Two goals:
- A more "global" one: to present an overview of the variation concerning verb particles across the Germanic languages, and
- A more "local" one: to use some of this variation data to argue for Yiddish being an SOV-language like German and Dutch rather than an SVO-language like English and the Scandinavian languages.

I will start out by suggesting that prepositions and (separable) particles have the same structure:

\[
\text{[VP [PP P° DP]] and [VP [PrtP Prt° DP]]}
\]

Where the difference is that prepositions assign case, whereas particles do not. Therefore the complement DP of a particle (e.g. the book in throw out the book) will not be assigned a case. This problem has two potential solutions:

**EITHER** the particle is incorporated into the verb (i.e. into V*), in which case V* (maybe via the trace in Prt°) may now assign case to the "object" (result: He threw out the book),

**OR** the DP may move to PrtP-spec, where it can be assigned case directly by V° (as in ECM-constructions) (result: He threw the book out).

The picture can be extended to the Germanic SOV-languages, assuming that what differs between SVO and SOV is only the ordering of the verb and a separable particle (a syntactic property), not the ordering of the verb and an inseparable particle (a morphological property).

I will then go on to show that the view that Yiddish is an OV-language like German and Dutch, not a VO-language like English or Danish, is supported by facts concerning verb particles. I shall argue against Diesing's (1997:383) claim that particles may not form the basis of an argument for the underlying order of Yiddish being OV. The point is that only if Yiddish is an OV-language like German and Dutch, not a VO-language like English or Danish, can we explain why Yiddish is like German and unlike Scandinavian in allowing even those particles to occur preverbally in non-V2 constructions that do not incorporate, as seen by their not moving along with the finite verb during V2.