The verb–particle combination in English. By BRUCE FRASER. New York: Academic Press, 1976. Pp. ix, 125. $13.00. [Corrected edition of work published by Taishukan, Tokyo, in 1974.]

Reviewed by ANTHONY S. KROCH, *Temple University**

This book is a revision of Fraser's 1965 MIT dissertation. It consists of three chapters and two appendices—one a list of verb–particle combinations, and the other a reprint of F's 1970 article on idioms. The first chapter gives F's definition of the verb–particle construction, describing a number of its syntactic, semantic, and phonological characteristics. The second discusses a number of verbal combinations which might be analysed as verb + particle but which, F argues, have different syntactic properties. The brief third chapter reports on what some traditional grammarians have had to say about verb–particle combinations.

Unlike the dissertation on which it is based, the book does not discuss how the verb–particle combination should be represented formally in a grammar of English. F has eliminated all technical notation, in the interests of 'present[ing] the results of the research carried out in a clear and understandable way to the widest audience possible' (p. v). By eliminating the formalism, however, he sidesteps important issues that an explicit formal treatment would raise, and so robs the book of much of its interest for students of syntax. To take but one instance, he does not discuss the way in which his dissertation's formal apparatus has been revised by Emonds 1972—a revision which forms the basis for Emonds' claim that indirect object movement is a structure-preserving rule.

There is no doubt that F is an acute observer of syntactic detail, and the strength of this book lies in the variety of facts it presents. It is much less successful at describing these facts systematically or providing explanations. In the semantic domain, F points out that the particle can have a variety of effects on the meaning of the verb with which it is associated. It can be in purely idiomatic combination with its verb (item 1 below; F's 1–31); it can have a systematic effect, producing a consistent alteration of meaning across a set of verbs (2 below, F's 1–19 to 22); it can be the apparent remnant of a reduced prepositional phrase (3 below, F's ex. 2–35); or it can appear as the reduced form of an adverb (4 below, F's ex. 2–46):

(1) play down, simmer down, drown out, fake out, cash in, stand in, tip off, goof off, pucker up, point up.
(2) drink down, gulp down, swallow down, bank away, store away, stow away, deed over, give over, hand over.
(3) The butler brought the dinner in (to the room).
She took her book out (of her purse).
The child ran ahead (of his mother).
(4) He threw the ball up(wards).
The engineer moved the lever down(wards).
Pull the knob out(wards).

In the syntactic domain, F points out differences and similarities among a number of verbal idioms that have affinities with the verb–particle combination,

* I wish to thank Ivan Sag for helpful discussions of many of the issues raised in this review.

and he discusses co-occurrence and ordering relations between particles and particle-like elements. These and other observations well illustrate the puzzling diversity and formal irregularity of natural-language phenomena, even within the smallest, seemingly unproblematic domains. For those familiar with Bolinger's extensive discussion (1971) of the phrasal verb, I should note that F's book complements more than it duplicates Bolinger's account. The relative lack of overlap results, first, from F's being more concerned with syntactic and Bolinger with semantic nuances, and second, from Bolinger's much greater use of the extant literature. (Of fourteen works cited by Bolinger as treating the verb–particle construction extensively, F mentions only three.)

One of the problems with this book is that it is dated. While it differs in detail from F's dissertation, it contains no substantive discussion of work on the verb–particle construction subsequent to 1965. In particular, there is no discussion of Bolinger's account of phrasal verb prosody, or of Emonds' categorization of particles as intransitive prepositions. Several references suggest that F originally expected his book to appear in 1968, before the discussions by Bolinger and Emonds. But it was not published in the United States until 1976, by which date one would have expected a discussion of the issues raised and approaches pursued by these authors.

The question of timing would have been of less note if the description and analysis reported were more solid and careful. Unfortunately, the book carries over from the dissertation a number of serious weaknesses which suggest that extensive reworking would have been appropriate. One glaring lapse is the description of the interaction between the particle construction and the dative alternation. As both Emonds and Bolinger recognize, the double-object dative co-occurs with particles; and when it does, the preferred position of the particle is between the two NP's. Whether the particle can also assume other positions is unclear, and there is little agreement on this issue. Thus 5 is entirely acceptable, but judgments on 6–7 vary widely:

(5) We sent the subscribers out a notice.
(6) ?We sent up John a stiff drink.
(7) ?Dish us that stuff out now.

Amazingly, F says 'the indirect object movement rule (the rule which transforms *give the book to the boy* to *give the boy the book*) may not apply if the verb consists of a verb–particle' (p. 18). His evidence for this statement is the claimed unacceptability of sentences like 6; but there is no mention of sentences like 5. This is all the stranger because F lists such sentences in his 1974 review of Bolinger, and labels them as grammatical.[1] A further oddity in the discussion of the

[1] In fact, F misses an opportunity in his discussion of the dative. Neither Bolinger nor Emonds mentions that, although many verb–particle combinations allow double-object datives, some do not. For instance, the sentences below all sound bad:

(a) *I gave {the children / them} out the apples. (cf. I gave out the apples to the children.)
(b) *I gave {the Salvation Army / them} away my old coat. (cf. I gave away my old coat to the Salvation Army.)
(c) *I turned {the police / them} in the money. (cf. I turned in the money to the police.)
(d) *The Knicks turned {the Sixers / us} over the ball. (cf. The Knicks turned over the ball to the Sixers.)

It is unclear what is responsible for this difference; but see the discussion in Green (1974:80 ff.), from which examples a–b are taken.

dative is F's citation of the following perfectly acceptable sentences as ungrammatical (his ex. 1-53):

(8) He cabled the message in to his boss.
The man gave the money out to the poor.
She showed her new dress off to her friends.

These sentences are claimed as evidence for the clearly false proposition that the particle cannot appear after the direct object NP in sentences with prepositional datives. In F's review of Bolinger, sentences like 8 are labeled with question marks.

Other descriptive lapses include F's statement that the element *back* 'may not occur when there is a particle associated with the verb, irrespective of whether there is a following directional adverbial' (p. 57). He correctly notes that 'the sequence verb – particle – (noun phrase) – *back* – (prepositional phrase) is not acceptable'; but he fails to see that the sequence verb – (noun phrase) – *back* – particle – (prep. phrase) is fine. Thus he lists the sentences of 9 below (his ex. 2-72ii) to establish his point, but does not mention sentences like 10:

(9) She handed out the food to the people.
She handed the food back to the people.
*She handed out the food back (to the people).
(10) She handed the food back out (to the people).

F does recognize the grammaticality of combinations like these:

(11) John ran back out.
(12) Sally pulled the knob back out.

But he argues that the particle in such cases is really an adverb, with a different syntactic source than the particle *out* in *hand out*. This, as we shall see below, is a dubious proposition; it is made even more unlikely by the parallelism of 10 with 11–12.

The carelessness that infects this book is further illustrated by the discussion of the effect of object NP length on particle position. The basic fact is clear: the longer and more complicated an object NP becomes, the less likely that the particle will be positioned after it. But since there is no point beyond which the particle-last order is absolutely unacceptable, this tendency (probably caused by processing constraints) is not a rule of grammar. F, on the contrary, assumes without argument that a grammatical rule is involved, saying: 'whenever the direct object noun phrase is long and complicated, the particle MUST [emphasis supplied] remain next to the verb' (p. 19). In support of this rule he cites the following sentences (his ex. 1-57) as completely unacceptable, when they are at most unpreferred variants:

(13) I called the man who left up.
The ogre ran the sweet innocent little children down.
The crooks bumped the man returning from the movie off.

It is noteworthy that F leaves the discussion of NP length after a few brief comments, although it is a crucial factor in the syntax of the verb–particle construction. As a result, there is no mention of sentences like the following, which show an interaction between heavy NP shift and particle movement—allowing the particle to remain away from the verb without running afoul of the length factor:

(14) I picked the bundle up that I had dropped.

Aside from lapses and errors of description, the most serious difficulty in the book is F's assertion that idiomatic verb–particle combinations can be syntactically differentiated from those constructions of verb + intransitive preposition in which the preposition has an independent adverbial force. These latter, he claims, are derived by reduction from adverbs or prepositional phrases. He bases his claim on four syntactic tests that are supposed to make a clear separation of particles from adverbial elements (p. 3):

> '(1) in an action nominalization 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 ... The sentences in (1-9) – (1-12) illustrate these points.

'(1-9) His throwing of {*his dinner / the ball} up (instead of down) was stupid.

(1-10) Jones pulled {*the deal off, and Peters the money in. / the old table cloth off, and Peters, the new one on.}

(1-11) The debator drew {*his opponent / his lucky number} only part of the way out.

(1-12) I said to carry {*the deception / the prop} ON, not OFF.'[2]

There is no doubt that verb + preposition combinations differ from one another in idiomaticity. Thus, in 15 the preposition clearly functions adverbially, but in 16 it is not a semantically independent element:

(15) The bouncer threw the drunk out.
(16) The student figured the answer out.

However, this difference is far from clear-cut; it admits infinite shades and nuances between the purely idiomatic and the purely adverbial. F's claim that his syntactic tests will categorically distinguish the sheep from the goats is overstated, as Bolinger (pp. 9, 12, 14) has already remarked.

First of all, the judgments of grammaticality which the tests call for are extremely subtle; and in one case, the action nominalization test, they seem impossibly so. Second, where I have intuitions of any strength, the results of different tests often seem inconsistent. Consider cases like *fill up* or *tighten down*. These combinations pass two of the tests for adverbial status but they fail the other two:

(17) a. His filling of the tank up was a wise precaution.
b. *Wilma filled the pitcher up and Betty the form out.
c. The attendant filled the tank part way up.
d. *He filled the page UP {instead of / not} OUT.

(18) a. His tightening of the hatches down was essential.
b. *Bill tightened the hatches down and Sam the screws up.
c. The sailor tightened the hatches only part way down.
d. *He tightened the screws DOWN {instead of / not} UP.

However, combinations like *put out* and *phase in* pass exactly the tests that the other constructions fail, and fail those that the others pass:

[2] Note here that, unless some modification is made, the contrastive stress test will not work at all. Contrary to F, any pair of particles—not just the more adverbial ones—can appear together when set off by contrastive stress. The reason is that the pairing of two elements in a phrase of the form 'X, not Y' can always be interpreted as a verbal correction. Since almost any substitution of words is a possible verbal error, almost any pairing of elements in an 'X, not Y' phrase is a possible verbal correction. Thus, in the case F gives, *I said to carry the deception ON, not OFF*, the sentence is unexceptionable if it is taken to mean something like 'You misheard my words; I said ...' The speaker here is being finicky but not ungrammatical. Embedding the contrast under the verb *say*, as F does, makes this interpretation even more prominent. But the problem of avoiding the 'verbal corrective' reading of contrastive stress can be eliminated if F's test is revised to use the form 'X instead of Y' rather than 'X, not Y.' Thus, of the following sentences, (a) has no verbal corrective reading, and (b) is unacceptable on any interpretation:

(a) He carried the props ON instead of OFF.
(b) *He carried the deception ON instead of OFF.

Of course the issue of how well this test distinguishes adverbial from idiomatic particles still remains, and is discussed below.

(19) a. *The putting of the dishes out took only a minute.
b. Sally put the dessert out and her husband the dinner dishes away.
c. *Henry put the dinner dishes partly out.
d. Put the dishes OUT {instead of / not} AWAY.

(20) a. *The phasing of the program in took a week.
b. Bill phased the new machines in and Sam the superfluous workers out.
c. *They phased the machine completely in.
d. As far as education is concerned, the president wants to phase money OUT {instead of / not} IN.

The failure of F's tests clearly to separate the idiomatic from the adverbial cases suggests that a unitary treatment be given to the syntax of all verb + preposition combinations that allow movement around the object NP. The great diversity of behavior which these combinations exhibit is more likely to be caused by semantics (perhaps also by residual historical factors) than by structural differences for which the motivation is weak. In these terms, F's tests may perhaps be interpreted as indices of the degree of semantic bonding between verb and particle. To the extent that the particle in a verb–particle construction makes a compositionally independent contribution to the meaning of the predicate, it will tend to come out on the adverbial side of the tests. To the extent that it makes no such contribution, it will tend to come out on the idiomatic side. The tests do not always give consistent results because there are several ways (of which adverbial force is only one) that the particle can make an independent semantic contribution to a predicate; and the tests are differentially sensitive to these different contributions.

The action nominalization test may be sensitive to whether the particle contributes a directional force. But the gapping and contrastive stress tests seem to depend on whether a given verb, when combined with two different particles, produces interpretations in polar opposition to one another. Since most English locative prepositions are paired into polar opposites on their literal readings (*on/off, up/down* etc.), and since these oppositions rarely carry over into nonliteral uses, the correlation is high between polar opposition and locative (adverbial) force in the particle. It is not, however, absolute, as these sentences demonstrate (see also 20b,d above):

(21) a. Ring out the old year and in the new!
b. The Congress caught everyone by surprise and voted the health insurance bill UP instead of DOWN.
c. The general called the artillery off and the tanks in.

Finally, the degree-adverb test seems to depend, first, on whether the predicate as a whole can be modified by a given degree-adverb, and then on whether the particle represents that part of the predicate's meaning to which degree modification is appropriate. Adverbial particles provide the most common example but not the only one, for which degree modification of the particle is appropriate. One obvious further example is the set of verb + *up* combinations, illustrated in the sentences below, for which the particle serves as a marker of aspect (see also 17c):

(22) a. You didn't pump the tire all the way up.
b. After Sally's retort, Bill shut completely up.
c. Only the excitement of the chase could wake Holmes fully up.

In summary, this book contains much useful information on the verb–particle construction, but it also contains more than its share of errors. Furthermore, Fraser is unconvincing in his attempt to differentiate syntactically the idiomatic from the adverbial for constructions involving particles. Finally, it is unfortunate for the reputation of so fine a publisher as Academic Press that the impression of carelessness given by the book is augmented by an enormous number of typographical errors.

REFERENCES

BOLINGER, DWIGHT. 1971. The phrasal verb in English. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
EMONDS, JOSEPH. 1972. Evidence that indirect object movement is a structure preserving rule. Foundations of Language 8.546–61.
FRASER, BRUCE. 1965. An examination of the verb-particle construction in English. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
——. 1970. Idioms within a transformational grammar. Foundations of Language 6.22–42.
——. 1974. Review of Bolinger 1971. Lg. 50.568–75.
GREEN, GEORGIA M. 1974. Semantics and syntactic regularity. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

[Received 26 January 1978.]

The linguistic atlas of Scotland: Scots section, Vol. 2. Edited, with an introduction, by J. Y. MATHER and H. H. SPEITEL. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1977. Pp. 292. $60.00.

Reviewed by R. K. S. MACAULAY, *Pitzer College*

This second volume of the Scots section of *The linguistic atlas of Scotland* (*LAS–2*) contains the responses to the second postal questionnaire (PQ2). It consists of an introductory note; 80 maps showing the distribution of lexical items, with lists of the actual forms supplied by the respondents; a list of the respondents with demographic information, and a map showing their localities; a list of the items on PQ2; a list of the maps in the two volumes; an index to the word lists in both volumes; and two pages of corrigenda for vol. 1.

The hope expressed in my review of the first volume (Macaulay 1977), that vol. 2 would include more analysis of the material, has unfortunately not been fulfilled. Mather & Speitel are even more reticent than in *LAS–1*, and their silence can frequently be frustrating. Thus there are 207 items in PQ1, of which 100 were mapped in *LAS–1*; there are also 207 items in PQ2, of which 80 are mapped in *LAS–2*. M&S do not discuss the basis of selection, or the fate of the material not mapped. It is possible that the items dealing with pronunciation will be incorporated into the third volume, which will contain phonological material, but that still leaves about half the items on each questionnaire unaccounted for, and no explanations are given in either volume.

One of Catford's examples to illustrate the work of the Linguistic Survey of Scotland (1957: 115–17) is the distribution of the words *bairn* and *wean* for 'child' in southern Scotland. However, 'child' is not mapped in either volume. It would be helpful to know why. Were there too few replies to this item? That seems unlikely. Was the distribution of the responses insufficiently interesting? This also seems unlikely, in view of Catford's maps. However, it is possible that the design of the maps chosen by M&S was inappropriate for this item. One of Catford's maps shows the distribution of *bairn* in percentages of responses from the various counties. This is, in some ways, a more informative method of display than the impressionistic shadings adopted by M&S, though it has the disadvantage of requiring a separate map for each word. Nevertheless, there might have been some advantage in using this format for some of the items. For example, map 37 shows *oose* 'fluff' as not occurring north of Perthshire; but this is misleading, since it occurs with a frequency of approximately 25% in Aberdeenshire, Banff, and Moray—even though the dominant form there is *caddis*. The frequency of *oose* increases to about 50% in Perthshire and