” Actually, even though this study does not concern computers, the purpose of this linguistic field is quite close to the one of this study. Indeed, the aim of this work is to analyze and classify verb-particle constructions according to the way their meaning is created through the association of words. Consequently, using tools borrowed from computational linguistics can be really helpful for the need of this study.

It is therefore necessary to define some of the terms used in computational linguistics. First of all, verb-particle constructions are abbreviated VPC's and they are part of an entire category which includes what is called MWEs, an abbreviation meaning “multi-word expressions” and which incorporates “idioms (e.g. over the moon), lexically fixed expressions (e.g. ad hoc), light verb constructions (e.g. make a mistake), institutionalized phrases (e.g. kindle excitement) and verb-particle constructions (e.g. run away)” (Patrick and Fletcher, 2004 : 1).

Then, the aim of computational linguistics is to determine the “**compositionality**” or “**decomposability**” of multi-word expressions including verb-particle constructions in other word “**whether individual elements determine the meaning of the construction**” (Patrick and Fletcher, 2004 : 2). This means that a verb-particle construction can be fully idiomatic that is to say that none of its parts contribute to its meaning or it can be compositional, in other words, in a multi-word expression which is compositional, the meaning of the entire expression is determined by the meaning(s) of one or all of its parts as illustrated by the following table extracted from Patrick and Fletcher's article entitled *Differentiating Types of Verb-Particle Constructions* (2004) :

VPC Example	Verb Contributes to Meaning	Particle Contributes to Meaning
1. Peter put the picture up	Yes	Yes
2. Susan finished up her paper	Yes	No
3. The thief made away with the cash	No	Yes
4. Barbara and Simon made out	No	No

Table 1. Summativity of VPCs; whether individual elements determine the meaning of the construction.

This table clearly illustrates the notion of compositionality and summativity and it is necessary to understand these notions for the purpose of this work. Indeed, the aim of this study is to show that verb-particle constructions are not created arbitrarily and therefore to understand how a specific meaning is attributed to a specific verb-particle construction as far as it is possible to do so. Consequently, it is necessary to define which part of the construction contributes to the meaning of the whole construction or more precisely which part of the meaning is given by each element when the phrasal verb is entirely compositional (i.e. when both elements contribute to its meaning). Each of these four examples illustrates one possibility over the four possibilities of compositionality (or non-compositionality). These examples are commented and explained more in detail by Patrick and Fletcher :

In these examples, 1) “put up”, is entirely composed of its constituent parts, as at the end of the action, the painting is both “put” somewhere, and is now “up”. In 2) “finished up”, the paper is finished but nothing is “up”, in 3) “made away”, the thief is “away” but nothing is “made”, and in 4) nothing is either “made” or “out”. (Patrick and Fletcher 2004 : 2).

According to Patrick and Fletcher's comment on these examples, we can conclude that the elements participating in the construction of the meaning of the phrasal verb can be both the verb and the particle as it is the case in example 1) “put up” meaning “raise sth from a lower to a higher position” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006). As a consequence, this means that the phrasal verb is fully compositional since “the painting is both “put” somewhere, and is now “up””.

Then, the second possibility is that only one element participates in the meaning of the phrasal verb which is illustrated by examples 2) and 3) namely “finish up” and “make away”. “Finish up” means “complete what you are doing; to do the last part of sth” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs*

Dictionary, 2006) which corresponds to “Susan finished up her paper”. For this example, Patrick and Fletcher underline the fact that “the paper is finished but nothing is “up”” meaning that only the meaning of the verb is obvious in the construction which is true, at least if the meaning is taken literally but we will see later that the addition of the particle is not completely useless in “finish up” but that “up” must not be used for its literal meaning but rather for its aspectual one which will be developed and explained more in detail later in this work. Then, “make away” defined as “steal sth and take it away with you” corresponds to “the thief made away with the cash” and for which Patrick and Fletcher explain that “the thief is “away” but nothing is “made”” that is to say that only the meaning of the particle is obvious and that the verb “make” seems to have been chosen arbitrarily. In this case, we could say that the phrasal verb is “semi-compositional” since only one of its parts participates in the meaning of the whole construction.

Finally, sometimes neither the meaning of the verb nor the meaning of the particle is used in the verb particle construction which indicates that it is categorized as “full idiom”. Indeed, an idiom is “a group of words in a fixed order that have a particular meaning that is different from the meaning of each word on its own” (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/fr/dictionnaire/anglais/idiom> accessed 24 September 2017). It is the case of example 4) namely “Barbara and Simon made out” and for which “nothing is either “made” or “out”, in other word, no explanation can be given for the association of the words composing the phrasal verb which is why it is considered as fully idiomatic.

At this point of the study, the tools which will be used for this work are described but this does not mean that some of the statements made here are completely true. Indeed, as it was explained in the case of “finish up”, the particle “up” is used for a specific purpose even though it is not for its literal meaning. Consequently, sometimes it is not possible to find an explanation with the literal meaning of each part, it is necessary to look further and to give other information in order to give an interpretation about the meaning of a specific verb-particle construction. As an illustration, and example extrated from Bannard, Baldwin and Lascarides (2003) will be used in order to analyse a construction in particular. The example in question is the following one :

(4) Philip gunned down the intruder

Concerning this example, Bannard et al (2003) explain that “it is the particle that contributes its simplex meaning and not the verb. As a consequence of Philip's action the intruder is *down*, but since there is no simplex verb *to gun*, we would not say that anyone gunned or was

gunned” (Bannard et al, 2003 : 66) and then on the same page “and [(4)] cannot entail that Philip gunned the intruder because there is no simplex verb to gun. **This is a very useful way of testing whether the simplex verb contributes to the meaning of the construction**” (Bannard et al, 2003 : 66). Actually, it is true that there is no simplex verb to gun and that we cannot “say that anyone *gunned* or *was gunned*”. However, we cannot say that the verb does not contribute to the meaning of the phrasal verb in this example. Indeed, according to the definition of *The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary* (2006), “gun down” means : “shoot sb, especially so as to kill or seriously injure them : He was gunned down outside his home.” Therefore we understand that the noun “gun” is converted and used as a verb in order to create the phrasal verb “gun down” from which results a specific meaning that could be paraphrased as follow : 'put someone **down** by shooting them with a **gun**' (or a firearm). Another argument in favour of the contribution of the verb to the meaning of the construction is the possibility to obtain almost the same paraphrase with the phrasal verb “beat down” whose definition is the following : “severely injure sb by hitting and kicking them” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary*, 2006) that could be paraphrased 'put someone down by beating them'. This shows that in “gun down”, the word “gun” even though it is not a verb, becomes a verb by means of conversion in order to be used as a verb and contributes to the meaning of the verb-particle construction. We can even say that the particle indicates that the victim is down and the verb expresses the way it happened. This demonstration underlines the fact that verb-particle constructions cannot be explained easily or thanks to their literal meaning and that therefore it is necessary to analyze them in detail in order to give satisfactory explanation to their meaning.

Next, to come back to the very notion of compositionality and starting from the table above, it is possible to create a classification according to the compositionality (or non-compositionality) of verb-particle constructions. Indeed, this is what has been done by Patrick and Fletcher (2004) and which is illustrated in the following table :

Class	Description	Example(s)
N – Non-decomposable VPCs (Phrasal Verbs)	Verb-preposition pairs which are semantically related, and whose meaning is somewhat or wholly idiomatic.	<i>“Leeds United carried off a massive victory.”</i> <i>“John and Julie made out.”</i>
D – Decomposable VPCs	Verb-preposition pairs which are semantically related, but whose meaning is literal, or where the preposition is redundant.	<i>“The bee carried the pollen off to another flower”</i>
I – Independent verb-preposition pairs	Verb-preposition pairs which have no semantic relationship.	<i>“The cables carry around 1,000 volts”</i>

Table 2. Description of NDI classification scheme.

This table illustrates the three different categories of verb particle constructions proposed by Patrick and Fletcher. The first category which is presented is labelled under the term “N” for “Non-decomposable VPCs” that is to say for phrasal verbs which can be classified as “full idioms” as already mentioned earlier in this work. However, the term “non-decomposable” underlines the fact that it is not possible to “decompose” the phrasal verb, that is to say that we cannot use the literal meaning of each part and that therefore, the phrasal verb is more linked to the notion of “non-decompositionality” than to the notion of “compositionality”. In other words, there is **no compositionality** for this type of phrasal verbs.

Then, the second category is “D” for “decomposable VPCs” meaning phrasal verbs for which the meaning of each part is transparent or for which the particle only emphasizes the meaning given by the verb itself. Contrary to the “Non-decomposable VPCs”, the meaning of each part contributes to the meaning of the complete construction or the meaning of the particle only underlines the meaning which is given by the verb, as if it were used as a support to the simplex verb more than for its own semantic properties. This means that the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the particle are quite similar and that they both express the same idea. In both cases, it is possible to “decompose” the phrasal verb in question and it is thus **fully compositional**.

Finally, the third and last category “I” for “independent verb preposition pairs” describes the verb-preposition pairs with no semantic relationship meaning that as it is the case in the “decomposable” category, each element contributes to the meaning of the construction but the difference is that there is no semantic relationship between them. In other words, we can say that

they are **complementary** to each other.

Of course, a classification can be specifically created for the need of each study which means that this classification is used as a starting point and as a source of inspiration but phrasal verbs are quite complex and other elements have to be taken into consideration. This first explanation enables us to have a first look at the functionality of phrasal verbs and to tackle notions which will be very useful for this study. The fact that other elements are important in the comprehension of verb particle constructions can be illustrated with an analysis of the example used in Patrick and Fletcher's (2004) last category :

(5) The cables carry around 1,000 volts

If it is true that “carry” and “around” have no semantic relationship with each other, that is to say that they do not both express the same idea, it does not mean that their association is not logical. Actually, they are complementary to each other as it was explained earlier. Indeed, here “carry” is used in a metaphorical way meaning that of course the cables do not literally “carry” anything but the electricity is conveyed from one point to another through the cables and since the cables are generally fixed all around in a house, we can say that “the cables carry around 1,000 volts” and both the verb and the particule contribute to the meaning of the phrasal verb. Therefore, this example highlights the fact that it is necessary to look a bit further in order to analyze those constructions more in detail and to take into account the fact that words do not only convey a literal meaning but also sometimes what could be labelled as a “metaphorical” meaning (at this point of the study at least) that is to say a meaning derived from the literal one but which is not used literally but rather “figuratively”. It is often the case in English and especially concerning particles and an example will illustrate this idea. According to *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006), the particle “up” literally means “movement upward, from a lower to a higher position”, metaphorically expresses “the idea of something increasing in volume, speed, price, strength and reputation” and also conveys an aspectual meaning marking telicity (i.e. the completeness of an action) which is discussed in Cappelle and Chauvin (2010) more in detail. In addition, since sometimes the particle seems to indicate none of the meanings mentioned above and are thus classified as idiomatic particles (Jackendoff 2002, Cappelle 2005), it is necessary to take a lot of elements into consideration in order to create a useful and relevant “classification” of the various and numerous verb-particle constructions. Indeed, we will see later that those constructions are far more complex than the literal meaning of words but that it does not prevent us from finding as many explanations as

possible concerning the construction of phrasal verbs. Consequently, since the difference between particles (i.e. adverbial particles) and prepositions have been evoked, it is thus necessary to analyze the differences between the two “categories” more in detail which is what is developed in the following part of this work.

3. Differentiating particles from prepositions : a syntactic and semantic approach.

As already explained earlier in this work, the most controversial question concerning phrasal verbs is the status of the “second element”, in other words and generally speaking, the particle. Indeed, generally, there is a distinction between particles and prepositions as already explained briefly at the beginning of this work. However, the explanations given previously were intentionally simplistic in order to present phrasal verbs from a general point of view but now the aim is to go further into the explanations given and to analyze the syntactic properties of particles and prepositions more in detail. In order to do so, arguments from different linguists will be exposed and explained. The aim is to present the works of different linguists from different generations in order to see how the point of view has changed on this question over the years and to demonstrate that some arguments are still valid today which shows their acceptability. In addition to the presentation of the syntactic aspect of particles and prepositions, phrasal verbs (i.e. generally speaking) will be analyzed from a semantic point of view. This presentation of the syntactic tests starts with Bruce Fraser and his book entitled *The Verb-Particle Combination* (1971), the aim is to expose the first arguments given by Fraser in 1971.

3.1 Fraser, *The Verb-Particle Combination* (1976)

In his book entitled *The Verb-Particle Combination*, Fraser explains the differences between prepositions and particles and he demonstrates that it is possible to separate them into two categories relying only on their syntactic differences. The “syntax” is “the grammatical arrangement of words, showing their connection and relation” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996) and syntactic tests consist in manipulations which can be applied to particles and prepositions in order to determine the nature of these elements, some manipulations can function with prepositions but not with particles and the other way round. Fraser explains that these tests are sufficient to categorize particles and prepositions :

In this section we will show that the distinction between a verb-particle combination

on the one hand, and a verb-preposition and/or verb-adverbial sequence on the other, can be maintained on the basis of their syntactic patterning and without reference to their semantic interpretation. (Fraser 1976 : 1)

Indeed, the first argument given by Fraser in order to differentiate particles from prepositions is “**this property of being able to appear after the direct object** which we claim to be sufficient to distinguish a verb-particle from a verb-preposition combination” (Fraser 1976 : 2). He gives the following examples which have been modified (i.e. the sentences have been written completely) in order to be more easily understood :

- (6) a. He sped the process up
 - *He sped the pole up
- b. Harry will look the client over
 - *Harry will look the fence over
- c. The man reeled the line in
 - *The man reeled the street in
- d. She ran the pamphlets off
 - *She ran the stage off

With Fraser's examples, we can see that the first sentence of each pair is grammatical whereas the second one is ungrammatical which shows that there exists a syntactic difference between prepositions and particles. Indeed, to be grammatical, the second sentences should be the following ones : “He sped up the pole”, “Harry will look over the fence”, “The man reeled in the street” and “She ran off the stage”. Actually, this “property of being able to appear after the direct object” is related to a concept explained earlier in this work and which is the fact that some phrasal verbs (i.e. generally speaking) are “separable” and other are “inseparable”, here, the phrasal verbs are **separable** in the first sentence of each pair and **inseparable** in the second one. This property “support[s] the claim that the formatives like *up*, *over*, *in* and *off* in the second sentence of each pair are indeed **prepositions**” (Fraser 1976 : 2).

Moreover, Fraser does not focus on the semantic aspect and thus on the semantic differences between particles and prepositions but these sentences do not have the same meaning depending on the status of the particle (i.e. generally speaking), on the order of the words in the sentence (i.e. the syntax) and also on the context of the sentence. In order to illustrate this statement,

one of the examples presented in (6b) will be analyzed more in detail. In order to make a relevant remark on this example, the preposition of the second sentence appears at the right place in the sentence :

(7) a. Harry will look the client over.

b. Harry will look over the fence.

In the first example, the particle “over” appears after the direct object whereas in the second sentence, “over” must appear before the noun phrase “the fence”, and as explained by Fraser, this is because in this second case, “over” is a preposition and not a particle.

Then, from a semantic point of view, the two sentences have two completely different meanings thus “look over” does not have the same meaning in example (7a) as in example (7b). In the first sentence, “over” is a particle and thus modifies the meaning of the verb “look”, therefore , here “look over” (sb) means “check or examine sb/sth to see how good, how big, etc.” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary*, 2006), the example given in this dictionary is the following one : “*He looked the painting over carefully*”, so we can deduce that “look over” can be replaced by “examine” or “check”.

In the second sentence, “look” and “over” both keep their meaning, that is to say that “Harry will 'literally' “look” and that “over” brings a precision about the direction giving the information “over the fence”. In order to illustrate this, we could ask “Where will Harry look?” and answer “over the fence” whereas in the first sentence, we cannot ask the same question. Indeed, for example (7a), we could ask “Who will Harry look over?” and the answer would be “the client”, which shows that in the first sentence, the particle is linked with the verb in order to function as a single unit whereas in the second one, “over” is more closely linked to the noun phrase following it, that is to say “the fence” forming the prepositional phrase “over the fence”, thus, in this example “over” is a preposition. Consequently, according to the answers given for these two questions, we can notice that in both cases, “look over” is transitive.

Next, Fraser underlines the fact that **particles are more related to the verb it follows whereas prepositions are more closely linked to the noun phrase following them** which is what was explained with examples (7a) and (7b) given above. Fraser also gives other syntactic properties permitting us to differentiate particles from prepositions :

There are also other syntactic properties which serve to differentiate the verb-particle

from verb-preposition combinations, properties which support the claim that the formatives like *up*, *over*, *in* and *off* in the second sentence of each pair are indeed prepositions; that is, that they are syntactically more closely associated with the noun phrase which follows them than with the verb which precedes. In this connection, we note that true prepositions usually have at least the following four properties: (1) various short adverbials may precede the preposition-noun phrase combination (prepositional phrase); (2) prepositional phrases may often occur in sentence-initial position; (3) prepositional phrases function as a syntactic unit in sentences in which gapping has occurred (cf Ross, 1967); and (4) the stress given the preposition is often very weak, if not completely reduced, with a pause possible just before it. (Fraser 1976 : 2)

In order to illustrate these four properties, Fraser gives an example for each of them. The first one concerns the fact that “various short adverbials may precede the preposition-noun phrase combination” :

- (8) a. Harry looked furtively over the fence.
- b. *Harry looked furtively over the client.

In examples (8a) where “over” is defined as a preposition, it is possible to add a “short adverbial” like “furtively” in the sentence whereas it is not possible in example (8b) where “over” is a particle. Indeed, again the particle and the verb must not be separated and must appear as a single unit.

Then, the second property namely “prepositional phrases may often occur in sentence-initial position” is illustrated with the following example :

- (9) a. In the street, the man reeled as if drunk.
- b. *In the line, the man reeled as if drunk.

Again, the first sentence is grammatically correct whereas the second one is not. Also, the difference is not just syntactic but also semantic. Indeed, in the first sentence, the verb “reel” means “walk, moving from side to side, looking like you are going to fall” (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/reel> accessed 8 September 2017) and the preposition “in” is linked to the noun phrase “the street” forming the prepositional phrase “in the street” which can be placed at the beginning of the sentence.

On the contrary, in the second sentence, “in the line” cannot occur in sentence initial-position since the particle “in” is more closely linked to the verb “reel” in order to form the phrasal verb “reel in” literally meaning “to wind sth on/off a reel” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb dictionary*, 2006) illustrated with the following example : “The line caught on something in the water as he reeled it

in” but which is used metaphorically in the example above.

The third example illustrates the third property that is to say “prepositional phrases function as a syntactic unit in sentences in which gapping has occurred” :

- (10) a. He sped up the street, and she, up the alleyway.
b. *He sped up the process, and she, up the distribution.

For this example, we can notice that gapping (i.e. the omission of the verb in the second of two coordinated clauses) is possible in the first example with the preposition “up” whereas it is not in example (10b) with the particle “up”. Again, the meaning is not the same for each sentence, in example (10a), “speed up” means that the subject went up the street very quickly whereas in the second example, “speed up” means “accelerate”. The fact that gapping is not possible can be easily explained. Indeed, in the first sentence, “up” is used as a preposition and it indicates the direction in which the subject “he” went, and the verb “speed” indicates the way he did it. In this sentence, the first subject “he” and the second one “she” did not go toward the same direction, indeed, if they both went “up” somewhere, they did it at two different places. Since they went to these places the same way, it is possible to keep the same verb for the two clauses and to modify only the direction in which they went.

On the contrary, for the second sentence, “speed up” is considered as a single unit which could be replaced by a simplex verb, here, “accelerate”, we could say “*He sped up the process, and she, up the distribution” in order to avoid the repetition of the verb, but since “up” is part of the phrasal verb “speed up”, it is not possible to use “up” in the gapping. Finally, the last examples given by Fraser have to do with phonetics and illustrate the fourth property which is “the stress given to the preposition is often very weak, if not completely reduced, with a pause possible just before it” :

- (11) a. She ran off [əf] the stage.
b. She ran off [əf] the pamphlets.

Again, a semantic analysis will show that there is a difference of meaning between example (11a) and (11b). Indeed, in the first sentence, “ran off” means “escape from sb/sth by running” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary*, 2006) whereas in the second one “ran off” means “produce copies of a piece of writing, etc. on a machine” or “produce sth that is usually difficult to write, such as a poem, speech, etc. quickly and easily” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006).

As a conclusion to Fraser's syntactic tests, we can notice that in 1976, when he wrote his book, Fraser could already find four syntactic tests allowing us to differentiate particles from prepositions even though he could not explain everything concerning verb-particle constructions and that today, linguists have found solutions to problems which were not solved or understood at that period. Indeed, the four syntactic tests given by Fraser can be used as a starting point to this syntactic study of phrasal verbs (i.e. generally speaking) but as already mentioned briefly in this part of the study and as it will be developed later, the syntactic properties of particles are linked to their semantic properties. Indeed, we noticed that in Fraser's examples, for each sentence the syntactic difference between the preposition and the particle was also linked to a semantic one. Therefore, we can conclude that syntactic tests constitute important clues for the analysis and the comprehension of phrasal verbs but that a semantic explanation must be given in order to explain the syntactic differences. Consequently, other syntactic test will be exposed and explained but each time, a semantic explanation or development will be exposed in order to underline the differences and the fact that those differences are not purely syntactic.

3.2 O'Dowd : a three way classification of particles

In the first part of her book entitled *Prepositions and Particles in English : A Discourse-functional account* (1998), O'Dowd intends to find a syntactic solution to what she calls “the problem of P”. Indeed, the aim of her first chapter is to find an efficient way to clearly separate particles from prepositions through syntactic tests which are supposed to fix the “problem of P”. Some of these tests were already used by Fraser under other denominations and other will be presented later in this work. As a consequence, O'Dowd's syntactic tests will not be developed in this part of the study devoted to her work. Indeed, the aim of O'Dowd's introduction to this work is to present **a three way classification of particles namely : prepositions, adverbial particles and adpreps**. The first two notions have already been presented in this study but O'Dowd, using Bolinger's work, explains that there exists a third category in which we could place what has been called “the second element”. Indeed, this time the aim is to focus on the particle (i.e. generally speaking) itself and to analyze it according to the way it is linked to the verb preceding it or to the noun phrase following it. As a matter of fact, O'Dowd presents examples taken from Bolinger (Bolinger, 1971, quoted in O'Dowd, 1998) who actually invented the notion of “adprep” which is presented and illustrated with the following examples :

- (12) a. She swept off the stage (cleaned it)
b. She swept off the stage (did her sweeping elsewhere)
c. She swept off the stage (departed majestically)

The three examples presented are the same sentence repeated three times but which can be interpreted differently each time. Indeed, the meaning has been put in brackets and we can notice that even though the three sentences given in this example seem to be identical, their meaning is different. Of course, this semantic difference can also be illustrated syntactically as follow :

- (13) a. She [swept off] the stage
b. She swept [off the stage]
c. She [swept off] [off the stage]

Each example presented in (13) corresponds to the same example given in (12). We can notice that for the first example, the phrasal verb “sweep off” is used in the sense of “cleaning” that is to say “remove sth from somewhere, especially by brushing with your hands, a brush etc.: *He swept the crumbs off the table. (figurative) The wind swept her hat off.*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) as well as in examples (12b) and (13b) whereas in examples (12c) and (13c) the verb is rather used figuratively. These examples are presented in order to introduce the “three categories” given by O'Dowd and to be aware that sometimes, a clear separation between preposition and particle is not possible even though generally there are clues more in favour of one of the two categories.

Indeed, as an illustration, in examples (12a) and (13a), what is important is the phrasal verb taken as **a single unit** meaning that off is a particle. Concerning examples (12b) and (13b), the action of sweeping is taking place “off the stage”, elsewhere, in other words anywhere but on the stage. Concerning this example, the verb is used as **a simplex verb** meaning “clean or clear (a room or area etc.) with or as with a broom” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996) and “off” is used as a **preposition** added to the noun phrase “the stage” in order to form the prepositional phrase “off the stage”. These two examples illustrates notions which have been seen before in this work, that is to say, phrasal verbs for the first one and prepositional verbs for the second one. What is more intriguing is the third example.

Indeed, finally and more importantly, examples (12c) and (13c) are a mixture of the use of a particle linked to a verb to create a phrasal verb which is presented in examples (12a) and (13a)

and the use of a preposition linked to a verb and constituting what is called prepositional verbs and which is mentioned in examples (12b) and (13b). This “mixture” between the two well-known categories and thus between a particle and a preposition is what was called an “adprep” by Bolinger (among other linguists) and used by O'Dowd. An “adprep” is an item which is half an adverb (i.e. an adverbial particle) and half a preposition. Such a term illustrates the fact that the “particle” (i.e. generally speaking) is **as related to the verb as it is related to the noun phrase following it**. Consequently, we come back to what has been mentioned earlier in this work namely the relationship with the verb and the relationship with the object. Indeed, it was explained that particles are more closely linked to the verb it follows than with the object it precedes and that, on the contrary, prepositions were more related to the object they precede than to the verb they follow. The creation of this third class shows that there can be “particles” which have a close relationship with the verb as well as with the object. “Accordingly, as we might expect, categorial tests [...] reveal the adprep in [(12c) and (13c)] as patterning in some ways like a preposition and in some ways like an adverbial particle.” (O'Dowd 1998 : 23) which only shows that particles in general are sometimes considered as prepositions and sometimes as particles even though most of the time it is possible to find out which role a particle (i.e generally speaking) plays. However, as illustrated in this paragraph, in some cases it appears that the particle seems to belong to both categories which can be justified by the following quotation :

Both Bolinger's and Talmy's interpretations seem to hold to the principle that, at some underlying level of syntax, the preposition and the particle are categorially distinct, even though they may be semantically identical” (O'Dowd 1998 : 24).

This quotation clearly illustrates the fact that indeed, prepositions and particles belong to two different categories even though they share the same meanings since they are homophonous, homonymous and both polysemous and that they can be separated into these two categories thanks to syntactic tests :

Much of the syntactic literature seems to agree on a polarization of P between the two categories of preposition and particle. The definition of these terms varies according to theoretical perspective, but it is generally agreed that prepositional Ps are somehow bound in constituency to a following NP, whereas adverbial particles are more bound to the verb. (O'Dowd 1998 : 14)

As a conclusion to this paragraph, the aim of presenting those examples was to demonstrate that in general tests used alone do not always permit to find a suitable solution to the

problem of “P-forms” as O'Dowd puts it and that particles, generally speaking, are sometimes considered as prepositions and sometimes as adverbial particles depending on their link with the verb and on their link with the noun phrase following the phrasal verb. However, it appears that sometimes, the particle seems to be as related to the verb as to the object following it even though it is generally possible to determine whether the particle belongs to the category of adverbial particles or to the category of prepositions which is why these two important notions will be developed more in detail.

We can also notice that the syntactic properties of particles depend on their semantic properties and on the context or the situation which will be explained at the end of this study. This necessity to take other element into consideration is pointed out by O'Dowd :

In conclusion to this chapter on categoriality, I suggest that syntactic tests do not clearly establish a dichotomy between prepositions and particles, although they do reveal a tendency for P-forms to participate in constructions and collocations which constrain their syntactic role. The most satisfactory explanations for the test results all seem to suggest that categoriality is flexible, influenced by semantic and pragmatic considerations. (O'Dowd 1998 : 25)

3.3 21st century : Jackendoff (2002), Cappelle (2004)

3.3.1 Tests for “particlehood”

As it was mentioned in the last paragraphs, the analysis of particles and prepositions relies on an analysis led from a syntactic point of view but also a semantic and pragmatic point of view. However, we noticed that at least two of these notions were linked together namely the syntactic and the semantic aspect. Nevertheless, syntactic tests enable us to find clues leading to the solution of the problem of particlehood as it was demonstrated with Fraser. The difficulty is to find tests which are valid in every circumstance otherwise they are not useful. The task is not easy since there exist different types of particles (directional, idiomatic and aspectual) and of prepositions. Indeed, this point will be developed more in detail later in this work. These internal differences make the task of establishing truly relevant syntactic tests quite difficult. Indeed, all syntactic tests are not valid since they “do not clearly establish a dichotomy between prepositions and particles” (O'Dowd 1998 : 25) however, this can be explained by the necessity to take into account the differences existing within each category as mentioned previously.

In his paper entitled *The Particularity of Particle, or Why They Are Not Just Intransitive*

Preposition (2004), Cappelle explains that tests can give different results depending on the category to which particles and prepositions belong and this is the reason why he decides to focus on one of these categories. Actually, the aim of his article is to tackle three different claims concerning particles which are : Particles and full PPs (prepositional phrases) behave syntactically alike, particles are reduced PPs and particles have the same meaning as their related prepositions. Cappelle intends to show that even if there are arguments in favour of these claims, there are also arguments against them which shows that particles and prepositions operate differently. In his work, he explains that his demonstration only concerns directional particles and that :

If it can be shown that even *directional* particles have different properties (leaving aside their lack of an object) from full directional PPs, then this must mean that particles *in general* cannot simply be analysed as one-word prepositional phrases, i.e. as “intransitive prepositions”. In that case, we will have to conclude that particles form a category *sui generis*. (Cappelle 2004 : 8)

Cappelle intends to compare particles with full PPs (i.e. Prepositional phrases such as “into the garden”) in order to prove that particles are not “intransitive prepositions” which he names “one-word prepositional phrases” in the quotation above. His aim is to demonstrate that directional particles and directional prepositional phrases do not syntactically behave the same way and that therefore the differences between them permit us to put them into two different categories.

Firstly, he shows that indeed, “particles and full PPs behave syntactically alike” (Cappelle 2004 : 9) but for the needs of this study, this part of his work will not be developed since the point is to show their difference.

Consequently, even though several factors have to be taken into consideration, it is still relevant to use some syntactic tests. As a consequence, concerning the differences between particles and full PPs, Cappelle presents not less than fourteen syntactic tests in order to prove that particles are different from prepositions. Of course, these fourteen tests will not be developed here, but it may be necessary to mention some of them especially the first one which is considered as the most useful test to detect “particlehood” as Cappelle put it and which is illustrated by him under the examples (19) and (19') which are here examples (14) and (14') :

- (14) a. She carried the logs into the house
- b. *She carried into the house the logs
- (14') a. She carried the logs in
- b. She carried in the logs

These examples illustrate the fact that full prepositional phrases and particles do not operate the same way since the shifting of the full PP “into the house” before the object “the logs” is not possible, otherwise the sentence is ungrammatical. Indeed, full PPs have to be put after the object when the verb is transitive therefore example (14b) is not correct whereas if we do the same manipulation with a particle, this time the sentence is grammatically correct as illustrated in example (14').

Consequently, we obtain two different results which show that indeed, particles and prepositions are not the same. Even though Cappelle developed several tests in his article, “this property is in fact **the standard test for particlehood. The ability to appear in post-verb-pre-object position** is a robust diagnostic for distinguishing particles from other elements, including full PP's” (Cappelle 2004 : 11). This statement concerns particles and is the opposite of Fraser's statement concerning preposition which was : “**this property of being able to appear after the direct object** which we claim to be sufficient to distinguish a verb-particle from a verb-preposition combination” (Fraser 1971 : 2). This shows that indeed particles must follow the verb whereas prepositions can be moved after the direct object and therefore do not have to appear right after the verb it is linked to.

Next, the second argument given by Cappelle is the fact that “particles and full PPs occupy different places with respect to each other. Particle must go first, and PPs have to follow them” (Cappelle 2004 : 12) or in other words “**the particle must precede any PP complement**” (Jackendoff 2002 : 72). This second argument was already mentioned at the beginning of this work with the example “how are you making out in your new home”. Here, it is represented with the following examples partially taken from Jackendoff's examples (10a) and (10b) on the same page :

- (15) a. Jill grew up into a strong woman
 Sim ran away to the city
- b. *Jill grew into a strong woman up
 *Sim ran to the city away

Once again, this test allows us to determine another property of particles and the relationship between particles and prepositions (here prepositional phrases). The examples (15a) show that the elements composing the phrasal verbs “grow up” and “run away” cannot be separated by the “PP complement” (Jackendoff 2002) or the “full PP” (Cappelle 2004) otherwise the sentence is not grammatical. In order to be grammatical, the particle must appear right after the verb and the preposition is added after the phrasal verb. For example, in the first sentence, “up” is part of “grew

up” and “into” is added after “grew up” in order to form the prepositional phrase “into a strong woman”.

Finally, over the fourteen tests used to prove that particles and full PPs do not behave syntactically alike, the next test which is used claims that “unlike single particle, full PPs can be used as a (sort of) rightdislocated element after a sentence with locative inversion whose initial element is *here* or *there*” (Cappelle 2004 : 16). This can be illustrated with Cappelle's examples whose reference is given in his paper :

- (16) a. There goes Harry, into the woods.
b. Speak of the devil ! Here comes Mr. Crab now, down the hill.
- (16') a. *There goes Harry, away.
b. *Speak of the devil ! Here comes Mr Crab now, down.

This test was selected because it appears as quite relevant. Indeed, in the first example, the prepositional phrase “into the woods” can be moved at the end of the sentence whereas in example (16'a), the phrasal verb “go away” is inseparable thus the particle “away” must appear after the verb and cannot be moved at the end of the sentence. Then, the second sentences of each example imply the phrasal verb “come down” and we can see that for the second sentence, “down” cannot be used on its own, in other words, when it is linked to a prepositional phrase it can be moved at the end of the sentence but this is not possible when there is no complement.

Of course, the three tests presented among the fourteen suggested by Cappelle only concern directional prepositions as explained previously and they consist in a comparison between particles and full prepositional phrases, consequently, in order to mention more methods to identify particles and to prove that particles and prepositions are part of a different category, four more tests used by Jackendoff (2002) and Cappelle (2004) will be presented. These tests were not contested nor presented by O'dowd (1998). Jackendoff's examples are presented here (Jackendoff 2002 : 70) :

- (17) a. Bill ran [pp up the street].
*Bill ran the street up. [no inversion of P and NP]
It was up the street that Bill ran. [Cleft]
Up which street did Bill run? [Wh-movement with pied-piping]
- b. Bill looked [Prt up] [NP the answer].
Bill looked the answer up. [inversion of Prt and NP]

*It was up the answer that Bill looked. [no cleft]

*Up which answer did Bill look? [no pied piping]

Examples (17a) concern directional prepositional phrases whereas examples (17b) involve particles (which are not directional). Indeed, in examples (17a), “up” is directional that is to say that it is added to the verb “run” in order to express an upward movement, in other words, “up” is here a preposition which is different from “up” used as a particle and from which results the verb “run up” meaning “move quickly towards sb/sth: *she ran up to me, smiling*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary*, 2006). In this case, “up” is rather used to express the speed at which the movement is executed but this does not mean that the movement is upward. As a consequence, in this first example “up” forms a constituent with the NP “the street” and not with the verb “run” which forms a prepositional phrase (PP). This link with the object as more important than with the verb was explained several times before. Once this explanation has been given, it is possible to focus on the three tests which are presented here. Indeed, we can notice that the syntactic uses which are grammatical for the prepositional phrase “up the street” are ungrammatical for the particle “up” and the other way round. However, it is necessary to underline the fact that in examples (17a) we are dealing with a directional preposition whereas examples (17b) involve a particle which does not express a directional movement.

Consequently, there exist several tests in order to find a solution to the problem of particlehood, however, it is clear that these tests are not always valid as O'Dowd put it (O'Dowd 1998 : 25) and that, as we noticed, it is necessary to take other aspects into account as for example the differences which exist within the categories of particles and prepositions.

As a conclusion, I would say that syntactic tests can be useful and help understand that particles and prepositions do not belong to the same category even though those tests cannot be applied to every type of particles and prepositions which shows their limit. Consequently, what has to be kept in mind is that if the classification of particles and prepositions into two different categories appears as quite complicated, it is because there exist differences within each category which prevents linguists from finding efficient tests that would be applied to every particle and every preposition.

3.3.2 Particles as intransitive prepositions

The claim that particles are “intransitive prepositions” could make sense since “English

verb particles form a class that is for the most part homophonous with prepositions” (Jackendoff 2002 : 69) it is thus legitimate to think that particles and prepositions are the exact same words but used differently. However, since a preposition is “a word **governing** (and usu. **preceding**) a noun or pronoun and expressing a relation to another word or element.” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996) we can say that the term “intransitive preposition” may appear as a bit contradictory. Indeed, if the role of a preposition is to express a relation to another word or group of words that it **precedes**, it is no longer a preposition if it is intransitive but indeed if particles can be labelled with this term, it is because as underlined by Jackendoff in the quotation given above, particles are homophonous with prepositions and since they do not precede any object, they are labelled as “intransitive preposition”. Of course, sometimes the object governed by a preposition is implied which can be problematic. Indeed, this is presented by Cappelle who mentioned many examples which were given by Jespersen (Jespersen 1924 : 88-89, quoted in Cappelle 5-6) and which are used here as an illustration :

(18) Put your cap on/Put your cap on your head.

(19) He was in/He was in the house.

(20) He climbs up/He climbs up a tree.

(21) He falls down/He falls down the steps.

In these examples, we can notice that the same phrasal verb can appear with or without an object. For the first example, “on your head” appears as obvious since the sentence “put your cap on” allows to think that the subject must put his cap on his own head. For the second example, “he was in” expressed the fact that the subject “he” was “in”, in other words “inside” but it could be “in a pub” or “in a shop” etc, the hearer cannot guess where the subject was if the precision “in the house” is not given by the speaker and the same explanation can be given for examples (20) and (21). We can therefore think that in these examples, “on”, “in”, “up” and “down” are prepositions which are not followed by any object, that is to say “intransitive prepositions”. This is what is developed by Cappelle “particles can indeed be called 'intransitive', in view of the fact that particles do not have a complement. To the extent that many particles are homonymous with prepositions, there is not much harm in calling them 'intransitive prepositions'” (Cappelle 2004 : 6). Then, he explains that there are “two complications”, one of them will be developed later in this work. For now, we will focus on something which appears important when it comes to define “particles”.

Actually, in the examples given above the verbs “put”, “be”, “climb” and “fall” all preserve

their original meaning, in other words, the preposition or particle added to them does not change their meaning. In fact, a “preposition” is an element which is put before the object it governs and the role of a particle is not to govern the object following it but rather to be added to the verb that precedes it in order to form a single unit, a particle is “an accented item that does not take an object and that usually **has a fairly close bond with the verb**” (Cappelle 2004 : 1). Consequently and again, the most important information that has to be taken into consideration is the fact that particles have a “close bond with the verb” in the sense that they are more linked to the verb than to the object following them as already explained. Again, Cappelle explains that “since there are many items that alternate between the use as a preposition and the use as a particle, homonymous sequences [...] are not so hard to come by” (Cappelle 2004 : 3) before illustrating his sentence with examples taken from Huddleston (Huddleston 2002 : 282, quoted in Cappelle 2004 : 3) used here under the examples (22) and (23) :

(22) a. They turned [in the wrong direction].

b. The [turned in] the fugitives. ('took them to the police')

(23) a. She ran [off the road].

b. She [ran off] another copy. ('produced one on a machine')

These two examples clearly illustrate the difference between prepositions and particles in the sense that prepositions are linked to the object whereas particles are linked to the verb in order to form a single unit. In examples (22a) and (23a), “in” and “off” are used as prepositions and are heads of the prepositional phrases “in the wrong direction” and “off the road” whereas in examples (22b) and (23b), they are used as particles, indeed, they are no longer linked to the noun phrases which follow that is to say “the fugitives” and “another copy” but they are linked to the verb in order to create a new meaning. If it is true that in examples (22a) and (23a) the verbs “turn” and “run” are used with their literal meanings, on the contrary, in the examples (22b) and (23b), the addition of the particle transforms each verb and gives them a new meaning as underlined by the definitions indicated in brackets.

Consequently, my first argument concerning the definition of a particle is that it is added to a verb in order **to form a single unit** and to provide a new meaning to the verb in question. Of course, this does not mean that phrasal verbs which are literal are prepositional verbs, what has to be kept in mind is the **close link with the verb** even when the verb-particle construction is not an idiomatic construction it does not mean that we are dealing with a preposition and not a particle as

illustrated with the following examples borrowed from Cappelle (Cappelle 2004 : 4) :

(24) a. Jill decided [on her wedding dress].

b. Jill [tried on] her wedding dress.

In the example (24a), the verb is “a so called 'prepositional verb', like *approve of NP, ask for NP, believe in NP, complain about NP, consist of NP, look after NP, object to NP, wait for NP, etc.*” (Cappelle 2004 : 4) that is to say a verb that has to be followed by a preposition in order to be linked to the noun phrase (NP) following it. In this case, the preposition clearly plays its role of relating the verb to its object, in the first example, the preposition “on” creates a link between the verb “decide” and the noun phrase “her wedding dress”, this preposition is necessary since we cannot say “*Jill decided her wedding dress” which concerns every prepositional verb. In the example (24b), the particle “on” is not used in order to create a link with the verb “try” and with the noun phrase “her wedding dress” but is rather a complement to the verb. Indeed, even though the verb “try” keeps its literal meaning here, the particle added to it gives a precision and thus gives another meaning to the verb “try”, “Jill tried on her wedding dress” meaning “she tried it **on her** in order to see what she looks like with it”. However, it is necessary to underline the fact that it is not because a verb is prepositional that its meaning cannot be changed by the preposition. Indeed, even though particles have a closer link with the verb than preposition concerning phrasal verbs in general, this does not mean that the preposition does not have an impact on the meaning of the simplex verb to which it is attached.

In order to illustrate this purpose, we can use one of the prepositional verbs given by Cappelle in the quotation above, that is to say “look after” . If we look up this prepositional verb in *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006), we find the following definition : “make sure that sb/sth is safe; take care of sb/sth : *His parents are looking after the children this week end.*”, this verb is a prepositional verb, it is identified as such in this dictionary with the following structure : v + prep, but still, the meaning of the simplex verb “look” whose definition is “use one's sight; turn one's eyes in some direction” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996) is derived here with the addition of the preposition “after” and the verb-particle construction resulting from this association is not the literal meaning of each element composing it. Therefore, we can notice that even though the verb is a prepositional verb, the meaning of the whole is different from the literal meaning of each part which means that particles are not the only elements which can modify the meaning of a verb but the difference lies in the link between the particle (i.e generally speaking) and the words surrounding it.

As a conclusion to this chapter, the information which has to be kept in mind is that a particle has a closer link with the verb than with the noun phrase following it whereas a preposition is more closely linked to the noun phrase it governs which forms a prepositional phrase (PP) but this does not mean that they have no relationship with the other elements composing the sentences.

Since the syntactic and semantic split between prepositions and particles has been presented and explained, it is now possible to focus on them more in detail. This is the purpose of next part of this work. The aim is to present the properties of prepositions and especially of particles which will be presented and analyzed more in detail.

4. The uses of prepositions explained

Throughout the present work was mentioned the fact that particles (i.e. generally speaking) could participate in the meaning of phrasal verbs therefore determine the compositionality of it. In addition to this, the possibility for particles to be interpreted differently was explained, and we saw that their meaning can be literal, “metaphorical”, aspectual or idiomatic depending on the purpose for which it is used. Moreover, we noticed that particles seem to be more linked to the verb whereas prepositions appear as being more closely associated with the object following it. However, the category of “adprep” was presented with O'Dowd. “Adprep” is the name used to define particles (i.e. generally speaking) which seem to belong to both the category of adverbial particles and the category of prepositions in the same sentence meaning that they are as linked to the verb they follow as they are to the object they precede, we noticed that generally, it is quite possible to find a difference between the two categories even though in some case, the role of the particle can be ambiguous. Consequently, now and for this part of the study, we will focus on prepositions and explain that they are generally divided into two different categories depending on their **syntactic involvement** in a sentence as opposed to their **semantic participation**.

4.1 A bipart classification of prepositions ?

In the same way particles belong to several categories (idiomatic, aspectual etc.), prepositions are generally divided into two different groups namely **lexical prepositions** vs. **functional prepositions**. Indeed, every part of speech (i.e. verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions etc.) is labelled either as a functional item or a lexical item or, as it is the case for prepositions, or as both, depending on the use that is made of it. Consequently, a functional item is defined as follows :

“a linguistic item is [+functional] if it provides connectivity between items in a sentence [...] without this [+functional] item, a sentence [...] is more difficult to interpret as the lack of the [+functional] item makes it ungrammatical” (Thomann 2013 : 2). In other words, the role of a functional item is more grammatical than semantic, it is used in order to create a link between words composing a sentence but it does not give a specific meaning to the sentence.

In opposition to functional words, we find lexical words : “we consider a linguistic item to be [+lexical] if it contributes to descriptive or notional content. Essentially, **the Functional feature concerns the syntactic contribution and the Lexical feature concerns the semantic contribution**” (Thomann 2013 : 2).

Consequently, these are the two features which are attributed to prepositions in general, of course, a preposition is always functional since it is its first role to link words together, however, since both features can be assigned to items such as prepositions or “preposition-like” elements (i.e. particles : adverbial particles) we can deduce that, as already evoked previously in this work, prepositions can participate in the meaning of a sentence and thus can change the meaning of a verb the same way particles do.

4.2 Towards a four class classification of “prepositions”

In a recent study led by Littlefield and mentioned and continued by Thomann (Littlefield 2009, quoted in Thomann 2013), this possibility for the preposition to be both functional and lexical has led to a new point of view over the lexicality and functionality of prepositions and “preposition-like” elements. Indeed, in her work entitled *Reaching Up and Reaching Out : Preposition processing* (Thomann 2013), Thomann summarises Littlefield's work and explains that “the features lexical and functional were not held in binary opposition of one another as they had been in previous work” (Thomann 2013 : 1). As a consequence, a new classification into four categories has been developed by Littlefield. This classification is illustrated by the following table taken from Thomann (Thomann 2013 : 2) :

		+Functional	-Functional
		+Case assignment (IP) Specific complement type	-Case assignment No specific complement type
+Lexical	+Semantic content +Theta-role assignment (morphophonetically heavy) Open class category	Semi-lexical Preposition (<i>in, on, under, with</i>)	Adverbial Preposition (<i>throw up the ball</i>)
-Lexical	-Semantic content -Theta-role assignment (morphophonetically light) Closed class category	Functional Preposition (<i>of</i>)	Particle (<i>throw up 'vomit'</i>)

Table 3 : The Prepositional Domain

The table above presents with the four categories established by Littlefield. Each category is linked to the notions of lexicity and functionality meaning that they have been created according to whether they are lexical or functional. Before explaining these four categories, it is necessary to define the following features : [+functional], [-functional], [+lexical] and [-lexical]. Indeed, “a preposition is [+functional] if it is able to link elements in a phrase together [and] a preposition is [+lexical] if it contributes to a descriptive content and a [-lexical] item cannot” (Thomann 2013 : 3). As a result, it appears necessary to present these four categories more in details.

Firstly, the category of “**semi-lexical prepositions**” concerns prepositions which are completely functional since they perform their role of case-assigners (i.e. they link elements together) and which “also convey descriptive content, and are thus [+lexical]” (Thomann 2013 : 4), meaning that they contribute to the meaning of the sentence. In order to illustrate this definition, the following table excerpted from Thomann (Thomann 2013 : 5) is presented :

Theta-roles	Examples
Locative	The book is on the table
Goal	We flew to Chicago
Source	We flew from Boston
Path	I walked along the river
Recipient	I gave the book to him
Benefactive	I bought it for him

Instrument	She cut the paper with scissors
Agent	You were bitten by the dog

Table 4. Theta-roles assigned by semi-lexical prepositions.

The second category which is presented is “**functional prepositions**” and implies prepositions which are purely functional, meaning that they “don't contribute significant semantic content and can assign Case” (Thomann 2013 : 6). This category is illustrated by the following examples given by Thomann on the same page : “*The destruction **of** the city*” and “*Sarah is proud **of** her son*”.

Next, the third category which is presented deserves more attention giving the subject of this work. Indeed, it concerns “**adverbial prepositions**” which are presented before being commented on. Indeed, this category concerns “adverbial prepositions” which contribute descriptive content but cannot assign Case, meaning that they are [+lexical] and [-functional]. The example which is given for this category is the following one :

(25) throw up the ball.

If we analyze this example, we can notice that it belongs to a category of phrasal verbs which has been mentioned previously in this work. Indeed, the phrasal verb “throw up” means “lift sb/sth and make them move upwards into the air by moving your hand quickly” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) thus giving its definition, it appears that this phrasal verb is fully compositional, in other words, both the verb and the particle contribute to the meaning of the construction. Undeniably, the verb “throw” corresponds to “by moving your hand quickly” and the particle “up” refers to the movement “upwards”. The aim of this explanation is to show that according to the elements presented previously in this study, “up” is not defined as an “adverbial preposition” but rather as an adverbial particle since we demonstrated that prepositions and particles are different from each other and therefore have to be divided into two categories. However, the decision to call them “adverbial prepositions” can be explained by the fact that “up” completes the verb “throw” and at the same time is linked to the object since we can say that “the ball is up (in the air)” which reminds us of the category of “adprep” introduced by O'Dowd, but still, here the most important function of “up” is its lexical participation to the meaning of the phrasal verb.

Finally, the fourth category which is presented concerns “**particles**” which are defined as

neither functional nor lexical which would mean that the particle does not participate in the meaning of the verb not more than it is used as a Case-assigner. Consequently, we could wonder why the particle is added to the verb if it does not modify its meaning and if it is not added to link words together. Actually, again, this situation has already been presented earlier in this work and refers to aspectual or idiomatic particles which will be more developed in the following paragraphs.

All the same, this four class classification decided by Littlefield illustrates the ambiguity of prepositions and particles, therefore, added to other elements, makes us understand why it is so difficult to clearly classify or separate particles and prepositions or even to find syntactic tests which could be valid for each subcategory. However, we can notice that both “adverbial prepositions” (i.e. adverbial particles for us) and “particles” share the same feature namely the [-functional] whereas “semi-lexical prepositions” and “functional prepositions” both belong to the [+functional] feature showing that indeed, particles and prepositions can be divided into two different categories.

Consequently, this observation proves what has been demonstrated previously concerning the dichotomy between particles and prepositions. Of course, since other differences exist, it is thus more complex to have a clear view of all the characteristics of each category, which is the reason why now that prepositions have been presented, it is important to come back to particles and to expose their characteristics more in detail. The conclusion of the next part of this work will lead us to a better comprehension of phrasal verbs and of their complexity which will enable us to obtain a better method to analyze them more accurately.

5. The characteristics of particles

As already mentioned earlier in this work, particles can be used to express different ideas and therefore are generally linked to a verb for a specific reason. Indeed, the four different uses of particles have been presented and now each of them will be developed more in details. As a reminder, particles can be used literally, usually expressing a direction or “metaphorically” meaning that its literal meaning is applied to abstract concepts, however, we will see that the question of the metaphorical use of particles is closely related to the notion of aspect which will be developed more in detail in this part of the study. Finally, the category of idiomatic particles logically appears as the last one since those particles do not seem to express any of the meanings mentioned above.

5.1 Directional particles

As indicated in the title of this chapter, directional particles indicate directions. Indeed, they are added to the verb in order to indicate the direction in which the movement expressed by the verb is performed. According to Cappelle (Cappelle 2005) we can distinguish **four types of directional particles** since “different directional particles may have different kinds of impact on the aspectual properties of motion event” (Cappelle 2005 : 362) meaning that directional particles can be separated according to the durativity of the event expressed by them.

The first category concerns particles which “are basically locative but that are interpreted as expressing a **non-extended path** in a motion construction” (Cappelle 2005 : 362) meaning that the path (i.e. the trajectory followed by the subject performing the movement) is quite short. This category concerns particles such as : “*apart, aside, away, back, in, off, on (surface support), out, together*” (Cappelle 2005 : 362), indeed, if we take the example of “move out” in the sense of “leave a particular place, area or situation: *We watched the boat moving out of the harbour*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) we can notice that in the example illustrating the definition, once the boat has “mov[ed] out of the harbour”, the action of “moving out” is completed which shows that indeed, the path expressed by this type of action is “a non-extended path”. As a consequence, the action cannot last for a long period of time and thus is **telic** meaning that the end of the event is inscribed in the event itself.

Besides, Cappelle presents a test which is used in order to detect telicity and which he uses for the explanation and illustration of this first category of directional particles. Indeed, this test consists in the compatibility of an action with the two following “durational adverbial phrase[s]” (Cappelle 2005 :362) : “**in X time**” and “**for X time**”. As a consequence, Cappelle explains that :

An event like *jump aside* or *run out* has no duration to speak of, and accordingly cannot combine with a durational adverbial phrase, whether of the 'in X time' or of the 'for X time' (e.g. I jumped aside {**in a second/*for a few minutes!*}), at least not when such a phrase is used to measure the duration of the motion event itself rather than the run-up period, the resultant state or a series of repetitions of the event. (Cappelle 2005 : 362)

Consequently, these two adverbial phrases enable us to test the duration of an event, actually, if the predicate is compatible with “in X time”, this means that the event is telic and thus the action is performed until it **naturally ends** whereas the compatibility with “for X time” expresses the atelicity of an event in the sense that this event can be interrupted but does not have a natural endpoint. These two tests are presented by Cappelle (Cappelle 2004 : 4) as an illustration of the “telicity” of the particle “up” :

(26) a. I drank tea {for an hour/*in an hour}

b. I drank up my tea {in 30 seconds/*for 30 seconds}

In example (26a), the action of drinking tea lasts for an hour but it could last for a longer or a shorter period of time. Actually, it can last until the subject performing the action decided to interrupt the action whereas in example (26b), “up” implied the end of the action meaning that the tea (i.e. a cup of tea for example) is completely drunk up, therefore the action of drinking it ends when the result is that there is no tea left in the recipient. Since this test has been explained, we can come back to the case of directional particles.

Indeed, the second category mentioned by Cappelle involves directional particles which “express a **bounded path** [meaning a path which is clearly restricted which concerns] *about* (180° rotation around one's axis, i.e. 'to a reversed position'; 360° around one's axis), *across*, *(a)round* (encirclement; 180° rotation around one's axis, i.e. 'to a reversed position'; 360° around one's axis), *over*” (Cappelle 2005 : 362). Those particles also express **telicity** since the bounded path involves an event which does not last in time, as illustrated by the following example excerpted from Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 363) :

(27) She walked across {in/*for} seven days.

Concerning this example, *across* used as a preposition would give a different result but I will not develop this idea in this chapter since the aim is to present the characteristics of particles.

Next, the third category of directional particles implies particles which “express a **non-bounded path** [and which are] “: *about* (random directions), *ahead*, *along*, *(a)round* (random directions), *on* (continuation)” (Cappelle 2005 : 362) and therefore which are atelic thus compatible with “*for X time*” but not with “*in X time*” as illustrated with Cappelle's example as follow :

(28) He hiked along {*in/for} five hours.

Concerning example (28), again, this particular result is valid when “along” is used as a particle. The fact that a non-bounded path is related to the notion of **atelicity** completely makes sense since the movement expressed by the verb can last for an undetermined period of time.

Finally, the last category presented by Cappelle concerns directional particles which

“express **a path that may or not be bounded** [namely] “: *by, down, home, up* ('to a higher position'; 'towards a contextually salient point')” (Cappelle 2005 : 362) and which can be **both telic or atelic** which is logical since a bounded path implies telicity whereas a non-bounded path does not. This fourth category is more clearly illustrated by Cappelle in the following quotation :

For instance, referring to a mountain and its peak, you can say that you *climbed up in five hours*, referring to the upward path itself, you can say that you *climbed up for five hours* (before you headed back or before the path sloped downward again). In the first case, the path is conceived of as endbounded by the peak, whereas in the second case, the path is not construed as having a definite end-boundary (or in any case, the end boundary is not included within the focus of attention). (Cappelle 2005 : 364)

This division of directional particles into four categories shows that the directions indicated by those particles can be of different kinds. Moreover, the fact that the nature (i.e. bounded or non-bounded) of the path has an impact on the telicity of the event proves that the notion of telicity is also linked to the object following a particle (i.e. a phrasal verb) and not only to the particle itself. This possibility that the telicity of an event could be linked to other elements than the particle itself has been evoked at the beginning of this work and will be developed more in details. In addition to this categorization of directional particles according to their aspectual impact, they can also be analyzed in term of compositionality and lexicality which are two notions that have been mentioned and explained previously in this work. Consequently, these other characteristics of directional particles are explained and summarized in the following quotation excerpted from Jakendoff :

Any verb that selects a directional PP can take any directional particle instead, and the meaning is fully compositional. Hence, such combinations are fully productive, and there is no need to list the verb-particle combinations in the lexicon. Rather the particles stand alone as a lexical item. (Jackendoff 2002 : 75).

This explanation points out the literal meaning of directional particles and underlines the fact that verb-particle constructions involving directional particles are fully compositional, in other words their meaning is the result of both the contribution of the verb and of the particle.

The next category of particles which will be presented concerns “aspectual particles” and in the same way directional particles were presented in detail, in the sense that they were all linked to a specific sub-category, I will now do the same with aspectual particles.

5.2 The notion of aspect : preliminary work to “aspectual particles and semi-aspectual particles”

As explained previously, the meaning of a particle can be literal (i.e directional), “metaphorical” or aspectual and when it does not refer to one of these three notions, it is defined as “idiomatic”.

In this chapter, the notion of aspect will be developed in detail. Indeed, it is a complex and important notion which has to be understood when it comes to study the aspectual meaning of phrasal verbs.

5.2.1 Definition

First of all, it is necessary to give a definition of the notion of aspect as it is developed and explained by Cappelle (2005) under the term of “lexical aspect” (as opposed to grammatical aspect) as follow :

Lexical aspect corresponds to what is referred to by the German term 'aktionsart' (or by its plural form 'aktionsarten'). Issues of interest in this domain are whether the lexical material in the VP represents a situation as having some duration or as taking up only a short moment in time; whether the situation is represented as consisting of a single occurrence or as being made up of sub-situations that repeat themselves; whether the VP refers to a situation that, by itself, tends to a natural endpoint or to a situation that can, in principle, go on for ever; whether the VP refers to a static or dynamic situation; and so on. Research into lexical aspect as led to a number of classification of situations into different 'aspectual classes', also known as 'eventuality type' or 'modes of action' (the translation of 'aktionsarten'). A well-known typology is Vendler's (1967 : 97-121) four-way distinction between 'states', 'activities', 'accomplishment' and 'achievements'. (Cappelle, 2005 : 344).

In his definition, Cappelle explains the origin of this notion and its meaning therefore we can understand that the notion of aspect designates **how a situation is represented** and he mentions several situations which are defined more in detail in Walková (2015) and McIntyre (2008) in particular.

5.2.2 Situation types and aspectual features

Before anything, it is necessary to start with the explanation of the different situations given by Cappelle. Actually, the first two that is to say “as having some duration or as taking up only

a short moment in time” and also but less obviously “is represented as consisting of a single occurrence or as being made up of sub situations that repeat themselves” represent the notions of **durativity** and **punctuality** which means that “a VP [(verb phrase)] is durative if it is perceived as lasting for a period of time, and it is punctual if perceived as instantaneous, as not having any internal temporal structure” (McIntyre, 2008 : 1).

Next, the following situation mentioned by Cappelle “tends to a natural endpoint or to a situation that can, in principle, go on for ever” illustrates the notion of **telicity** which can be explained as follow : “a situation is telic if it has a natural completion or endpoint arising from the meaning of the VP. If not, it is atelic” (McIntyre, 2008 : 1). This notion of telicity is particularly important since it is actively discussed concerning the aspectual meaning of particles in verb-particle constructions.

Finally, Cappelle's statement “whether the VP refers to a static or dynamic situation” refers to the notion of **dynamicity** which “sets apart non-dynamic states from dynamic events (activities, accomplishments, achievements)” (Walková, 2013 : 5). Once these four notions have been defined and explained clearly, it is thus possible to give the explanation of Vendler's four-way distinction mentioned by Cappelle at the end of the quotation.

Indeed, the four “situation types” mentioned above namely “states”, “activities”, “accomplishments” and “achievements” are defined by McIntyre in *Tense, Aspect and Situations Types* (2008) as follow : “**states** are situations which are static (unchanging) throughout their duration [...] states don't involve change [...]. A situation that is not a state is called an event.”; “**activities** are durative and atelic, they typically involve an agent. Unlike states, they are dynamic, i.e some sort of change is involved.”; “**achievements** are punctual and telic” and finally, “**accomplishments**” are durative and telic. They consist in an activity with an achievement at the end of it”. The following examples (29), (30), (31), and (32) partially borrowed from examples (16), (17), (18), (19) given by McIntyre (2008) illustrate the “four situation types” which have been defined :

(29) He hates beer, she knows the answer. (states)

(30) Work, eat ice cream, play the piano. (activities)

(31) Explode, flash, spot a tiger, hit the wall. (achievements)

(32) Burn down, hammer the metal flat, paint a picture. (accomplishments)

Those examples illustrate the definitions given by McIntyre which are going to be

developed more in detail. Indeed, the first example corresponds to the situation-type named **“state”**, this situation does not involve any action contrary to the other three, we can notice that “he hates beer” is not an action, the subject “he” does not do anything and the predicate “hate beer” is not an action but a state, a fact or an information about the subject.

The second example concerns **“activities”** as in “play the piano”. As underlined by McIntyre, activities involve an agent meaning a subject performing the action which is defined as “durative” since this type of situation lasts in time and atelic because the action itself does not imply its own end.

The third example concerns **“achievements”** meaning actions which are punctual and telic since they only happen once and do not last in time, indeed, for example “hit the wall” cannot last in time, it is a very short action and it can last in time only if there is a repetition of the action meaning that the subject would “hit the wall” several times and consecutively.

Finally, the fourth example involves an **“accomplishment”** that is to say an action which lasts in time, indeed, “hammer the metal flat” is an action that takes some time to perform and this action involves its own end because once the metal is flat, the action is over, the purpose is accomplished which is why this situation-type is called “accomplishment”, what matters is the result.

It is important to clearly define all those terms because they are the basis of the notion of aspect and it is really necessary to understand this notion in order to analyze the aspectual meaning of particles in verb-particle constructions. Furthermore, as already explained previously, those terms refer to notions which are all linked together, consequently, the **“aspectual features”** that is to say durativity (and thus punctuality), telicity and dynamicity are features of the **“aspectual classes”** or **“situation types”** in other words of states, activities, achievements and accomplishments which can be illustrated in the following table which was taken from Walková’s table 1 (Walková 2013 : 7) and which original title has been kept :

situation types	durativity	dynamicity	telicity
states	+		
activities	+	+	
accomplishments	+	+	+
achievements		+	+

Table 5. Aspectual features of Vendler's aspectual classes from Olsen (1994)

This table illustrates the definitions used previously and given by McIntyre (2008), it represents the four situation types and their aspectual features as indicated in its title. Indeed, this

table is a summary of the definitions and explanations given previously which permits to see which aspectual features are involved in each situation type. To summarize, the four situation types : states, activities, accomplishments and achievements imply three aspectual features namely durativity, dynamicity and telicity.

5.2.3 Notions related to the aspectual meaning of particles

Now that the theoretical framework has been given, it is possible to come back to particles and to illustrate the notions mentioned above. Indeed, for the moment, the concept of aspect may appear as quite abstract and as having no relationship with particles but it will become clearer with some examples. Consequently, it is important to present and define some of the notions linked to the aspectual meaning of phrasal verbs. These notions are mentioned and illustrated by some examples in Walková (2015) :

The particle in aspectual particle verbs contributes an aspectual meaning to the verb root (e.g. Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman 1999; Jackendoff 2002). This aspectual meaning may involve various notions, such as aimless behaviour (e.g. *play around*), persistent action (e.g. *work away*), endurance (e.g. *last out*), and completion (e.g. *drink up*), as suggested by Quirk et al. (1985 : 1162-1163), or inception (e.g. *Start up*), continuation (e.g. *Play along*), iteration (e.g. *Write over*), and completion (e.g. *Cut off*) as proposed by Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman (1999 : 432-433). (Walková 2005 : 149)

This gathering of information given by Walková provides us with terms which correspond to what is developed above by Cappelle and which are illustrated with an example for each of them. Each definition given for each example is taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary* (2006).

Indeed, the first notion mentioned by Walková is “**aimless behaviour**” which is illustrated with the verb “play around” meaning “behave in a careless way, without thinking about the results”, for this notion, we can see that it concerns an activity which implies durativity but which is not telic (i.e. which is therefore **atelic**) that is to say that the end of the action is not announced by the construction as well as for “**persistent action**” illustrated by the verb “work away” meaning “continue to work hard for a period of time” and the notion of “**endurance**” with “last out” for which all definitions convey a notion of time : “survive for a period of time”, “continue in the same situation or manage to do sth for a particular length of time” and “be enough for a particular length of time”. Of course, with this last example we can notice that the meaning is also conveyed by the verb “last” itself but this point will be explained more in detail later in this work. We can also include the notion

of “**continuation**” with “play along” meaning “pretend to agree with sb/sth, to believe sb/sth, etc., to gain an advantage, amuse yourself, avoid trouble, etc.”. All those events imply durativity but not telicity and they represent activities or states.

Then, on the contrary, the notion of “**inception**” with the example “start up” meaning “begin happening”, “start operating, make sth start operating” or “start operating or trading, establish a business” represents actions which are achievements that is to say that the action is punctual and thus telic. Indeed, the action of starting something cannot last for a long period of time.

Finally, it is important to underline the fact that the particle “up” is often considered as a marker of telicity which will be discussed later. For the moment, it is important to understand that the addition of the particle “up” (or another one) has an important impact on the representation of an event :

It cannot be denied that there are cases in which a simplex verb refers to an atelic event whereas a combination of the same verb and an added particle refers to a telic event. We have already cited drink/eat vs. {drink/eat} up. Other examples include fade vs. fade out, polish vs polish down, etc. However we would like to argue that the telicizing capacity of particle is not to be overemphasized. (Cappelle 2005 : 354)

Indeed, the examples given by Walková (2015) to illustrate the notion of “**completion**” is “drink up” meaning “finish all of a drink” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary*, 2006) whereas the simplex verb “drink” is defined as “swallow (a liquid)” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996) which does not imply the notion of telicity that is to say that “drink” describes only the action of drinking while “up” added to the verb “drink” expresses the idea of “drink something completely” illustrated by the use of the verb “finish” in the definition of “drink up”. In addition, the particle “off” can also imply the notion of “completion” with the verb “cut off” which is an achievement meaning that it implies dynamicity and telicity since the action is punctual.

Another aspect refers to the moment when “the situation is represented as consisting of a single occurrence or as being made up of sub-situations that repeat themselves” which is the notion of **iteration** illustrated by the verb “write over” expressing a repetition of the action of writing in the same way “*cook the food over* means 'cook the food again' or 're-cook the food'”(Jackendoff 2002 : 79).

Actually, the various notions and examples given by Walková are concrete illustrations of table 5 which combines aspectual features with situation types.

As we saw with “last out”, sometimes the verb itself has an aspectual impact on the

construction and the particle is redundant as underlined by Jackendoff (2002 : 76) : “it can be freely omitted. It is often even redundant” speaking about “up” which can be attributed to other particles than “up” as soon as the verb and the particle both express the same idea as in “cut off”. In other words, other elements than the particle can contribute to the aspectual meaning of a combination as explained in Walková (2015 : 152) : “one needs to take into account the type of verb root with which the particle combines, the transitivity of the particle verb and the type of direct object”. Of course, some of these notions will be developed later but it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that the particle is not the only element in the construction that can contribute to its aspectual meaning.

Now that the notion of aspect has been introduced and developed more in details in the last part of this work, another type of particles can be exposed. Indeed, the different aspects expressed by particles were mentioned briefly but now aspectual particles will be developed more in detail.

Indeed, the aim is to give more information about the aspectual impact of particles on phrasal verbs and to show that the notion of “metaphorical use” mentioned previously is actually aspectual (i.e semi-aspectual). As a consequence, some of them will be presented briefly whereas others will be developed more in details. However, the aim of this chapter is to present those particles in order to have a better knowledge of the different aspectual meanings expressed by particles. Finally, this part will concern the semantics of aspectual and semi-aspectual particles therefore I will not develop their syntactic characteristics but rather focus on the ideas expressed by them and on the telicity (or atelicity) implied by their addition.

5.3 Aspectual particles

In his thesis entitled *Particles Pattern in English, a Comprehensive Coverage* (Cappelle 2005), Cappelle lists all particles which have an aspectual impact on the action expressed by the verb they accompany and he separates them into two categories : aspectual particles and semi-aspectual particles. The explanation for this split is quite logical, indeed, aspectual particles express an aspect of the event described but the literal meaning of the particle is completely absent and it appears difficult to make a link between the aspectual particle and its directional meaning whereas semi-aspectual particles express an aspect which seems to be “metaphorically” related to their directional meaning as pointed out by Cappelle concerning the particle “away” : “this use is, of course, closely related to directional *away*, and may easily be seen as a metaphorical extension of it” (Cappelle 2005 : 432). Those particles will be presented depending on their aspectuality or semi-aspectuality even

though some of them can belong to both categories.

5.3.1 Aspectual “about” and “around”

The first two particles presented are “**about**” and “**around**” which are linked to the notion of “**inactivity and aimlessness**” and which are considered as aspectual particles. This notion was already presented in the introduction and illustrated by Walková (Walková 2015 : 149) with the verb “play around” however, I would like to focus on the verb “fiddle around” whose definition is “spend your time doing nothing or doing sth that is not important : *He's fiddling around in the garage*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) and which therefore completely illustrates the notion of “inactivity and aimlessness” firstly introduced under the term of “aimless behaviour”. Moreover, we can notice that some phrasal verbs including “about” and “around” are more transparent (e.g. *play around*) than others (e.g. *fiddle about*). In addition, concerning the fact that particles imply telicity, Cappelle explains that :

It is clear that {*about/around*} does not convey a directional meaning in these examples, but it is equally clear that it does not convey anything like telic aktionsart either [...]. On the contrary, the particle underscores the atelic nature of the event. As pointed out above, however, its meaning is richer than just '+telic' : apart from this aspectual sense, it conveys negative appreciations. (Cappelle 2005 : 367)

Indeed, a general belief is that particles are markers of telicity as explained in the introduction of this work, but here, Cappelle insists on the fact that this particle does not mark telicity but rather another idea which is the notion of “inactivity and aimlessness”. As a consequence, it appears logical that such a particle does not mark telicity but rather atelicity since an event which has no goal, no accomplishment at the end of it, cannot imply telicity, in other words, the action of doing nothing could last “forever”, or at least, until the subject started doing something.

5.3.2 Aspectual “along”

Next, the following particle which is presented concerns “along” which is a bit more complex to understand as an aspectual particle than other ones. Indeed, the idea expressed by the particle “**along**” depends on whether it is associated to a verb of movement or to a verb referring to an event. Consequently, when it is associated to a verb of movement, it generally implies the idea of “**continuation**” but Cappelle explains that in motion event (i.e. event which implies a movement),

“along” should not be considered as an aspectual particle because indeed :

In motion contexts, *along* merely expresses the spatial idea 'further in the same direction', and this, of course, inevitably gives rise to the idea of continuation in time. For example, if you *walk along*, this simply means that you walk further down a real or imaginary path; naturally, this can only happen if the walking also extends further in time, but this is not what is expressed by *along* in itself. (Cappelle 2005 : 377).

According to Cappelle this idea of “continuation” is a secondary effect of the real aspectual meaning of “along” which completely makes sense since we saw earlier that the telicity or atelicity of an event can be expressed by a particle but is also the result of all the elements composing a sentence. Then, another argument is given by Cappelle namely the fact that this interpretation is valid only when “along” appears after a verb of movement but not after verbs referring to “events that can be extended in time (e.g. sing along)” (Cappelle 2005 : 377). Finally, concerning motion events, “along” can be **inchoative** meaning that instead of expressing the idea of continuity, it implies the beginning of an action as in “*Please move along folks, there is nothing to see here*” (Cappelle 2005 : 377) which could be interpreted as “don't stay here” or “move away from here”. When not associated with verbs of movement, “along” is seen as “a **marker of synchronized temporal development**” (Cappelle 2005 : 377) as illustrated in the following example excerpted from Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 378) :

(33) The lecturer spoke freely, and students followed along on their handouts.

In this example, we can notice that the action of the students takes place “at the same time as” the action of the lecturer who speaks, which shows that “this use of along informs us that the event referred to by the verb temporally unfolds itself 'in sync' with another event, it could be argued that it really does convey something aspectual” (Cappelle 2005 : 378). Of course, the two actions do not really take place precisely at the same time, indeed, with the verb “sing along”, the idea of two people singing together is expressed but the first person starts singing and the second one “sings along” which shows “that the temporal simultaneity of the two events is not always perfect: they can also occur with partial overlap or in immediate succession” (Cappelle 2005 : 378). Finally, concerning the telicity involved by this aspect of “along”, Cappelle explains that the event could be seen as repetitive if it is durative, indeed, if two persons “sing along” they can sing together as long as they want to, but then the activity of singing would repeat itself until they stop. To conclude this

presentation of “aspectual along”, we can notice that this particle appears as more complicated to be developed as another aspectual one since its impact on the verb depends on the type of verbs and since it is important to understand that telicity is not always involved by the particle but rather by the verb itself or the context of the action.

5.3.3 Aspectual “away”

Then, next particle to be presented is “**away**” which is seen as “**continuative/iterative**” again depending on the action expressed by the verb. Indeed, Cappelle explains that “Brinton (1985 : 166) more specifically claims that *away* expresses continuation in those cases where the verb refers to an atelic event (“durative situations, which can be continued”) but iteration in those cases where the verb refers to a punctual (instantaneous) or telic event (“which cannot be continued” (Cappelle 2005 : 382). Indeed, this can be illustrated with two examples the first one is taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) and the second one from Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 382) :

(34) Ruth spends hours in the library, working away at Japanese.

(35) She was sneezing away.

In example (34), the verb “work” describes an action which can last over a period of time whereas in example (35), the action of “sneezing” is quite short and thus punctual but the presence of the particle “away” indicates that the action lasts, meaning that it is repeated several times. As a consequence, this “continuative/iterative” aspect completely makes sense. However, “away” can be used differently namely as “**inchoative away**”. Indeed, the verb “fire away” is defined as “used to tell sb to **begin** asking question or to begin to speak” but “talk away” means “talk without stopping for a period of time” (both definitions are taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs dictionary*, 2006) which shows that this “inchoative” aspect is less obvious than the “continuative/iterative” one. This difficulty is expressed by Jackendoff (Jackendoff 1997b : 540, quoted in Cappelle 2005 : 385) and mentioned by Cappelle :

For him, *away* always summons a continuative/iterative reading, a possible inchoative semantic reading occurring merely “in addition to the desired iterative reading”- or continuative/iterative reading, to be precise. So, Jackendoff considers the continuative/iterative meaning an invariable semantic aspect, which may sometimes have an inchoative sense as overlay.” (Cappelle 2005 : 385)

This quotation clearly summarizes the situation concerning the aspectual meaning of “away” showing that this aspectual particle generally expresses continuation/iteration and sometimes refers to the beginning of an action. As a consequence we can admit that the following quotation excerpted from Cappelle makes sense : “I think, therefore, that the presence of an inchoative surplus is merely a matter of interpretation based on contextual clues. We can nonetheless provide some generalizations” (Cappelle 2005 : 387). Actually, Jackendoff (Jackendoff 2002 : 77) uses “keep on V-ing” in order to illustrate the notion of continuation and he applies it to the aspectual particle “away” but also to “on” which will be developed more in details in the next paragraph.

5.3.4 Aspectual “on”

As a matter of fact, the following explanation implies the particle “on” which expressed “**continuation**” as already mentioned previously but which therefore implies some restrictions. Indeed, since this particle expresses an action which “continues”, it cannot be associated with every type of verb. Indeed, Cappelle gives eight restrictions which are illustrated in the following table and accompanied with examples taken from his work (Cappelle 2005 : 395-401) :

Restrictions	Examples
1 The verb must not be punctual	*Joan sneezed on.
2 The verb must not be telic	*The substance {dried, froze, melted} on.
3 The verb must not belong to the class of <i>stop, quit, end</i> etc.	*Will they cease on firing?
4 The verb must not evoke change	*His reading will improve on.
5 The verb must not be stative	*His mom worried on.
6 The verb is preferably not perfect	*He has read on.
7 The verb is preferably not progressive	?*He was snoring on.
8 The verb must be intransitive or have an independent intransitive use	Jack drank on ({*a glass of beer/*beer/*many pints of beer}).

Table 6. Cappelle's verbal restrictions applied on aspectual “on”

Those restrictions are presented in a table in order to have a clear view of all of them and mainly because some of them are related to each other by the notion they express. According to Cappelle, the first restriction implies that “the verb must **not be punctual**”, indeed, the example “*Joan sneezed on” is ungrammatical because this type of verb refers to actions which can be repeated but which do not last in time if they are not. As a consequence, it appears that “away” is a better choice to express the notion of iteration which explains why there are two particles which can express the notion of “continuation”.

The second restriction states that “the verb must **not be telic**” which appears as obvious since an action cannot last in time, at least not for a long period of time, if its end is inscribed in the verb expressing it. In the example “*the substance {*dried, froze, melted*} on”, the verb implies the end of the action since for example, once an ice cube is frozen, it cannot be more frozen therefore the action does not last. This point is made clear by Cappelle himself : “a prohibition on accomplishment verbs might seem obvious. Such verbs, per definition, have an endpoint beyond which they cannot be continued, so there is little point in adding a particle that says otherwise” (Cappelle 2005 : 396). Indeed, it would be completely contradictory to associate a verb which refers to the end of an action with a particle expressing continuation.

Next, “the verb must **not belong to the class of stop, quit, end** etc.” which is concisely explained by Cappelle : “naturally, continuative *on* does not combine with verbs that explicitly refer to the termination of an event” (Cappelle 2005 : 396). This third restriction is closely linked to the second one.

Then , the fourth restriction implies that “the verb must **not evoke change**”, indeed, the verb “improve” used in Cappelle's example implies a succession of changes, indeed, a person who is playing tennis for the first time can be bad at it and then, by practicing, becomes good and finally even better. This shows that “on” is used to express a purely regular action which stays the same from the beginning to the end.

Next restriction implies that “the verb must **not be static**”, indeed, as seen previously with the explanation of the aspectual features of Vendler's aspectual classes, even though they can express durativity, states do not imply the notion of dynamicity and therefore are opposed to actions. As a consequence, they can not be compatible with “on” marking the continuation of an action. However, the structure “keep on V-ing” can be used with these verbs.

Then, the sixth example states that “the verb is preferably **not perfect**”, at least not with the present perfect since “future, past perfect and conditional perfect tense forms seem much

better in comparison" (Cappelle 2005 : 399) as illustrated by Cappelle's examples on the same page :

(36) If you connect to an interest the reader, he will read on.

(37) Josette had read on so late into the night and been so excited over
what she read that sleep had quite gone out of her eyes.

(38) I could have read on for another entire book...

The explanation given by Cappelle is that the temporal views expressed by both the verb and the particle are incompatible which actually appears as relevant. Indeed, the example "*he has read on" implies that the result is known by the speaker, meaning that he could specify the amount of time during which the subject "has been reading" whereas "on" implies that the action continued for a period of time which is unknown, hence the incompatibility with telic events.

Then, the penultimate restriction states that "the verb is preferably **not progressive**" as illustrated with the example "?*he was snoring on", indeed, again, it possibly concerns the incompatibility of the two viewpoints as it was the case for the present perfect or because, according to Cappelle, it can be paraphrased by "?*He wasn't stopping (reading)" which is ungrammatical. It is quite possible that the viewpoints are problematic because indeed, the progressive refers to an action which is happening, a description of the action thus we could say "he was still reading" when describing someone in the middle of an action but not "*he was reading on".

Finally, the last restriction given by Cappelle implies that "the verb must **be intransitive or have an independent intransitive use**" indeed, the example "Jack drank on ({*a glass of beer/*beer/*many pints of beer})" shows that the addition of an object makes the use of "on" ungrammatical, indeed, we could say that this is because "a glass of beer" implies telicity since once the glass is empty, the action is over but "beer" and "many pints of beer" are also prohibited therefore Cappelle explains that it could come from the prohibition of an object or from the necessity for the verb to be intransitive being rather in agreement with the second idea. Indeed, I think it could be because an object involves the repetition of the action as for "many pints of beer", instead, we could say "Jack drank a pint of beer, then another one and another one" and since "on" seems to be rather used to refer to activities which are regular, meaning actions which stay the same from beginning to end, "on" therefore excludes repetition whether of punctual actions or of actions lasting in time which can explain the necessity for the verb to be intransitive. Moreover, "on" is used to express an action which has been momentarily interrupted and which then, continues.

As a conclusion, "on" and "away" are used to express the idea of continuation but "away" is linked to the notion of repetition whereas "on" seems to be used for unchanging and regular

actions.

5.3.5 Aspectual “out”

Next, the following particle concerns the aspectual use of “out” even though, according to Cappelle this particle often appears as idiomatic when not used for its directional meaning. As a consequence, it is difficult to clearly attribute an aspectual function to “out”. Indeed, “the aspectual meanings of *out* are harder to pinpoint or articulate than the aspectual meanings of particles discussed so far. The reason is that most instances of non-directional *out* involve idiomatic rather than clearly aspectual cases” (Cappelle 2005 : 403) . In this case, the meaning of “out” does not seem to express the same idea depending on the verb to which it is added as illustrated by the following examples given by Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 403) :

(39) A severe punishment was meter out to them. ('given')

(40) The wind snuffed out the flame. ('extinguished')

(41) I can't figure him out. ('understand, grasp')

“out” will not be developed much in detail in this paragraph since a part of this work will be entirely devoted to this particle, however, some information about “aspectual out” will be presented. As a consequence, the idiomatic combinations formed with “out” are not always fully idiomatic and can be partially explained which led to subclasses “shar[ing] some semantics elements” (Cappelle 2005 : 404) including the notion of 'distribution' expressed by verbs such as “give out” meaning “hand something to a lot of people: *The teacher gave out the exam papers*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006), and “hand out” defined as “give sth to each person in a group: *She handed textbooks out to the new students*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006). In the same way, several lists of verbs with “out” can be made according to the idea expressed by the verb. In addition, two other “notions” are given by Cappelle and which are important : the first one conveys the idea “in full” or “in detail” and is associated with the notion of production as of a document for example as in “*argue out a plan*” and which can also be used with verbs implying “calculation or computation” for which “we find the idea of carrying out an operation 'in full'” (Cappelle 2005 : 406). This idea will be more developed later in this work under the notion of “creativity”. Next, the second aspectual use of “out” which can be mentioned rather implies a semi-aspectual out therefore it will be explained in the next part of the present work.

5.3.6 Aspectual “through”

The penultimate aspectual particle presented is “**through**” and implies several notions even though it generally means “completely” as illustrated in the following examples given by Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 410) with his explanations in brackets :

(42) In reading a book from the first time, read the book through without stopping. ('from beginning to end')

(43) Trowa opened the fridge and scanned it through for bacon and eggs. (from top to botton')

(44) The smile that she flashed at me was almost proof that she'd worked the problem through. ('until (something) has been thoroughly dealt with a solution or decision has been reached')

Indeed, this use of “through” means “completely” in the sense that in the first example the book has to be entirely read, 'from beginning to end', in the second example, the fridge is entirely scanned in order to find specific ingredients and in the third example, the problem is entirely/completely examined in order to be solved. As a consequence, we can say that “through” has a telic impact on the verb to which it is associated since once the action has been completely performed, it cannot last for more time. Indeed, Cappelle compares two examples (Cappelle 2005 : 410) :

(45) I read the paper {in/for} an hour.

(46) I read the paper through {in/*for} an hour.

The incompatibility with the “for X time” structure demonstrates the fact that “through” is a marker of telicity since the same example without the particle is not telic.

5.3.7 Aspectual “up”

“Up” has been mentioned earlier in this work and it was associated with the notion of telicity. Actually, it is often claimed that particles in general are markers of telicity and “up” is

considered as the most telicizing particle which will be explained in the following paragraph. Indeed, “up” is seen as a “telicizer” as Cappelle puts it. Firstly, he proposes to analyze “up” as a telicizing particle and lists the verbs with which “up” appears as such. Those “types of verbs” are listed in the following table gathering Cappelle's examples (Cappelle 2005 : 415-418) :

Types of verb	Examples
1 After verbs of mixing	<i>mash, mix, scramble, shake etc.</i>
2 After verbs of heating	<i>fry, grill, heat, warm etc.</i>
3 After verbs of clean or treating-with- aproduct	<i>clean, grease, polish, shine, wash, wipe etc.</i>
4 After verbs of locking, fastening or tying	<i>close, glue, lock, seal, shut, tape, wrap etc.</i>
5 After verbs of repairing	<i>fix, heal, patch, sew, weld etc.</i>
6 After verbs of destruction, physical harm or spoilage	<i>bash, beat, blow, bust, cut, mess, stab, tear etc.</i>

Table 7. Cappelle's list of verbs occurring after “aspectual up”

The types of verb listed by Cappelle are often followed by “telicizing up” in the sense that once the action is done, it cannot last any longer. For example, with the first type of verbs once ingredients are mixed together, the action is over. However, Cappelle proposes that “up” actually refers to other notions than telicity and gives several argument against “up” as a telicizing particle. First of all, he explains that up cannot be replaced by “*completely*” which is illustrated by the following example given by Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 420) :

(47) she fried the fish {up/*completely/*to completion/*to a finish} good
and crispy.

Indeed, the example given above is a demonstration of Cappelle's argument : The fact that *up* cannot be replaced by *completely* indicates that such a result has been achieved without the situation having reached its absolute endpoint. As a matter of fact, there may not be an inherent endpoint to the situation at all : if you have heated up the soup (good), this does not mean that you cannot heat the soup some more. (Cappelle 2005 : 420) Indeed, “up” might not be seen as a telicizing particle

and may rather imply that **a satisfactory result is reached** as illustrated in example (47). Indeed, in this example, the aim of the action is to fry the fish “until it is good and crispy” not until it is not possible to fry it more. However, Cappelle explains that “there may not be an inherent endpoint to the situation at all” which appears as quite wrong since if we fry a fish until it is burnt, there will be a moment when it will not be possible to fry the fish some more and the same goes for verbs such as “freeze, heat etc.”. Another example given by Cappelle is the following one (Cappelle 2005 : 421) :

- (48) a. I wrapped the present up { in / *for } twenty seconds.
b. I wrapped up the present { in / *for } twenty seconds.

Examples (48a) and (48b) seem to give the same result but actually, there is a difference between the two of them. Indeed, according to Cappelle, instead of being telic, “up” implies “**resultativeness**” meaning that it focuses on the result of the action. As a consequence, in example (48b), we can say that “the present is wrapped”, of course, we could say the same thing for example (48a) but the action in itself appears as more important than the result whereas in example (48b), “up” points out the result of the action.

Then, Cappelle gives another argument, the possibility to add “a bit” or “some more” involving a notion which can be expressed by the verbs “improve” and “increase” as illustrated by the following example (Cappelle 2005 : 421) :

- (49) You may notice the place has been prettied up a bit.

This example illustrates the idea of improvement, indeed, we could say that “the place has been improved a bit in order to be prettier” and this does not mean that the place could not be prettier hence that an endpoint has been reached, but only that we can notice an improvement concerning the appearance of the place. As a consequence, Cappelle's argument appears as quite relevant. Consequently, we could say that “up” is resultative rather than telic since it expresses a result which is implied by the verb and not by the particle as developed by Cappelle :

Up is a resultative particle, but not, in the sense that it leads to the interpretation that the referent of the object NP was up as a result of the event. For example, *heat up the soup* does not result in the soup being *up*, as might be the case for directional *up* (cf Brinton 1988 : 179). Rather, the particle *up* is resultative in the sense that it directs the hearer's attention, not to the event itself, but to whatever salient result the event produces (which is different from each verb that combines with *up* and which is not

necessarily an inherent terminal point). For example, if you *heat up the soup*, you cause the soup to get in a (literally) 'heated' state. The heated state of the soup is a prominent result, foregrounded by the use of *up*. (Cappelle 2005 : 423)

This quotation from Cappelle clearly defines the idea of “up” as a resultative particle meaning that it is added to a verb in order to make the result appear as more important than the action itself. As a consequence, the fact that “up” implies a result does not mean that the action is telic therefore, the distinction is important. Indeed, the result is “not necessarily an inherent terminal point” meaning that sometimes it can be the case but this is not what is expressed by “up”.

As a conclusion to this part about aspectual particles, we can notice that those particles can have various meanings depending on the verb associated with them and that sometimes, it is complex to find an explanation since several elements have to be taken into account in order to determine the aspectual impact of a particle over a verb. Of course, here, only aspectual particles have been presented but there exist semi-aspectual particles which will be developed in the following paragraphs.

5.4 Semi-aspectual particles

As already explained briefly in the introduction of this chapter, the particularity of aspectual particles is that they have an aspectual impact on the verb in verb-particle constructions but without completely losing their literal meaning which is the reason why they are labelled as “semi-aspectual”. This use of particles actually refers to the “metaphorical” use mentioned previously in this work.

5.4.1 Semi-aspectual “away”

Indeed, the first semi-aspectual particle to be presented is “**away**”. Firstly, we can notice that “away” has already been mentioned in the aspectual particles category which shows that it can be used for its aspectual impact with or without a trace of its literal meaning. Actually, as a semi-aspectual particle, “away” is used to express the notion of “**gradual disappearance**” which truly makes sense since its literal meaning is “to or at a distance from the place, person, or thing in question (*go away, give away, look away, they are away, five miles away*)” whereas the second definition found in the dictionary is “towards or into the non-existence (*sounds die away; explain it*

away, idled their time away)” (both definitions are taken from *The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996). The first definition corresponds to the literal and thus directional meaning of “away” whereas the second one seems to be the definition of Cappelle's “gradual disappearance”. Indeed, the second definition seems to be a “metaphorical” use of the first one as stated by Cappelle : “this use is, of course, closely related to directional away, and may easily be seen as a metaphorical extension of it” (Cappelle 2005 : 432). Here are the examples given by Cappelle on the same page to illustrate the use of “away” as “gradual disappearance” :

(50) *boil away ‘evaporate’, die away, drop away, eat NP away, ebb away, erode away, fade away, fall away, fritter NP away, melt away, mo(u)lder away, pass away, pine away, rot away, scour NP away, slip away, tail away, trail away, waste away, wear (NP) away, whittle NP away, wither away.*

Concerning the telicity of the events expressed by “away”, it seems that “semi-aspectual *away* refer[s] to durative events, while expressions with directional *away* are usually construed as non-durative” (Cappelle 2005 : 432). Indeed, this makes sense since a “gradual disappearance” is “gradual” which means that it takes time for the object (or person or else) to disappear. This can be illustrated by the following example excerpted from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) :

(51) Something was eating away the foliage

(52) The crowd dispersed, melting away into the side streets

The first example concerns the phrasal verb “eat away” defined as “gradually damage or destroy sth over a period of time” and the second one “melt away” meaning “disappear gradually, make sth disappear gradually” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) which shows the notion of “gradual disappearance”. In opposition, “away” used as a directional particle implies non-durativity in the sense that once the person is “away” from a place, the action of “running away” for example, is over.

5.4.2 Semi-aspectual “back”

The following particle is “**back**” and is used to express an action performed “in return”, as a response to another action firstly executed by someone else. Therefore, this is the reason why this use of the particle is labelled under the expression “**reciprocal back**”. This use of “back” can be illustrated with the example presented by Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 433) as follow :

(53) Ron grinned nervously at him, and Harry grinned back.

Cappelle underlines the fact that we might compare “back” with aspectual “along” but that with “back” the events are consecutive whereas “along” implies that the events happen simultaneously.

5.4.3 Semi-aspectual “down”

Then, the next semi-aspectual particle which is presented is “**down**”. Here it is used to express “a decrease or lowering in size, degree, standard, intensity and so on” (Sinclair 1989 : 460, quoted in Cappelle 2005 : 436) which corresponds to the “metaphorical” meaning of “down” mentioned in the introduction with the example of “come down”. This use of “down” is designated by the expression “**decremental down**” and can be illustrated by the following verbs “calm down”, “cool down”, “go down”, “melt down”, “slow down” etc. In addition to this idea of a “decrease or lowering”, other phrasal verbs with “down” “contain ideas of collapsing, cutting and destruction” (Sinclair 1989 : 461, quoted in Capelle 2005 : 436). This can be illustrated by the following example taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) :

(54) They had to get the police to break the door down.

Moreover, as largely developed in their paper entitled *Interpretations des verbes à particules en anglais : téliques, comparatifs, résultatif* (2010) Cappelle and Chauvin underline the fact that “down” does not necessarily imply a negative interpretation since “cool down” for example, can be paraphrased by “become/make cooler” and not “become/make less cool” meaning that if “down” implies a decrease it is because of the verb to which it is associated. Concerning the telicity of the event, we are faced with the same interpretation which was made of “up” previously, in other words, the event can be telic for example for “slow down”, you can continue to slow down but until you stop or until you reach an appropriate speed.

Then, there is another semi-aspectual use of down but which implies a completely different interpretation. Indeed, it is named “**surface treatment down**” and refers to “down” associated with verbs of cleaning, polishing, applying a substance on something etc. as in “clean down”, “dust down”, “sponge down”, “spray down”, “wipe down” etc. This use of “down” is semi-aspectual which makes sense since in order to apply something on a surface or to clean a surface, it

is necessary to perform a movement downwards towards the surface concerned. Consequently, “down” partially keeps its literal meaning. Concerning the telicity of the event, it can be either telic or atelic as illustrated by Cappelle (Cappelle 2005 : 438) :

(55) He dusted the piano down { in / for } a minute.

In example (55), the compatibility with both “in” and “for” shows that the event can be telic or atelic. Indeed, “he dusted the piano down in a minute” implies that the action is over, there is no dust left on the piano whereas with “he dusted the piano down for a minute” means that the action of dusting the piano has been performed for a minute but this does not mean that the piano is completely clean.

5.4.4 Semi-aspectual “off”

Next particle to be presented is “**off**” implying “**exasperation off**” as in “piss off” developed by Cappelle “if you are *pissed off* { about / with } an event or if an event *pisses you off*, you want it to come to an end because you are annoyed with it. Similarly, if you are *pissed off with* a person, you want him to stop doing something irritable” (Cappelle 2005 : 439). In general, phrasal verbs concerned with this aspect of “off” are composed of verbs which lose their literal meaning, as a consequence, “off” is not productive (i.e. they are not numerous since they are not compositional).

5.4.5 Semi-aspectual “out”

Then, the penultimate semi-aspectual particle is “**out**”, already mentioned in the category of aspectual particles. As a semi-aspectual particle, “out” expresses the idea of “**unusual mental state**” which is linked to the literal meaning of the particle in the sense that :

There is... a conceptual link between the notion of exit from a landmark and that of change from a normal to an abnormal state, such as from consciousness to unconsciousness, or from self- control into lack of control. Hence the use of *out* in an extensive and growing set of verb + preposition idioms, including *black out*, *bomb out*, *fade out*, *flip out*, *freak out*, *knock out*, *lash out*, *pass out*, *pig out*, *psych out*, *space out*, *tune out*, *wig out*, *zone out*. (Pullum and Huddleston 2002 : 652, quoted in Cappelle 2005 : 441)

The use of “out” appears here as “metaphorical”, indeed, instead of being in one place and then “out”, meaning somewhere outside this place, “out” is applied to the passage from one state to another. Actually, we could say that there is a passage from reality to outside reality which is illustrated as follow :

(56) I was blissing out over my scrambled eggs.

(57) That sleeping pill knocked me out.

Both examples are taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) from which the definitions of “bliss out” and “knock out” were taken too. Indeed, “bliss out” means “feel very happy and relaxed, make sb feel like this”, and “knock out” is defined as “make sb/yourself fall asleep or become unconscious” which appears as a detachment from reality whether positive or negative. In the first example we could say that the subject is completely in ecstasy over his/her scrambled eggs and in the second one, the subject is leaving reality by falling asleep or being unconscious. Of course, there is the idea of “unusual mental state” since the subject shifts from one mental state (reality for example) to another (out of reality).

5.4.6 Semi-aspectual “over”

Finally, one last particle put in the category of semi-aspectual particles is “**over**” in the sense of “**repetitive over**”. Indeed, “over” can be used to express a repetition of the action but this time not in the same sense as “away” which implied an exact repetition of the action. This is explained by Cappelle :

As Rice (1999 : 239) writes, “*over* tends to indicate a *single, second* occurrence of an action... It conveys a sense that the activity is being repeated for corrective purposes and that it is or was being completed in a slightly different way the second time around”” (Cappelle 2005 : 444).

This quotation clearly shows that “over” is not used to express repetition the same way “away” does. Indeed, “away” and “over” are used for this purpose but they both convey differences in the repetition of the event. This can be illustrated by the following example taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) :

(58) Your handwriting is too messy – you'd better do it over (=write it out

again)

However, the repetition of an event does not always imply the correction of it :

(59) I'm glad the campaign was successful, but I would not want to do it
over.

In this example, the subject only expresses the fact that he would not like to live this event (i.e. the campaign) a second time but the notion of correction is not involved in the process. As a consequence, "over" refers to the notion of repetition either in order to do something which has already been done but differently or simply to do something which has already been done, again.

As a conclusion, concerning the notion of aspect, particles can be either fully aspectual, in other words their literal meaning is not involved or semi-aspectual meaning that their aspectual meaning seems to be still related to their literal meaning hence the expression of "metaphorical extension". In opposition to these meanings namely literal and aspectual we find idiomatic particles, or rather **idiomatic verb particle combinations** such as "bring up" meaning "care for a child until he/she is grown up; teach a child a particular way to behave, etc." (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) for which the meaning is neither literal (i.e. directional) nor aspectual and the association of the particle with the verb is not obvious.

Now that prepositions and particles have been presented in detail, we have a better comprehension of verb-particle constructions and many elements have been given in order to be able to analyze these constructions more in detail. Indeed, next point of this study is the internal difference existing within the category of particles or more generally speaking, of phrasal verbs (i.e. in the sense of a verb and an adverbial particle). These differences are exposed in the next part of this work.

6. A division among the category of particles

6.1 Bas Aarts' A-verbs and B-verbs

As underlined by Aarts in his article entitled *Verb-Preposition Constructions and Small Clauses in English* (1989), there are differences within the categories of particles and prepositions which leads to the difficulty to completely separate them from each other and to develop efficient

syntactic tests which would clearly put particles in one category and prepositions in another. For the need of this study, only phrasal verbs will be taken into consideration, phrasal verbs in the sense of a verb accompanied by an adverbial particle. The differences existing within this category were mentioned earlier in the present work, indeed, several types of particles were presented and it was explained that this diversity was a factor which has to be taken into account. Truly, the differences existing within the category of particles have been pointed out by Bas Aarts in his article entitled *Verb-Preposition Constructions and Small Clauses in English* (1989). Bas Aarts went even further since he argued that phrasal verbs do not exist and proposed two other categories instead, namely : A-verbs and B-verbs. Indeed, in his paper, Bas Aarts mentioned four tests in order to show that the category of phrasal verbs does not exist and that therefore, the analysis of the internal differences existing within this category allow us to create two different groups to classify phrasal verbs. Before starting presenting these four tests, I would like to present the examples given by Bas Aarts (Aarts 1989 : 277) for the needs of his study :

(60) I *switched* the light *off*.

(61) I *looked* the information *up*.

(62) *Look at* the prospectus : it clearly states that your admission *depends on* your examination results.

We can notice that example (62) concerns prepositional verbs as underlined by Aarts and we will not focus on them. However, examples (60) and (61) both correspond to the category of phrasal verbs. The aim of Aarts' article is to show that phrasal verbs do not exist but we will rather say that phrasal verbs can be divided into two different groups which, once again, confirm the statement that there exist differences within each category (i.e. prepositional verbs and phrasal verbs). For Aarts, the category of A-verbs refers to example (60) and B-verbs concern example (61). The first test which is used by Aarts involves what he calls the "absolute construction" which is illustrated in the following examples taken from Aarts' paper :

(63) Jim turned the radio off, *with the radio off* he could finally relax.

(64) *Jim sold the car off to a friend, *with the car off* he could buy a boat.

We can notice that the "absolute construction" can be applied to A-verbs whereas it does not work with B-verbs. This shows that putting those verbs into two different groups is quite relevant.

However, we can see that the particle “off” does not express the same idea in both examples. Indeed, in the first example, “off” is used in the sense of “so as to break continuity or continuance; discontinued, stopped (*turn off the radio; take a day off; the game is off*).” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 1996) which is underlined by Aarts : “I will show that the semantic difference between spatial-resultative constructions such as [(63)] and idiomatic constructions such as [(64)] is paralleled by the different syntactic behaviour of these two constructions.” (Aarts 1989 : 280). Indeed, in example (63), “off” is resultative, in other words, the result of the action performed by Jim is that the radio is off whereas in example (64), the verb “sell off” means “sell things cheaply because you no longer want them or because you need the money [...]”. *The family silver was sold off to pay the debts*” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) and we could say that :

(65) Jim *sold* the car *off* to a friend, with the car *sold off* he could buy a boat.

These examples make us think about what has been said concerning the different types of particles and the different types of phrasal verbs that is to say their compositionality or decomposability. Indeed, in example (63), the meaning of the particle is complementary to the meaning of the verb, the verb “turn” expresses the action which is performed while the particle “off” specifies the result of the action, in other words the result of Jim's action is that the radio is off. Moreover, the verb and the particle do not form an idiomatic combination whose meaning cannot be guessed, on the contrary, the meaning of each part is quite clear and the particle could even be replaced by its opposite “on” in another context. Concerning example (65), the verb “sell” and the particle “off” form a constituent whose global meaning results specifically from the association of these two elements in particular. Next, the second test is the following one :

(66) My teacher always puts his pupils down. **His pupils down* is terrible.

(67) *Botham out* is a disaster for the England team.

Example (67) “reveal[s] another interesting property of the [NP + particle] complements to A-verbs, namely their ability to appear in subject position.” (Aarts 1989 : 281). Indeed, we can notice that in example (67), “Botham out” can be used as a subject whereas in example (66) “his pupils down” is ungrammatical. Once again, the particle does not express the same idea. In example (67), we could say that “Botham is out” the same way we could say that the “radio is off” in example (66) whereas we could not say that “the pupils are down”, not because the sentence would be ungrammatical but it would not have the same meaning because here “down” is not used as a directional particle or at

least not literally but rather figuratively that is to say in the sense of “in or into a low or weaker position, mood or condition” (*The Oxford English Reference Dictionary*, 2006). Consequently, these examples bring us back to the problems mentioned previously, namely and to make it short, the polysemy of particles.

The third demonstration made by Aarts consists in the possibility for constructions such as [NP + particle] to occur on their own. This statement is illustrated by three examples given by Aarts in his paper :

(68) The room was extremely noisy : children shouting, *the tv on, the record player on*, and little Jimmy kicking the cat.

(69) *Hands up !*

(70) The thief, *while out*, swore never to end up in jail again.

Again, in these examples, we are still dealing with the category of A-verbs. Since they express a **result**, those verbs offer the possibility to put the object in subject position as in “the tv was on, the record player was on”, “Hands are up” and “the thief was out” illustrated by Aarts as follows “again in each of these sentences there is a subjectpredicate relation between the NP and the particle” (Aarts 1989 : 282) before adding “the [NP + particle] strings which are part of B-verbs constructions do not occur on their own, as the reader can easily verify.” (Aarts 1989 : 282).

Finally, the last test proposed by Aarts implies “coordination facts” which are presented with the following examples given by Aarts :

(71) Mel and Kim were watching television in the dark when suddenly Rick burst in ; he *switched the lights on and the tv off*.

(72) *He sorted *the problem out and the clothes out*.

Example (71) shows that it is possible to use two different particles expressing opposed ideas with the same verb without repeating the verb in question. In example (72), we can notice that the repetition of the particle is not possible with B-verbs. Actually, this completely makes sense because the verbs “switch on” and “switch off” used in example (71) are both used to express the same action, the only thing that changes is that the result is not the same one for these actions. Indeed, if we take the definitions of those verbs in *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006), we see that they are almost identical since for “switch on” we find “start an electrical device, a machine or an engine **by**

pressing a switch, a button etc.” and for “switch off”, “stop an electrical device, a machine or an engine working **by pressing a switch, a button**, etc.” which shows that indeed the action is identical in both situations but the result is different, we find an opposition between “start” and “stop”. Concerning this last demonstration, Aarts explains that “given the standard assumptions regarding coordination, namely that units that can be coordinated are constituents [example 32] offer[s] strong empirical support for the claim that the sequences in italics are constituents” (Aarts 1989 : 282). Indeed, we cannot say that “*the light on*” and “*the tv off*” are constituents in the sense of a prepositional phrase in which the preposition and the noun phrase form a constituent with the preposition as head of the PP but we can see that the particle has a semantic relationship with the noun phrase following (or preceding) it since it can express a state in which the element mentioned by the noun phrase is.

On the contrary, example (72) is ungrammatical since the particle “out” is added to the verb “sort” in order to form an “idiomatic construction”. Actually, for the first part of the sentence, the verb “sort out” means “solve a problem” whereas for the second part “put sth in order, tidy and organize sth” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006) is the idea expressed by the verb-particle construction which means that the actions mentioned in this sentence are two different actions united in the same sentence which is possible but not for the “coordination facts” explained by Aarts where the meaning of the verb must be the same one for both particles.

As a conclusion to this paragraph, the aim of this demonstration is not to conclude that phrasal verbs do not exist and that therefore it is necessary to use the terms of “A-verbs” and “B-verbs” but rather to show that indeed, there exist differences within the category of phrasal verbs and that those differences can be explained from a semantic point of view. Indeed, the results of the different syntactic tests depend on the idea expressed by the particle and we saw that it can express a result and in that case, the particle seem to be more independent from the verb even though of course it is still closely linked to it. In other words, the verb can be kept and used with another particle in order to express another result as we saw with “switch on” and “switch off” but it is not possible for the other type of phrasal verbs.

6.2 Fraser's third category

In 1976, Fraser already showed that there exists differences within the category of phrasal verbs. He does not introduce this point this way but he rather separates verb-particle combinations into three categories the same way Aarts mentioned the categories of prepositional

verbs, A-verbs and B-verbs. Fraser calls this third category “verb-adverbial combinations” in addition to the other two categories namely : “verb-particle combination[s] on the one hand, and verb prepositions and/or verb-adverbial sequence[s] on the other” (Fraser 1976 : 1). He notices four syntactic differences which are mentioned in the following quotation :

In particular, we find that the element in question has the following characteristics in just the second sentence of each pair : (1) in an action nominalization (cf. Lees, 1961 ; Chomsky, 1970 ; Fraser, 1970) the element may occur on either side of the direct object noun phrase; (2) in a gapped sentence, the element may function as a constituent ; (3) it may be modified by certain degree adverbials; and (4) it may take contrastive stress. (Fraser 1971 : 3)

Then, he illustrates these four differences with four examples constituted of two sentences. For each example, the first sentence is ungrammatical whereas the second one is grammatical. From a semantic point of view, we can also notice that the meaning of each sentence is different, therefore and as already mentioned previously, the semantic aspect is linked to the syntactic aspect. Of course, Aarts and Fraser consider this syntactic difference as a possibility to separate verb-particle combinations into three categories but to be in accord with this study, it is important to consider that there is a split within the category of phrasal verbs and that even though they do not always syntactically behave the same way, all type of phrasal verbs are considered to be the association of a verb with a particle (i.e. an adverbial particle). The four examples given by Fraser are exposed here :

- (73) a. *His throwing of his dinner up (instead of down) was stupid.
b. His throwing of the ball up (instead of down) was stupid.
- (74) a. *Jones pulled the deal off, and Peter the money in.
b. Jones pulled the old tablecloth off, and Peters, the new one on.
- (75) a. *The debator drew his opponent only part of the way out.
b. The debator drew the lucky number only part of the way out.
- (76) a. *I said to carry the deception ON, not OFF.
b. I said to carry the prop ON, not OFF.

We can notice that example (73) corresponds to the first characteristic given by Fraser in the quotation above namely “in an action nominalization [...] the element may occur on either side of the direct object noun phrase”. Indeed, even though the same verb is used in each sentence, the first sentence is ungrammatical whereas the second one is grammatical. This can be explained by

the difference of meaning. Indeed, in both cases we are dealing with the phrasal verb “throw up” which is defined as such in *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) with the following illustration : verb + adv for both definitions which are given next.

In the first sentence, “throw up” is used in the sense of “bring food you have eaten back out of your mouth” and whose synonym is “vomit”. For the second sentence, “throw up” means “lift sb/sth and make them move upwards into the air by moving your hand quickly”. First of all we can notice that “throw up” does not have the same meaning depending on other elements in the sentence, in other words, depending on the context. Indeed, in the first sentence, the noun phrase “his dinner” enables the hearer to understand that “throw up” is used here in the sense of “vomit”, it can even be replaced by this simplex verb. This argument was given at the beginning of this study concerning the fact that phrasal verbs are composed of two words but that they have to be understood as a single unit.

On the contrary, for the second sentence, even though “throw up” is still considered as a phrasal verb, its meaning is different which is linked to its compositionality. Indeed, here we can say that “the ball has been thrown” and that it is “up”, so both the verb and the particle literally participate in the meaning of the whole construction, therefore in this sentence, “throw up” is fully compositional. Moreover, the notion of result was mentioned by Aarts and can be applied to this sentence, indeed, the result is that “the ball is thrown up” whereas in the first sentence, nothing is literally thrown nor literally up. However, the association of these two words is completely logical, it is used metaphorically to express the trajectory of the food.

Next, the same remark can be made about example (74). Indeed, this example corresponds to “in a gapped sentence, the element may function as a constituent”. We already mentioned the case of the gapping in example (10) which was “he sped up the street, and she, up the alleyway”. In the same way, we can notice that this gapping is possible in the second sentence but not in the first one. Indeed, in the first sentence, it is not possible not to repeat the verb since “pull off” and “pull in” have two completely different meanings. As a consequence, according to *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006), “pull off” means “succeed in doing or achieving sth difficult” and “pull in” is defined as “earn a particular amount of money”. Of course several meanings can be attributed to this verb which reminds us of the polysemy of phrasal verbs (i.e. generally speaking) which was mentioned at the beginning of this work. The definition given here corresponds to the meaning of the phrasal verb given in these examples. Therefore we notice that “pull off” and “pull in” are two different phrasal verbs and that they do not express the same idea. Moreover, they are not fully compositional, we can even say that they are idiomatic. In the second sentence which is

grammatical, “pull off” means “remove an item of clothing quickly or with difficulty” and “pull on” is defined as “put an item of clothing on quickly and with difficulty”. Again, only the result changes but generally speaking the phrasal verb is linked to the same idea namely “ [...] an item of clothing quickly or with difficulty”. The difference is that in one case the item of clothing is removed and in the other case, it is put on. As a consequence, we notice that only the result changes but the idea expressed is the same one. Furthermore, we notice that this phrasal verb is fully compositional.

The same explanations could be given concerning examples (75) and (76). Consequently, analyzing and explaining these examples enable us to demonstrate that if there exist differences within the category of phrasal verbs it is because many elements have to be taken into consideration namely : the compositionality of the construction, the semantic aspect which is obviously linked to the notion of compositionality. Indeed, this notion concerns the meaning of each part and the meaning of the whole construction which is the semantic aspect of phrasal verbs. In other words, the syntactic possibilities are linked to the semantic aspect and therefore to the compositionality of phrasal verbs. As a consequence, we understand that if the comprehension of phrasal verb is so complex, it is because many elements interact with each other and that these elements must all be taken into consideration and analyzed together.

As a reminder, we saw that the association of particles (i.e generally speaking) with verbs enable to create many different combinations and therefore to obtain different meanings. Then, we also noticed that the same phrasal verb can have several meanings depending on the context or we could say, on the situation. Indeed, this fact was verified with the examples given in this chapter. In addition, apart from the phrasal verb itself, there are other elements which have an impact on the meaning of the whole sentence. As we saw with example (73), it is the noun phrase “his dinner” which permits us to understand which meaning of “throw up” is used. In the same way, other elements can participate to the comprehension of the sentence and this is what is presented next.

7. The importance of the context and of other elements

7.1 The notion of telicity and the type of direct object

Throughout the analysis of phrasal verbs and of particles in particular, we mentioned several times the notion of telicity (and thus atelicity) which is the fact that an event implies (or does not imply) its own end. As we have already seen this notion is an aspectual feature of two situation types namely : accomplishments and achievements. Now it will be explained that this telicity is not

only linked to the particle itself but also to other elements in the sentence. Indeed, in her article entitled *English Aspectual Particles are of Two Types* (2015), Walková explains that telicity depends on the type of direct object that there exist two types of direct object which can determine the telicity or atelicity of an event. First of all, she explains that “not all direct object mark telicity” (Walková 2015 : 152) and she gives the following example :

(77) Bill pushed the cart for/*in two minutes (atelic)

As we can notice, she uses a test which was presented in this work and which is the compatibility with “for X time” or “in X time” allowing us to determine the telicity or atelicity of an event. Here, the sentence is not compatible with the expression “in X time” therefore the event is atelic. After presenting this example, Walková explains that this fact depends on the type of direct object :

To account for this fact, Tenny (1994) distinguishes two types of direct object, affected and unaffected, depending on how the denoted event participant is involved in the action. She (1994 : 11) defines an affected event participant undergoing a “necessary internal motion or change”, e.g. The direct object in *eat an apple*. In contrast, the direct object in [(73)] does not undergo an internal change or contrast – only the object as a whole is moved. (Walková 2015 : 153)

As an explanation to this statement, we can say that indeed in “Bill pushed the cart for two minutes”, “the cart” is what is called an “unaffected object” meaning an object which does not undergo an “internal motion or change” but rather an object which is moved as a whole as developed by Walková. On the contrary, the example “eat an apple” is given to illustrate the notion of “affected object” meaning an object “undergoing a “necessary internal motion or change”” meaning that the apple does not remain as a whole, progressively, we could say that its shape changes, therefore there is an internal change happening, the object is “affected” by the action. This notion can be applied to example (26) which was given in this study and which is used differently in the following example :

(78) I drank up my tea in 30 seconds

We can notice that the sentence is compatible with “in X time” therefore it is telic. Moreover, the object is “my tea” but since “tea” is uncountable we can deduce that we are talking about “a cup of tea” or at least that the tea is in a recipient and thus that a specific quantity is determined by this

recipient. Starting from this point, we can understand that the “cup of tea” is an affected object and that there is an “internal change” throughout the process of drinking. We can guess that there is a progression, a diminution of the quantity of liquid.

As a consequence, the aim of these examples is to show that the telicity of an event is not determined only by the phrasal verb itself or by the particle more than by the verb but that other elements in the sentence have an impact on the aspectual properties of an event. Of course when we mention the “type of direct object”, the analysis seems to be purely grammatical whereas in reality, we also refer to an extralinguistic context which can be defined and explained with notions a linguistic field which has not been explored in this work so far, namely pragmatics.

7.2 Pragmatic approach to phrasal verbs : types of context

7.2.1 Presentation of the types of context

In order to introduce important notions of pragmatics and of styles of context, a lecture which was given by Walt Detmar Meurers at The Ohio State University will be used for the need of this chapter on pragmatics. Indeed, before analyzing phrasal verbs from a pragmatic point of view, it is necessary to explain what pragmatics is and to define the terms used in this linguistic field which are relevant for this chapter. Of course, this does not concern phrasal verbs directly by rather sentences in general but the pragmatic aspect must be considered since it has an impact on the comprehension of the sentence. First of all, it is necessary to give a definition of pragmatics : “Pragmatics is the study of how language is used and how language is integrated in *context*”. Indeed, we saw previously that the context is important to understand a sentence properly thus the four types of context must be presented.

The first type of context concerns the “**physical context**” and which implies “what is physically present around the speakers/hearers at the time of communication. What objects are visible, where the communication is taking place, what is going on around”(Meurers 2004 : 4). This means that apart from the linguistic context, there are external, or in other words, extralinguistic elements which have to be taken into account. In order to be relevant, the example chosen to illustrate this first type of context contains a phrasal verb. It is excerpted from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) and from the definition of the phrasal verb “pick up” :

(79) The bus stopped to pick up some passengers.

This example illustrates the idea of physical context. Indeed, reading this sentence does not enable us to know where the bus stopped or even who the passengers were. It is necessary to be physically present to know where this action took place and to be aware of who was here at that precise moment.

Next, the second type of context which is presented concerns “**linguistic context**”. This notion was already mentioned before and involves clues which are present within the conversation, it is defined as “what has been said before in the conversation. The “history” of thing said so far” (Meurers 2004 : 5). Another example taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) is presented here to illustrate this notion :

(80) He pulled back and stared at her in disbelief.

Again, if we only read or hear this sentence out of context, we cannot understand every element, for example we do not know who is “her” and where the subject “he” was before he “pulled back”. The complete comprehension of this sentence requires a preliminary explanation of the situation, this sentence alone cannot permit the hearer to understand everything of the situation if other elements have not been mentioned before.

Then, the third type of context is the “**social context**” and it implies “the social relationship of the people involved in communication”. This notion can be illustrated by the following example excerpted from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) :

(81) **Piss off and leave me alone !**

In this example, the phrasal verb which is used is “piss off” which is “used to tell sb rudely to go away”. Of course, we understand easily that such a phrasal verb cannot be used with anyone in the everyday life and that it is quite familiar.

Finally, the last type of context concerns the “**epistemic context**” that is to say the “knowledge and beliefs of the speaker/hearer”. Indeed, when we have a conversation with someone, we expect our interlocutor to possess some knowledge and if we make a reference to something in particular, we expect this interlocutor to understand what we are talking about. This “epistemic context” is illustrated with the following example :

(82) Don't forget to sign out when you go.

The phrasal verb used in this example is “sign out” which means “write your name or the name of a guest when you leave an office, a club etc”. Here, the speaker expects the hearer to know what the phrasal verb “sign out” means and thus that he will understand what he has to do before he leaves.

As a conclusion, these four types of context are four other elements which have to be taken into consideration in order to properly understand a sentence and thus to be able to determine which meaning of a phrasal verb is expressed in a particular sentence. Generally speaking, the linguistic context can be sufficient to find out the meaning of a phrasal verb as it was already developed previously thus next paragraph will be devoted to the analysis of phrasal verbs in different contexts in order to determine which elements enable us to find the meaning which is applied in a sentence in particular.

7.2.2 analysis of phrasal verbs in context

For the purpose of this part of the study, several examples will be analyzed in detail. These examples will be composed of several sentences with the same phrasal verb but with a different meaning for each of them. The examples and the definitions given throughout the following paragraphs will all be taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006).

Since the phrasal verb “make up” was presented at the beginning of this study in the part concerning the polysemy of phrasal verbs, it can be interesting to analyze this phrasal verb more in detail :

(83) It takes her an hour to make up before going on stage.

(84) He's made up with his parents.

(85) The course is made up of five modules.

(86) The pharmacist made up the prescription.

(87) She made up an excuse for being late.

The five examples presented above present with the phrasal verb “make up” which have several meanings depending on the context of the sentence.

Indeed, in the first sentence, “make up” is used in the sense of “put make-up on to make sb/yourself attractive or to prepare for an appearance in the theatre, on television, etc.” and it is

possible to understand that it is used this way thanks to elements given in the sentence, that is to say thanks to the linguistic context. Indeed, the prepositional phrase “before going on stage” informs us that the subject prepared herself for a specific purpose. In addition, the “epistemic context” can be mentioned here since when we perform such an utterance, we expect our interlocutor to know that generally, before going on stage, people put make up on in order to be prepared for a representation for example. Moreover, the physical context can apply too if this “conversation” takes place in a theatre for example and that the two interlocutors are part of the audience, one of them can tell the other “it takes her an hour to make up before going on stage”. In this case, the situation is even more understandable and obvious.

Next, concerning example (84), “make up” is used in the sense of “end an argument or disagreement with sb” and this is expressed by the prepositional phrase “with his parents” which is the linguistic context of the utterance. For this example, the physical context is less useful but the social context is implied since in order to inform an interlocutor of this kind of “personal” piece of information. Therefore, the two interlocutors must know each other quite well or at least enough to have this kind of conversation. In addition to this, the epistemic context can intervene in the sense that the hearer must know that “he” was in a disagreement with his parents before being informed that “he's made up with his parent”. In other words, the hearer must have been informed before in a linguistic context or must have witnessed to an argument between “he” and his parents in a physical context. In any case, all these elements enable the hearer to understand quite quickly which meaning of “make up” is expressed in this sentence.

Then the following example expresses the idea of “put sth together from several different things” which can be deduced thanks to the linguistic context that is to say “the course” and especially “five modules” which corresponds to “several different things”. Of course, as it is the case for other examples, other extralinguistic elements can be taken into consideration.

The penultimate example concerns “make up” defined as “prepare sth, make sth ready to use” which can be understood thanks to the linguistic context informing us of the direct object “the prescription” and also from other elements. Of course, if the speaker and the hearer are still in the pharmacy in which the action took place, the hearer can easily understand the speaker's purpose. In addition to this, “the pharmacist” leads the hearer towards clues allowing him to understand the meaning of “make up” in this particular sentence, from the linguistic context but also from the epistemic one.

Finally, the last example concerns “make up” meaning “invent sth, often in order to trick sb” and this can be understood thanks to the following object “an excuse” and completed by the

end of the sentence namely “for being late”. Indeed we learn what “she” did, “made up and excuse” and why, “for being late”. Of course all these examples provide us with many linguistic elements but it is not always the case as developed above in the section devoted to the physical context. Again, other elements can be commented on depending on the complete context of the situation. Here, we are mainly informed of the linguistic context and we can only imagine what other contexts could be.

We could analyze more examples like these since many phrasal verbs are polysemous and that therefore it is necessary to have clues in order to determine their meanings which can be understood thanks to the context generally speaking, that is to say : the physical context, the linguistic context, the social context and the epistemic context. These contexts are all linked together even though sometimes one of them is more helpful than another one when it comes to understand a conversation properly.

As a conclusion, we can notice that many elements have to be taken into consideration and that indeed, the semantic aspect of phrasal verbs is linked to many other aspects which are linked to the intra-linguistic and to the extra-linguistic contexts. Of course, for the need of this study we focused mainly on the intra-linguistic context but this does not mean that other elements must be ignored. Phrasal verbs have been presented quite in detail and now, the last part of this work will be devoted to one particle in particular which was briefly presented earlier in this work namely “out”.

8. Focus on the particle “out”

The particle “out” was presented earlier in this work in the paragraphs devoted to aspectual and semi-aspectual particles and we noticed that “out” belongs to both categories. Now, the aim of this part of the work is to study the particle “out” when it is not used literally. Of course, the point in looking for further explanations concerning “out” is to analyze what is more problematic about this particle.

First of all it can be useful to remind the literal meaning of “out” : “the basic meaning of out is of movement from inside to outside” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006). Indeed, in her work entitled *Figuring out figure out : Metaphor and the semantics of the English verb-particle construction* (1997) Morgan quotes Lindner (1983) and explains that :

In her work, Lindner points out that the prototypical sense of *out* involves “paths in the spatial domain”, relating a landmark (LM) to one or more trajectors (Trs). Thus, *out* refers to “the removal or departure of one concrete object from within another

object or place" (1983: 60-61), or, more succinctly, "removal from a bounded region via dislocation in space" (1983: 74)" (Morgan 1997 : 328)

Starting from this point, it is possible to apply this idea of "from inside to outside" to more abstract concepts, or from a metaphorical point of view and it can be interesting to focus on this idea in particular :

OUT-1 is schematic not only for projections onto the spatial domain of a trajector's change of location, but also for "projections" onto various abstract domains (temporal, perceptual, cognitive, social, etc.) of a trajector's change of state. In other words, because versions of the spatial relation OUT-1 are perceived as similar to various nonspatial relations in abstract domains, these nonspatial relations themselves will become, via metaphoric extension, versions of OUT." (Lindner 1983 : 77 quoted in Morgan 1997 : 338).

The most important information given in this quotation is the mention of the ""projections" onto various abstract domains "temporal, perceptual, cognitive, social, etc.)". Indeed, this shows that the different meanings attributed to the particle "out" are clearly derived from its literal meaning and that they can apply to many domains which enable us to find relevant explanations about the meaning of "out" even in what is called "idiomatic verb-particle constructions". As a matter of fact, sometimes "out" seems to be associated to a verb completely arbitrarily since the association is not obvious because of the non-compositionality of the phrasal verb. However, it seems that phrasal verbs with "out" but also phrasal verbs in general as already mentioned are not constructed arbitrarily underlined by Morgan :

The semantics of verb-particle constructions are not arbitrary; the meaning of verb-particle constructions are directly related to (aspect of) the individual meanings of the component verbs and particles, by inheritance and/or by (metaphorical or metonymic) extension. (Morgan 1997 : 329).

Starting from this quotation, the aim of the following paragraph is to attempt to find an acceptable semantic solution concerning "out". More precisely, next paragraphs will focus on phrasal verbs of the same type as "make out" following a lead given by Lindner (quoted in Morgan 1997 : 340) and which is the idea of a "**Change from Hiddenness to Accessibility**". This notion will be at the basis of this study on "out". Moreover, this notion will be applied to the concept of "creativity".

First of all we can give one example expressing the literal meaning of "out" namely "from the inside to the outside" linked to a second example associated to its metaphorical "projection" :

(88) Jenny usually goes out with her friends on Friday evenings.

(89) Word went out that the Prime Minister had resigned.

Concerning the first example, the phrasal verb “go out” means “leave your house to go to social events” which points out the literal meaning of “out”. Indeed, leaving a house means going “from the inside to the outside”, no matter where the next event takes place, what is important is the action of “leaving the house”. Starting from this point, we can explain the second example. Indeed, concerning example (89), “go out” means “be made public, published” (both definitions are taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006). Therefore we can notice that for the second example, the literal idea expressed by “out” is used metaphorically to express a “change from hiddenness to accessibility”. Indeed, “word went out that the Prime Minister had resigned” means that people start talking about the Prime Minister's resignation, this information is made public, from private to public, from unknown to known by everyone. In the continuity of this example, the next examples given concern the phrasal verb “figure out” :

(90) I could never figure him out.

(91) Can you figure out what's going on ?

In these two examples, “figure out” is used as “come to understand sth/sb **by thinking carefully**” (*The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary*, 2006). This part of the sentence “by thinking carefully” has been underlined because it is important for the development of an argument in the following paragraphs. Indeed, the idea of thinking, of something happening in the mind has been already mentioned by Morgan and is exposed here :

Thus, again, something that is outside a container is more accessible than something that is inside, to *figure out* is to make a solution cognitively “accessible” by “thinking”. That is, this verb-particle construction is used in situations in which the person who is attempting to find a solution to a problem does so by means of reasoning from the known (facts/situations) to the unknown. (Morgan 1997 : 343)

This quotation is considered as quite important concerning this part of the study. Indeed, the key sentences of this quotation are “to make a solution cognitively “accessible” by “thinking” and “to find a solution to a problem [...] by means of reasoning from the known [...] to the unknown”. In other words, we can say that the solution to a problem is “figured out” from inside the brain (by

“thinking”) to real situations. This can be illustrated with the following examples taken from Lindner and exposed by Morgan :

(92) He figured out the way to San Jose / the way to boil water.

(93) Try to figure out how to do it.

(94) Figure out the solution.

Each of these examples illustrates the idea expressed before namely “to make a solution cognitively accessible by “thinking””. Indeed, for the first example, the subject “he” thinks about a solution to go to San Jose and then, once the solution is “figured out”, it can be applied to the real situation and therefore permits him to go to San Jose. This explanation is valid for each example presented above and can be applied to other phrasal verbs as for example “carry out” illustrated by the following examples taken from *The Oxford Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2006) :

(95) Carry out a plan/a promise/an order.

(96) He had no intention of carrying out his threats.

(97) She had carried out all his instructions.

(98) Carry out repairs/checks/tests.

(99) It is not yet clear who carried out the attack.

(100) Carry out a survey/an investigation.

These examples illustrate the notion of “from inside the brain to real situations”. Indeed, examples (95), (96) and (97) are linked to “carry out” meaning “do sth that you said you would do or that you have been asked to do” and examples (98), (99) and (100) are associated to the following definition of “carry out” : “do and complete a task”. In both cases we can notice that the actions concerned imply a part of the task which is linked to the action of thinking and another part which is associated with real situations. Indeed, relying on this idea, the association of “out” with the verb “carry” completely makes sense since “out” expresses the idea of “from inside to outside” and that “carry” expresses the idea of something materialised, in real life situations for example.

As a conclusion, the aim of presenting a part devoted to “out” is to separate this interpretation from other interpretations which were given earlier in this work. Indeed, here the aim is to “figure out” the meaning of “out” when used as a supposedly “idiomatic particle”, when hardly understandable and more importantly to present the notions mentioned above which appear as

quite relevant.

9. Conclusion

As a conclusion to this work, phrasal verbs appear as quite complex as it was mentioned and explained in the first section of this presentation. However, their complexity does not prevent us from understanding their syntactic behaviour and from noticing that concerning phrasal verbs, several elements have to be taken into consideration. Indeed, gradually we understand that the syntactic differences which exist between and within the different sub-categories of phrasal verbs are associated to semantic differences. Therefore, we understand that it is necessary to analyze prepositions and particles more in detail in order to have a better comprehension of phrasal verbs. Indeed, the polysemy of phrasal verbs and of their constituents adds another difficulty which has to be overcome or at least, reduced as much as possible. Indeed, progressively the problematic concerning the status of particles is undermined by the main argument which is that the particle is more closely linked to the verb when it is an adverbial particle whereas a preposition is bounded to the noun phrase it governs. Then, their semantic aspect is more understandable and we figure out that there exist differences within the category of phrasal verbs (i.e. in the sense of a verb with an adverbial particle) and that those differences can be explained thanks to the semantic aspect of the particle, in other words, depending on the idea which is expressed by it but also on the compositionality of the verb-particle construction. Moreover, apart from the intra-linguistic context, we understand that other elements have to be taken into account therefore we can deduce that understanding phrasal verbs is not exclusively a matter of syntax but also of semantics and even pragmatics. This fact can be at the basis of the solution to the problem of phrasal verbs, indeed, it may not be possible to interpret phrasal verbs from a purely syntactic point of view since as we noticed, the syntactic aspect is closely linked to the semantic one which is why the latter must be taken into consideration. In addition, the pragmatic aspect can be mentioned and analysed even though we understood that generally, it is possible to figure out the meaning of phrasal verbs thanks to intra-linguistic elements or clues, the aim of mentioning pragmatics was to underline the amount of elements which have to be considered when analyzing parts of speech. Finally, the brief focus on "out" enable us to take an idea which is not often evoked in the study of phrasal verbs which is the concept of "change from Hiddenness to Accessibility" which appears as a relevant lead to be followed for further research on this particle.

Bibliography

Aarts, Bas. "Verb-preposition constructions and small clauses in English." *Journal of Linguistics* 25. (1989) : pp277-90.

Bannard, C., Baldwin, T. and Lascarides, A. A Statistical Approach to the Semantics of Verb Particles. In *Proceedings of the ACL-2003 Workshop on Multiword Expressions: Analysis, Acquisition and Treatment*, Sapporo, Japan, 2003 pp. 65-72.

Cambridge Dictionaries Online, [en ligne], 31 Mai 2016. <dictionary.cambridge.org/fr>

Cappelle, Bert, Chauvin, Catherine. "Interprétations aspectuelles de verbes à particule en anglais : téliques, comparatifs, résultatifs". *Approches de la scalarité*, Genève, France. 2010 pp249-281.

Cappelle, Bert. *Particle Patterns in English, A Comprehensive Coverage*. Dissertation. University of Leuven, 2005.

Cappelle, Bert. "The particularity of particles, or why they are not just 'intransitive prepositions'." *Adpositions of Movement*. éds. Cuyckens, Hubert, Walter De Mulder, et Tanja Mortelmans. Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 2004. pp29-57.

Chalker, Sylvia, Weiner, Edmund. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar, the New Authoritative guide*, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1994.

Fraser, Bruce. *The Verb-Particle Combination in English*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Jackendoff, Ray. "English particle constructions, the lexicon, and the autonomy of syntax." *Verb-Particle explorations*. éds. DEHE, Nicole, Ray JACKENDOFF, 2002.

McIntyre, Andrew et Urban, Silke. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. pp67-94.
McIntyre, Andrew. *Tense and Aspects in English*. Workshop on English Language and Literature, Neuchâtel, 2008.

Meures Detmar, linguistic 201, lecture given at the Ohio State University on the 9th April of 2004.
<<http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~dm/04/spring/201/03-pragmatics.pdf>>

Morgan, Pamela S. "Figure out *figure out*: Metaphor and the semantics of the English verb-particle construction". *Cognitive linguistics*, 8 (4): pp327-57, 1997.

O'Dowd, Elizabeth. *Prepositions and Particles in English: A Discourse-Functional Account*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1998.

Patrick, Jon and Fletcher, Jeremy. Differentiating Types of Verb-Particle Constructions. *Proceeding of the Australasian Language Technology Workshop*, 2004. pp163-170.
<<http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/U04-1022>>

Stunell, Kari Ann. *La construction du sens dans les verbes à particule et les verbes prépositionnels anglais ; étude de over*. Linguistics. Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle - Paris III, 2010. French. <NNT : 2010PA030049>. <tel-00834713>

The Oxford English Reference Dictionary, Oxford : Oxford University Press (Second revised edition) 1996.

The Oxford Phrasal Verb Dictionary for learners of English. Oxford : Oxford University Press (Second revised edition), 2006.

Thomann, Hollis. *Reaching Up and Reaching Out : Preposition Processing*. 2013.
<https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/downloads/neu:376963?datastream_id=content>

Walková, Milada. *The Aspectual Function of Particles in Phrasal Verbs*. Dissertation. Technical University of Košice, 2013.

Walková, Milada. *English Aspectual Particles are of Two Types*. Technical University of Košice, 2015. <<http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/222739>>