

Стаття надійшла до редакції 29.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – д. філол. н., проф. Павловська Н. Ю.

УДК 811.111-112

V. V. Mykhaylenko

ON DYNAMICS OF OLD ENGLISH PHRASAL VERBS

The area of phrasal verbs or V+P verbal complexes (Laurel J. Brinton and Minoji Akimoto, 1999) in Old English has been virtually neglected. Though the study of these constructions at the early stage of English may highlight diachronic questions concerning their development, raising issues pertaining to grammaticalization, lexicalization, and idiomaticization – processes which are not always clearly differentiated nor fully understood. Besides, the status of the postposition of the phrasal verb must find its clear-cut definition. See the common definition in the school grammar: A phrasal verb is a verb plus a preposition or adverb which creates a meaning different from the original verb, e.g.:

He ran into his professor at the library in the morning. (To run+into =”To meet”)

The youngster ran away when he was underaged. (To run + away = “To leave home”). See more phrasal verbs with the verb *to run*: (1) run into a problem “encounter a problem”; (2) run after “chase or pursue”; (3) run around “run around an area”; “be very busy doing many things”; (4) run for “try to be elected to a political or leadership position”; (5) run off “ make photocopies”; (6) run off with (someone) = when a married person abandons their husband or wife and stays together with a new lover”; (7) run on “ be powered by”; (8) run out of “have none left”; (9) run over “ hit with a vehicle (car, train, truck)”; “take more time than planned”; (10) run through “explain quickly”; “quickly practice or rehearse a play, performance, song, or presentation”;(11) run up “run to somebody or something”; “spend a lot of money on credit”: (12) run with “to spend time with people (normally bad)”; run against “to meet suddenly or unexpectedly”; run by or run past “to present to (as for evaluation)”, etc. These illustrations prove the semantic changes of the verb to run, cf. its own meaning: to move with your legs at a speed that is faster than walking: to leave a place quickly by running; to run as part of a sport, for exercise, or in a race; to go faster than a walk; to move at a fast gallop; to flee, to retreat, to escape; to utilize a running play on offense; to go without restraint; to sail before the wind in distinction from reaching or sailing close-hauled; to roam, to rove; to go rapidly or hurriedly; to go in urgency or distress; to make a quick, easy, or casual trip or visit; to contend in a race; to enter into an election contest; to move on or as if on wheels; to roll forward

rapidly or freely; o pass or slide freely; to ravel lengthwise; to sing or play a musical passage quickly; to go back and forth; o migrate or move in considerable numbers; to turn, to rotate; to function, to operate; to continue in force, operation, or production; to accompany as a valid obligation or right; to continue to accrue or become payable; to pass from one state to another; to flow rapidly or under pressure; to develop rapidly in some specific direction; to tend to produce or develop a specified quality or feature; to go back; to occur persistently; to spread or pass quickly from point to point; to cause (an animal) to go rapidly; to go in pursuit of; to follow the trail of backward; to put forward as a candidate for office ; to drive (livestock) especially to a grazing place; to pass over or traverse with speed; to travel on (as a river) in a boat. The given components constitute the verb semantic structure, wherein the dominant component is “to move fast” which is not actualized in the given phrasal verbs. David Crystal (1998) in his *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* calls this linguistic phenomenon a "multi-word verb" that is best described as a lexeme, a unit of meaning that may be greater than a single word Dwight Bolinger (1970) answers the question of why there are so many of these formations in English. He states, that they are words. The everyday inventor is not required to reach for elements such as roots and affixes that have no reality for him. It takes only a rough familiarity with other uses of *head* and *off* to make them available for *head off*, virtually self-suggesting when the occasion for them comes up, which is not true of learned formations like *intercept*.

Phrasal verbs are a common verb form in the English language. They are also called verb-particle constructions, the simplest definition of phrasal verbs is a verb plus one or more p-words. Other common definitions of the English phrasal verb include the following descriptions: an English verb followed by one or more particles where the combination behaves as a syntactic and semantic unit consisting: a verb and one or more additional words, having the function of a verb; a verb plus a preposition or adverb which creates a meaning different from the original verb; idiomatic expressions, combining verbs and prepositions [1, p. 99 – 102] to make new verbs whose meaning is often not obvious from the dictionary definitions of the individual words; formed by a verb phrase followed by a marooned preposition, the phrasal verb forms a semantic constituent whose meaning is not determined by the verb phrase or preposition as individual parts but rather by the whole phrasal verb as a single lexical item.

A phrasal verb in Present-Day English is a verb that takes a complementary particle, in other words, an adverb resembling a preposition, necessary to complete a sentence [2, p. 37], e.g. “to fix up”: “*He fixed up the car.*” The word “up” here is a particle, not a preposition, because “up” can move: “*He fixed the car up.*” This movement of the particle “up” quickly distinguishes in it from the preposition “up”. [3, p. 516 – 517; 1162 – 1163; 454 – 455; cf.: 4; p.5]. The applications of the particle “up” in Old English conveyed a sense of direction upward, as in “to grow up (ward)”, rather than

the completive sense, as in “to break up (completely)”, that would become more common in Middle English and beyond [4, p. 39 – 43] David Denison argues that not until the Peterborough Chronicle did the completive sense appear.

The dynamics of the particle (postposition) in the phrasal verb can be projected onto the development of the ‘pre-verbs’ or so-called ‘clitic’ verbs in Old English (Arnold Zwicky, 1985; David Denison, 1993). Stefan Thim put forward his arguments for the existence of preverbs in non-Indo-European [5, p. 13] and Indo-European languages. Preverbs, he believes, result from the decategorialization of adverbs in the preverb position. In an object-verb language such as Germanic, univerbation of some preverb plus verb syntagms yields a prefixed verb, resulting in a synchronic layering of older prefixed verbs and newer preverb-verb combinations [5, p. 74 – 116]. Arnold Zwicky in his turn, underlines that the ‘particles’ classification as clitics or words, or something else is not clear at all. This thesis is proved by recent literature on clitics, which is very much inclined to assume that anything labeled a particle is a clitic [6, p. 284].

Our task must be a search of the way to suggest the status of the postpositional constituent of the English phrasal verb despite a numerous number of its investigations in synchrony and diachrony. The objective of the present paper is to consider a model of the phrasal verb dynamics in English starting with its early stage.

Traditionally, the phrasal verbs are considered to develop from Old English verbs with separable preposition prefixes evolved into phrasal verbs in which the preposition follows the verb in Middle English [7, p. 207 – 409; cf.: 8]. Phrasal verbs are a periphrastic verb form unique to Germanic languages including Modern English. [2]. Much more common in Old English was the inseparable-prefix verb, a form in which the particle was attached to the beginning of the verb. These Old English prefixed verbs are directly comparable to current phrasal forms. For example, in Present-Day English, there is the monotransitive verb “to burn” and then the phrasal monotransitive “to burn up.” Old English had “*bærnan*” ‘to burn’: *bærnan*; p. *bærnde*; pp. *bærned*; v. a. ‘to kindle, light, set on fire, to burn, burn up’; e.g.:

Bærnaþ nú eower blácern light now your lamp, Bd. 4, 8; S. 576, 5.

Hí bærndon gecorene they burned the chosen, Exon. 66a; Th. 243, 26; Jul. 16. [Plat. *brennen*; p. *brende ardere, urere*: Dut. *branden*; p. *brande id*: O. Dut. *bernen*; p. *bernde; branden*; p. *brande id*: Ger. *brennen*; p. *brannte; but brinnan*; p. *brann ardere*: M.H. Ger. *brennen*; p. *brante urere*: O.H. Ger. *brennan*; p. *branta; prennan*; p. *pranta id*: O. Sax. *brinnan, brennan*: Goth. *brannjan*; p. *brannida*: Dan. *brände ardere, urere*: Swed. *bränna urere*: O. Nrs. *brenna*; p. *brendi id*.] DER. *forbærnan, ge-, on-*. v. *byrnan, beornan* [Anglo-Saxon Dictionary]. And *forbærnan* “to burn up”, e.g.: *for-bærnan, -bearnan, to-bærnenne*; part. *-bærnende*; p. *-bærnde*, pl. *-bærndon*; pp. *-bærned, -bærnd*; v [Anglo-Saxon Dictionary].

Nerón hét forbærnan ealle Róme burh “Nero commanded to burn up all the city of Rome”, Bt. 16, 4.

Isaac bær wudu to forbærnenne ða offrunge “Isaac bare wood to burn the offering”, Homl. Th. ii. 60, 16.

Man hine forbærneþ “one burns him”, Ors. 1, 1; Bos. 22, 44..

Hí hine forbærnaþ “they burn him”, Ors. 1. 1; Bos. 22, 26.

Ðæt he werod forbærnde “that it [the pillar of fire] would burn up the host”, Cd. 148; Th. 185, 16; Exod. 123. [Anglo-Saxon Dictionary]

The prefix *for-* prep. ‘before’ remained affixed to the verb and could not move as modern particles can. Such Old English compound verbs were also highly idiomatic, in that the meaning of the compound form did not necessarily reflect the meaning of the root. Denison provides *berædan* as an example because it meant “to dispossess”, while its root verb, *rædan* “to counsel, give advice”, e.g.:

Girwan Godes tempel, swá hire gásta weard reórd, Elen. Kmb. 2043.

Hé rád and ræ-acute;dde, rincum tæ-acute;hte hú hí sceoldon standan, Byrht. Th. 132, 18;

The phenomenon still survives today in the participle *forlorn*, as well as the verb *understandan*, *under-standan*; p. *-stód*, pl. *-stódon*; pp. *-standen* “to understand, have insight into”, e.g.:

Dú genóh wel understentst ðæt ic ðé tó sprece, Bt. 13; Fox 38, 1.

Se godcunda foreþonc hit understent eall swiþe ryhte ... wé ne cunnon ðæt riht understandan, 39, 8; Fox 224, 19-21.

Gecýðnessa ðíne ic ongeat &l-bar; understód testimonia tua intellexi, Ps. Lamb. 118, 95.

Understand ðás gesihðe intellige visionem (Dan. 9, 23), Homl. Th. ii. 14, 9.

The referred verb does not mean “to stand underneath (something)” in Present-Day English, but idiomatically “to comprehend”. Minoji Akimoto suggests that Old English prefixes often remained before the verb because Old English had strong object-before-verb (OV) tendencies, whereas Present-Day English is largely a VO language, which has made it possible for particles to travel to post-verbal positions [9, p. 21 – 23]. There may be another suggestion that the adverb (or the particle) due to the loss of its stress and lexical attraction followed the model of the Old Germanic enclitic. Traditionally, the enclitic is attached to and dependent on a preceding word in stress and accent, as *ge* in Greek and *-que* in Latin. Such forms yield their own accent and generally change that of the word to which they are attached, usually causing a secondary accent to be laid on the final syllable of the latter. The particles *de*, *ge*, and *te* in Greek and *-que*, *-ne*, and *-ve* in Latin are examples.

Some Old English verbs did function as modern phrasal verbs do. David Denison [3, p. 27 – 39] points out that Hilda Koopman (2010) finds and analyses examples of Old English phrasal verbs with post-verbal particles. In the Chronicles of England, the speaker says:

“ac he teah forð þa his ealdan wrenceas” (but he drew forth his old tricks).

See the dictionary entry: *forþ-teón*; p. *-teáh*, pl. *-tugon*; pp. *-togen* ‘to lead forth, make known, discover, betray, render up’, e.g.: *forþ-tihan*; *he -tihþ*; p. *-táh*, pl. *-tigon*; pp. *-tigen* ‘to draw forth’ [Anglo-Saxon Dictionary], e.g.:

Meaht forþtíhþ heofoncondelle ‘his might draweth forth heaven’s candle’ Exon. 93 a; Th. 349, 29; Sch. 53.

In this case the adverb (preposition) underwent a lexical attraction and developed into a “proclitic” (a prefix). Compare: certain monosyllabic words in Modern Greek normally lack their own accent and attach themselves in pronunciation to the following word to form a single word unit.

Hence, there was in Old English the rare incidence of phrasal verbs with post-verbal particles. However, D. Denison notes about such examples that the meaning of post-verbal particles in this period was still often very directional, in close relationship with a prepositional meaning [3, p. 27 – 39; cf.:10, p. 13 – 20]. The postpositional adverbs (or prepositions) gradually started to separate from the verbal prefixes acquiring phonetic and syntactic autonomy and developed into “enclitics” or regained their autonomy. Being a constituent of the phrasal the verb particle begins to introduce the following nominal phrase, e.g.:

to look up the word in the dictionary **β** *to look up + the word* ; *to look through the newspaper* **β** *to look through + the newspaper*.

Semantically the verb and the particle are close, though the particle as a preposition introduces the nominal phrase [11, p. 28 – 33].

These particles (or prepositions) are called proclitics “lean forward”. Proclitics certain monosyllabic words normally lack their own accent and attach themselves in pronunciation to the following word to form a single word unit. These words are called proclitics because they are considered to “lean forward” on the following word for their accent. In Greek there are ten monosyllabic words (the preposition included) which have no accent and are closely connected with the following word. The Old English prefix verbs are identified as preverbs and the shift towards postposition of the particles is due to the development of more general patterns of word order. The interplay of phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic factors in the loss of the native prefixes in the history of English is investigated.

References

1. **Tanabe H.** Composite Predicates and Phrasal Verbs in The Paston Letters / Harumi Tanabe // Collocational and Idiomatic Aspects of Composite Predicates in the History of English. Eds. Laurel J. Brinton and Minoji Akimoto. – Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. – Pp. xii, 283.
2. **Thim S.** Phrasal Verbs: The English Verb-Particle Construction and its History/ Stefan Thim. – N.Y. : Walter de Gruyter, 2012. – 302 p.
3. **Quirk R.** Greenbaum Sidney, Leech Geoffrey and Svartnik Jan. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / Randolph Quirk, et al. – London : Longman, 2000. – 1779 p.
4. **Visser F. T.** An Historical Syntax of the English Language / Fredericus Theodorus Visser. – Leiden : E. J. Brill, 1973. – 648 p.
5. **Denison D.** The Origins of Complete ‘up’ in English / David Denison //

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. – 1985. – P. 37 – 61. **6. Sroka K. A.** The Syntax of English Phrasal Verbs / Kazimierz A Sroka. – The Hague and Paris : Mouton, 1972. – 216 p. **7. Fischer O.** Syntax. / Olga Fischer // The Cambridge History of the English Language. – Vol 2. – P. 1066 – 1476. – [Ed. Norman Blake, Gen Ed. Richard Hogg]. – Cambridge : UP, 1992. – P. 207 – 409. **8. Zwicky A.** Clitics and particles / Arnold Zwicky // Language. – 1985. – 61. – №2. – P. 283 – 305. **9. Akimoto M.** Collocational and Idiomatic Aspects of Composite Predicates in the History of English. Eds. Laurel J. Brinton and Minoji Akimoto / Minoji Akimoto. – Amsterdam and Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1999. – 283 p. **10. DeCarrico J. S.** The Structure of English: Studies in Form and Function for Language Teaching. / S. Jeanette DeCarrico. – Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press, 2000. – 232 p. **11. Jacobs A. R.** English Syntax: a Grammar for English Language Professionals / A. R. Jacobs. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1995. – 392 p. **12. Lamont G. J. M.** The Historical Rise of the English Phrasal Verb [Електронний ресурс] / George J. M. Lamont. – Режим доступу : http://www.ksu.ru/fil/knl/win/kn1_28.htm. **13. Denison D.** English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions / David. Denison. – London and New York : Longman, 1993. – 530 p. **14. Kari E. E.** On the Grammar of Clitics in Degema / Ethelbert E. Kari // Journal of West African Languages. – 2005. – XXXII. – №1–2. – P. 13 – 20.

Михайленко В. В. До питання про динаміку давньоанглійських фразових дієслів

Динаміка фразових дієслів у давньоанглійському періоді може вирізнити пересуви прислівника через префікс у постпозитив. Результати яких залишаються валідними до теперішнього часу, де зміна статусу прислівника та його семантична атракція до дієслова призводить до утворення фразового дієслова як складової його словотвірної парадигми.

Визначення прийменникового поспозитива у структурі фразового дієслова до тепер залишається не ясним – його частиномовна приналежність багатозначнаЖ прийменник, прийменник, пстпозитив, частка. Отже, частиномовна класифікація слів у сучасній англійській мові також перебуває у перехідному стані, коли мають місце внутрішньопарадигматичні пересуви, які уможливають змінити конфігурацію частин мови. Конструкти типу клітики (енклітики та проклітики) унаочно ілюструють зазначені пересуви у давньоанглійській мові, які діють також і в сучасній англійській мові, див., наприклад: bring + up → bring up → upbring. Визначена модель формування давньоанглійського фразового дієслова: „Дієслово + Прислівник → Префікс + Дієслово → Дієслово + „Післяменник” (Прийменник) → Дієслово + Частка”. Справа в тому, що постпозитив проходить трансформацію лексикалізації, коли незалежна частиномовна одиниця нейтралізує свій граматичний статус у зазначеній конструкції і виражає компонент загального значення. Відповідно, аналіз мовного явища виключно в окремій історичній площині може тільки загострити

проблему перед дослідником, але її інтегральний опис лежить в історичній динаміці.

Ключові слова: фразове дієслова, прийменник, прислівник, частка, семантика, дистрибуція, динаміка, проклітика, енклітика.

Михайленко В. В. О динамике древнеанглийских фразовых глаголов

Динамика фазовых глаголов в древнеанглийском периоде способна вскрыть сдвиги наречия через префикс в послелог. Результаты которых валидны до настоящего времени, где изменение статуса наречия и его семантическая аттракция к глаголу приводит к образованию фразового глагола как составной его словообразовательной парадигмы.

Определение предложного постпозитива в структуре фразового глагола остаётся не ясным – его частеречная принадлежность многозначна: наречие, предлог, послелог, частица. Соответственно, классификация частей речи в современном английском языке также пребывает в транзитивном состоянии, при котором происходят внутри парадигматические сдвиги, способные изменить конфигурацию частей речи. Конструкты типа клитики (энклитиков и проклитики) наиболее чётко иллюстрируют указанные сдвиги древнеанглийском языке, которые „работают” и в современном английском языке, см., например: bring + up → bring up → upbringing.

Определена модель формирования древнеанглийского фразового глагола: „Глагол + Наречие → Префикс + Глагол → Глагол + Послелог (Предлог) → Глагол + Частица”. Дело в том, что постпозитив проходит трансформацию лексикализации, когда не зависимая частеречная единица нейтрализует свой грамматический статус в указанной конструкции и становится выразителем компонента общего значения. Следовательно, рассмотрение языкового явления только в одной исторической плоскости может поставить проблему перед исследователем, а её развязание скрыто в исторической динамике.

Ключевые слова: фразовый глагол, предлог, наречие, частица, семантика, дистрибуция, динамика, проклітика, енклітика.

Mykhaylenko V. V. On dynamics of Old English phrasal verbs

The dynamics of phrasal verbs in Old English may reveal the shift of the adverb through the prefix to the ‘postpositive.’ The consequences of which are still valid at present, where the change of the status of the adverb and its being semantically attracted to the verb bring about the phrasal verb formation as an intrinsic constituent of the verb-building paradigm. The ‘prepositional postpositive’ definition in the phrase verb structure is still vague – its part of speech character is polisemantic: adverb, preposition, postposition, particle.

Accordingly, the part of speech classification in Modern English is not stable undergoing transition, wherein there are some internal paradigmatic shifts which can change the part of speech model system. The constructs of the clitic type (enclitic and proclitic) vividly illustrate the referred shifts in Old

English which are observed in Modern English, for example, bring + up → bring up → upbringing.

The model of forming the Old English phrasal verb is defined: “Verb + Adverb → Prefix + Verb → Verb + Postposition (Preposition) → Verb + Particle. The fact is that the postposition undergoes the transformation of lexicalization when the grammatical status of an independent part of speech is neutralized in the given construction and becomes the marker of the component of the common meaning. Consequently, an investigation in one historical period can put forward the problem but its solution can be found due to the historical dynamics study.

Key words: phrasal verb, preposition, particle, proclitic, enclitic, semantics, distribution, dynamics.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 29.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – д. філол. н., проф. Омельченко Л. Ф.

УДК 811.111'373.4

І. М. Навроцька

ДИСТРИБУТИВНЕ І КОМПОНЕНТНЕ МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ СЕМАНТИЧНОЇ СТРУКТУРИ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ІМЕННИКІВ ЯК МЕТОДИКА РОЗМЕЖУВАННЯ ПОЛІСЕМІЇ ТА ОМОНІМІЇ

Проблема розмежування полісемії та омонімії періодично виникає на перетині різних розділів мовознавчої науки, концепцій лексичного значення та методологічних критеріїв та підходів. Її можна з упевненістю назвати одним із найнебезпечніших викликів сучасної лексикографії, адже словники у деяких випадках довільно вирішують, куди віднести неоднозначну вокабулу, ігноруючи її етимологічну спільність чи віддаленість відносно інших вокабул тієї ж категорії. Незважаючи на багатовікову традицію постановки проблеми та теоретичних пошуків її вирішення, вчені продовжують замислюватися над тим, яким повинен бути правильний семантичний опис багатозначного слова, де проходить межа його варіативності і яке місце в системі лексичного значення займає омонімічний лексико-семантичний варіант (ЛСВ).

Іменникова полісемія та омонімія у їх співвідношенні та розмежуванні є одним із аспектів загальної лексикологічної проблеми. Найновіші дослідження саме в цій галузі належать О. Ю. Герві, А. І. Головні, І. С. Губановій, О. М. Ляшевській, Д. М. Новикову, Л. П. Солдатовій, та ін.

Н. О. Кузьменко використовувала в якості інструмента розмежування пояснювальні трансформації як різновид компонентного