CHAPTER TWO: GROUP-VERBS IN PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH

There is a vast amount of work published on group-verbs in PE; I have not attempted to read all the items intended for foreign learners of English and their teachers. A good short account is that of Quirk and Greenbaum, *Univ. Grammar*, pp.347-52, based on the analysis in Mitchell, 'Syntagmatic Relations'. More detailed discussions of group-verbs and tests which may be used to discriminate between them can be found in the works of Bolinger, Carstensen, Cowie and Mackin, Dietrich, Fairclough, Lipka, Palmer, and Sroka.¹ Lipka and Sroka in particular give useful surveys of previous work. The following account draws on observations made by these and by certain other scholars who will be cited in the course of discussion.

Tests for group-verb status

The single most useful test is to attempt to substitute a generalised adverb like there, then, thus, so for a particle or for a constituent containing the particle: if the substitution is appropriate, the particle does not belong to a group-verb. For example, a grammatical and appropriate generalisation of *John sat at the table* is *John sat there*: there

is no group-verb. But John laughed at the proposal is not adequately paraphrased by John laughed there, because laugh at is a group-verb. A variant of the test is to transform a sentence into a where-, when- or how-question (if possible at all): any particle which can be 'absorbed' in the interrogative adverb without destroying the essential meaning of the sentence is not part of a group-verb. If applied to the sentences They went through with the project, The measure went through with all-party support, Seeing an open door, he went through with a smile on his face, the test would reveal the verbs to be respectively go through with, go through, and go. It is a simple measure of idiomatic combinatory meaning.

If a one-word synonym exists for a verb-particle collocation, this too is an indication that it may be a group-verb, but the results are haphazard. It is hard, for example, to find a one-word synonym for get away with (misbehaviour, etc.), an idiomatic combination which conforms to a common syntactic group-verb pattern, whilst go into has the close synonym enter when used in a wholly literal sense without any apparent collocational restrictions holding between verb and particle. The existence of various kinds of nominalisation can also be an indication that verb and particle are becoming lexicalised, but here too there are haphazard gaps, and such tests are anyway less applicable to verb-preposition collocations. Other syntactic tests apply only to certain kinds of group-verb and do not serve to delimit group-verbs as a whole from other co-occurrences of verb and particle(s).

A factor common to all undisputed group-verbs is that the particle is, or is part of, the verbal complement, rather than an adjunct. In TG terms, the particle is in rather than outside the VP.² And in many cases

the meaning of a group-verb is not the sum of individual meanings of its components. Trying to draw a clear distinction between group-verbs and not-group-verbs is unrewarding, however. It must be recognised that group-verbs vary along many different axes, and that far enough along any axis of variation there will be collocations which are not group-verbs. No one test can delimit the area cleanly and in full accord with one's intuitive notions, but several tests of the kinds mentioned above can be used to locate a core area of group-verbs, shading off vaguely into unrestricted co-occurrences.

THE CLASSIFICATION

Although the outer bounds of the set of group-verbs are somewhat indistinct, the internal divisions are easier to mark out. Perhaps the simplest classification, a syntactic one, is to use just three binary features: whether a group-verb has one particle or two, and whether in the active voice it appears with or without a direct object and with or without a prepositional object. There are thus potentially eight classes, and certain kinds of overlap must also be acknowledged. I number the classes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class</th>
<th>second particle</th>
<th>direct object</th>
<th>prepositional object</th>
<th>name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'intransitive phrasal verb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'transitive phrasal verb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>'prepositional verb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>'phrasal-prepositional verb'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Classes of group-verbs
I shall discuss each class in turn, then the areas of overlap. In order to keep the scheme simple I have made no allowance in the classification for indirect objects, which may co-occur with the direct object of a class 2 group-verb (e.g. write me out a prescription) or which may be transformationally interchangeable with a prep0 in a pattern of the class 6 type (e.g. John gave Bill a present vs. John gave a present to Bill). I shall discuss indirect objects separately. I have also failed to allow for possible group-verbs with two prepositional objects, e.g. argue with (sb.) about (sth.), for despite the narrow collocational restrictions which may obtain for verb and both particles, the syntactic properties seem to be those of a class 3 group-verb with optional prepositional phrase.

Class 1 group-verbs, the intransitive phrasal verbs, have one particle and no object. Examples include back out 'withdraw', carry on 'proceed', get by 'manage adequately'. The verbal formative nearly always precedes the particle and usually comes immediately before it. They may sometimes be separable by an intensifier (e.g. We've run right out) or, in literary English at any rate, by a manner adverb (e.g. He mated heavily out).

In certain circumstances the particle may be clause-initial or

More elaborate classifications which allow explicitly for certain intermediate types are those of Fairclough, 'Studies', esp. p.70, and Cowie and Mackin, ODCTE, pp.xxxiv-lvii. Their equivalents of my classes 1-6 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairclough</td>
<td>a, e</td>
<td>c, d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>g, i, k, m</td>
<td>f, h, j, l</td>
<td>prepositional verb type-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowie &amp; Mackin</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fairclough's scheme, which has thirteen types of phrasal verb, takes account not of a single occurrence of the collocation but of the possibility of adding or removing first particle, direct object, prepositional object, and second particle.
nearly so (i.e. following an initial conjunction, adverbial, or vocative), usually for exclamationary or vivid effect: Down came the rain; We were just about to leave when along came a porter; Up you go; All of a sudden out it shot, etc. The particle is then almost always literal and directional, the verb one of motion, so that such collocations are only marginal to the group-verb system. We may compare Off it went (of a train), Off it went (of a bomb), Off it went (of fruit). As can be seen from the examples chosen, there is subject-verb inversion unless the subject is a light pronoun. Initial placement of the particle seems most natural when there is a simple present or past tense verb without auxiliaries. It may be appropriate to relate the phenomenon to minor clauses of exclamationary type which lack a verb, e.g. Back, you brute; Up and at 'em; Off with his head; Down with the Government.

Class 2 group-verbs, the transitive phrasals, have one particle and a direct object. Examples include bear out 'confirm'; put by 'save, store'; take in 'deceive'. The verbal formative precedes the particle, except for rare cases of initial placement for vivid effect. Insertion of another adverbial between verb and particle is also uncommon.

4 A more idiomatic initial particle is that seen in On they battled until both were exhausted, although Fraser argues that this continuative on is not a particle (in his sense), because of its ease of initial placement and of reduplication, and because of other properties alleged to distinguish it from particles (VFC, pp.58-59).

5 Even then it is conceivable that inversion might take place to give end-focus to the pronoun: *And then of course in came you. (It seems less likely with a pronoun marked for case: *And then of course in came she/ her.)

6 This observation is confirmed in Quirk and Greenbaum, Univ. Grammar, p.228, and in Kohonen, Development, p.59, quoting Emmonds.

7 One finds examples like the following: I don't think it would have all got me quite so down if ... (J. D. Salinger, Franny and Zooey (Harmondsworth | Penguin], 1969, p.145)); and ... when the chance came Alice turned it firmly down (Graham Greene, A Sort of Life (London, 1971), p.95).

A suggestion by Erades has found general favour, that it is the 'news-value' of the item denoted by the object which is the crucial factor, objects of high news-value tending to come after the particle, and conversely. Bolinger has modified the idea to one of 'semantic focus', in which both accent and position play a part. Other factors which may be relevant (and all are covered to some extent by the principle of semantic focus) are whether object or particle are subject to further modification, whether the group-verb is so idiomatic that the meaning of the particle is entirely opaque (favouring V-p-0), and whether the particle has 'effective value' (favouring V-0-p).\footnote{See, for example, Visser, *Hist. Syntax*, i, 602-603.} A number of the contributions listed in note 8 draw attention to set phrases in which a class 2 group-verb plus object together form an idiom 'frozen' in either V-p-0 or V-0-p order, e.g. bring up the rear, keep your hair on. A special case of this is group-verbs like fight it out, live it up, in
which it may have no specific reference. Some have a passive turn, others do not.

Class 3 group-verbs, the prepositional verbs, have one particle and take a prepositional object. Examples include go for 'attack', jump at (an offer), set about 'begin'. The verbal formative precedes the particle, interruption by a manner adverbial frequently being permissible. The particle in turn precedes the object, and interruption of the particle-object string (which is a prepositional phrase) may occur if the particle resembles a spatial adverb—on which see p.17 above—or when the equivalence of the whole group-verb to a single transitive verb comes to the fore, notably in the case of a shared object, e.g. John looked for and found a substitute; otherwise it is rare.

A relative or interrogative object will normally precede the whole group-verb, unless the particle is also placed at the front of the clause in such a pattern as The supplies on which we depend, usually in more formal registers. This is sometimes known in TG jargon as 'Pied Piping', because the particle accompanies the Wh-word to the front of the clause. Now Goyvaerts claims that 'it is evident that there are two categories of verb + prep structures; (i) purely prepositional verbs and (ii) verbs which need a preposition to introduce their object'. His first category would include my initial three examples, his second would be appropriate for the like of approve of, rely on. There is a difference here, because the 'purely prepositional verbs' are less prone to 'Pied Piping' and to topicalisation of the type On me you can rely and are also less open to

10 See Visser, Hist. Syntax, i, 451-57; Bolinger, Phrasal Verb, p.131; Fraser, VPC, pp.34-35.

11 Ellipsis of the prepO may be found occasionally, for instance in the language of packaging, where a NP referring to the package or its contents is often omitted. Cans of Coca Cola are marked Dispose of properly.

insertion of an adverbial between V and p. But Coyvaerts's two categories are better seen as different points on a cline, a large number of class 3 group-verbs falling somewhere between them.

There are other ways to subdivide class 3. Palmer introduces the prepositional verb as a relation of the phrasal verb and is therefore able to point out two characteristics: 'First, the verb is a verb of motion and secondly, the preposition has a meaning similar to that of the adverb of the phrasal verbs—motion plus terminus' (Eng. Verb, p.230). The particle is therefore Bolinger's 'adprep'. He then goes on, rather confusingly, to discuss several types of prepositional verb which share neither of these characteristics but are apparently included because they are semantically (partially) opaque or because verb and preposition are collocationally restricted. Finally, more literal combinations like sleep in are rejected as prepositional verbs without explanation but apparently because their formatives do not possess the two notional characteristics mentioned earlier (Eng. Verb, p.233). They can, however, occur in the passive.

Now the striking fact about many class 3 group-verbs is that the prepO of the active may become the subject of the passive turn, e.g. The offer was jumped at, His discretion can be relied on. Palmer rejects the test because its results do not coincide with his other, somewhat vague criteria. Fairclough also points out that collocations like amount to, consist of have no passive but should be regarded as belonging to the close-linked type of prepositional verb because of the pronominal interrogative ('Studies', p.26)—viz. What does it amount to?, not *Where does it amount? A further problem is that some collocations cannot be tested in isolation or even by the consideration of individual sentences, as the possibility of passivisation may depend crucially on the NPs chosen and
on the context.\textsuperscript{13}  

Class 4 group-verbs, the phrasal-prepositional verbs, have two particles and take a prepositional object. Examples include \textit{come in for 'incur', look forward to 'anticipate (eagerly)', put up with 'tolerate'}. In form the structure is best analysed as that of a prepositional verb whose verbal formative is an intransitive phrasal:\textsuperscript{14} compare \textit{cut down on (inessentials) (class 4)} with \textit{cut down (class 1)}. That would be sufficient to explain the severe collocational restrictions on verb and particles and the fact that many class 4 group-verbs have a passive turn, e.g. \textit{She can't be kept up with, He was looked down on}. As with class 3, there is no settled limit on which collocations can be passivised.\textsuperscript{15}

The reasons for regarding this kind of group-verb as a class in its own right are that the string of verb and two particles is rarely interrupted or inverted in any way,\textsuperscript{16} and that the constituent structure

\textsuperscript{13}Dwight L. Bolinger explores the conditions under which passivization may occur (both in class 3 and elsewhere) in 'Transitivity and Spatiality: The Passive of Prepositional Verbs', in Linguistics at the Crossroads, edited by Adam MakKay, Valerie B. MakKay, and Luigi Heilmann (Padua and Lake Bluff, Ill., 1977), pp.57-78. Two recent studies, by Vestergaard and Couper-Kuhlen, may provide further insights: I have not been able to take account of them but give details in the Bibliography.

\textsuperscript{14}A different analysis of at least one class 4 group-verb is suggested by Quirk and Greenbaum: 'Check up on (his record), "investigate", is analysable as consisting of the prepositional verb check on plus the intensifying up' (Univ. Grammar, p.351). That is, they suggest class 3 within class 1 rather than class 1 within class 3. However, the latter fits equally well here and is more widely applicable with other examples.

\textsuperscript{15}Nonce passives sometimes appear without a collocation being fully lexicalised, e.g. a notion got about that I had been bolted away with (Joseph Conrad, author's note to Lord Jim (London, 1917)); I don't like being hung up on (Bad Timing [film], directed by Nicholas Roeg, 1980)—active hang up on now in OBES Supp. s.v. hang v. 28a; cf. Visser, Hist.Syntax, iii-2, 2135.

\textsuperscript{16}The effect of doing so is either deliberately humorous, as in Churchill's up with which I will not put, or somewhat stilted, as in Unfortunately, this is a point on to which Mr Beighton cannot with enthusiasm (TLS, 28 October 1977, p.1265); . . . towering giants, up to whom each candidate roasts that he alone can stand (Guardian, 1 November 1980, p.8).
discernible in some of them, e.g. keep on at 'nag' = keep on + at, is not always present. For instance, go through with 'complete' ≠ go through + with, put up with ≠ put up + with. 17

Class 5 group-verbs have two particles and take both a dir0 and a prep0. They are not mentioned in many studies, but they belong here as idioms in which verbal formative and particles are under tight collocational restriction with a relatively free choice of NP for the two object positions. Examples include let (sb.) in on (a secret, etc), single (sb.) out for (sth.), take (anger, etc) out on (sb.). In form the class can be regarded as class 2 within class 3, though again the theoretical phrasal constituent may have no independent existence. The string V-dir0-p-p-prep0 is rarely interrupted, except that either NP may appear at the beginning of the clause if it is a relative or interrogative. In the passive, if there is one, the subject normally corresponds to the dir0 of the active.

Class 6 group-verbs have one particle and take both a dir0 and a prep0. Examples include foist (sth.) on (ab.), read (sth.) into (sth.), take (ab.) for (a fool, etc). Class 6 has marginal status in a classification of group-verbs. On the one hand particle and verb never form a syntactic constituent, and it is possible to regard examples of such collocations as transitive verbs which co-occur with a prepositional phrase. On the other hand the choice of particle is severely restricted and the verbal formative may have quite a different meaning (or no meaning) on its own, whilst the choice of NPs is relatively open.

There are different sorts of collocation within class 6. The

17 Go through with and go through can be used in similar extra-linguistic contexts (see the examples used on p.22 above), but the subject NP will not be the same in each case. Put up cannot by itself mean 'be tolerant', although as Jespersen points out, it used to be a transitive phrasal meaning 'tolerate' (MEG, iii, 270-71); see also Chapter 7.
preposition is well-nigh obligatory in the three examples already given. A prepositional phrase or other adverbial is required with such verbs as keep, place, put in their common uses, so that a preposition may be part of their complement and so arguably part of a group-verb; however, almost any locative preposition may be used with them. There are verbs like give, send, etc which may or must have another NP, typically animate, in addition to the dir0, this second NP appearing either in a to-phrase or as an indirect object marked by position. The prepositional form can be included in class 6 because of the high predictability of to in collocation with the verb. (The form without preposition and its associated 'indirect passive' need not concern us here.) A similar set contains transitive verbs + for-phrase interchangeable with ind0, e.g. John cooked a meal for Jane/John cooked Jane a meal. Other prepositions are occasionally found too (e.g. in ask sth. of sb.), and the prepositional phrase is usually optional. In another set it is the non-prepositional object which is typically an animate or human NP, as in remind sb. of sth. This object may then on semantic grounds be called an indirect object—thus Quirk and Greenbaum, Univ. Grammar, pp.371-72. However, for present purposes I see no objection to calling that NP a dir0 and classing remind sb. of sth. together with explain sth. to sb., put sth. into sth., and foist sth. on sb.

The grounds for positing a class 6 of group-verbs include high mutual predictability of verb and particle (collocational restriction) and/or idiomatic combinatory meaning. In addition, certain syntactic patterns make verb and particle adjacent and enhance the impression that they form a group-verb, e.g. I know the interpretation which they read into the story. If there is preposition stranding too, then verb and particle stand together at the end of the clause: What are they made of? (a passive with no corresponding active), Who was it said to?, You are not
too old to have a stick taken to. 18

The passive of class 6, if there is one, has as its subject the dir0 of the active, except perhaps in the 'have-passive' illustrated in the last example. If the string consisting of verb, dir0 and particle has become lexicalised, then there may be a prepositional passive whose subject corresponds to the prep0 of the active. In such cases we are no longer dealing with verb-particle collocations of class 6 but with a different kind of group-verb. The boundary between them is not fixed. In recent novels I find such examples as . . . individuals who feel they have been taken what they call advantage of (with parenthetic interruption of the long-established be taken advantage of), Why else should the track . . . have been kept a watch on?, and the nonce passive We could be beat up, we could be done anything to and no one . . . was on our side. 19

Class 7 group-verbs have two particles and no object, class 8 a direct object. Satisfactory examples of group-verbs with two adverbial particles are hard to come by. For class 7 we might consider come on in 'enter' (imper.), come out ahead 'show a net profit', get along/on together 'be on good terms', get back in 'be re-elected', hang on in (there) 'persevere' (AmE and ephemeral?), move along over, pass on by.

The second particle tends either to be fairly literal and so only dubiously in a group-verb, or else, like together, peripheral to the set of particles. The same is true of class 8: put (sth.) back together, read (a message, etc) back out, and so on. The closest to an idiomatic member of class 8 is get (sth.) over with, but this appears to be a unique idiom

18 The latter example is from Flann O'Brien, The Hard Life (London [Picador], 1976), p.78.

19 The first two examples are from Paul Scott, The Day of the Scorpion (London [Heinemann], 1969), pp.88, 386; the third from Marilyn French, The Women's Room (London [Deutsch], 1978), p.219. Cf. Jespersen's citation from Dickens, He must be done something with, which he describes as 'not quite natural' (MEC, iii, 317).
rather than witness to a syntactic pattern. (Adverbial with is otherwise very rare in PE.)

Classes 7 and 8 enhance the symmetry of the classification; in fact they are largely the product of the classification adopted and do not appear to be of much real importance.

**Overlap between classes**

It is convenient to refer to a particular group-verb as belonging to a particular class, though strictly speaking the classification is based on an actual occurrence of the group-verb with its associated NPs. Many group-verbs typically occur in just one pattern. A number of them, however, may appear in the configurations which define more than one class, usually because an object NP is optional. If the presence or absence of an object affects neither the meaning of the group-verb (and so by implication its relation to the other NP(s), especially the subject) nor the grammaticality of the sentence, then it makes sense to speak of 'the same' group-verb belonging to two different classes. The classes most often paired in this way are 1 and 2, when there is an optional dir0, e.g. drink up, find out, and 1 and 3, when there is an optional prep0, e.g. do without, hang around. When the optional item includes a prepositional particle, then classes 1 and 4 are brought together, e.g. out down (on ath.), and so too classes 2 and 5, e.g. single sb. out (for ath.).

Classes 4 and 5 contain an adverbial particle followed by a preposition. In some instances it is arguable that the two particles in fact constitute a single complex preposition—there is a gradience of cohesion

---

20Cf. Fraser, VPC, pp.10-11, who believes this to be rarer than is in fact the case, and Lipka, Semantic Structure, p.190.
between two such particles—so that the collocations inhabit a grey area between classes 4 and 3, e.g. get ahead of 'overtake', get out of 'shirk', or between classes 5 and 6, e.g. hide (sth.) away from (sb.), leave (sth.) up to (sb.).

A few group-verbs consist of a verb and a particle each of which is optimally transitive; examples include pass by, read through, run over, talk over. (Of course, run and talk in those senses are rarely 'transitive' except in collocation with an adverbial: separate characterisation of the formatives is rather misleading here.) There is little difference in meaning between Take that article and read it through, in which read through is class 2, and Take that article and read through it, class 3. In those patterns where the distinction is neutralised, e.g. The car ran over a pedestrian, there is genuine overlap between classes 2 and 3.

Indirect objects

Prepositional objects of class 6 group-verbs which are replaceable with indirect objects have already been discussed above. The only class of group-verbs in PE which may co-occur with a non-prepositional indO is class 2, for example ... Joyce seems to have set himself up a kind of continuum ... 23 The ordering possibilities are discussed by Bolinger, who concludes that 'it seems safe to say that [a] dative pronoun virtually has to precede the particle, regardless of the position of the direct object' and that 'when the indirect object is a noun, it still tends to

21See, for example, Torben Vestergaard, 'On the Open-Endedness of the Form-Class "Preposition" in English', ESL, 65 (1973), 148-63.

22On neutralisation of the distinction between preposition and adverb, see Kazimierz A. Sroka, 'Critique of the Traditional Syntactic Approach to Adverb/Preposition Words in Modern English', Bulletin de la société polonaise de linguistique, 21 (1962), 127-40 (pp.139-40). Further references are given in Chapter 5 below, in the section on syntactic re-analysis.

23Anthony Burgess, Jovysprick (London, 1973), p.17. One could perhaps argue that class 1 write back may co-occur with an indO.
precede the particle' (Phrasal Verb, pp.169-70). He shows that the common position of the particle before the dirO if there is an indO can be reversed under suitable conditions of accent and semantic focus. See also Fraser, VPC, pp.17-18, rightly criticised in the review by Kroch.

**Intonation**

A full account of group-verbs in PE must deal with the question of intonation, which can be a useful diagnostic tool for distinguishing between alternative structures. For example, stress and intonation are an important part of the difference between The number was looked up and The number was looked at, although syntactic tests which make use of transformational possibilities are sufficient to distinguish them. But not only are there many anomalies in the stressing of verb–particle collocations, the 'normal' patterns too are vulnerable to distortion for contrast or emphasis. And more to the point, stress and intonation are hardly recoverable from historical records, especially prose. As it is not possible to discuss the history of intonation patterns in the same detail that can be given to word-order, there is no analysis here of PE group-verb intonation.

**Stative verbs**

A verb marked with the feature [+stative] in FG theory is one which does not ordinarily occur in the progressive or the imperative. Fraser observes that 'stative verbs such as know, want, see, hear, hope, resemble, etc. practically never combine with a particle' (VPC, p.11)—that is, in those kinds of class 1 and 2 group-verb which he recognises

---

as 'verb-particle combinations'. His own apparent counter-example, hear out, shows that a nonstative phrasal verb can be formed with a stative verbal formative, despite his claim that 'no verb marked as stative can combine with a particle' (VPV, p.11). But even phrasal verbs can be stative. Possible examples include add up (intr., of figures), come over (as sincere, etc), owe out, weigh in (of a boxer). Fraser has mistaken a tendency for an absolute rule. It remains true that the majority of phrasal verbs are dynamic (nonstative).

Related areas of syntax

Some of the characteristics of particle group-verbs are retained even if different formatives are permitted. The verbal formative in classes lacking a direct object can be be: be off (of meat), be for (sth.) 'approve', be on to (sb.) 'suspect', be off out 'go out'.

Fairclough concludes that collocations of be and particles can be dealt with within his original classification ('Studies', pp.155-69). Any idiomatic meaning in such collocations is perceived as belonging to the particle(s) alone and is usually found with other intensive verbs as well.

Alternatively we may relax the condition that the non-verbal formative(s) must come from the more or less closed set of particles. Group-verbs can be formed with, instead of an adverbial particle, a component which is otherwise a noun, noun phrase, adjective, adverb, prepositional phrase, or participle. In general the scheme of classification holds good. Examples like class 1 include go bad, take place; like class 2 make clear, put right; like class 4 get to grips with, put paid to, stop short of.

25 The restriction is explored further by Bolinger, Phrasal Verb, pp.89-90. Note also that adjectives like hot, jolly, pretty, which can be regarded as stative, may become dynamic verbs by the addition of a particle.

take care of; like class 5 lay (sb.) low with (sth.), make (sb.) aware of (sth.); like class 8 catch (sb.) up short. As with verb-particle collocations there are different degrees of cohesion. For example, set fire to is a close-knit group-verb which has a prepositional passive and in which fire has no independent nominal behaviour, though it is phonetically and semantically akin to the noun fire. In take care of, on the other hand, which follows a similar pattern, care can accept many typical modifiers of nouns (e.g. any, great) and may be made subject of the passive. However, a prepositional passive is also possible and is in fact normal, especially if care is unmodified.

Apart from the rhythmic similarity of many of these group-verbs to the purely particle group-verbs discussed earlier, two other parallels are worth observing. Many of those which lack a preposition resemble members of classes 1 and 2 in having 'effective value': the particle or other element in analogous function includes the idea of resultant condition in its meaning. To chop sth. down or cut sth. out is to leave it 'down' or 'out', respectively; similarly to paint sth. black or put sth. right is to make it 'black' or 'right'. And many group-verbs ending in a preposition become lexicalised in the same way as classes 3 and 4, so that the whole group-verb behaves like a transitive verb in its ability to have an object or undergo a passive turn.

Another related area of syntax is the compound verbs which have a particle as first element, e.g. outbid, overthrow, understand. Compound verbs will be mentioned in historical contexts, especially in Chapters 4 to 6, but in PE there is now little direct relationship between them and the system of group-verbs. There are a number of word-formation patterns for nouns and adjectives which use particles and de-verbal derivatives as formatives, e.g. burnt out, downtrodden, fall-out, income, ongoing; some of the types with initial particle are related to both the group-verb and compound verb patterns. Such derivatives are not treated in any detail
in this dissertation, except where they can throw light on the history of the verbal forms.

Semantic analysis of classes 1 and 2

Semantic analyses of various degrees of formality are attempted in a number of the works on PE group-verbs mentioned in this chapter; useful insights on classes 1 and 2 are to be found in particular in Bolinger, *Phrasal Verb* and Lipka, *Semantic Structure.* 27 Although outside the scope of the present dissertation, which is concerned primarily with syntax, a number of the analytic tools for PE discussed by Lipka appear to be relevant to diachronic study too, and so I list a selection below, each with one of Lipka's examples in illustration.

The class 1 use of *tidy up* is to be accounted for by 'object deletion' (*Semantic Structure*, p.170); cf. the section on Reduction in Chapter 5 below. For the class 1 use of *fold up* (of a chair) Lipka suggests a process of 'subject deletion' and perhaps also of 'subject transfer' (*ibid.*, pp.170, 173-75). And for the relationship between *clean out (dirt)* and *clean out (a desk, etc)* Lipka posits 'object transfer' (*ibid.*, pp.93-97, 171-72, and *passim*); cf. also Bolinger, *Phrasal Verb*, pp.24-25 and Fraser, *VFC*, pp.24-25, and the section on Semantic development of a literal collocation in Chapter 5 below.