

# Swedish particles and directional prepositions

Peter Svenonius

## 1. English: Prepositions and particles

As is well known, the grammar of English distinguishes between particles and prepositions (both of which I will abbreviate P; see Emonds 1985). A P–DP string after a verb, like those in (1), is in principle ambiguous. Particle shift, seen in (2), constituency tests, illustrated in (3), and Heavy NP Shift, as in (4), distinguish particles from prepositions.

- (1) a. The professor ran up a hill.  
b. The professor ran up a bill.
- (2) a. \*The professor ran a hill up.  
b. The professor ran a bill up.
- (3) a. Up which hill did he run first?  
b. \*Up which bill did he run first?
- (4) a. \*The professor ran up yesterday the biggest hill in Skåne.  
b. The professor ran up yesterday the biggest bill in Skåne.

In some cases one test or another fails; for example the prepositional phrase in (5a) does not pass constituency tests, as indicated in (5b-d).

- (5) a. I thought of a problem.  
b. \*Of which problem did you think?  
c. \*Of that problem, I never thought.  
d. \*It was of a problem that I thought.

However, (5a) clearly does not undergo particle shift or HNPS, consistent with its prepositional status. Traditionally, English grammarians take particle shift as a more important diagnostic than constituency tests.

## 2. Swedish prepositions and particles

Swedish grammars also distinguish prepositions from particles, and there as in English there are many elements which belong to both categories (for example *på* 'on,' *av* 'off,' *i* 'in'; see e.g. Ejerhed 1981, Norén 1996). Often the examples can be translated directly into English prepositional and particle constructions.

- (6) a. De bor i en liten lägenhet.  
they live in a small apartment  
b. Vi hällde i lite mera mjölk.  
we poured in a.little more milk

Swedish does not have any particle shift alternation, and DP–P order is bad in both cases.<sup>1</sup>

- (7) a. \*De bor en lägenhet i.  
they live an apartment in  
b. \*Vi hällde lite mera mjölk i.  
we poured a.little more milk in

However, other diagnostics do serve to distinguish PPs from particles, for example constituency tests.

- (8) a. I en liten lägenhet bor de nuförtiden.  
in a small apartment live they nowadays  
b. \*I lite mera mjölk hällde vi då.  
in a.little more milk poured we then

As in English, HNPS can affect direct objects (as in (9a)) but not prepositional complements (as in (9b)).

- (9) a. ?Vi måste hälla i med det samma tre bägare med mjölk.  
we had.to pour in with the same three cartons with milk  
'We had to pour in at once three cartons of milk'  
b. \*De måste bo i för ögonblicket en liten lägenhet i staden.  
we had.to live in for the.moment a little apartment in the.town

Just as in English, these tests can be difficult to apply in certain cases. As mentioned in §1, the most reliable distinction between particles and prepositions in English appears to be particle shift. In Swedish grammars, the most reliable distinction is taken to be stress placement. The P *i* 'in' in (6a) is unstressed, whereas the P in (6b) is stressed. This is systematic for Swedish particles. Another contrasting pair is given in (10), where *om* in (10a) is a preposition and unstressed, and *om* in (10b) is a particle and bears a phrasal stress.

---

<sup>1</sup> Swedish does have small clause constructions, e.g. *Maria skjutsar henne hem* 'Maria drives her home' (from Toivonen 2001), some of which alternate with particle constructions with P–DP order (*Maria skjutsar hem henne*), giving rise to particle alternations (see Vinka 1999) for a certain set of verb-particle combinations, subject to speaker variation.

- (10) a. Hon skrev inte om musik.  
 she wrote not about music  
 ‘She didn’t write about music’  
 b. Hon skrev inte om avhandlingen.  
 she wrote not over the.dissertation  
 ‘She didn’t write her dissertation over again’

### 3. Directional P in Swedish

Relying on stress as a diagnostic leads to the surprising result that many constructions which in English are straightforwardly prepositional translate into Swedish as constructions which Swedish grammarians call particle constructions; for example, all of the examples in (11) have stress on P.

- (11) a. Fågeln flög på fönsteret.  
 the.bird flew on the.window  
 ‘The bird flew into the window’ (crashed into the window flying)  
 b. Hon gick över gatan.  
 she went over the.street  
 ‘She crossed the street’  
 c. Vi hoppade i vattnet.  
 we jumped in the.water  
 ‘We jumped into the water’

Systematically, P with a directional meaning bears stress in Swedish, contrasting with locative P which does not. Example (11b), read without stress on P, has the strange meaning ‘she walked above the street,’ and example (11c) with stressless P also has a locative meaning, e.g. ‘we jumped (up and down) in the water.’

Despite the tradition of classing all stressed P together as particles, there is evidence internal to Swedish that directional Ps like those in (11) have a different syntax from particle constructions like those in (6b) and (10a). In this paper I will deviate from the Swedish terminological convention and use the term ‘directional P’ for constructions of the type in (11) (including certain idiomatic constructions), reserving the term particle construction for the type in (6b) and (10a).

Although PP sometimes fails constituency tests (as mentioned in §1), examples can often be constructed to show that directional P’s form PPs with their associated DPs, e.g. as in (12).<sup>2</sup> This is never true for particles of the sort that translate into English particles.

---

<sup>2</sup> In these examples the characteristic stress of the directional preposition is not evident; in (12a) it is attracted by the degree word *rätt* ‘right,’ and in (12b) it is masked by the contrastive focus on the whole PP, which falls by regular stress assignment rules on the noun.

- (12) a. Rätt på fönstret flög fåglarna.  
right on the.window flew the.birds  
'Right into the window flew the birds'
- b. Det var över gatan hon gick.  
it was over the.street she went  
'It was across the street that she went'

HNPS gives somewhat ambiguous results; some speakers reject HNPS of the DP after a directional P, but others find the contrast between (13) and (9a) less salient (I use a slash to separate two different groups of judgments).

- (13) a. \*/?Han har brakat i många gånger alla staket runt posthuset.  
he has crashed in many times all fences around the.post.office
- b. \*/?Vi måste gå över med det samma alla gatorna som kommer ut från flygplatsen.  
we had.to go over with the same all the.streets as come out from the.airport ('with the same' = 'at once')

A test which generally does demonstrate a contrast between Swedish particle constructions of the English type and Swedish directional prepositions is incorporation under passive: particles generally incorporate in the periphrastic passive, while directional and locative prepositions generally do not.<sup>3</sup>

- (14) a. Mjölken blev ihälld.  
the.milk was in.poured
- b. \*Lägenheten blev ibodd.  
the.apartment was in.lived
- c. \*Vattnet blev ihoppat.  
the.water was in.jumped

These results can be arranged in a table showing to what extent directional P patterns with particles and to what extent it patterns with locative P:

	<i>Locative PP</i>	<i>Directional PP</i>	<i>Particle</i>
<i>Stress on P</i>	no (10a)	yes (11)	yes (10b)
<i>HNPS</i>	no (9b)	% (13)	yes (9a)
<i>P-DP is a constituent</i>	yes (8a)	yes (12)	no (8b)
<i>P-V in passive</i>	no (14b)	no (14c)	yes (14a)

<sup>3</sup> Apparent counterexamples, such as *Det blev omtalat*, literally 'it was about.talked,' are usually passives of verbs which are incorporated in the active: *omtala* 'mention.' Another source of apparent counterexamples is lexicalized compound adjectives such as *omtyckt*, literally 'about.thought' meaning 'popular,' related to the prepositional verb *tycka om* 'like.'

#### 4. Analysis: P moves

If directional P and particles have different syntax, then, why do they share a stress pattern? Taking particles to be predicates in a small clause structure of the form [<sub>SC</sub> DP [<sub>PP</sub> P ]] (as in Kayne 1985), the P–DP order in Swedish can be derived by movement of P to the left into a functional position (cf. Svenonius 1996a, Ramchand & Svenonius 2002). It is clear that this movement does not involve actual cliticization, given the systematic separation of P from V under V2 (cf. (10b)); furthermore, reflexives appear between V and P in many cases.<sup>4</sup>

There is also independent motivation for head movement of directional P, from English, where directional P sometimes shows an overtly incorporated Path head *to*; while a sentence like *we jumped in the lake* is ambiguously directional or locative, *we jumped into the lake* is unambiguously directional and plausibly involves movement of spatial *in* to a directional head *to*.

This can be diagrammed as in (16) (cf. van Riemsdijk 1990, Koopman 2000).

- (16) a. We jumped [<sub>PLACE</sub> in the lake].  
b. We jumped [<sub>PATH</sub> in(to) [<sub>PLACE</sub> *t* the lake]].

Compare Swedish, where (17a) is disambiguated by stress, and (17b), with the overt directional particle *in*, is unambiguously directional.

- (17) a. Vi hoppade i vattnet.  
we jumped in the water  
b. Vi hoppade in i vattnet.  
we jumped into in the water

Assuming that Swedish and English have the same functional structure, the locative reading of (17a) can be diagrammed as in (18a), and the directional reading as in (18b); the Path head in (18b) attracts the P, and carries a stress accent in Swedish. (18c) is the structure for (17c), where the Path head is pronounced *in*, and does not attract P (unlike English *to*).

- (18) a. hoppa [<sub>PLACE</sub> i [<sub>DP</sub> vattnet]]  
b. hoppa [<sub>PATH</sub> i-Path<sup>0</sup> [<sub>PLACE</sub> *t* [<sub>DP</sub> vattnet ]]]  
c. hoppa [<sub>PATH</sub> in [<sub>PLACE</sub> i [<sub>DP</sub> vattnet]]]

(See also Tungseth 2002 on the very similar structure of Norwegian PPs.) There is always stress of the Path head, falling on *i* in (18b) but on *in* in (18c). This

---

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Hon har armbågat sig in (i mängden)* ‘She has elbowed herself in(to the crowd).’ Thanks to Ida Toivonen and Anders Holmberg for (independently) bringing the reflexive examples to my attention. See Toivonen (2001) and Josefsson (1998) for discussion of the differences between (standard) cliticization and the prosodic association of the Swedish particle with the verb.

stress could be derived structurally, through a remnant movement analysis (giving the structure [ hoppa [[<sub>PATH</sub> i t ] [[<sub>DP</sub> vattnet] ... ]]] for (18b), with P heading a phrase by itself in a stressed specifier position), but I assume here an autosegmental lexical analysis in which the Path head bears stress lexically.

If particles also move to or through the Path head, then the similar stress of particles and directional prepositions can be captured. However, there is clearly more to the story given that a particle plus a DP does not pass constituency tests, while a directional PP does.

A clue about the nature of the difference is provided by the fact that complements can in certain cases follow P in the particle position, to the left of the direct object. Here the PP is bracketted (examples from Toivonen 2001).

- (21) a. Vi tog [ifrån fången] friheten.  
 we took from the.prisoner the.freedom  
 ‘We deprived the prisoner of his freedom’  
 b. Hunden sliter [av husse] mössan.  
 the.dog tears off owner the.hat  
 ‘The dog is tearing the hat off its owner’  
 c. Maria satte [på pojken] kläderna.  
 Maria set on the.boy the.clothes  
 ‘Maria put the clothes on the boy’

It is clear that a phrasal movement is necessary for these cases. The simplest analysis may then be that there is always phrasal movement in particle constructions in Swedish (as in Vinka 1999; see also Taraldsen 2000 for Norwegian). The impossibility of modifiers with moved particles suggests that what moves is relatively small, e.g. PathP but not DegP (cf. Koopman 2000).

Thus, the full range of P constructions might look something like (22).

- (22) a. Locative: live [<sub>PP</sub> in an apartment] (6a)  
 b. Directional: jump [<sub>PATH</sub> in [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>P</sub> the water]]] (11c)  
 c. Particle: pour [<sub>AspP</sub> [<sub>PATH</sub> in [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>P</sub> ]]] Asp<sup>0</sup> [<sub>SC</sub> the milk t<sub>PATH</sub>]] (6b)  
 d. Particle: put [<sub>AspP</sub> [<sub>PATH</sub> on [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>P</sub> boy ]]] Asp<sup>0</sup> [<sub>SC</sub> clothes t<sub>PATHP</sub>]] (21c)

These structures can account for all the properties observed in the preceding sections (cf. in particular the table at the end of §3).

Stress: P in (22b-d) occupies the Path head and is therefore stressed.

HNPS: In (22c-d) DP after the particle position (‘the milk’ and ‘clothes’ respectively) is in the small clause subject position, a position from which HNPS is allowed; in (22a-b), HNPS is not expected as the DP (‘an apartment’ and ‘the water’) is a complement of P.

Constituency: As for constituency tests, the failure of P–DP to move in (22c) is captured if AspP cannot move.

Passive: Finally, the passive incorporation in (22c-d) but not in (22a-b) is captured if passive participles occupy Asp<sup>0</sup> in Swedish, while active V moves to a higher position.

## Conclusion

Both English and Swedish have directional and locative PPs, with distinct syntax, and both have particle constructions with direct objects. The grammar of English makes the particle vs. PP distinctions salient, while the grammar of Swedish sets the locative PPs apart from the directional PPs and classes the latter with particles. Despite the fact that the salient distinction falls in two different places, I hope to have shown here that the English distinction (also manifest in Norwegian and the other Scandinavian languages) is present in Swedish as well.

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to Lars-Olof Delsing, Lena Liepe, Lennart Lönngren, Anders Holmberg, Ida Toivonen, Mai Ellin Tungseth, Gillian Ramchand, and David Adger for discussion.

Thanks to Christer Platzack for inspiration, both for this work and for much else, right from the start of my career as a generative linguist and on through our cooperation on the IGLO project (see IGLO 2003), from his many important theoretical works to his work on the reference grammars in the IGLO project. It is a pleasure and an honor to be able to congratulate him on the occasion of his 60th birthday.

## References

- Ejerhed, Eva I. 1981. Swedish verb-particle constructions: Syntactic and semantic problems. In *Generative Studies in Swedish Syntax*, University of Umeå.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1985. *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- IGLO 2003. Public website organized by Peter Svenonius. <http://tea.fernuni-hagen.de/Iglo/Install/kurs/Ressourcen/start.htm>
- Koopman, Hilda. 2000. Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles. In *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads*, by Hilda Koopman, 204-260. London: Routledge.
- Norén, Kerstin. 1996. *Svenska partikkelverbs semantik*. PhD dissertation, University of Gothenburg. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Ramchand, Gillian, and Peter Svenonius. 2002. The lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verb-particle construction. WCCFL 21 Proceedings, 387-400. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1990. Functional prepositions. In *Unity in Diversity*, ed. H. Pinkster and I. Genée, 229-241. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Svenonius, Peter. 1994. *Dependent Nexus*. PhD dissertation, University of California at Santa Cruz.
- Svenonius, Peter. 1996a. The verb-particle alternation in the Scandinavian languages. Ms., University of Tromsø.
- Svenonius, Peter. 1996b. The optionality of the verb-particle construction. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57:47-75.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2001. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Taraldsen, Tarald. 2000. V-movement and VP-movement in derivations leading to VO-order. In *The Derivation of VO and OV*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 97-122. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Toivonen, Ida. 2001. *The Phrase Structure of Non-projecting Words*. PhD dissertation, Stanford University.
- Tungseth, Mai. 2002. PP, FP, and the telic/atelic distinction in Norwegian motion constructions. Iowa Aspect conference proceedings.
- Vinka, Mikael. 1999. Predicative and non-predicative verb particle constructions. WCCFL 18 Proceedings, 570-585. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Peter Svenonius  
CASTL/Department of Linguistics  
Faculty of Humanities  
University of Tromsø  
N-9037 Tromsø, Norway  
[www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/](http://www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/)  
[peter.svenonius@hum.uit.no](mailto:peter.svenonius@hum.uit.no)

