The Particle Zone

by Daniel Brockman

January 21, 2026

Prepositions can live one long life being really being nothing but absolutely nothing but mistaken and that makes them irritating if you feel that way about mistakes but certainly something that you can be continuously using and everlastingly enjoying. —*Gertrude Stein*

Consider the sentence "I found out that ten years ago." There is, and let us be clear about this from the outset, something deeply and possibly irreducibly weird going on here, something that resists the kind of clean taxonomic slotting that your ninth-grade English teacher—the one with the diagramming fetish and the apparent belief that Reed–Kellogg

notation represented some kind of Platonic access to linguistic truth—would have wanted to impose on it. The word "out" is doing something, clearly, but what exactly? It is not, in any recoverable spatial sense, indicating a direction. Nobody is finding anything outward, or finding anything that was previously in and is now out, or locating some object in the region external to some other region. The "out" has, as the linguists say, bleached—which is itself a gorgeous metaphor if you stop to think about it, this image of semantic color leaching away from a morpheme until what remains is this pale grammatical ghost of what was once robust prepositional meaning.

The problem, or rather one of the problems, because there are many, is that "find out" is what gets variously called a phrasal verb or a particle verb or a verb–particle construction or, in some of the older literature, a discontinuous verb, and each of these terminological choices carries its own theoretical commitments and also its own blindnesses. "Phrasal verb" emphasizes the phrase-hood, the fact that we are dealing with multiple words that function as a semantic unit, but it rather downplays the special status of that second element, lumping it in with any old multi-word verbal expression. "Particle verb" is probably better, because

it names the thing that is actually interesting, which is the particle itself—this strange category of word that isn't quite a preposition anymore and isn't an adverb and isn't quite really anything else, but rather occupies a kind of grammatical purgatory, a liminal space between word classes where the normal rules of semantic compositionality have been suspended or at least severely attenuated.

The term "particle" deserves some attention here, because it participates in a broader pattern in linguistic terminology where we use words that basically mean "small thing" to designate categories that we don't fully understand or that resist clean definition. In phonetics you have the schwa, which is the vowel that other vowels collapse into when they are unstressed, when the articulatory system stops bothering to hit a specific target and just produces something neutral, central, unmarked. The schwa is what you get when vowelness is preserved but vowel-identity is abandoned. And the particle, you could argue, is the grammatical analogue: it is what you get when a preposition or adverb bleaches out, when its specific spatial or temporal or relational meaning fades but its grammatical presence remains. The "out" in "find out" is to the preposition "out" (as in "the cat went out the door") roughly what schwa is to a

full vowel: a reduced, centralized, semantically neutral version that still occupies the relevant structural slot.

This analogy can be pushed further, and probably should be. Just as the schwa exists on a continuum with full vowels—there is no sharp line where a full vowel becomes a schwa, just gradations of reduction depending on speech rate, emphasis, phonological context—so too do particles exist on a continuum with their prepositional and adverbial sources. Consider "depend on." Is this "on" a preposition with a bleached but still vaguely recoverable spatial meaning, something like "your reliance rests on this foundation"? Or has it become a pure particle, semantically empty—"zero-dimensional," so to speak—, just a syntactic requirement of the verb "depend" with no more meaning than the "of" in "think of"? The answer is probably: both, neither, it depends, there is genuine grammatical indeterminacy here rather than just analytic uncertainty.

The language itself has not decided, or has decided not to decide, or the question is simply not one that natural language grammars are built to answer.

※

And here is where it gets genuinely interesting, or at least where what was already interesting becomes in-

teresting in additional and orthogonal ways. Because particles are not just semantically bleached, they are also positionally promiscuous, syntactically flexible in ways that full prepositions and adverbs are not. You can say "I found out the truth" or "I found the truth out"—the particle can either follow the verb directly or follow the object noun phrase. This is not possible with prepositions proper: "I went out the door" cannot become "*I went the door out." The flexibility is a diagnostic, a way of telling particles from prepositions, but it is also a mystery that requires explanation. Why should semantic bleaching correlate with positional freedom? What is the connection between losing your meaning and gaining mobility?

One answer, or part of an answer, has to do with processing. When you say "I found out the truth," the particle comes early, right after the verb, and this signals to the listener that they are dealing with a phrasal verb unit. The semantic chunk is established before the object arrives, so when "the truth" shows up, the listener knows to integrate it as the object of "find out" as a whole rather than as the object of "find" alone. But when the object is heavy—"I found out everything my mother had been hiding from me for twenty years"—stranding the particle at the end would be catastrophic

for real-time parsing: "I found everything my mother had been hiding from me for twenty years out" is nearly unprocessable, because by the time you reach "out" you have long since closed the finding event in your mental representation, and "out" arrives as this weird orphan, syntactically homeless. So the particle has to stay near the verb when the object is heavy, not because of any grammatical rule per se but because of cognitive constraints on working memory, on how much syntactic structure a listener can hold open while waiting for resolution.

And but so here is the really delicious part: there is also a floor, a minimum object weight below which particle-adjacent-to-verb starts sounding wrong. "I found out that" is bad—not ungrammatical exactly, but marked, weird, because "that" immediately following "find out" gets parsed as a complementizer, the "that" which introduces a subordinate clause, as in "I found out that he had been lying." The single-word object "that" (meaning "that thing") is too light, too ambiguous, too easily captured by another construction. You have to say "I found that out." But as soon as you add even one more word—"I found out that shit," "I found that shit out"—both orders become available again, because "that shit" is heavy enough, and more impor-

tantly unambiguous enough, to resist the complementizer parse.

So the particle is sandwiched between two pressures: objects that are too heavy force it toward the verb, objects that are too light force it away from the verb. The zone of free variation, where you can say either "I found out the truth" or "I found the truth out" with roughly equivalent acceptability, is the zone where neither pressure dominates, where objects are heavy enough to be unambiguous but light enough to tolerate stranding. The grammar has built into it, somehow, a sensitivity to processing load, to the demands that different constructions place on real-time comprehension. This is not the kind of thing that shows up in traditional phrase structure rules or even in most formal syntactic theories, which tend to abstract away from processing in favor of competence, the idealized grammatical knowledge of an idealized speaker-hearer with infinite memory and attention. The behavior of particles is a place where performance, in the Chomskyan sense, leaks back into competence, where the grammar itself has encoded facts about how it will be used.

※

Now as for the semantics— We have been talking as though particles are simply bleached, as though the "out" in "find out" has just lost its meaning and become a grammatical place-holder. But this is not quite right, or is right only for some particle verbs and not others, or is right in some uses and not others. Because particles do contribute something, often something quite specific, even if that something cannot be easily reduced to the spatial meanings of their prepositional sources. Consider the aspectual function of "up" in verbs like "eat up," "drink up," "use up," "finish up." The "up" here indicates completion, telicity, the action being carried through to its endpoint. You can eat a sandwich or you can eat up a sandwich; the first is neutral about whether you finished it, the second implies that you did. This is genuine semantic content, but it is not spatial content—there is no upward direction involved, no vertical axis. The particle has been repurposed, its meaning shifted from spatial to aspectual, but it has not been emptied.

Or consider "out" in its various guises. "Find out" is epistemic—discovering information. "Tire out" is completive—exhausting someone thoroughly. "Freak out" is intensive—becoming extremely agitated. "Map out" is comprehensive—planning something fully.

"Work out" can mean exercise, or can mean succeed ("things worked out"), or can mean calculate ("work out the answer"). The "out" is doing different things in each case, but none of them are simply nothing, and all of them seem to share some family resemblance having to do with completion, or thoroughness, or emergence into visibility. The spatial meaning of "out"—movement from inside to outside, from hidden to exposed—has been metaphorically extended into these various domains, leaving traces of itself in each extension.

This is where Saussure becomes relevant: the structuralist insight that linguistic elements get their identity from their position in a system of contrasts rather than from inherent content. Phonemes are the classic case: /p/ means nothing in itself, it is just a point in a space defined by its differences from /b/ and /t/ and /k/ and so on. And prepositions, particularly in their more grammaticalized uses, approach this condition. Why do we say "interested in" but "fascinated by"? Why "on Monday" but "in the morning"? Why "depend on" and "rely on" and "count on"—what is the "on" doing in each case, and is it the same thing? The honest answer is probably that these are mostly or almost completely arbitrary, that the preposition choice is lexically specified

by the verb or noun rather than semantically motivated, that "on" in these expressions means "not-in" and "not-at" and "not-by" more than it means anything positive. The prepositions have become diacritical, markers of construction type rather than carriers of spatial meaning.

And so when prepositions become particles, they bring this diacritical quality with them, but they also remain available for semantic contribution when the right contexts arise. The particle system is hyperproductive in a specific sense: productive not just within a category but across categorical boundaries. A particle can simultaneously retain traces of its prepositional origin, function as an aspect marker, contribute pragmatic force, and be on its way toward fusing with the verb into a new lexical item. "Up" in "hurry up" is still vaguely completive or intensive or upward or all of these at once, and the grammar does not force a resolution. The particle exists in superposition, multiple functions coexisting without collapsing into any single analysis. Its semantic freedom is omnidirectional precisely because its essence is zero-dimensional.

This superposition is particularly visible in the way particle verbs relate to their non-particle counterparts. Sometimes adding the particle changes the meaning

dramatically: "make" versus "make up" (fabricate), "give" versus "give up" (surrender), "put" versus "put up with" (tolerate).

These are cases of full lexicalization, where the particle verb has become a separate dictionary entry with an unpredictable meaning. But sometimes the particle seems to add only a subtle shading, an intensification or completion that does not fundamentally alter the verb's semantics. "Hurry" versus "hurry up"—both mean move faster, but "hurry up" feels more urgent, more imperative. "Eat" versus "eat up"—both mean consume, but "eat up" implies finishing. The particle is contributing something, but the something is not always easy to articulate, and speakers may not be consciously aware of what work the particle is doing.

There is a pragmatic dimension here that deserves attention, because particles can modulate illocutionary force in ways that go beyond semantic content. Consider the difference between "hurry" as an imperative and "hurry up" as an imperative. "Hurry!" requires prosodic support—an exclamation point, a sharp intonation—to function as a command. It could equally be the truncated form of a declarative ("I hurry," said while demonstrating) or a question ("Hurry?" said with rising intonation). But "hurry up" carries its im-

perative force internally; the particle recruits enough agentive, urgent energy that the command interpretation is already primed. The verb alone is neutral about speech act type; the particle tips it toward directive function.

This pragmatic loading of particles connects to another phenomenon: the way temporal adverbs like "now" can themselves become particle-like in imperative contexts. "Hurry up now" does not mean "hurry up at the present moment as opposed to some other moment." The "now" has lost its temporal content and become a pure urgency marker, an intensifier of the directive force. You could say "hurry up now" to someone who is already late, where the "now" cannot possibly be doing temporal reference because the relevant time was already past. The "now" has bleached, has become diacritical, has joined the particle zone where meaning fades and grammatical function remains. The construction "verb + up + now" starts to feel like a template, a three-part imperative formula where each element contributes force rather than content.

The particle zone, in other words, is a place where words go when they are transitioning between categories—a kind of syntacto-semantical Casablanca—or when speakers are being noncommittal about their

status, or when the language itself has decided that categorical indeterminacy is more useful than categorical precision. It is the grammatical equivalent of neutral ground, a space where the normal distinctions between prepositions and adverbs and aspect markers and pragmatic particles are suspended. And this neutrality is productive: it allows new constructions to emerge, new meanings to be generated through novel combinations. A speaker who has never heard "weird out" can produce and understand it, because the particle zone provides a template—verb plus "out" yields an intensified or completive version of the verb—that can be instantiated with new verbs.

Let us turn now to the internal structure of prepositional sequences and the way this illuminates the particle phenomenon. Consider "out from under," as in "the cat came out from under the bed." What is the phrase structure here? Is "out" modifying "came," with "from under the bed" as a separate prepositional phrase? Is "out from under" a complex preposition, a single constituent with internal structure? Is it three separate prepositions, each contributing independently to the meaning? Traditional phrase structure grammars want to assign a tree, a hierarchical organization with clear dominance relations, but the actual parsing expe-

rience is more like—these prepositions are just stacked, chained spatially, each one adding another layer of relational meaning without any clear syntactic subordination.

You see this even more clearly in examples like "up on top of the roof" or "down in under the covers" (the latter being dialectal but attested). The prepositions do not nest neatly; they concatenate and sometimes even commute. Each one specifies a spatial relation, and the overall meaning is compositional in the sense that you can work out what it means from the parts, but not compositional in the sense that there is a clear hierarchical structure to the composition. It is more like the prepositions are beads on a string, each one adding its contribution to a cumulative spatial specification.

And this concatenative, non-hierarchical character is what particles bring with them when they detach from their spatial meanings and start functioning as verbal modifiers. "Put up with" is three morphemes that do not compose in any transparent way—you are not putting anything up, you are not putting anything with, the whole chunk just means "tolerate" and has to be learned as a unit. The syntax sees three words—you can interrupt them: "put the hell up with," "put up, if you must, with"—but the semantics sees one mean-

ing. This is the inverse of the usual compositionality picture, where syntactic complexity is supposed to map onto semantic complexity. Here the syntactic structure is visible, the pieces are separable, but the meaning is holistic, undecomposable, arbitrary.

The arbitrariness becomes particularly stark when you consider paradigm gaps and blocking effects. If "put up with" means "tolerate," why does "put down with" not mean "intolerate"? Why can you "freak out" but not "*freak in"? Why "work out" (exercise) but not "*work in" with the opposite meaning (leisure?)? Some of these gaps are accidental—the language just never happened to lexicalize that combination. But some of them seem motivated: "in" does not want to participate in intensive or completive constructions the way "out" does, because "out" has metaphorical associations with emergence, visibility, thoroughness that "in" lacks. The particles have proto-semantic content that constrains which verbs they can combine with and what meanings can result. They are not fully arbitrary, not just diacritical markers, but they are also not transparently compositional. They occupy an intermediate zone, that purgatorial space again, where meaning is present but underdetermined, where the system provides constraints without providing rules.

There is also the phenomenon of particle verb families, clusters of verbs with the same particle that share some semantic thread. Consider the "up" verbs: "clean up," "tidy up," "straighten up," "fix up," "patch up," "dress up," "make up" (apply cosmetics), "touch up." There is something about "up" that invites readings of improvement, completion, putting in order. Or the "out" verbs of depletion: "wear out," "tire out," "burn out," "run out," "use out" (dialectal), "sell out." The "out" here indicates exhaustion, using something until nothing remains. These family resemblances are real, productive, available to speakers as templates for coining new expressions. But they are also vague, overlapping, inconsistent—"make up" also means fabricate, "sell out" also means betray, "run out" also means flee (where out functions much more as a normal adverb rather than a particle). The particle provides a semantic neighborhood, not a determinate meaning.

※

The question of how other languages handle this, whether the particle zone is a Germanic peculiarity or a universal attractor in grammatical space, turns out to be both more interesting and more complicated than you might expect. The quick answer, the one

you would get from a typology textbook, is that verb–particle constructions in the robust English sense are a Germanic phenomenon, that German and Dutch and the Scandinavian languages all have versions of this system while Romance and Slavic and Sino–Tibetan languages do not.

But this is one of those quick answers that becomes less true the longer you look at it, that dissolves into qualifications and counterexamples and "well, it depends on what you mean by particle."

Start with the obvious comparisons. German has separable prefix verbs, the famous trennbare Verben that every German learner struggles with, where "aufmachen" (to open) splits into "ich mache die Tür auf" (I open the door) with the "auf" stranded at the end of the clause. This looks superficially like English particle verbs, and it is historically related, both systems descending from Proto-Germanic patterns. But the German system is in some ways more regular and in other ways more constrained. The prefixes are more tightly bound to their verbs, more predictable in their meanings, less promiscuously combinable. You cannot coin new separable verbs in German with the same ease that English speakers coin phrasal verbs. The productivity runs in different channels. And the positional facts are

different: German particles go to the end of the clause, not just to the end of the verb phrase, which means they can end up very far from their verbs in embedded clauses, creating those infamous sentence-final particle pileups that make German subordinate clauses feel like syntactic obstacle courses.

Dutch is probably closer to English in the relevant respects, with a particle system that is both productive and positionally flexible in similar ways. Swedish and Norwegian and Danish all have particle verbs that behave recognizably like their English cousins. So there is a Germanic core here, a family resemblance that is not accidental. But even within Germanic, the systems differ in their details, their productivity, their semantic ranges. The particle zone is not one thing but a cluster of related things, a design space that different languages have explored differently.

Now here is where it gets genuinely strange: when you look outside Germanic, you do not find a clean absence of particle-like phenomena. You find instead a proliferation of structures that are not quite particles but are not quite not-particles either, that solve similar problems through different means, that make you wonder whether "particle" is even the right category or

whether it is just a Germanic-centric label for something more general.

Take Mandarin. Mandarin has what are called resultative verb compounds, and they are fascinating in ways that most English speakers never encounter because the translations smooth them out. Consider “打破” (dǎ pò), which gets translated as “break” but which is internally complex: “打” (dǎ) means “hit” or “strike,” and “破” (pò) means “broken” as a state. So “打破” is literally something like “hit-broken” or “strike into a state of brokenness.” The first element is the action, the second element is the result, and together they form a compound verb that specifies both what you did and what happened because of it.

This is not obviously the same as English particles, but the functional parallels are striking. English “eat up” specifies eating plus completion; Mandarin “吃完” (chī wán) specifies eating (吃) plus finishing (完). English “find out” specifies seeking plus epistemic success; Mandarin “找到” (zhǎo dào) specifies seeking (找) plus arrival at a result (到). The second element in the Mandarin compound is doing aspectual work, modulating the verb to indicate that the action reached its endpoint, exactly like completive “up” and “out” in English. The formal mechanism is different—Mandarin

uses compounding where English uses syntactically separate particles—but the semantic function is eerily parallel.

And the Mandarin system has its own version of the bleaching phenomenon. The element "到" (dào) originally means "arrive" in a physical, spatial sense. But in resultative compounds it has extended to mean successful attainment of any result, not just physical arrival.

"看到" (kàn dào) is "see" (看) plus "arrive" (到), meaning "catch sight of," "succeed in seeing." "听到" (tīng dào) is "hear" (听) plus "arrive," meaning "succeed in hearing," "manage to hear." The spatial meaning of arrival has been metaphorically extended into a general marker of successful result, exactly parallel to how English "out" extends from spatial emergence to epistemic discovery to thorough completion. The bleaching follows similar paths even in unrelated languages.

But here is where Mandarin diverges in an instructive way: the resultative complements are not positionally flexible the way English particles are. You cannot say "*我找我的钥匙到" (I seek my keys arrive) with the resultative element after the object, the way you can say "I found my keys out." The compound verb is tight, unseparable under normal circumstances. Mandarin has

other constructions for when you want to put the object in the middle—the famous "把" (bǎ) construction, which fronts the object before the verb—but it does not have the same particle-stranding flexibility that English does. So the semantic parallel is strong but the syntactic parallel is weak. Same problem, different solution, different constraints.

This pattern repeats across languages. Hungarian has verbal prefixes that separate under specific conditions—negation, focus, certain clause types—which is somewhere between the German system and the English system in terms of separability. Russian has verbal prefixes that are completely bound, never separate, but that do similar aspectual work, converting imperfective verbs to perfective, marking completion or inception or intensity. The prefixes are synthetic where Germanic particles are analytic, affixal where particles are free-standing, but functionally they occupy the same ecological niche in the grammar.

Even Romance languages, which supposedly lack particle verbs, have structures that creep toward particle-hood. French "sortir" (to go out) is a single morphologically simple verb, not a verb plus particle. But French also has "faire sortir" (to make go out), where the causative is analytic, decomposed into two

words. And in some registers and dialects, you get things like "sortir dehors" (go out outside), which is technically redundant but which suggests a pressure toward the explicit, the analytic, the decomposed. Italian has "venire fuori" (to come out) alongside "uscire" (to exit), and the two-word version is gaining ground in colloquial speech. The particle solution keeps being reinvented, keeps emerging as an attractor in grammatical space, even in languages that are not supposed to have it.

What this suggests is that the particle zone is not a Germanic quirk but a functional region that languages converge on from different directions. The need to modulate verbs for aspect, for result, for completion, for intensity, for epistemic success—this need is universal, or close to it. Languages can meet this need with bound morphology, with auxiliary verbs, with adverbs, with resultative complements, with particles proper. The solutions differ in their formal properties but they cluster around the same semantic territory. The particle zone, in other words, is a place in grammatical design space, not just in English grammar. It is where languages put the machinery for tweaking verb meaning in ways that are too fine-grained for lexical distinction but too important to leave unexpressed.

The universal, if there is one, seems to be that languages need some way of modulating verbal aspect and Aktionsart—the difference between eating and eating up, between finding and finding out, between an activity and an accomplishment. Some languages do this with verbal morphology, some with auxiliary verbs, some with particles, some with resultative complements. The Germanic particle system is one solution to a universal problem, a way of adding semantic content to verbs without adding morphological complexity. The particles are analytic rather than synthetic: separate words rather than bound morphemes, positionally flexible rather than affixally fixed.

And this analyticity may be what allows the system to be so productive. Because particles are separate words, they can be recruited for new combinations without any morphophonological adjustment—you just put them next to a verb and see if the result is interpretable. Because they are positionally flexible, they can appear in different syntactic environments, which increases their exposure to reanalysis and semantic shift. Because they are semantically bleached but not quite empty, they provide a kind of grammatical raw material that can be repurposed for multiple functions. The particle zone is a workshop where new constructions are forged,

a place of grammatical creativity that operates below the level of conscious word formation.

※

We should close by considering what all of this means for the speaker and learner. Native speakers of English navigate the particle system with remarkable fluency, producing and understanding novel combinations, observing the constraints on particle placement, deploying the subtle pragmatic shadings of particle choice, all without any explicit knowledge of what they are doing. This is implicit grammatical knowledge at its most intricate: a system with hundreds of lexicalized expressions, productive patterns for generating new ones, constraints that depend on processing factors and information structure, and semantic contributions that range from fully compositional to completely opaque. Children acquire this system gradually, making overgeneralization errors ("I holded it up") that show they are learning rules rather than just memorizing forms, but also showing sensitivity to item-specific properties that suggests they are tracking lexical details simultaneously.

For second language learners, particles are notoriously difficult. The problem is not just that there are

many combinations to memorize, though there are. The problem is that the combinatorial logic operates in this hyperproductive space where the normal rules about what words mean and what grammatical categories do have been suspended. You cannot learn particles by learning rules, not fully. You have to develop a feel for the space, an intuition for how meanings flow and blur and recombine. You have to acquire the proto-semantic content of individual particles—the completive force of "up," the epistemic or depletive flavor of "out," the reversative or negative sense of "un-" when it functions as a particle—while also learning the idiosyncratic combinations where that content has been overwritten by lexicalization. It is a domain where linguistic competence looks more like a vibe than a grammar, more like knowing your way around a neighborhood than following a map.

Perhaps that is the deepest lesson of particles: that grammatical knowledge is not all one thing, that some parts of language are rule-governed in the clean generative way while other parts are statistical, probabilistic, a matter of weighted constraints and family resemblances and default inferences that can be overridden. The particle zone is where these different types of knowledge meet, where rules and items coexist, where productiv-

ity and idiomaticity are not opposed but interleaved. It is a reminder that natural languages are not designed systems but evolved ones, full of kludges and redundancies and historical accidents that have been pressed into service as grammatical resources. The particle is a repurposed preposition is a bleached spatial term is a metaphor is a grammatical marker is a pragmatic intensifier—and it is all of these at once, superposed, underdetermined, fluid.

This fluidity is not a bug. It is what allows language to do what language does: to mean new things by combining old pieces in new ways, to shift categories without losing continuity, to be precise when precision is needed and vague when vagueness serves. The particle zone is a place where language keeps its options open, maintains flexibility, resists the crystallization into fixed form that would limit future creativity.

And if this makes particles hard to analyze, hard to teach, hard to fit into neat taxonomic boxes—well, that is the price of expressive power. The schwa is not a failed vowel; it is a vowel at rest, a vowel conserving energy, a vowel ready to become any other vowel when the context demands. And the particle is not a failed preposition; it is a preposition in reserve, a grammatical

resource held in potentiated form, ready to contribute whatever meaning the construction calls for.

When you find something out, you are not finding it outward, or finding it in the out region, or performing any spatial operation that "out" would literally name. You are just—finding it out. The "out" is there because it has always been there, because English is the kind of language that puts particles after its verbs, because "find" alone would mean something subtly different—locating rather than discovering, encountering rather than learning. The particle marks the epistemic shift, the movement from not-knowing to knowing, which is itself a kind of emergence, a coming out from the darkness of ignorance into the light of knowledge. Or maybe that is just a story we tell ourselves, a post-hoc rationalization of an arbitrary construction. The particle does not say. It just sits there, bleached and potent, doing its grammatical work in that strange intermediate zone where meaning is always arriving and never quite arriving, where the word is more than its history and less than its analysis, where language keeps its secrets even as it tells us everything we need to know.

