

## **The Diachronic Development of Phrasal Verbs in English**

**Éva Kovács**

In this paper I set out to discuss the diachronic development of phrasal verbs from Old English through Middle English to Modern English. Modern English phrasal verbs seem to have a long history. While in the Old English period prefixed verbs were dominant, in the Middle English period, when the language became SVO, most English prefixes were no longer productive and disappeared altogether. The most notable new development in Middle English was the emergence of phrasal verbs, in which the particle was either a preposition or an adverb, and they almost completely replaced the Old English prefixed verbs. As far as their semantics is concerned, the majority of OE phrasal combinations had literal, spatial meanings, though some of them could have metaphorical meanings in certain contexts. But it was not until eME that we find a growth of aspectual/figurative senses. Their syntactic and semantic flexibility no doubt contributed significantly to their subsequent productivity and popularity.

In comparison with the vast literature on the problems of phrasal verbs in Modern English, which has considerably grown in volume since the 1970s, (cf. e.g. Bolinger (1971), Lipka (1972), Sroka (1972), Fraser (1976), Lindner (1981), Lakoff (1987) etc.), the diachronic studies are not so numerous. The most important studies on the historical aspects of phrasal verbs to have appeared so far are those of Curme (1913/1914), Kennedy (1920), Konishi (1958), Kiffer (1965), de la Cruz (1969), Hilliard (1971), Von Schon (1977), Mitchell (1978) Hiltunen (1983a, 1983b) and Brinton (1988).

Examining the diachronic development of phrasal verbs and their relation to prefixed verbs from OE through ME to Modern English, we can see a structural shift from verbal prefixes to post-verbal particles and that the non-spatial, aspectual meanings of phrasal verbs developed from their concrete, spatial meanings.

### **1 From verbal prefixes to post-verbal particles**

From Old English to Early Modern English, the language underwent an important structural shift, from a productive system of verbal prefixes to a new system of post-verbal particles. In this shift, phrasal verbs as well as prepositional verbs came to be the equivalents of the older prefixed verbs

(see Curme 1913/14: 325, de la Cruz 1975: 55). Though many of the modern post-verbal particles are the etymological counterparts of the verbal prefixes, Konishi (1958: 118) and de la Cruz (1972: 74, 84, 86) point out that the system of post-verbal particles represents a new development.

In the OE period prefixes were predominant, but verbal particles also occurred, both following and preceding the verb. It is, however, generally acknowledged that preverbal position of the particle is more common in the OE phrasal verb than post-verbal position. De la Cruz (1975: 11) and Hiltunen (1983a: 105–26) show that although p [...] V order is more common in Old English, the frequency of V [...] p order increases steadily from late Old English to early Middle English.

The ME period was characterised by the loss of some prefixes and the continued productivity or partial productivity of others, but also by the increasing frequency of verb particle combinations. Hiltunen (1983a: 92) sees the rapid decline of prefixes and sudden rise of particles in early Middle English as “remarkable”.

By the Modern English period, verbal prefixes were no longer productive, and the phrasal verb was fully established in the language (see Kennedy 1920: 13–14; Konishi 1958: 121–2) and has increased steadily in frequency and productivity.

In Modern English, however, prefixed verbs survive in remnant forms preserving the stress pattern of Old English, for example, *arise*, *bereave*, *forbear*, *outdrink*, *overtake*, *upbraid* or *withdraw*.

A number of reasons have been proposed for the structural shift from prefixes to post verbal-particles. Some of the explanations include the following:

- the general analytic tendency of English (Konishi 1958: 118, 119; de la Cruz 1975: 67; Traugott 1982: 250);
- the shift in word order from OV to VO (Konishi 1958: 118; Traugott 1982: 250; Hiltunen 1983a: 125, 144–6, 222);
- the model of Old Norse, which had lost verbal prefixes at an early stage (Roberts 1936: 477; Samuels 1972: 60, 163–4; Hiltunen 1983a: 43, 97);
- the lack of stress in the particles and subsequent loss of phonetic content (Samuels 1972: 163; de la Cruz 1975: 78; Hiltunen 1983a: 52) or, conversely, the stressing of the prefixes (Curme 1913/14; Kennedy 1920: 11, 16–17);
- the weakening of the meaning of the prefixes, their syncretism, and grammaticalization (Samuels 1972: 164; de la Cruz 1975: 78; Hiltunen 1983a: 94–8, 100);
- the development of adverbial functions in the particles (de la Cruz 1972: 79);

- the greater clarity and expressiveness of phrasal forms (de la Cruz 1975: 49, 77; Hiltunen 1983a: 96, 97, 99)

Brinton (1988: 191), however, points out that there are several aspects of the shift which are not dealt with by the above scholars, namely why some prefixes have counterparts as particles and others do not, why new particles develop, what the meaning relationships are between prefixes and particles, and how and when non-spatial meanings develop in the prefixes and particles.

## 2 Semantic change in the verbal prefixes and particles

During the structural shift from prefixes to post-verbal particles, a change in the semantics can also be observed. The development of 'aktionsart' or aspect meanings in the verbal prefixes or particles is traditionally seen as resulting from one of two kinds of semantic change: 'bleaching' or 'metaphorical change'. In the view of bleaching, the particles are thought to lose their 'original' adverbial meaning and they are seen as fading gradually from concrete to more abstract meanings. This view goes back as far as Streitberg (1891: 102-3), who considers that the meaning of the prefixes has 'disappeared', 'evaporated' or been 'blown away'.

In the other standard view, i.e. the metaphorical shift, the particles are understood as participating in a figurative shift from concrete to abstract, or more specifically from spatial to aspectual meanings (e.g. de la Cruz 1972: 115-16; Hiltunen 1983a: 148).

Brinton (1988: 193), however, points out two aspects of the meaning of prefixes and particles which weaken the standard explanations of bleaching and metaphor. First, Brinton notes that both concrete and non-concrete meanings can be present in the same expression. The possibility of such meanings occurring simultaneously argues against the theory of bleaching, which proposes that particles and prefixes fade from one meaning to another. Second, Brinton also points out that the semantics of the particles is explained as a continuum from spatial to aspectual meanings. She (1988: 197) suggests that "the relation between spatial and aspectual expressions is based on an analogous relation of parts between objects in space and situations developing through time. Spatial expressions which indicate directions (or lines) yield telic aktionsart expressions, whereas spatial meanings which indicate locations yield continuative/iterative aspect expressions."

Brinton (1988: 198) regards the shift not as metaphoric, but metonymic because "the particles themselves do not assume figurative value, nor does the combination of verb particle effect some figurative shift." The author

observes that metaphorical shifts in prefixed and phrasal verbs affect only the root of the verb, not the particle and the particle usually preserves directional meaning.

### 3 Meanings of prefixes in OE and ME

#### 3.1 Meanings of prefixes in OE

A standard grammar of Old English lists the following prefixes

	OE prefix	Meaning	Modern German cognate
(a)	ā-	away, out	er-
	be-, bi-	about, around	be-, bei-
	for-	forth, away	ver-
	full-	full	voll-
	ge-	together	ge-
	of-	off, away	ab-
	to-	apart, away	zer-
	þurh-	through	durch-
(b)	forð-	towards	fort-
	ofer-	over	über-
	up-	up, away	auf-
	ūt-	out, away	aus-
	ymb-	around	um-

The prefixes in (a) express 'perfective', 'intensive', or 'completive' senses (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 109–19), while the ones in (b) are said to have only 'adverbial' or concrete senses. Although Quirk and Wrenn list *ūt-*, and *up-* as prefixes, Brinton (1988: 280) notes that they are extremely rare as verbal prefixes in Old English. Brinton (1988: 22) argues that "when not purely spatial in meaning, all these prefixes may, like the post-verbal particles in Modern English indicate the goal of action. Thus, they are better analysed as expressions of telic aktionsart than of perfective or intensive aspect." For an understanding of the development of aktionsart meaning in these forms, it is important to note that in their concrete sense, the above prefixes except *ge-* and *full-* all have a directional meaning of movement from or to.

*Purh-* is a verbal prefix which according to Quirk and Wrenn (1957: 118) modifies verbs with the sense of 'through, completely', e.g.:

(a) *Purhirnan* 'to run through' where the prefix is primarily directional in meaning and occurs with a verb of motion.

(b) *Purhclænsian* 'to cleanse thoroughly' where the prefix may have both meanings 'to clean through' (directional) and 'to clean to the end, completely, thoroughly (telic)' according to Brinton (1988: 205).

(c) *Purhtēon* 'to carry through or out, to an end, to accomplish' where the root of the verb undergoes a metaphorical shift from the physical to the mental domain, bringing the prefix along.

(d) *Purhlæran* 'to persuade' where the meaning of the prefix is restricted to the meaning of non-spatial goal or endpoint.

*Of-* usually gives 'perfective aspect' (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 114) or normally occurs with an 'intensive value' (de la Cruz (1975: 56). Brinton (1988: 208), however argues as follows:

(a) *ofgifan* 'to give up, leave, abandon', which is primarily telic but retains some directional meaning.

(b) *ofsettan* 'to beset, press hard, oppress' in which a metaphorical shift from the physical to the mental domain has affected the root and the prefix marks the endpoint of psychological pressure, namely oppression.

*Tō-* is a prefix which "with many verbs, especially verbs of force... gives perfective aspect" (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 114), while Brinton (1988: 206) interprets it like this:

(a) *tōcwisan* 'to shatter, to break to pieces' with the notion of goal

(b) *tōsyndrian* 'to separate'; *fig.* 'to distinguish' in which the root has both a literal and a figurative meaning, i.e. the physical action of dividing and the mental action of dividing.

*For-* "intensifies, often with a shift to perfective aspect" (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 110). De la Cruz (1975: 51) suggests that it may have developed the connotation of "wrongness" or "the contrary with a negative connotation." Brinton (1988: 208) points out that the adverbial notion of "forth, away" yields by iconic principles the notion of the endpoint of an activity, which may result in intensification, or destruction, e. g.:

(a) *forwisnian* 'to wither away'

(b) *forrotian* 'to become wholly rotten'

Although Quirk and Wrenn (1957: 114) say that *ofer-* "has straightforward adverbial sense" with verbs and indicates 'superiority in degree or quality' with nouns, Brinton (1988: 208) states that it frequently denotes telicity with verbs as well, e.g.:

(a) *oferseglian* 'to cross by sailing'

(b) *oferseolfrian* 'to cover with silver'

(c) *oferdrincan* 'to overdrink'

The semantics of the prefix *be-* is quite complex. Frequently, *be-* seems to have a transitivizing function in OE or sometimes has an Aktionsart meaning (de la Cruz 1975: 64) or it may add the sense 'round, over', often with only intensifying or perfective effect (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 110). According to Brinton (1988: 209), the concept of goal can be understood to follow from the directional meaning of surrounding or encompassing, e.g.:

(a) *bewindan* 'to wind round' in which *be-* has directional and telic meaning.

(b) *bestandan* 'to stand by, surround', in which an intransitive verb is made transitive by the prefix *be-*.

Brinton (1988: 210) states that the prefix *ymb-* 'around', with a concrete meaning similar to that of *be-*, acquires aktionsart meaning in much the same way, e.g. in *ymbhlennan* 'to crowd about, surround' directional and telic meanings coexist.

Though *forð-*, too, is considered by Quirk and Wrenn (1957: 116) to modify verbs only with a concrete meaning of 'motion forwards', it may assume telic meaning according to Brinton, eg.:

(a) *forðfaran* 'to forth, depart, die'

(b) *forðberan* 'to bear or carry forth, bring forth, produce' where in both cases, the verbal root has undergone a metaphorical shift.

Neither *ā-* nor *ge-* provides clear evidence for the semantic shift from directional to telic, since back in OE their meanings are widely extended. Both Quirk and Wrenn (1957: 119) and de la Cruz (1975: 73) point out that *ā-* has an intensifying meaning. Nonetheless, Brinton (1988: 210) lists examples in which directional and telic meanings co-exist in OE, e.g.:

*āfyllan* 'to fill up'

*āsceacan* 'to shake off'

*āwritan* 'to write out, down'

OE *ful-* is also said to have perfective meaning (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 116) or denotes the "fullness, completeness or perfection" of the meaning of the word with which it is joined (Bosworth and Toller 1973: 68), but Brinton (1988: 211) points out that its origin and subsequent history differ from those of the above-mentioned verbal prefixes. *Ful-* is clearly adjectival rather than adverbial in origin. As a verbal prefix, it is fairly productive in OE, e.g.:

*fulbreca* 'to break entirely'

*fulgangan* 'to fulfil, accomplish, finish'.

It is not at all productive in ME. Instead, *ful-* becomes a very frequent intensifier, especially with adjectives, adverbs and verb phrases.

No prefixes in OE are said to mark continuation or iteration, as *on-* does in Modern English. OE *on-* often indicates the inception of an action (Quirk and Wrenn 1957: 111–12), e.g.:

- ontendan 'to set fire to, to kindle'
- onslæpan 'to fall asleep'

### 3.2 Meanings of prefixes in ME

During the ME period some of the OE verbal prefixes continue to be productive as aktionsart markers. However, the meanings of *a-*, *ge-*, and *on-* are seriously over-extended, and as these prefixes become semantically unclear or empty, they cease to be productive derivational forms.

New formations with the prefixes *bi-*, *for-*, *forth-*, *of-*, *out(e)-* and *over-*, as well as with *to-* and *thurh-*, are attested with directional, telic, and various extended meanings. In fact, *of-*, *out(e)-* and *over-* are deemed very productive in the ME period and have telic (a) and extended meanings, especially of 'superiority and 'excess' (b).

- (a) outbāken 'to bake thoroughly'
  - ofernen 'to overtake ; flee; run (a horse) to exhaustion'
  - overbrennen 'to destroy with fire'
- (b) outrennen 'to outrun'
  - ofrīden 'to outride'
  - overchaufen 'to overheat'

The prefix *bi-* continues to have both transitivity and Aktionsart functions in ME, e.g.:

- bicasten 'to surround or cover'

*For-* is likewise productive in ME, especially with negative connotations (of failure, opposite results) with goal interpretations, e.g.:

- forlēten 'to forsake, give up'
- forwerpen 'to cast out, banish'

The prefix *to-* continues to have directional and telic force in ME, e.g.:

- toreaven 'to take completely away'

The values of the prefixes *forth-* and *thurh-* remain in ME much the same as in OE, though neither prefix is highly productive, e.g.:

- forthcasten 'to cast out, reject'
- thurhcostnen 'to provide completely'

#### 4 Emergence of the phrasal verb: from spatial to aspectual meanings in OE and ME

Although verbal prefixes were productive during the OE and much of the ME period, there is evidence for the origin of the phrasal verb even in OE.

It appears clear that the particles of phrasal verbs at first have literal, spatial meanings (as noted by Curme 1913/14, Kennedy 1920: 16, Konishi 1958: 119). Hiltunen (1983a: 146–7) also determined that the 'basic' meaning of the 'phrasal adverb' was 'the direction or the location of the action denoted by the verb'.

In the shift from prefixes to verbal particles, there are losses and additions to the set of forms used. The prefixes *ā-*, *be-*, *for-*, *ge-* and *tō-* fall out of favour, and only the adverbial equivalents of *of-* (off), *ofer-* (over), *þurh-* (through) and *forð-* (forth) remain as common verbal particles in the OE and ME periods. The innovated forms, *away*, *down*, *out*, *up*, and *along*, function only as adverbs, not as verbal prefixes in OE and have clær directional, or in the case of *along* locative meaning. According to Brinton (1988: 215), the directional markers may assume telic values and the locative may assume continuative/iterative values. Furthermore, spatial and non-spatial meanings often also co-exist, and in such a context, the particles may acquire pure aktionsart or aspect meanings by a change of focus from one kind of meaning to another. Where metaphorical shifts have occurred in the verbal roots, the particles retain spatial meaning.

Among the verbal prefixes and particles of OE, three groups can be distinguished: prefixes which have no corresponding particles, prefixes which do have corresponding particles, and new particles which have no corresponding prefixes.

Among the first group are OE prefixes *ā-*, *be-*, *for-*, *ge-* and *tō-*; de la Cruz (1975) terms these 'pure prefixes', that is, prefixes without prepositional counterparts or with widely differing functions from their counterparts.

Among the second group of particles, those which correspond to verbal prefixes, are *þurh*, *forð*, *ymb*, *on*, *ofer* and *of*. In OE most occur only occasionally as adverbial particles, usually with quite literal meaning. However, *of* and *forð* show fairly full development as verb particles in OE. As Brinton (1988: 217) states, *of* most commonly denotes 'separation, removal', notions which combine directional and telic meanings, especially with verbs of physical action such as *cut*, *drive*, *pull*, *knock*, etc, e.g.:

Gif man cealf *of* adri*fe*.

'If someone drives off a calf'

*Forð* also commonly exhibits particle functions. The sense of *forð*

is generally spatial 'forwards, forth', but it may also express combined directional and telic meaning 'away, to the end' or almost pure telic meaning, e.g.:

Abraham *eode forð*.  
 'Abraham went forth.'  
 & *ferē se ceorl forð*  
 'and (if) the man dies.'

The third group, consisting of those verb particles which do not correspond to prefixes are the adverbs *up*, *ūt*, *onweg/aweg*, and *ofdūne/adūne*.

Combinations with these adverbs seem to be quite fully developed as phrasal verbs, with the particles often undergoing the change from directional to telic meaning, and with figurative shifts taking place in the verbal roots. Brinton (1988: 220) states that these combinations clearly represent the beginnings of the new system of post-verbal particles which in later ME will replace the system of prefixation.

*Ofdūne/adūne* usually carries directional meaning with verbs of motion (a), but it also has telic meaning (b). e.g.:

- (a) He *adūne astah*.  
 'He descended (went down).'
- (b) *Wendaþ min heafod ofdūne*.  
 'Move my head down.'

*Onweg/aweg* also occurs with verbs of motion with its directional meaning (a), but also with verbs of driving, taking, removing etc. with both directional and telic meanings (b), e.g.:

- (a) *Sceall þonne feran onweg*.  
 'He shall then travel away.'
- (b) He hi *raðe aweg aþywde*.  
 'He quickly drove them away.'

Both *ūt* and *up* are frequent and well-established adverbial particles in OE. *ūt* may be used with verbs of motion and of communication with more or less literal directional meaning (a), but is more often used with verbs of casting, pouring, freeing, leading, putting, etc. with combined spatial and aktionsart meaning (b), e.g.:

- (a) *Vtan gan ūt*.  
 'Let them go out.'
- (b) *Geote hit man ūt*.  
 'Let one pour it out.'

*Up*, the most common post-verbal particle in Modern English, is also the particle of highest frequency in Hiltunen's corpus (1983a: 208). Both Hiltunen and Brinton have found that *up* frequently expresses both

directional and goal meanings as in *lift up, dig up, pull up, grow up* and *blow up* (a). It is also used commonly in figurative phrasal verbs (b).

(a) He *upp asæ*.

'He sat up.'

(b) *þe læs þe God up brede ðone godspellican cwide.*

'lest God bring up words of the gospel against thee.'

In conclusion, one can say that both the semantics and the syntax of the phrasal verb appear to be quite well-developed even in OE, especially with the particles *of, forð, ofdūne, onweg, up, and ūt*. Though they occur primarily with verbs of motion or physical activity, the particles in these combinations express, at the same time, directional meanings, *off, forth, down, away, up, out*, and telic meanings, 'completely' or 'to an end'. The verbs in these combinations have both literal and metaphorical meanings, though the former are more common in OE. Finally, one can say that the syntactic development lags somewhat behind the semantic development. While aktionsart meanings appear early, the establishment of post-verbal and post-object order of the particle takes a long time. Both orders appear in OE, but preverbal order is still predominant.

As the verbal prefixes continue to be weakened and overgeneralized, the phrasal verb extends its domain in Middle English. Although pure directional meanings of the particles still abound, the contexts in which both directional and telic meanings co-exist increase and then the telic meaning of the particle seems to be foregrounded. In addition, there are more figurative uses of phrasal verbs and more purely telic particles. Finally, idiomatic senses of phrasal verbs begin to appear.

As Brinton (1988: 226–231) points out, the common telic particles in OE continue to be used in ME; these include *of, forth, (a)down, awei, out(e)* and *up*.

As in OE, *of* may have both directional and telic meaning with verbs of cutting (a) and the putting off of earthly things, of events, or of fears and the breaking off of activities are, of course, figurative. (b), e.g.:

(a) The devyl *smyte of* here hed.

'The devil smote off her head.'

(b) We schulde *putte of* material and erþeliche þinges.

'We should reject material and earthly things.'

*Forth* is primarily directional in the meaning 'forth, forwards' (a), but it has both directional and telic meanings (b). In the figurative bringing forth of reasons or news and the putting forth of presumption or the active life, the particle has a strong telic sense (c), e.g.:

(a) So there com a squyre *brought forthe* two sperys.

'So there came a squire (who) brought forth two spears.

(b) What helpeth it to *tarien forth* the day.

'What does it help to tarry forth the day.'

(c) þe contemplatijf lijf. *bringiþ forþ* his actijf lijf.

'The contemplative life brings forth his active life.'

Again as in OE (a)*down* has both directional and goal meaning in the senses 'down to the ground' or 'down to destruction' (a) and figurative phrasal verbs with (a)*down* are also common (b), e.g.:

(a) He *hew adoun* a god sapling of an ok.

'He felled a good oak sapling.'

(b) *Trouthe is put down*, *resoun is holden fable*.

'Truth is put down (eradicated), reason is considered fable.'

*Awei* has both directional and telic meanings (a) and combination with it can also be metaphorical (b), e.g.:

(a) In fure he *berneþ al away*.

'In a fury, they burn all away.'

(b) To *puten alle wraththe away*.

'To put all wrath away.'

*Out(e)* occurs with a wide variety of verbs with a strong telic and little directional meaning, especially in the senses 'to an end', 'into prominence', and 'to extinction' (a), but it can also have telic (b) and figurative meaning (c), e.g.:

(a) The thef *entrith þe hous and doth oute* the fire.

'The thief enters the house and puts out the fire.'

(b) A coward is but as a drane in an hyue, and *etiþ out þe hony*.

'A coward is but a drone in a hive and eats up the honey.'

(c) If *euył thoghtes our hertes tak*, *Kast þam oute* for godes sake.

'If evil thoughts take hold of your hearts, cast them out for God's sake.'

By ME, *up* had become a very common particle. One can observe an increasing change in emphasis from directional to goal meanings (a), and figurative phrasal verbs with *up* are also common (b), e.g.:

(a) Aurora hadde *dreyed up* the dew of herbes wete.

'Aurora had dried up the dew of wet plants.'

(b) *Plukke up* yuore hertes, and beeth glad and blithe.

'Pluck up your hearts and be glad and happy.'

The clearest continuative/iterative marker in ME is *along*, e.g.:

In that gardyn gan I goo, *Pleyynȝ along* full meryly

'Into that garden I began to go, playing along very merrily.'

Locative *on* is not yet a frequent continuative/iterative particle in ME. A more common continuative/iterative particle with verbs of communication is *forth*, e.g.:

Now wol I *telle forth* my tale.

'Now I will tell forth my tale.'

## 5 Conclusion

The present study has been an attempt to trace the evolution of some prefixed and phrasal constructions in OE and ME, which involved extremely complex linguistic changes. Modern English phrasal verbs are doubtless a problem not only to learners of English as a foreign language but also to those trying to describe them linguistically. As we have, however, seen, their early history was even more complicated, and their syntactic and semantic complexity reached its peak at the end of the OE and the beginning of the ME period. The above discussion has shown that in the course of the development of both verbal prefixes and post-verbal particles in Old and Middle English, it is possible to see a semantic shift in some of these forms from spatial meanings to aspect/aktionsart/figurative meanings. It has consequences for an understanding of the meaning of phrasal verbs in Modern English as at least a subset of the post-verbal particles functions in quite a systematic way in expressing aspect or aktionsart meaning, and this is a direct consequence of their original spatial meaning. These meaning relations have served as a basis for the analysis of prepositions/particles/prefixes by cognitive grammarians, who considered metaphoric processes to be the major factors in this semantic shift. Cognitive-semantic studies of polysemy structures such as verb-particle constructions with the particles UP and OUT by Lindner (1981), the meanings of OVER by Brugman (1981), Taylor (1989) and Lakoff (1987) have succeeded in uncovering motivation and order behind previously random-looking groupings of meanings. They have pointed out that the meanings of prepositions/particles/prefixes are not completely arbitrary but motivated by their spatial meanings and by metaphors in our conceptual system.

## References

- Bolinger, D. (1971). *The Phrasal Verb in English*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Brinton, L. J. (1988). *The Development of English Aspectual Systems*. Cambridge University Press.

- Brugman, C. (1981). *Story of Over*. M.A. thesis, University of California, Berkeley. Reproduced by LAUD (1983).
- Comrie, B. (1991). *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cruz, de la, J. M. (1972). The Origins of the Germanic Phrasal Verb. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 77: 73–96.
- Curme, G. O. (1913/14). The Development of Verbal Compounds in Germanic. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 39: 320–61.
- Fraser, B. (1976). *The Verb-Particle Combination in English*. Academic Press.
- Hilliard, R. (1971). A Reexamination of the Separable Verb in Selected Anglo-Saxon Prose Works. Diss., Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Hiltunen, R. (1983a). The Decline of the Prefixes and the Beginnings of the English Phrasal Verb: the Evidence from some Old and early Middle English Texts. In *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*, series B, Tom 160), Turku: Turun Yliopisto.
- Hiltunen, R. (1983b). Phrasal Verbs in English Grammar Books before 1800. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*. 84: 376–86.
- Kennedy, A. G. (1920). *The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kiffer, T. E. (1965). A Diachronic and Synchronic Analysis and Description of English Phrasal Verbs. Diss., Georgetown University.
- Konishi, T. (1958). The Growth of the Verb-Adverb Combination in English — brief sketch. In *Studies in English Grammar and Linguistics: a Miscellany in Honour of Takanobu*, eds. Otsuka, Kazuo Araki Taiichiro Egawa, Toshiko Oyama and Minoru Yasui, 1958: 117–28. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Kovács, É. (1998). The Syntax and Semantics of Phrasal Verbs in English. PhD diss., KLTE. Debrecen.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lindner, S. J. (1981). A Lexico-Semantic Analysis of English Verb Particle Constructions with OUT and UP. PhD diss., University of California. San Diego.
- Lipka, L. (1972). *Semantic Structure and Word-Formation*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Mitchell, B. (1978). Prepositions, Adverbs, Prepositional Adverbs, Post-

- positions, Separable Prefixes or Inseparable Prefixes in Old English? *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 79: 340–357.
- Mitchell, T. F. (1958). Syntagmatic Relations in Linguistic Analysis. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 101–118.
- Mitchell, T. F. (1979). The English Appearance of Aspect. In *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis*, eds. Allerton, D. J., Carney, E. and Holdcroft, D. 1979: 158–184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R. and Wrenn, C. L. (1957). *An Old English Grammar*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London and New York: Methuen.
- Roberts, M. H. (1936). The Antiquity of the Germanic Verb-Adverb Locution. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 35: 466–481.
- Samuels, M. L. (1972). Linguistic Evolution with Special Reference to English. In *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*, 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schon, von, C. V. (1977). The Origin of Phrasal Verbs in English. Diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook.
- Sroka, K. A. (1972). *The Syntax of English Phrasal Verbs*. Mouton.
- Streitberg, W. (1891). Perfective and Imperfective Aktionsart im Germanischen. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 15: 70–170.
- Traugott, E. C. (1982). From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization. In *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, eds. Lehmann, W. P. and Malkiel, Y. 1982: 245–271. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 29). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin.