

AN INVESTIGATION OF OPINIONS CONCERNING THE VERB-ADVERB
COMBINATION AND A SURVEY OF THE PREVALENCE OF THE
COMBINATION IN PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH

By

GLADYS WELKER

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1951

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
August, 1959

FEB 29 1960

AN INVESTIGATION OF OPINIONS CONCERNING THE VERB-ADVERB
COMBINATION AND A SURVEY OF THE PREVALENCE OF THE
COMBINATION IN PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH

Thesis Approved:

Lloyd Douglas

Thesis Adviser

William R. Van Riper

Robert MacVicar

Dean of the Graduate School

438788

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. Loyd Douglas, for his time, counsel, and encouragement in guiding the preparation of this thesis, the investigator extends sincere appreciation. Dr. William R. Van Riper's helpful criticisms and suggestions are also gratefully acknowledged.

Special thanks are due those who have assisted in obtaining research materials: Mr. Gill Ring, Bloomington, Indiana; Mr. A. J. Pouch, Reno, Nevada; Mrs. Priscilla Finberg and Mr. and Mrs. Charles Leonard Fitch, Evansville, Indiana; and Mr. Fred Eggers, story editor of "The Lineup," CBS Television Network.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	4
Definition of Terms	5
Organization of Thesis	6
PART ONE OPINIONS CONCERNING THE VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION	
Chapter	
I. DEFINITIONS AND COMPARISONS OF VERB COMBINATIONS	8
The Verb-Preposition	8
The Verb-Adverb	13
Observations and Comparisons	14
II. ANALYSES BY WRITERS OF THE LARGER GRAMMATICAL WORKS	19
A Kind of Unit	19
Compound Verbs	25
Verb Phrases and Combinations	28
III. ANALYSES BASED ON CONSIDERATION OF THE PARTICLE	33
The Particle as a Preposition	33
The Particle as a Preposition and as an Adverb	34
Particles as "Prepositions or Adverbs"	40
The Particle as an Adverb	42
The Particle as a Connective	48
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS	50
Recommendations of Opinions	50
Recommendation for Terminology	52
Recommendations for Determining the Presence of a Combination	53
PART TWO A SURVEY OF THE PREVALENCE OF THE COMBINATION IN PRESENT- DAY ENGLISH	
V. PLAN AND CRITERIA FOR THE SURVEY	61

Chapter	Page
VI. ENGLAND VERSUS AMERICA	65
VII. THE COMBINATION IN MASS MEDIA	77
Occurrences in Advertising	77
Occurrences in the Newspaper	82
Occurrences in Radio and Television	85
VIII. THE COMBINATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	88
Occurrences in Conversation	88
Occurrences in Educated Informal Speaking and in Formal Speeches	93
Occurrences in Writing	95
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	99
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Frequency of the Combination in Plays	93
II. Frequency of the Combination in Higher Level Speaking	95
III. Frequency of the Combination in the Short Story	96
IV. Frequency of the Combination in the Editorial	97
V. Frequency of the Combination in the Essay	97

INTRODUCTION

Grammarians and grammar students coping with the verb combination --that is, trying to define and categorize it and its component parts-- compare favorably with officers of the law contending with an offender who, over a long period of time, has evaded the attempts to identify or confine him. This often-accused character, usually composed of two words, always manages either to have his own defense or to have a faction come to his rescue. Easy to picture is his standing back to laugh at the world of words and their authorities, for he has managed to flourish in spite of his method of making a place for himself in that world, and the other charges against him of redundancy and absence or disguise of meaning, and of being "too much with us."

Besides his elusiveness, the character displays antagonism. Throughout the ages he has stood belligerently between the purist and the liberal--at one time, for instance, between two great figures in the literary world, Dr. Johnson and John Milton.¹ England holds America responsible for his existence and prevalence, and America has answers to the denunciation. Within these nations he sets a cult or a specific group against the people at large. Moreover, he causes confusion between the English-speaking nations and other nations, the latter having little or no understanding of him. He has been the source of

¹Infra., p. 71.

taunting of Oxford by Cambridge.² Where he has recognition by the more alert elementary student, he is, at the same time, ignored by some of the erudite; and he draws forth the simplest terminology as well as the highly technical in attempts to identify him. In most instances his vividness and color win him a place over his more aesthetic one-word cousins. He "flits about" antagonizing first one and then another, some of whom make brave gestures toward understanding him, but others of whom think better to leave the culprit to his ways or to acknowledge him in only a very brief manner.

Highly versatile and prolific, the character sometimes moves in his true personality, the literal, but he is really happier in the disguised role of assumed impressions, the figurative. He can expand himself to many meanings, and may extend in many directions from his root verb by way of his second word, which he may change at will to take on a host of additional impressions. These impressions are destructive in their bad effects, but fruitful and rewarding in the good. Because of his versatility, he serves in many offices of the grammatical construction business--the main verbs, transitive active and passive, and intransitive; the verbals; and the derivative nouns and adjectives.

It is through the versatility, rapidity of movement, and productivity that the character has gained his prominence, taking a stand like a moneyed, though uneducated, man in the higher levels of linguistic and syntactical society. Strangely enough, he has maintained his greater influence in the lowest levels of speech while absorbing for himself, through insistence and determination, some measure of a place among the

²Infra., p. 65.

elite. Where he is not wanted he comes anyway; where wanted he moves with alacrity.

Because of the delayed acceptance on some levels and a hearty welcome on others, the construction is at war within himself and has a split personality. At times he is very charming and effective and at others quite loathsome or awkward. He may occur in the lines of the masters or in the argot of the pickpocket or of a "hot-rod" society.

Defiant he is, not only against classification, but against his very name, or rather, names. These do not come from the character himself, but from authorities who are the first to declare them unsatisfactory. Many really do not know what to call him; nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that the character enjoys his many aliases. Like the man without a country and an orphan left on the doorstep, he has no definite home, family, or name. He, like Topsy, has "just growed."

The character has many good qualities, and, one might say a uniqueness. Aside from answering a need for more emphatic and colorful expression in an easy way, he, in genius fashion, fills a requirement wherein his one-word relative would be inadequate, or, at best, a poor substitute.

Born with the language itself, he has the treasure of longevity.³ Today, while still under investigation, he is more powerful than ever before. The investigator's plan is to present some opinions of the character, to offer for consideration the problems surrounding him, to show him both as a "trouble-maker" and a "trouble-shooter," and to survey his influence in modern writing and speaking.

³Infra., p. 66.

The Problem

"An increasingly important factor in the English Language, and one which deserves additional study is the merger of a verb and an adverb or preposition as a single part of speech."⁴ This opinion of Hook and Mathews is succinct in stating the basic problem of this thesis.

Whereas the verb-adverb combination is the principal concern, the term "verb-adverb" involves the study of the "verb-preposition," for the caption, according to some grammarians, embraces both constructions.

There are divers analyses of combinations as well as many terms for naming them; therefore, this syntactical study is concerned not so greatly with developing a set of facts as with presenting and elucidating a number of opinions which in their variety provide an area of grammatical confusion, and with a study of frequency of appearance of combinations.

Herein are attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What constructions are, in actuality, verb-adverb combinations?

Which ones are verb-preposition combinations?

2. What are the characteristics of each kind of combination?

3. What definitions and opinions concerning combinations do leading grammarians offer?

4. During the past century what changes in thought have occurred relative to the particle portion of the combination?

5. What is the best solution for the understanding of the combinations?

⁴J. N. Hook and E. G. Mathews, Modern American Grammar and Usage (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956), p. 206.

6. What is the most suitable terminology for combinations?
7. What are the values and weaknesses of the combination?
8. Who is responsible for the prevalence of the combination in modern usage?
9. How prevalent are the constructions in speaking and writing?
What situations prevail concerning the prevalence?

Definitions of Terms

"Verb-preposition" and "verb-adverb" are terms used by the investigator to refer to the respective combinations. "Particle" refers to the non-verb portion of combinations, chiefly because it is the term approved by most experts. "Combination" often appears throughout the thesis to refer to one or both types of construction. Dictionary references appear as follows: WNID, Webster's New International Dictionary; WNTCD, Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary; and OED, Oxford English Dictionary.

Definitions of constructions are the investigator's, compiled from views of grammarians listed in the bibliography. Such definitions along with examples of combinations do not always necessarily represent the ultimate opinion of the investigator, but rather, in a summarized form, existing data. Examples, other than those designated as belonging to a grammarian, writer, dictionary, or some other specified source, are also her own. Any similarity of definitions or examples to those grammarians offer is the inevitable result of this type of investigation. The aim has been to present the definitions and examples in the simplest of terms.

Organization of Thesis

Because of the wide difference which exists between the comparatively limited or inharmonious recognition of combinations and the vast popularity of the construction in modern usage, this thesis appears in two parts. The intent is that the two divisions reveal conditions surrounding the grammatical conception at the present time.

Part One presents definitions of combinations followed by sample opinions of grammarians, interspersed with criticisms, comparisons, and recommendations by the investigator.

Part Two offers material concerning the frequency of combinations, and factors influencing that frequency. A survey of specific examples of speaking and writing showing the number of occurrences of combinations and the ratio of these occurrences to total number of words concludes this part.

PART ONE

OPINIONS CONCERNING THE VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION

CHAPTER I

DEFINITIONS AND COMPARISONS OF VERB COMBINATIONS

Verb combinations are those grammatical constructions wherein the verb portion depends upon the particle portion, prepositional or adverbial, for a more complete verb idea. First in importance is the segregation of the verb-preposition from the verb-adverb by way of definition, examples, and comparison or contrast. Because there are reasons for and against the separation of the two for purposes of classification, it is necessary to present both the two-fold and single conceptions, the latter to include the verb-preposition and verb-adverb under the heading, "Verb-Adverb."

The Verb-Preposition

The verb-preposition is that construction in which the preposition, rather than being intimately connected with its object, moves, by way of meaning, from its object to a closer relationship with the verb than it maintains with the object. In an indubitable verb-preposition, the closeness of the preposition to the verb is quite obvious, but at times the decision whether the preposition introduces an adverbial prepositional phrase modifying the verb, or whether the preposition goes more fittingly with the verb is very difficult. To see the degrees of relationship requires several example sentences:

1. Jane can shoot this gun at target practice.

Word order: Subject, verb, object of verb, adverbial prepositional phrase.

Verb construction: Transitive active, independent of preposition.

Stress: Verb, strong; preposition, weak.

Meaning: Literal.

2. a) She must shoot at a specified time.
 b) She can shoot at three levels of gun position.

Word order: Subject, verb, adverbial prepositional phrase.

Verb construction: Intransitive, independent of preposition.

- a) Prepositional phrase tells "when."
 b) Prepositional phrase tells "where."

Stress: Verb, strong; preposition, weak.

Meaning: Literal.

3. a) She can shoot at three or four different targets.
 b) Jane can not hit the center target; she will merely shoot at it.

These sentences reveal the difficulty in deciding the office of the preposition. In a) is the meaning "to shoot" or "to shoot at," the latter meaning that she might try, but because of her inexperience, she hasn't a chance? Likewise, in b) is the meaning "to shoot" or "to shoot at"? As underlined, the analysis is as follows:

Word order:

- a) Subject, verb, adverbial prepositional phrase.
 b) (Second clause) Subject, verb-preposition, object of verb-preposition.

Verb construction:

- a) Verb, intransitive, independent of preposition.
 b) Verb-preposition, transitive.

Stress:

- a) Verb, strong; preposition, weak.
 b) Verb, strong; preposition, strong.

Meaning:

- a) Literal.
- b) Literal, with a suggestion of the figurative.

Here, however, one must consider the possibility of shoot at as the complete verb idea in a). The two words in combination may have equal stress, will be transitive, may have the same meaning as in b), or remain literal, and may occur in the passive: Three or four different targets can be shot at by her. Consequently, one recognizes the possibility of the existence of a combination in a) and can realize one area of confusion and of disagreement among authorities.

The possibility of throwing a verb and particle into the passive is a test grammarians often use to determine the presence of a combination, some saying that in the passive, the verb and particle result in a combination. Others maintain that if the words are a combination in the passive, they are in the active.

4. It is questionable which target should be shot at.

Word order: (Clause in apposition) Subject, verb-preposition.

Verb construction: Verb-preposition, transitive-passive.
The passive results in stronger linking between verb and preposition.

Stress: Verb and preposition, equal.

Meaning: Literal.

5. a) Which one do you think she should shoot at?
b) Which one do you think she should shoot at?

Here again appears the difficulty of deciding whether the preposition introduces the phrase or goes with the verb. The purist might insist on the first analysis; however, the second is a popular one:

Word order:

- a) Object of preposition, verb, subject, verb, subject of clause, verb, preposition.
- b) Object of verb-preposition, verb, subject, verb, subject of clause, verb-preposition.

Verb construction:

- a) Verb, intransitive, independent of preposition.
- b) Verb-preposition, transitive active.

Stress:

Verb and preposition equal in both a) and b), a point in favor of the verb-preposition interpretation.

Meaning:

Literal, both a) and b).

6. It is better to shoot at and miss the target than not to try at all.

Word order: (Infinitive phrase in apposition) Compound infinitive, object of compound infinitive.

Verb construction: (Infinitives) Infinitive verb-preposition, infinitive. Sense of parallelism invites the verb-preposition interpretation for the first infinitive. Transitive active.

Stress: Verb and preposition, equal.

Meaning: Literal or figurative.

7. I do not know whether or not John can make top score in the match, but he will shoot at it.

Word order: (Second clause) Subject, verb-preposition, object of verb-preposition.

Verb construction: Verb-preposition, transitive active.

Stress: Verb and preposition, equal, or preposition can be stronger.

Meaning: Figurative, in the sense of to strive for.

In the preceding sentence examples, the word shoot or at do not stray far from the literal meanings, except for shoot in sentence 7.

Sometimes the verb and preposition depart from their true respective meanings as in the favorite among grammarians, run across.

I ran across Jim at the ball game.

Such a combination has the repute of being synonymous with a one-word verb:

I met Jim at the ball game.

The one word, however, is hardly adequate, for ran across carries the idea of an unexpected meeting, or an unpredicted, unarranged for, occurrence. Likewise, some offer the one-word synonym, discover, for ran across:

I ran across my scrapbook in the attic this morning.

I discovered my scrapbook in the attic this morning.

One can not really say that discover is as adequate for the intended meaning as is ran across, for the verb-preposition means more aptly "happened to find."

The investigator's opinion is that in most instances, it is difficult to find an adequate one-word synonym for the verb-preposition. The one-word verb often requires a preposition or some qualifying word or phrase to match meanings with the verb-preposition.

shoot at. To drive at, strive for, aim at... (WNID)

run across. To encounter by chance. (WNTCD)
To meet with by chance. (WNID)

run into. (a) to encounter by chance.
(b) to collide with. (WNTCD)

run in or into. a To enter; to step in; esp., to rush in. b To come in collision with. c To change or transform into; to merge in... d Slang. To arrest. (WNID)

Among these examples, there is only one one-word synonym, enter, which requires qualification to parallel the meaning of run in.

The Verb-Adverb

The verb-adverb is that construction in which the verb joins with a primary adverb for a more complete verb idea, the adverb portion of the unit serving to give a situational, directional, or intensive force. While there are also degrees of proximity between the component parts of the verb-adverb, in the great majority of occurrences, the verb-adverb is more strongly unified than is the verb-preposition. The reason is that in the true and obvious verb-adverb, there is no connection between the adverb alone and the noun that serves as the object of the verb-adverb. Where there is no object, the adverb, except in cases of bold redundancy, is essential to the meaning of the verb.

1. Jane cut the pictures out of the magazine.

Word order: Subject, verb, object of verb, adverbial prepositional phrase.

Verb construction: Verb, transitive; phrase tells "where."

Stress: Verb, ordinary strong stress.

Meaning: Literal.

2. Jane cut out the pictures in the Good Housekeeping magazine.

Word order: Subject, verb-adverb, object of verb-adverb, adverbial prepositional phrase.

Verb construction: Verb-adverb, transitive active. To be noted is lack of connection between out and pictures.
Cut out becomes the action.

Stress: Verb and adverb, equal.

Meaning: Literal.

3. Jane cut the pictures out before anyone else did.

Word order: Subject, verb-(object of verb-adverb)adverb, adverbial clause.

Verb construction: Verb-adverb, transitive active.

Stress: Verb and adverb, equal.

Meaning: Literal.

4. Jane wished that every one would cut out the noise.

Word order: (Dependent clause) Subject, verb-adverb, object of verb-adverb.

Verbsconstruction: Verb-adverb, transitive active.

Stress: Verb and adverb, equal.

Meaning: Strictly figurative.

5. Jane, this other picture should be cut out.

Word order: Nominative of address, subject, verb-adverb.

Verb construction: Verb-adverb, transitive passive.

Stress: Verb and adverb, equal.

Meaning: Literal.

Observations and Comparisons

In consideration of the two types of construction, the following comes to mind:

1. The adverb in the verb-adverb has no connection with the noun which follows, whereas the preposition in the verb-preposition maintains the link with the noun that follows.

- a) Jane will shoot at the target, but she will probably miss.
- b) I ran across Jim at the ball game.
- c) Jane cut out the pictures.
- d) Would you deliberately run out my guests?

At and across maintain the link with target and Jim respectively, but out in c) or d) does not link with pictures or guests.

2. In the verb-preposition, the acquisition of the preposition makes an originally intransitive verb transitive. The verb-adverb may be either transitive or intransitive.

- a) I do not want you to laugh at me.
- b) Would you run out the guests?
- c) Sit down before you fall down.

In a) laugh is intransitive without the preposition. In b) the verb-adverb is transitive, and in c), intransitive.

3. The verb-adverb lends itself to a greater variety of meanings than does the verb-preposition.

- a) shoot at: To drive at; strive for; aim at, or have in view, as the goal of one's efforts. Colloq. (WNID)
- b) run across: To meet with by chance. (WNID)
- c) cut out: a To remove by cutting or carving; as, to cut out a piece from a board...b To shape or form by...to cut out a garment...c To scheme; contrive; prepare; as, to cut out work for another day...d To step in and take the place of ...as, to cut out a rival...e To debar; "I am cut out from anything but common acknowledgments." Pope. f To remove from the midst of a number, group, or series; as to cut out a steer from a herd; to cut out a car from a train; to cut out a lamp from an electric circuit. g To move, esp. sharply or without warning, to one side or the other out of a moving line, as of traffic. h Colloq. To eliminate; as to cut out waste; hence, Slang, to stop doing, using, etc.; to cease; omit; as cut out the slang. i Australia. To finish the process of shearing a flock of sheep... j Card Playing. In partnership games, to draw cards to determine which players shall give way to newcomers. k Mach. (1) To disconnect (a machine) from the source of power. (2) To disconnect (a part, as an engine muffler) so as to prevent normal operation. l Elec. To disconnect (electrical equipment) from a circuit...m Nav. To seize and carry off (a vessel) from a harbor, or from under guns of the enemy. (WNID)
- d) run out: a To thrust or push out; to extend. b To waste; to exhaust; squander; as, to run out an estate; also Slang, to cause to leave; to expel; as, to run a person out of town. /A more obvious example occurs in "I did not intend to run out the company when I came in."/ c To flow out, as a liquid. d To pass freely out from some source; as, the headland runs out into the sea. f To come to an end; to expire, as a lease. g To extend; to spread. h To expatiate; as, to run out into beautiful digressions. i To be wasted or exhausted; to degenerate; to become extinct; as, an estate managed without economy will soon run out. j To exhaust or expend one's strength in running; as he ran himself out in the first half mile. Book binding (substitute

for fan out) Cricket. /Term in game/ m Print. To fill out a line with quadrats, leaders, points, or ornaments. (WNID)

Even when the connection in the verb-preposition is difficult to discern, what might be considered the verb-preposition has a limited number of meanings. Where there is a variety of meanings for those constructions that may be either verb-preposition or verb-adverb, there will customarily be more meanings for the latter construction.

- a) come in: a To enter, as a town, house, etc. /verb-preposition/ b To arrive; as, when my ship comes in, /verb-adverb/ c To be brought into use. "Silken garments did not come in till late." Arbutnot. /verb-adverb/ d To comply, yield, surrender. /The answers came in abundantly. verb-adverb/...f To enter in its place or course; fit in; as, this comes in pat. /verb-adverb/ g To assume official station or duties; as when Lincoln came in. /verb-adverb/ h To enter as a partner. /Will you come in with me in my new venture? verb-adverb/ i To mature and yield a harvest, as crops.../The corn came in early this year. verb-adverb/ j Collog. U. S. To bring forth young.../At what time did the mare foal? She came in around six o'clock this morning. /verb-adverb/ k To begin to yield (oil); /The well on the Phillips Lease came in at fifty barrels. verb-adverb/ (WNID)

4. To find one-word synonyms is much easier for the verb-adverb than for the verb-preposition. In the dictionary meanings just presented, there is no one-word synonym for shoot at or for run across, whereas there are several for cut out and run out. There is for come in only one for the verb-preposition, but several for the verb-adverb. This again reveals the closer connection of the component parts of the verb-adverb over verb-preposition.

5. The verb-preposition does not permit the object to intervene between the component parts, whereas the verb-adverb does allow the intervention. One cannot say with grace or logic;

- a) John will shoot the top score at.
b) I ran Jim across at the ball game.

However, one can say,

- c) Jane cut the pictures out.
- d) Did you run the guests out?

6. Because of the compact quality of the verb-adverb and because of the lack of connection between adverb and the noun which follows, the verb-adverb is more easily recognized than the verb-preposition.

7. Except for verbals, the verb-preposition does not so readily lend itself to derivative nouns and adjectives. One does not say the shot at target, the run across Jim, a shoot at, or a run across.

However, "Running across Jim at the ball game was a pleasant surprise" is plausible. One can designate the cut-out pictures from those which are not cut out, or speak of a cut out on a car. "The run-out guests" is perhaps not the best expression, but runout as a noun has two meanings in WNID. The verb-adverb, then, appears more often in derivatives than does the verb-preposition.

8. Because of the greater number of meanings into which the verb-adverb may expand, naturally there are more figurative, colloquial, and slang meanings for the verb-adverb than for the verb-preposition. The loss of the primary meanings for both words is more frequent in the verb-adverb.

9. Another test for distinguishing the verb-preposition from the verb-adverb might be in question and answer form:

First party: Jane shot at the center target.
Second party: At what?

First party: I ran across Jim at the ball game.
Second party: Across whom?

First party: I did not intend to run out your guest, Jim Brown.
Second party: Run out whom? (Not "Out whom?")

First party: Jane cut out the pictures.

Second party: Cut out what? (Not "Out what?")

If one could accept the preceding data as infallible in distinguishing verb-adverb from verb-preposition, the study of the constructions would not be particularly difficult; but because of a number of instances wherein the designation of a combination, either verb-adverb or verb-preposition, becomes tedious, there are many analyses offered. A presentation of grammarians' opinions as to recognition, classification, and terminology of combinations is now in order.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSES BY WRITERS OF THE LARGER GRAMMATICAL WORKS

To begin observation of opinions concerning the combination, this chapter presents views of three writers of more extensive grammars-- Poutsma, Curme, and Jespersen.

A Kind of Unit

That which is established as a verb-preposition in Chapter I appears in Poutsma under the discussion of the prepositional object.¹ He offers three requirements for differentiating the prepositional object from an adverbial adjunct:

1. The prepositional phrase must be a necessary complement of the verb.
2. The preposition is distinctly vague in meaning.
3. The unity between the verb and preposition is equal to a transitive verb for which there is a synonymous simplex of approximate meaning in English or a cognate language.

Before showing the differences existing between the two types of phrases, Poutsma says, "Of an uncertain nature are a great many verb modifiers containing a preposition, the characterizing features distinguishing prepositional objects from adverbial adjuncts being vague

¹H. Poutsma, A Grammar of Late Modern English (Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1904), II, pp. 31-36.

and floating."² At the end of the discussion he reiterates, "...there is no rigid line of demarcation between objects [prepositional] and adverbial adjuncts, and...the distinction is more or less arbitrary."³

To be noted, then, is that if one leaves the preposition within the phrase and works with a prepositional object rather than the verb-preposition as a unit, there are apparently as many sources of grief in determining the qualities of modifying phrases as there are in working with the kinds of combinations presented in Chapter I.

Poutsma, even though admitting of the closeness of verb and preposition, refuses to call the two words a true compound because of the remaining linking quality between preposition and object. Rather, he terms the closeness a "kind of unit" or a "quasi-compound" and maintains that the union can be complete only when the combination can appear as an attributive adjunct, as in "the longed-for peace" or "the agreed-upon price."⁴ Since Poutsma acknowledges the difficulties in separating the two types of phrase modifiers, the question arises as to whether or not it is better to call one of them a verb-preposition with an object of that combination, and the other a verb with a true adverbial phrase modifier.

A look into Poutsma's three rules for the prepositional object and example sentences brings some dissatisfaction. To accept the requirement of the phrase being a necessary complement of the verb comes readily enough if one is to work only with phrases, but

²Ibid., p. 31.

³Ibid., p. 36.

⁴Ibid., p. 34.

difficulty arises in accepting the idea that the preposition becomes distinctly vague in meaning "answering none of the requirements of place, time, cause, purpose, agency, or instrumentality, etc., some one of which is always discernible in the preposition of adverbial adjuncts."⁵ For instance, there is inclination to exception in Poutsma's laugh at or impose (up)on. Judging from dictionary meanings, one feels that at and on bear a relation of direction and at least a sense of place; therefore, Poutsma's "distinctly vague" appears somewhat harsh.

at: An object of action, effort, or emotional concern; in the direction of; toward...to strike, point, shout, wink, mock, be angry at one. (WNID)

on: Indicating the object of action or motion...b...That to which certain actions are thought of as directed...She smiled on him. (WNID)

While it is true there may be some simplex found in English or a cognate language for an "approximate meaning of...", it is a fact that the verb-preposition (or verb-adverb) has entered and flourished in the language in answer to the need for a more accurate expression in simple words to take the place of more difficult verbs or those which acquire prefixes and suffixes to lend a sense of direction, condition, and so forth. Therefore it is not easy to agree with Poutsma's contention that laugh at differs but slightly from deride.⁶ One may "laugh at" in enjoyment as well as in derision; besides, there are more forms of derision than "laughing at." When Poutsma designates impose upon

⁵Ibid., p. 32.

⁶Ibid., p. 33.

practically equivalent to deceive,⁷ the comparison again seems faulty, for the act of "imposing upon" may take form in many different ways-- for room and board, or for financial assistance, to name two. If one, then, says, "The boy derided the situation," how does one know he "laughed at"? The point is that it is easier to tell the meaning of "laughed at" by context than it is to tell the form of derision without a qualifying phrase for the verb. Also in "The boy deceived his parents," how can one necessarily know the boy "imposed upon"? To parallel the exact meaning of a verb-preposition with a one-word synonym is not often easy.

Again Poutsma's term "kind of a unit" appears in "such adverbs as about, back, by, down, in, off, on, out, over, through, and up...often form a kind of unit with the verb."⁸ However, here he is not so interested in the closeness of the verb and adverb as in the position of the relationship in connection with the so-called object.

Before the "object": He took out his watch. HERO, 12.

Adverb after "object": You cannot carry a clock about with you.
GUNTH., LEERB.⁹

The problem now arises as to how one can designate an object prior to ascertaining what word or words take the object. Logically, then, it seems a declaration of a unit instead of a kind of unit is absolutely essential. Many times the adverb must come in with the verb to provide any kind of sense relationship with what is called an object,

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., I, p. 272.

⁹Ibid., pp. 273-274.

as is evident in more of Poutsma's examples:

This set off his other attractions. CHUZ., CH. xx, 173a.
 We knocked over the forms. OLD CHAP.
 She shook off her temporary sadness.
 When he had put up his fence. CHUZ., CH. v, 37b.¹⁰

In examining the verbs, what is the meaning, really, of set without off? "To knock the forms" makes no sense without over, nor does shook without off or put without up, and there are no objects until these words receive recognition as true units.

In distinguishing prepositions from adverbs, Poutsma says that primary prepositions differ from primary adverbs only in that they are furnished with a noun or pronoun by way of a complement; or conversely, primary adverbs may be defined as primary prepositions without a complement. These particles keep the function of prepositions when their complement is omitted because it is to be found in a preceding or following part of the discourse, but the particle is to be apprehended as an adverb when there is not in the preceding part of the discourse a (pro)noun that may be understood as its complement.¹¹ This opinion receives consideration by way of comparison with those of other grammarians later in this chapter. However, presently one might weigh Poutsma's view on calling the preposition in the verb-preposition an adverb:

DEUTSCHBEIN (System, par. 26, 3; par. 43, 3. Anm. 2) makes out that the movement of the preposition from the (pro)noun to the verb, by which prepositional objects are characterized, causes it to assume the function of an adverb, the adverbial function being especially pronounced in passive constructions. But it is difficult to see that, except for passive constructions, the preposition preserves its

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 273-276.

¹¹Ibid., II, p. 806.

function as a connective link between verb and (pro)noun as strictly as in the case of adverbial adjuncts. This is evidenced by its always retaining its weak stress as opposed to the strong stress which a real adverb has in apparently similar combinations, such as He called out the military, He cast off the dogs (Ch. VIII, 35).¹²

Hence, Poutsma rejects the idea that a preposition can assume the function of an adverb if the stress is weak, but he gives two sentences illustrating the preposition as follows:

If your thoughts should assume so unhappy a bent, you will the more want some mild and affectionate spirit to watch over and console you. Sher., Riv., V, 1.

I must have a woman that can sympathize with and appreciate me. Browning, A Soul's Tragedy, II.¹³

The investigator does not find weak stress for over and with in these sentences.

With Poutsma, then, there is a "kind of a unit," yet there is not a unit for the verb-preposition and verb-adverb; but he insists on a declaration of an object without recognizing the full merit of the construction required in order to have that object. Dissatisfaction arises with his reference to the "distinct vagueness" of the preposition, his inadequate one-word synonyms for the verb-preposition, and his opinion that the preposition consistently has weak stress. It is debatable whether his involved and tedious phrasal interpretations for prepositional objects as distinguished from adverbial adjuncts is altogether justifiable. In "I shall watch over you," is it not much more facile to unify watch and over, and have you as the object, than to work with the properties of over and the various interpretations for over you? It seems so.

¹²Ibid., I, p. 35.

¹³Ibid., II, p. 34.

Compound Verbs

Curme also presents the prepositional object with the qualification that the preposition and its object stand a little closer to the verb than the adverbial element does, but at the same time he is pleased to call the verb and preposition a compound when such compound, upon becoming transitive, is capable of going into passive voice.¹⁴ If one takes the verb-preposition as a compound, where goes the prepositional object? If there is a compound, there can not be a preposition and its object at the same time.

In other relations, however, Curme maintains the preposition is often in a closer relation to the noun than to the verb so that the verb remains intransitive and can not be put into the passive:

She went about her duties as usual.

I don't fall for that kind of conduct.¹⁵

Now it seems that "The household duties were gone about in her usual slovenly way" is not such a remote possibility. Whereas fall for does not gracefully go into the passive, the combination does have dictionary entry (WNID) as a unit, and there seems little or no reason to consider for closer to the object kind than to the verb fall. Curme gives believe in as a synonym for fall for.¹⁶ In the language of today one might well find such a sentence as "At Vassar such a practice is not believed in."

¹⁴George. O. Curme, A Grammar of the English Language (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1925), II, pp. 89-90.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁶Ibid.

To return to Poutsma, the following brings question:

.... He rode on a mule, He jumped over a wall, He slept in a bed, etc. Nor can it be truly said that the things mentioned in the modifiers are not concerned in the activity expressed by the verb. But the preposition is here used in its full local meaning, and can hardly be said to form an unmistakable unit with the verb...¹⁷

He says the verb plus preposition is practically equivalent to a transitive verb of one of the cognate languages:

He leaped over the fence. He cleared the fence.
He has slept in this bed. Hij heeft dit bed beslapen. (Dutch)

He also shows the Passive:

The wall has been leaped over.
The bed has been slept in. ¹⁸

Now, since Curme has specified the closeness of the preposition and its object to a verb, and since he offers the test of placing the compound in the passive voice, would he, then, consider leaped over and slept in compounds? It is this type of question which confronts the student as he compares the views of prominent grammarians.

But to examine Curme further, there is a paragraph on inflectional prepositions wherein he states that preposition and verb fuse into a real compound:

You can depend upon him.
He can be depended upon.¹⁹

And again in another of Curme's works based in part on the more extensive one, there is this passage:

In modern times the list of transitive verbs has been greatly increased by the addition of a large number of originally intransitives

¹⁷Poutsma, II, p. 31.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁹Curme, A Grammar of the English Language, II, p. 91.

which took a prepositional object, as to depend upon a man, laugh at a person, talk over a matter. In the course of time the preposition has become attached to the verb as an integral part of it so that the object is no longer a prepositional object, but a direct object of the compound verb.²⁰

Hence one sees the disappearance of the prepositional object as related to intransitive verbs and preference for the verb-preposition.

Then there is the section on prepositional adverbs or adverbial prepositions which often stand at the end of a proposition because of the suppression of the governing noun or pronoun, which is omitted since it is suggested by a preceding noun or by the situation:

I threw the ball at the wall, but I threw too high and it went over.

We soon reached the park and strolled through.²¹

Over and through according to Curme differ from prepositions at the end because of heavier stress. Poutsma's statement that "particles preserve their function of prepositions when their complement is omitted because it is to be found in a preceding or following part of the discourse,"²² shows that Poutsma would term over and through prepositions because wall and park appear previously.

The material on separable compounds defines them as the verb entering into a close relationship with a more strongly stressed element, usually an adverb, prepositional phrase, or an object, forming with it a unit in thought, a real compound.... It is here one finds

²⁰George O. Curme, English Grammar (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1955), p. 24.

²¹Ibid., pp. 285-286.

²²Poutsma, II, p. 806.

Curme's recognition of the verb-adverb.

His father set him up in business.²³

Also, while he does not label the constructions as compounds in his discussion of point-action aspect, the underlining designates the unity, and the adverb portion in the following examples serves to determine the ingressive or effective aspect:

Ingressive: The boat slowed up (began to go slower) as it came in.
The children quieted down.
(Others are set in, set about, start in, start out.)

Effective: They ate up everything that was on the table.
(Goal has been reached.)
He put the rebellion down.²⁴

Thus, with Curme, one has to consider prepositional objects, compounds, inflectional prepositions, prepositional adverbs, separable compounds, and point-action aspect in the investigation of combinations.

Verb Phrases and Combinations

One of the more elaborate efforts in distinguishing the prepositional portion from the adverbial portion of combinations comes from Jespersen, who offers an abundance of illustrations taken from literature along with some of his own composition, and arranged under the headings of a number of specific prepositions and words which may be either preposition or adverb. Jespersen prefers to call verb-preposition combinations phrases, as may be seen in the following excerpts:

Many verbs can be constructed either with an object or with a preposition (plus its object). In the latter case we may say that the

²³Curme, English Grammar, p. 24.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 55-56, 262-264.

object is governed by the whole composite phrase consisting of a verb and the preposition.²⁵

What in the active is the object of a preposition connected with a verb or with a verb and its object may be made the subject of a passive construction. ...we see that the particle has greater cohesion with the verb than with what (in the active) is either the object of the particle alone (preposition) or of the whole phrase.²⁶

Note the complex prepositional phrases in: Hawth 1.506 should all the above business be reasonably got through with.../NP when you wonder whether your telephone is being listened in on...²⁷

Even a phrase consisting of a transitive verb, its object, and a preposition may be treated the same way in the passive.../DiD 286 he was too rheumatic to be shaken hands with.../Shaw Ms 95 You women are kept ideal and dressed up for no other purpose than to be made love to...²⁸

Along with the references to "phrases," Jespersen calls attention to to more complex combinations of more than two words. If one is to analyze get through with word by word, the answer is verb-adverb-preposition, and another complication enters the picture.

Jespersen's treatment of verb-preposition shows the difficulty of telling the difference in meaning between a verb and its object and the verb with preposition plus its object. He says, "...sometimes the meaning is identical or nearly so, but in some cases there is a marked difference, and not infrequently the preposition serves to make the whole expression more graphic...":

Fight the enemy, fight against the enemy--no marked difference.

Catch, grasp, strike, clutch, and similar verbs take an object when the accomplished action is to be expressed, and at when the

²⁵Otto C. Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar (Heidelberg: Carl Winters, 1927), III, p. 252.

²⁶Ibid., p. 312.

²⁷Ibid., p. 314.

²⁸Ibid., p. 315.

attempt is meant:

<u>guess</u> a thing	<u>guess at</u> a thing
to <u>get</u> the apples	to <u>get at</u> the apples (requires ladder) ²⁹

These examples appear at this time to challenge Poutsma's claim that the preposition becomes distinctly vague in meaning. At in to get at the apples seems anything but vague. Nor can one apply the accusation of weak stress for at.

Jespersen has a section headed "Adverb or Preposition" wherein he states, "In some combinations of a verb plus a particle plus an object it may be doubtful whether the particle is an adverb or a preposition."³⁰ He offers stress and meaning as the first determining factors:

If we say "I couldn't get in a word," in is shown to be an adverb, not a preposition, both by the sound (stress on in, long /n/) and by the meaning...³¹

When these fail he recommends word order:

But sometimes these criteria fail us. Word order often serves to determine which of the two possibilities is the right one. When the particle comes after the object, this must be governed by the verb, and the particle accordingly is an adverb; but when the particle precedes the object, both alternatives are possible...

The position of over after the object shows that it is an adverb in: Doyle S. 1.28 I should like to chat this little matter over with you...³²

But in the following quotations the position of subjuncts and of it shows that the authors took over as a preposition: Kingsley Y 48 he tried to think earnestly over the matter.³³

²⁹Ibid., p. 253.

³⁰Ibid., p. 273.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid., p. 275.

Again the problem arises as to stress. It seems to the investigator that in in get in a word is no stronger than at in get at the apples; consequently, stress appears to be a weak approach in separating adverbial particles from prepositional particles, even though it is quite important in determining the presence of a combination.

Jespersen's analysis is intriguing because he tends to present the sentence and apply the analysis, thereby taking care of unusual along with usual occurrences of particles and also establishing the importance of meaning. The approach seems much better than rigidly giving rules for the structures and then providing examples, as most other authorities attempt to do.

By applying the mental microscope, one can see and appreciate Jespersen's distinctions. While one may not agree with each and every example, Jespersen's discussion is quite the best the investigator has viewed for the division of the two kinds of combinations. However, one comes to realize that determining verb from verb-preposition and preposition from adverb in a possible verb-preposition or verb-adverb often requires consideration of several governing factors.

With Jespersen there is the verb phrase to term the verb-preposition and combinations for verb-adverb with criteria to determine the nature of the particle.

In the study of Poutsma, Jespersen, and Curme, it is interesting to note variances existing in the matter of pass by:

Poutsma: I passed him by. OSC. WILDE De Profundis, 17.

By is a preposition with more or less the character of an adverb.³⁴

Curme: Let us pass the matter by. By is an adverbial preposition.³⁵

Jespersen: Hardy R 291 she passed him by. By is an adverb.³⁶

The next chapter continues presentation of opinions in a more summarized form and has as a basis the consideration of the particle and its effects toward various interpretations and terminology.

³⁴Poutsma, II, p. 810.

³⁵Curme, English Grammar, p. 133.

³⁶Jespersen, p. 276.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSES BASED ON CONSIDERATION OF THE PARTICLE

The oftentimes confusing properties of the particle portion of the verb-adverb and verb-preposition result in several terms for the particle and the combination in which it figures. Consequent classifications range from the very definitive to the vague. Considerations of the particle may fall into five divisions: (1) as a preposition only, (2) specifically as a preposition or as an adverb, (3) as "preposition or adverb," (4) as an adverb only, or (5) as a connective. In this chapter continuance of scholarly presentation of thoughts surrounding combinations will have as a governing structure this five-fold classification of the particle. One or more writers represent each division, and along with the representation, each grammarian will receive credit for any novel idea pertaining to combinations, and, where pertinent, criticism by the investigator and comparison with other views.

The Particle as a Preposition

According to W. C. Folwer, the particle in a combination is always a preposition. The classification of almost a century ago must be indicative of the trend of thought at that time, for in the research for this thesis, the view has not occurred elsewhere. Excerpts from Fowler are as follows:

The prepositions up, on, over, by, etc., are often subjoined to

verbs, so that the verb and preposition can be regarded as a compound word; as, "To get up." Some of these compounds are idiomatic; as, "To get up" = to rise; to go on = to proceed.¹

Prepositions sometimes form compound verbs by being joined with Intransitive verbs, and also with verbs in the passive voice; as, "She smiled at him;" "A bitter persecution was carried on."²

According to the grammarians presented in the previous chapter, and to the observations in the chapter wherein the investigator has classified the two types of combinations, Fowler has only one example to fit the category of verb-preposition: "She smiled at him." Rise and proceed are both intransitive; consequently, to get up and to go on in these meanings are intransitive, a quality which designates up and on adverbial chiefly because of the lack of connection of the particle with any noun. "A bitter persecution was carried on" placed in active voice, "The king's army carried on a bitter persecution," reveals no connection between on and persecution.

The Particle as a Preposition and as an Adverb

Scholars presented in this division are not the only ones, of course, who designate the particle sometimes as a preposition and other times as an adverb. There are many of these, including Jespersen, Curme, and Poutsma, who recognize the two-fold concept for the particle.

Henry Sweet calls the verb-preposition a "group verb" and accents the idea that the preposition is grammatically associated with the

¹W. C. Fowler, Fowler's English Grammar (new ed., New York: Harper & Brothers, 1868), p. 615.

²Ibid.

noun-word it governs, but in meaning it is associated quite as closely with the verb.³ The definition might have the following illustration:

I ran across Jim at the ball game.

Grammatical association: ran-----across Jim

Meaning association: ran across----- Jim

Even though the definition is well-put, one must admit upon surveillance that in the verb-preposition there is also a grammatical association, precisely, verb-preposition, and with the double association, grammatical and meaning, Jim is rather left out in the cold. This illustrates the problem encountered in defining a verb combination.

For verb-adverb, Sweet chooses the term "compound verb," calling attention to even stress on the two parts. For the adverb portion of the verb-adverb he offers the classification of "separable particle";⁴ he does not do the same for his recognition of the preposition in the verb-preposition.

Verb plus Preposition and Verb plus Adverb Combinations are R. W. Pence's categories, and he takes the view that the adverb out in "They put the fire out" completes the predication begun by the verb put much in the same way a regular objective complement completes the predication begun by the verb in "They scrubbed the floor clean."⁵ This idea seems to be novel with Pence and accents the cohesiveness of a verb combination.

³Henry Sweet, A New English Grammar (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1892), p. 137.

⁴Ibid., p. 243.

⁵R. W. Pence, A Grammar of Present-Day English (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), pp. 45-46.

For the verb-preposition he has, among others, this example sentence:

You should make much use of the dictionary.

In agreement with Jespersen, Pence designates make much use of as the group verb (Jespersen's verb phrase) and gives the following as a parallel meaning:

You should consult the dictionary.⁶

It seems quite obvious that one can not say consult is synonymous with make much use of, again proving difficulty in finding one-word synonyms for verb-prepositions. Likewise, there can be dissatisfaction with declaring the same meaning for take good care of and safeguard.⁷

John B. Opdycke proclaims the preposition the most idiom ridden part of speech in English grammar.⁸ While the observation is not unique with Opdycke, it seems true and should have note. For definitions of combination constructions he has,

...certain verbs are followed by adverbs and prepositions that idiomatically lose their adverbial or prepositional nature and become embedded in the meaning of the verbs, as to turn on, to stand by, to do without, to give up, to hold out, to lay up, to try out. When such particle after the verb is an adverb it is called a verbal adverb; when it is a preposition, it is called a verbal preposition.⁹

Later Opdycke calls particles when inseparable from verbs component parts of verb phrases.

To be questioned is Opdycke's statement on the one hand that

⁶Ibid., p. 46.

⁷Ibid.

⁸John B. Opdycke, Harper's English Grammar (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), p. 264.

⁹Ibid.

adverbs and prepositions idiomatically lose their adverbial or prepositional nature, and on the other, his analysis that when such particle after the verb is an adverb, it is called a verbal adverb; when it is a preposition, it is called a verbal preposition. The investigator's conclusion is that particles do not always completely lose the natures of their respective parts of speech. Also it is very easy, but not very illuminating, to say that when such a particle after the verb is an adverb, it is called a verbal adverb; when it is a preposition, it is called a verbal preposition. This is like saying, "When we put beef in the stew, we have stewed beef; when we put lamb in the stew, we have stewed lamb."

Opdycke pronounces context the all-important factor in recognizing combinations and classifying their particles: "The context must decide in all such expressions just which quality of functioning [verbal preposition or verbal adverb] predominates, and the part of speech thus decided upon."¹⁰ This is an excellent observation. In the previous chapter of this thesis, Jespersen advocates meaning, stress, and word order; however, stress and word order are means to the end of determining the intended thought.

E. Krusinga uses the term "semi-compounds" for those "verbs that take what is called a prepositional object"¹¹ and for "some verbs, [which] instead of merely being modified by an accompanying adverb, form one whole with it."¹² For the former he says more elaborately:

¹⁰Ibid., p. 269.

¹¹E. Krusinga, A Handbook of Present-Day English (5th ed., Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1932), II, p. 11.

¹²Ibid., p. 337.

We may also consider as semi-compounds the verbs that take what is called a prepositional object: to laugh at a man. The preposition really forms part of the verb and has the function of an adverb rather than of a preposition.¹³

To be especially noted in Kruisinga is the movement away from the prepositional object and the recognition of the function of an adverb for the preposition in the verb-preposition. Attributing the function of the adverb for the preposition is the idea basic to the forming of one category for combinations, the verb-adverb, which receives discussion later in this chapter.

The preposition with adverbial function goes a step further in the following examples and discourse by Grattan and Gurrey:

He has run up a bill.
 I picked up the book yesterday.
 You have brought up an interesting subject.
 Parliament threw out the bill.
 Mary has wrung out the dish cloth.
 Augustus has polished off sixteen buns.
 You must carry over the answer to the next page.
 Tommy has knocked over the tea pot.
 He ran down the performance.
 These boxes take up too much room.

They [prepositions] happen to occur before nouns, but they might be placed later in the sentence without affecting its meaning in the slightest. They do not show the relation in which the nouns that happen to follow them stand to any other words. They do not fuse, as it were, with any noun. But whether they follow it closely or at a distance, they belong to the verb, not to any noun. You would not, therefore, be wrong in stating that they are adverbs /italics not in the original/. And yet such words do not perform exactly the same work as the general run of adverbs do....

When, therefore, such words differ clearly from the ordinary adverb, it is advisable to give them a more precise label: VERBAL PARTICLES.¹⁴

Grattan and Gurrey ask for the examination of at in these

¹³Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁴J. H. G. Grattan and P. Gurrey, Our Living Language (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, LTD., 1925), pp. 79-80.

sentences:

- (a) They laughed at our remarks.
- (b) These are the remarks at which they laughed.
- (c) These are the remarks that they laughed at.
- (d) These are the remarks they laughed at.
- (e) Our remarks were laughed at by them.

They call attention to the fact that in (b), (c), and (d), at is not pre-positied, and advocate calling the word a Postposition (or Postfixed Particle). They say that in (e) at has clearly fused with the word laugh and formed a compound transitive verb, "every bit as much a compound verb as, for example, pump out, fold up, go back, exhaust, return, destroy," and that such word "has been repelled from the noun and attracted to the verb." It is a Verbal Particle. While pronouncing at a preposition in (b), they call at in (c), (d), and (e) a verbal particle and ask for a consideration of at in (a). Their opinion is that it is not easy to determine here whether at is a preposition-- the reason: Language is in a state of flux.¹⁵

Here, then, is a solution offered by way of a common denominator, Verbal Particle, and in conclusion, the formula works something like this: If a preposition be a particle with the verb and one would not be wrong in calling it an adverb as used in the first set of examples, and if sentences (c), (d), and (e) in the second group have compound verbs as compound as those in the first group, then one assumes there would be no error in calling any particle an adverb; and the excuse for not being able to distinguish a preposition from a particle in certain situations would be the state of flux of the language. This treatise aptly illustrates just how involved the interpretation of

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 83-84.

verb combinations and their particles may become.

Particles as "Prepositions or Adverbs"

There is a type of classification which reads "preposition or adverb" or vice versa, really a very convenient connotation for the study of particles whereby one need not declare oneself as to the prepositional or adverbial quality of a particle.

Janet Rankin Aiken offers this type of recognition in "Very often an adverb or preposition will combine with a verb so closely as to form a new single idea, the parts having lost their original or literal meaning."¹⁶ Such constructions she calls "merged verbs." Her standard for distinguishing a merged verb from other verb situations is that the merged verb is figurative. To be able to judge when an expression is figurative and when it is not sometimes becomes quite a fete. Who can actually define as figurative Mrs. Aiken's send out? Yet she gives send out the classification of a merged verb in testing it by the one-word synonym. Who can say that wake up, put out, or pick up are always removed from their literal meanings? The figurative quality of a combination or loss of literal meaning of its component parts will not consistently prove the existence of a combination.

Again there is the insistence that "some single word will always be an approximate equivalent," and the investigator claims one is not looking for an approximate equivalent and challenges anyone to find an approximate single word equivalent for wore out in Mrs. Aiken's

¹⁶Janet Rankin Aiken, A New Plan of English Grammar (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933), p. 53.

example sentence, "He wore out the gloves."¹⁷

Very much in accord with Mrs. Aiken is Margaret Bryant, who uses "merged verbs," adverb or preposition which loses its meaning when combined with the verb, and the single word giving an approximate idea for a combination.¹⁸

The reader's reaction at this time is no doubt that the investigator is far too critical of the smaller works and their authors for not being more definite about a suitable name and function for the particle and the combination in which it functions. She may be, but she feels that the constructions under study should certainly have ample treatment in the college level texts. She realizes through this study and survey that the understanding of the verb-preposition and verb-adverb needs a far more important place than it is allowed in the study of the living language--than it has, for instance, in comparison with Miss Bryant's manifold classification of adverbs.¹⁹ The classification is excellent, of course, but the question is one of weighing values in mastery of grammatical conceptions. Which study is more important today?

But to continue, "Verb-expressions" is the term used by Earle, Savage, and Seavy for accommodating "adverbs and prepositions [*italics not in the original*]" often become so intimately associated with the verb that they may be conceived as making up with the verb

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Margaret Bryant, A Functional English Grammar (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1945), p. 208.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 191.

a verb-expression which acts in important ways like a transitive verb."²⁰
 This statement is, of course, entirely true, but the so-called expression does not always have to act in important ways like a transitive verb. For instance, here are sentences which illustrate "verb-expressions" in the intransitive:

Please sit down and rest for a while.

Jane is always showing off when company comes.

The grammar now being considered offers the following idea:

Whether we consider a preposition or an adverb as a part of a verb expression or as the whole or a part of an adverb modifier of the verb is unimportant as long as we are concerned with one language only; but when we undertake to translate or to express our thoughts in a foreign tongue, we find that idioms frequently differ at this point: a simple verb in one language may correspond to a verb plus a preposition or plus an adverb in another language.

He obeys his captain.	Il obeit a son capitaine.
He is asking for a book.	Il demande un livre.
I am thinking of my brother.	Je pense a mon frere.
I remember him.	Ich erinnere mich seiner.

That idioms differ in the manner designated is indisputable, but how anyone can say the study of combinations is unimportant within a single language is quite incomprehensible.

The Particle as an Adverb

Some grammarians prefer to term the particle portion of a combination an adverb, be that combination verb-preposition or verb-adverb. Therefore, all verb and particle combinations fall into the classification of verb-adverb. Ben Jonson's famous grammar of the seventeenth

²⁰Samuel C. Earle, Howard J. Savage, and Frank E. Seavy, Sentences and Their Elements (2nd ed., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), p. 20.

²¹Ibid., p. 22.

century reads thus: "Prepositions are also a peculiar kind of adverbs, and ought to be referred hither. Prepositions are separable or inseparable."²² Over three centuries later Paul Roberts reminds the student that most prepositions are adverbs in origin and continues with, "So close, indeed, is the correspondence [preposition and adverb] that many grammarians, beginning with Aristotle, have refused to recognize them as two parts of speech."²³

Concise and logical is Robert's analysis of the verb-adverb, if one is to make only the one classification for combinations. One may say it is the most thorough capsule-like review to be found, requiring not more than five pages of text space. He stresses meaning and position in determining the existence of a combination, and because he considers verb-adverb and verb-preposition one category, he can say without reproach, "...we can often find single-word synonyms."²⁴

Several of his examples concern the verb look:

look after: Please look after my little brother.
 look for: Look for a decent restaurant.
 look on: He said he was merely looking on.
 look out: Look out--a car is coming.
 look into: Look into this if you have time.
 look to: He looks to his Aunt Flo for advice.
 look up to: He looks up to his Aunt Flo.
 look up: Look up the word in the dictionary.
 look in on: I think I'll look in on Melrose.

In "Look after my little brother," do we say that the verb is look or look after? The first point to be clear on is that after is not a preposition in this sentence, or at least would not normally be

²²Strickland Gibson, ed., Ben Jonson's English Grammar (London: Lanston Monotype Corporation LTD, 1928), p. 107.

²³Paul Roberts, Understanding Grammar (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 227.

²⁴Ibid., p. 122.

understood as such; for if after my little brother is a prepositional phrase, the sentence must mean not "Guard my little brother," but either "Look when my little brother is done looking" or "Look in the direction my little brother took when leaving." Similarly up in "Roll up the rug" is a preposition only if the sentence means, "Lie down at one end and roll to the other."²⁵

Roberts recognizes the difficulty in distinguishing between adverb and preposition and gives the example sentence, "He shot at the lion." Here, he says, there appears to be a prepositional phrase modifying the verb shot. However, shot at can be a transitive verb with lion the object, an interpretation bolstered by placing in the passive:

He shot at a lion.
The lion was shot at.

He will look into the charges.
The charges will be looked into.

We tried out the new fly spray.
The new fly spray was tried out.²⁶

Roberts stresses the fact that many constructions are borderline and continues with,

The verb-adverb combination (as distinct from the verb-plus-prepositional phrase) provides another variation. In place of "Roll up the rug," we may say, "Roll the rug up."...Similarly we have:

Turn back the covers.
Turn the covers back.

Look over this.
Look this over.

But we cannot thus transpose all verb-adverb constructions which may be put into the passive. We cannot say, "He shot a lion at," "He will look the charges into." Usage differs in such borderline constructions as "We tried the new fly spray out."²⁷

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid., p. 228.

²⁷Ibid.

A great portion of Roberts's discussion has appeared herein because his is the sensible approach; that is, the construction, while often strengthened in the passive, can not always be so transposed; many cases are borderline; and above all, "we can often not always find a single-word synonym."²⁸

Arthur G. Kennedy is another who considers all combinations verb-adverb:

The particle, it is true, loses much of its usual adverbial or prepositional signification but in the combination assumes peculiar adverbial values...And in many others, finally the usual values of verb and prepositional-adverb remain fairly evident, as in brush off, brush out, ...burn down...²⁹

First in importance is his idea that combinations are not a fixed category--that overnight there can be new combinations and new meanings. Status of a combination, says Kennedy, is almost impossible to determine because colloquial and even slang combinations may reach good standing within a year's time.³⁰ Also important is his reason for the name "verb-adverb combination":

I have avoided the use of 'verb-adverb' compound because I do not wish to give the impression that in all the combinations I have studied and cited hereafter, the verb and combining particle are welded together with a uniform closeness...combinations differ greatly in respect to closeness of combination.³¹

Kennedy seems to be the only grammarian who, along with agreeing with others that the particle may function to make an intransitive verb

²⁸Ibid., p. 121.

²⁹Arthur G. Kennedy, The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination (Stanford University Publications. Stud. in Lang. and Lit., Vol. I, No. 1, 1920), p. 9.

³⁰Ibid., p. 10.

³¹Ibid., p. 9.

transitive, accents the faculty of the particle to make a large number of transitive verbs intransitive: beg off, brace up, bundle up, cheer up, make out, and so forth.³²

Two other factors he presents are that an object of a combination may be of a very different character from that of the verb (argue a case, but argue down an opponent)³³ and that verbs entering into combinations are usually monosyllables.³⁴

The investigator believes Kennedy's work to be the most extensive treatise to be found on the verb-adverb; it has a tremendous amount of credit due for copious examples and a history of the construction.

For a truly laborious study one may examine Edward Mason Anthony's doctoral dissertation on the word up. Mentioning combinations as two-word verbs, Anthony refers this caption to Fries, Staubach and Harris, and one sees another term for the verb combination. Anthony insists that languages operate systematically and that classifications [of up and similar words] "must not rest on what a researcher sees meanings to be at the moment, but rather the grammatical class of words accompanying a given expression, the order of the separate parts of expression, the substitutions possible, and the type of utterance in which these utterances appear."³⁵ The investigator deems this to mean that one can not judge the presence of a combination by the mere question, "What

³²Ibid., p. 26.

³³Ibid., p. 31.

³⁴Ibid., p. 29.

³⁵Edward Mason Anthony, Jr., "Test Frames for Structures with Up in Modern American English" (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954), p. 4.

is the meaning of this combination?" without considering the syntax, position, substitution of a one-word synonym or a synonymous group of words, and thought of a portion of a sentence or the entire sentence in which the combination appears, each of which contributes to the intended meaning. In other words, to arrive at the conclusion for the meaning of a combination on the basis of the words forming the combination without survey of the governing factors influencing that meaning is a careless approach which can result in an erroneous pronouncement. The Anthonian proclamation in this regard is excellent.

Anthony prescribes five test frames, or five different groups of constructions with up, isolated and described in terms of "sames" in the response of native speakers. "Each example," he says, "has been submitted to a series of tests--in fixed order, so that any new examples (i.e. outside the 409 treated here) will at worst invite only the creation of a new group."

Group I	He called John up.
Group II	The baby acted up.
Group III	John went up.
Group IV	His upbringing was good.
Group V	The frame-up was good. ³⁶

In conclusion Anthony says,

...the validity of the results...depends not so much on merits of macroscopic or microscopic, as upon the five sets of test frames which would guarantee the patterning of up as argued in preceding chapters...

Thus, many studies of words in this class as such, together with investigations of other two-word verb combinations, may eventually lead to a comprehensive statement. But no such statement can be defended without the support of multiplicities of detail--multiplicities of which this thesis is but a single example.³⁷

³⁶Ibid., p. 4.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 113-114.

Questions now arise as to which test frame would accomodate the following:

Mary, it is so clumsy to fall up steps.

I can't put up with the noise.

I am fed-up with your indifference.

If the investigator is correct in feeling the uses of up in these sentences require additional listings in the test frames, the structural analysis could become considerably more involved than it visibly is in its present form. To accommodate still other adverbial particles by the same analysis would, no doubt, add several more divisions, and one goes into an infinitum of confusion. Anthony calls attention to another doctoral dissertation on the word at,³⁸ and one can hardly help but wonder if it takes a doctoral dissertation to reach an understanding of each of the adverbs and prepositions which may function as adverbs in two-word verbs. It seems, if this be so, that one is defeated before beginning the analysis of combinations.

The Particle as a Connective

To go now from the extremely intricate procedure of Anthony to the amazingly simple approach of Myers, one feels the urge to applaud loud and long for the latter. His opinion reads thus:

Moreover, many words are called prepositions in some uses and adverbs in others, with no very clear boundary between them. This is especially true when they are used closely with verbs. For instance:

He came in.
She fell down.

³⁸Ibid., (Kuo Pin Chou, "The Uses of the Function Word at in Present-Day Standard English" unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1951).

She fell down the hill.
 I hate to get up.
 It is hard to get up those stairs.
 It is hard to get up much interest in the plan.

Some grammarians would call all the italicized words prepositions. Others would call at least some of them adverbs (while still others would argue that they are really "separable particles").

From what has been said it is clear that these three types of words--prepositions, conjunctions, and those "adverbs" which are neither identical with adjectives nor marked by the characteristic -ly ending--cannot be satisfactorily separated on the basis of function, and they certainly cannot be distinguished on the basis of form. Therefore they...may reasonably be considered as belonging to a single part of speech, which may be defined as follows:

Connectives are uninflected words with no characteristic endings. Their principal functions are to indicate connections between other words or groups of words, and to show certain relations of time, space, manner, degree, emphasis, and so forth, usually without clearly modifying a specific word in a sentence. Since the definition of connectives is the most elastic of all, it may also be said that "Any uninflected word that cannot be clearly identified as belonging to one of the other parts of speech may be called a connective."³⁹

With this view, then, there would be no combinations to worry about. Inviting as it might be, the approach involves a new organization of the study of grammar beginning with the very parts of speech.

Hence, there are particles termed in a variety of ways thereby affecting the study of the verb-adverb in as many ways. The range extends from the simple analysis of Myers to Grattan and Gurrey's involved procedure and Anthony's "multiplicities of detail." Excepting Myers's "connectives," the terminology has moved from preposition to adverb for the particle, and classification of combinations from the two-fold to the single, the verb-adverb.

³⁹L. M. Myers, American English (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 81.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

The understanding now of the term "verb-adverb combination" is two-fold. As presented in the previous chapters, it may designate one kind of combination, as differing from the "verb-preposition," or it may be a term to classify both types of combinations. Certainly the trend today is toward the latter. Not to be ignored are the various terms like "compound verbs," "verb phrases," and "phrasal verbs" by which, in a way, authorities are calling combinations verbs. One would probably not be wrong in predicting that combinations will at some time appear as verbs.

Recommendations of Opinions

To choose between the two types of classification for combinations is, of course, difficult, and to take a stand between purist and liberal is not the investigator's desire. If there is to be a division, the recommendation is Jespersen's examples, which are broad in number for words he chooses to illustrate even if narrow in number of particle words presented, particularly adverbs which may also be prepositions. To the investigator's knowledge, there is no really adequate development for verb-adverb and verb-preposition as separate categories. However, if one desires the division, there is really no reason for avoiding it because most instances have a solution as being a "verb-

preposition" or "verb-adverb." Those under dispute may have an analysis to meet the individual's satisfaction, if not always in agreement with others. There is no option but to use one's own judgment in the more trying decisions as to whether a combination is present and as to which type it happens to be. The division, then, is fine for the expert to use and reach his own conclusions.

The tendency toward a common category, "verb-adverb combination," appears in the previous chapter of this thesis and is bolstered by the following questions and answers found in a scholarly magazine:

Can you suggest a source of information on such constructions as "put off," "wind up," etc. Are "off," "up," and "out" considered part of the verb? Please comment.

.../Source: Grattan and Gurrey, Our Living Language/ But whether they follow it closely or at a distance they belong to the verb, not to any noun. You would not, therefore, be wrong in stating that they were adverbs...¹

In the sentence "The boy put on his hat," is on a preposition, an adverb, or a part of the verb?

The on should be construed as an adverb attached to the verb put...²

In the sentence "We called on Mrs. Brown," is "on Mrs. Brown" an adverbial phrase?

The adverbial phrase does not seem to be the solution. Rather the verb is called on, a verb-adverb combination, and Mrs. Brown is the direct object...³

The abundance of occurrences of combinations in today's usage demands an analysis which may have understanding in elementary grammar as well as advanced. The common category, therefore, is the more sensible approach to combinations throughout the study of English

¹"Current English Forum," College English, III (January, 1942), 410.

²Ibid., V (October, 1943), 42.

³Ibid., IV (December, 1942), 196.

grammar. The recommendation here is Paul Roberts for clarity and conciseness of presentation. For an expanded treatment under the term of "verb-adverb combination," and for history, examples, and observations, an excellent source is Arthur G. Kennedy.

Recommendation for Terminology

If there is to be a division into two categories, the terms should be "verb-preposition" and "verb-adverb," for that is what the two types of combinations explicitly are. If there is to be a common category, then the "verb-adverb combination" should be the name. In combination one can easily see the adverbial property of a preposition which leads to the placement of all combinations under one term. Actually the temptation to recommend "verb combination" has been very strong, but here other cohesive constructions enter the picture such as run amuck, go beserk, go south, and let loose which can be considered unified verb expressions and which can take one into another vast realm of associations not treated within this work.

The investigator has chosen these terms over and above others which have appeared in this thesis and offers the following reasons. A "Kind of a Unit" is indefinite. A unit must be a unit as one is one. "Compound Verbs" is confusing because of the existence of verbs known as true compounds: outbid, overflow. "Merged Verbs" is inappropriate for the understanding of the word merger is a combining of like with like, such quality not being true of combinations. "Verb Phrases" and "Phrasal Verbs" are confusing since the terminology might well designate other verb constructions: was writing, have been talking, should have been seen. As to the latter term, one writer says this:

The term 'phrasal verbs' has been suggested to me by Dr. Bradley, not, as he writes, that he is satisfied with it, or would not welcome any alternative that he could feel to be an improvement...although the word 'phrasal' is perhaps objectionable in formation, it fills a want, and is sometimes indispensable.⁴

"Two-word Verbs" is inadequate; many verbs are "two-word": can see, will go, may have. Besides combinations are not always two-word: put up with. "Semi-Compounds" is inaccurate and too mathematical, since words do not lend themselves to mathematical analysis. Arthur Kennedy says when the combination has great solidity, such might bear the name of "compound."⁵ For those which are not so closely bound, then, or even for those that are, the term "semi-compound" does not suffice. "Verb plus Verbal Particle" is decidedly awkward and too involved. "Group Verbs" is inadequate in that it could pertain to other verb constructions, as is "Verb-Expressions," and both are vague.

Combinations are a combining of two parts of speech for one function, the verb. It would be better to call them verbs than any of the names just presented. Since, however, combinations do differ from verbs in structure, some special name at present seems a necessity.

Recommendations for Determining the Presence of a Combination

In working with a two-fold classification of verb-combinations, the best approach in the study of factors conducive to the presence of a combination and the nature of its particle is Jespersen's criteria.⁶

For the single classification, Anthony sums up rather neatly, if

⁴Logan Pearsall Smith, "English Idioms," S. P. E., Tract XII, (1923), p. 5, n. 1.

⁵Kennedy, The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination, p. 7.

⁶Jespersen, p. 273.

a bit learnedly, the requirements for the existence of a combination.⁷

His last requirement, "the consideration of the type of utterance in which these utterances appear," receives support from one Benjamin Lee Whorf, who says,

...in a language with simple primary types of moduli the meaning of the individual lexeme is more or less under the sway of the entire sentence, and at the mercy of the manifold potentialities of connotation and suggestion which thereby arise.⁸

It seems safe to assume that combinations are a specialized type of verbation, and certainly one can see that combinations very often are determinable by the meaning of the entire sentence. Roberts's "Roll up the rug" is a fitting example.⁹ One does not know the meaning of roll or roll up until seeing rug. Likewise the true meaning of ran or ran across or across is indeterminable without reading the entire sentence, "I ran across Jim at the ball game." Indeed it is challenging to think of very many combinations whose meanings are not under the "sway of the entire sentence."

Meaning, then, as one considers some or all of the factors conducive to that meaning--word order, stress, position, and "sway of the entire sentence"--is the ultimate test. The one-word synonym is very frequently but not always an aid in determining a combination's presence. Again, the synonym is a support for the meaning. Stress figures with importance in finding all verb combinations. It is almost foolproof in oral discourse; however, in writing, where one is

⁷Anthony, "Test Frames for Structures with Up in Modern American English," p. 4.

⁸Benjamin Lee Whorf, "Grammatical Categories," Language, XXI (1945), 9.

⁹Roberts, p. 122.

naturally more concerned with analysis, trouble arises with this factor, for stress can be a variant quality, depending upon individual reading and interpretation. Stress is of great significance in the designation of a verb-prepositional relationship, but is not so consistently vital for the verb-adverb, the component parts normally being even in stress as is a regular verb and adverb relationship. Even with all these factors, one must, now and then, rely upon his own judgment.

Values and Weaknesses of the Combination

The values of verb combinations are as follows:

1. They are generally more forceful than one-word synonyms or other constructions parallel in meaning.

Stand up for your rights.

Uphold your rights.

Take a firm position for your rights.

2. They are in many instances more direct in revealing an action than other forms of expression. They are, therefore, time and energy saving.

The baby pulled up to the table.

The baby grasped the edge of the table, placed his feet under him, and stretched to a standing position. (Note one could say the baby stood up to the table, but there is still a combination, and the meanings are not exactly parallel.)

3. Being more forceful and more direct, they are often more expressive and colorful than expressions of like meaning.

Cheer up! Things are not so bad.

Be of good cheer! Things are not so bad.

4. Combinations serve at times where there is no adequate one-word verb available.

Johnny wears out his shoes in a very short time.

Fill in the blanks on page three.

5. They can carry additional meanings to those implied by the combination of component parts.

Did you run across anyone you know downtown?

Did you happen to meet anyone you know downtown?

Did you by chance (or unexpectedly) meet anyone you know downtown?

6. Above all, combinations are easy. Kennedy proves that most of them have a monosyllable for the verb portion.¹⁰ Their use replaces the more difficult longer verbs or prefixed or suffixed verbs. This is the principal reason for the vast number of combinations in the living language.

"Our speech is never adequate to express the inexhaustible richness of life...there is hardly any action or attitude of one human being to another which cannot be expressed by these phrasal verbs."¹¹ So says Logan Pearsall Smith who perhaps offers the greatest defense for combinations:

Idioms like 'on the rocks' or 'under a cloud' are visual images; phrasal verbs like 'to pull through,' 'to keep up,' are kinaesthetic metaphors, arousing imagined sensations of muscular effort. These verbs of motion and effort possess so protean and self-multiplying a power of entering into combinations and throw off such a kaleidoscope a variety, that compared with the other inert elements of our vocabulary, they seem to possess, like radium, an inexhaustible store of life and energy.¹²

Aside from the assets of the combination, one must consider its weaknesses:

1. The combination is sometimes redundant. Some grammarians attack such expressions as fill up, cry out, fall down, kneel or bow

¹⁰Kennedy, The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination, p. 7

¹¹Smith, "English Idioms," p. 5.

¹²Ibid., p. 46.

down, tire out, and wake up with the descriptions, "superfluous," "redundant," "ambiguous," "tautological," or "pleonastic." Janet Rankin Aiken says, "Sometimes the extra word is superfluous, as in wake up for awake or wake; and then we have tautological expressions like continue on or return back. Such merged verbs as these last are to be avoided."¹³ Opdycke cautions against refer back, repeat again, subjugate under, start out, dive in, do over again, divide up, and so forth, claiming such expressions to be wordy and bungling.¹⁴

But there are opinions to oppose the attacks. Kennedy feels that "the speaker almost always feels a nice distinction even though his sense of the logical tells him that the particle should be quite unnecessary," and does not mention a single instance of redundancy.¹⁵ In a scholarly magazine Anthony refers to his dissertation on the word up and has the following to say:

In one group of two-word verbs it was found that, although by structural criteria the members should have been ambiguous, they were not. Some examples, together with a word or phrase indicating the meaning in which they were grasped, stand below:

I'm glad you brought that up.	'introduce into the discussion'
Button your coat up.	'fasten completely'
I called her up six or eight times.	'telephone'
I'd certainly follow it up.	'pursue a subject'
They put it up on the shore of the lake.	'erect' ¹⁶

The investigator agrees that while such expressions appear and sound

¹³Aiken, p. 53.

¹⁴Opdycke, p. 247.

¹⁵Kennedy, The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination, p. 7.

¹⁶Edward Mason Anthony, Jr., "An Exploratory Inquiry into Lexical Clusters," American Speech, XXIX (August, 1954), 175.

superfluous, they do answer a need in expression. One recalls in Smith's opinion the idea of particles replacing gestures in their values of showing muscular effort.

2. The combination is commonplace. One must readily admit that a combination is in the majority of instances less distinctive and less learned than one-word verbs. Likewise, the popular song is less elevating, culturally, that is, than the classical. One might put it this way: Remove the popular song; remove much pleasure--remove the combination; oust a happy and popular medium of exchange. As established earlier in this work, the combination is not here because of distinctive quality, but through its popularity.

3. The combination is too abundant in usage. The charge of combinations being used too frequently must, of course, stand unopposed. Approximately twenty years after his extensive work on the verb-adverb combination, Kennedy offers the following:

The limitations of Basic-verb expression to a relatively small group of commonly used verbs necessitates the employment of many verb-adverb combinations..., and while such combinations have become increasingly important in the idiom of Modern English,--I have estimated that 20 such verbs can be combined with some 16 adverbial containing elements...to produce at least 155 verb-adverb combinations with more than 600 fairly distinct significations or uses,--it is undoubtedly true, as I stated 20 years ago, that "owing to the multiplication of meanings, the possibility of confusion or misunderstanding is greatly increased...and even tho this possibility can be largely obviated by emphasis on attendant circumstances of speech, there is still danger of lessening the capacity for precision in the expression of ideas if the more highly specialized verbs give way to commonplace combinations."¹⁷

4. Not so much as a weakness peculiar to the combination itself, but rather as a hindrance to understanding, the combination takes an

¹⁷Arthur G. Kennedy, English Usage (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1942), p. 107.

exceedingly prominent place in idiomatic expressions which foreigners, in trying to learn and speak English, find so taxing to comprehend.

To illustrate is this story:

...a German resident in England who spoke English perfectly for ordinary purposes, but who, not having mastered the idiomatic differences of meaning between upset and set up, recommended some wine to a guest with the remark, 'You might drink' a bottle of it, and it would not set you up.' (English Prose, p. 144). Another foreigner wishing to recommend a tonic, wrote that it had 'quite upset him.'¹⁸

Thus, the combination has its assets and its liabilities. To resort to the more bungling forms or to use the construction too frequently will not be conducive to the better speaking and writing. But to go to the other extreme by refusing to note the values of combinations is not only intellectual snobbishness, but intellectual idiocy.

The first part of this thesis has presented opinions which ultimately lead, for all practical purposes, to one category, the verb-adverb combination, such term to include the verb-preposition and the verb-adverb.

Part Two presents a survey of frequency of appearance of the combination, along with the influences behind such frequency.

¹⁸Smith, "English Idioms," p. 5, n. 2.

PART TWO

A SURVEY OF THE PREVALENCE OF THE COMBINATION IN PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH

CHAPTER V

PLAN AND CRITERIA FOR THE SURVEY

England's censuring America for the prevalence of the verb-adverb combination is the topic to appear first in Part Two. Remaining chapters show the number of verb-adverb occurrences in various types and levels of writing and speaking. Within the survey there are observations concerning occasions or influences which cause the construction to appear and flourish, as well as those conditions which bring about a decrease in usage.

Words are at times evasive, and combinations are no exception. The designation of a verb plus a particle as a verb-adverb combination can evoke disputation comparable with that presented in the chapter which follows immediately. Combinations have various degrees of attraction between their component parts, and now and then a decision as to the existence of a verb-adverb becomes difficult.

Often a grammarian in treating the construction limits himself to a few specific words to serve as the second word of a combination, as is the case with Arthur Kennedy who uses only sixteen particles: about, across, around or round, at, by, down, for, in, off, on, out, over, thru, to, up, and with. Edward Mason Anthony confines his study to up. This survey, however, runs the scale from the more pronounced combination to the less cohesive one.

The reason for the broad consideration is that a verb-adverb

relationship may or may not be a combination in the opinion of a grammarian, or, for that matter, a layman. For example, a combination may be as obvious as cut out in "cut out the picture," or it may be as questionable as go back in "Go back to the end of the line." If a student has been misbehaving at the front of a line, the teacher may use this reprimand, and, in the minds of some, back would be a purely adverbial modification. If, however, the student has been at the back of the line and has assumed for himself a place toward the front, the teacher may use the same correction, and in this sense, go back means return and may well have the classification of verb-adverb. Then there is the thought that if go back is a combination in one instance, it is in the other, and so it goes.

Such verbs as get, come, go, take, and keep are, more often than not, vague or short of meaning without a second word which follows immediately or within a few words. Logan Pearsall Smith has this opinion:

And yet it is exactly from these abstract verbs, in combination with adverbs and prepositions of abstract direction that we derive thousands of the vivid colloquialisms and idiomatic phrases by means of which we describe the greatest variety of human actions and relations.¹

Expressions like come in, go out, come along, take away, and keep on have consideration throughout the survey.

The investigator realizes the fine distinctions are a source of controversy. With this in mind, she has governed her choices according to the following standards:

¹Smith, "English Idioms," p. 47.

1. The second word has an important bearing on the action of the first or lends action or direction to that word.

2. A combination included in the tally may have appeared as an example in some grammarian's discussion of the construction.

3. The verb-adverb has recognition in its derivatives, the noun and adjective. For instance, one may check up on an individual's reputation (verb-adverb), but one goes to his physician for a check-up (verb-adverb noun derivative). Other noun derivative examples are fallout, standby, and dugout. Adjective derivatives appear in these phrases: quite a grown-up young lady, a bang-up affair, and a closing-out sale.

4. Because of the variety of interpretations which may sometimes exist in determining the presence of a combination, the investigator, on such occasions, has used her own judgment. She has invited meaning, stress, "sway of the entire sentence," sound, position, and the one-word synonym to help in her decisions. Where there has been appreciable doubt that the first and second words lack unity sufficient for a combination, there has been no count.

5. There has been no attempt to find those materials which unfairly promote the investigator's point in establishing the combination's frequency. To illustrate, the request for television scripts reads for "any two presentations of" that particular program. In other words, there has been no listening for a program which is particularly filled with the usage. Some programs will have more occurrences, and some fewer than those presented for survey. The same procedure holds true for other materials, chosen at random, except for type and level.

6. Counting in the various materials has been, in the very

greatest majority, by the word, not by so many words to a line and the number of lines in a column, and so forth, with one time through a selection for word count and one time through for number of combinations. Because of the vast amount of counting, the survey, while quite indicative, is not exact.

CHAPTER VI

ENGLAND VERSUS AMERICA

On several occasions England has held America responsible, not only for the origin, but for the cultivation and consequent prevalence of the verb-adverb combination. Herein appear some of the accusations and answers to the charges against America.

Upon examining a series of letters in The London Times, one finds a blatant accusation of "Americanisms" appearing in an address by Mr. Baldwin, Chancellor. The combination causing the editorial arguments is try out, used by Mr. Baldwin in the phrase, "In order to try out the possibilities of these new methods." The series alternately deplores and upholds the Chancellor in this usage, the one faction maintaining that "try out" should be "try," and the other proclaiming the difference in meaning of the two terms, advocating "try out" as good solid Elizabethan English, or saying the Teutonic word combinations differ little from Latin verbs, the former adding a separable suffix to a verb and the latter attaching the preposition or adverb as a prefix to the root verb. The arguments fly back and forth under the heading of "American Prepositions," which creates still another turmoil concerning terminology, to include a shaming of Cambridge by Oxford for the use of "Prepositions" when the term should be "Adverbs."¹

¹Editorials in The London Times, February 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 16, 1933.

Actually there is nothing new concerning the understanding of combinations in this series of letters, the arguments being time-worn and inconclusive. The very fact, however, that such usage has the name of "Americanisms" places the blame for origin on America. Again it is Logan Pearsall Smith who offers the greatest defense for the combination, and who places what he would term credit instead of blame on England herself. He proclaims the idioms to be as old as the English language and maintains that large numbers of combinations appear in the writings of Wyclif, Gower, Chaucer, Lydgate, and Malory. His comment is, "How such Americanisms reached the shores of England before the discovery of America is a problem which I should like to suggest to the considerations of these pundits."² With sarcasm, Smith continues,

The porter in Macbeth may have picked up his unseemly phrase about drink, how 'it sets him up and takes him off' from American sightseers at Macbeth's castle; and Othello learned perhaps from tourists in Venice the Americanisms which he uses so effectively in the lines:--

Keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them.
Put out the light, and then put out the light.³

There are appearances of the construction in the Book of Common Prayer, in the revised translation of the Bible, in Spenser, and in Shakespeare, according to Smith. He says Milton puts Americanisms into mouths of his characters as when Eve says in Paradise,

Sweet the coming on of grateful evening mild.⁴

Henry Dobinson, another writer in the series, states the following:

²Ibid., February 13, 1933.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

...the Norsemen were thus tempering the meanings of their verbs [adverbially converted prepositions] when they discovered America a thousand years ago, and there is no reason why today's Americans should not carry on the Norsemen's work. If at any time this work had been checked, our languages would never have grown.⁵

History relates the story of the Norsemen's early visits to America as consisting of several attempts to make permanent settlements along the shores of Iceland, Greenland, and Vinland. Such efforts, however, were unrewarding and soon forced them to return to Europe. Any influence on American usage, consequently, would have had to have come from the Norseman via England to America.

But aside from opinions just quoted, one may find ample proof in the OED to substantiate England's originating, as well as cultivating, the so-called Americanisms:

Up (adv.)

1. To or towards a point or place higher than another and lying directly (or almost directly) above it; so as to raise or bring, come or tend, to or towards a higher position in space.

c 888 K. ÆLFRED Boeth xxxiv. § 11. Hwæðer þu nu onzite forwhy pæt fur fundiz up & slo eorðe ofdane?

- b. Towards or above the level of the shoulders or head.

Beowulf 2575. Hond up abraed zeata dryhten gnyre fahne sloh.

- c. So as to raise into a more erect (or level) as well as elevated position.

c 891 K. ÆLFRED Gregory's Past. C. l. v. 425 Ne hebbe ze to up eowre hornas. Donne ahebbað ða synfullan swiðe up hura hornas [etc]...

1535 COVERDALE... Ezek. viii 17. Purposly to cast vp their noses vpon me.

Under figurative and transferred applications [up] there is,

⁵Ibid., February 13, 1933.

8. From a lower to a higher status in respect of position, rank, or affluence.

c 825 Vesp. Psalter xxxvi, 34 Dryhten... hefeð up ðe þæt
 ðu ineardie eordan.

c 888 K. ÆLFRED Boeth. xxxix § 11. þy læs hi for longum
 zesælcum hi to up ahaebben.

9. To a higher spiritual or moral level or object.

c 888 K. ÆLFRED Boeth. xli § 6 Se mann ana gæp uprihte;
 þæt tacnað þæt he sceal ma þencan up þonne nyðer.
 1297 R. Glouc. (Rolls) 9342 Holdeþ vpto god... zoure pozt.

- b. To a state of greater cheerfulness, confidence, resolution, etc.

1297 R. Glouc. (Rolls) 9336 Zoure herten hebbep vp...
 Hopieþ al on god.

10. To or towards mature age, or proficiency in some art, etc.

a 900 O. E. Martyrol. 21 Oct. 192 [Hilarion] waes vp
 cymen in Palestina.

11. Into existence, prominence, vogue, or currency: so as to appear or prevail.

a 900 Andreas 1236 (Gr.) Storm upp aras æfter
 ceasterhofum.

18. To or towards a state of completion or finality.

a 1300 Cursor M. 6634 Slas vp yon caitefs al bidene!
 c 1374 CHAUCER Troylus v. 1470 She made vp frete here corn.

- b. With other verbs, denoting progress to or towards end.

1307 York Memo Bk I. 181. Oute taken girdels that er fully wrought upp.

These examples along with Smith's opinion that America has not been responsible for either Shakespeare's or Milton's uses of combinations lead one to believe America could have had little to do with England's earlier use of combinations. It is doubtful that England's literary classes, or even lower classes, could have been affected to any extent in their speaking and writing by the settlers of America, who, it is known, were struggling for their very existence, and many

of whom had lower-class status upon their departure from England. It seems conservative, then, to estimate that at least a century would have to pass after the discovery of America (1492) before there could be any influence of American usage on that of the English. America's literature, according to anthologies, begins with the settlement of Jamestown (1607), the first newspaper has the date of 1690, and it is ludicrous to believe there was any appreciable amount of verbal contact across the seas before 1600.

To accept this date more wholeheartedly, one may again examine the OED and find certain listings of verbs with prepositions and verbs with adverbs under "Figurative and Specialized Uses." Many of these, by way of example, accommodate the definition of a verb-adverb combination as defined in this thesis. Where there is doubt one can often feel satisfied to designate the specialized use a precursor of a combination.

80. Go in

To go in and out: in quasi-Biblical lang., to conduct oneself, 'to do the business of life' (j.). The Heb. phrase on which this is founded appears in the Eng. Bible as to go out and to come in;...

c 915 Rushw Gose Matt. vii. 13 Gab inn purh naarwe zeate.
c 1440 Pramp. Parv. 202/2 Goon yn to a place...

73. Go away

- a. To depart, go from a place or person.

c 1200 Vices & Virtues (1888) il Ga awei fram me, du zewerezede, forð mid te dieule!

91. Go to[†] go till

- ta. To go about one's work...to get to work.

c 1200 ORMIN 9199 Gab tull & zarrkepp Godess wezze.

a 1250 Owl and Night 836 Thu gest al to mid swikelede.

d. To shut, close.

1481 CAXTON Reynard (Arb.) The grynne wente to.

94. Go up (used to show expanded uses at later dates)

a. To go, pass, or change to a place or position which is, or is viewed as, higher; to ascend, rise.

c 1386 CHAUCER Shipman's T. 212 Vp to hir housbonde is this wyf ygon.

c. Of a cry.

1535 COVERDALE I Sam v. 12. The noyse of the cite went up into heaven.

1890 Murray's Magazine Oct. 556 A shriek has gone up as to the wickedness of carrying cattle on ship.

e. To increase in number, price, or value.

1883 Mrs. C. Praed Meloch I. i. iv 79 Wool would go up a penny a pound.

Specialized uses for run with a preposition and with an adverb appear as follows:

With prepositions, in specialized uses.

59. Run across	1887	J. Hawthorne <u>Tragic Mist</u> viii
60. Run after	1526	Skelton <u>Magnyf.</u> 2172
61. Run against	1375	Barbour <u>Bruce</u> ii, 434
62. Run before	1596	Shaks. <u>Merch Ven.</u> II. vi. 4
63. Run in	1386	Chaucer <u>Can. Yeom. ProL.</u> & <u>T.</u>
64. Run into	1380	Wyclif <u>Wks.</u> l. 1880
65. Run on	1472	Paston <u>Lett</u> III. 57
66. Run out of	1710	<u>Tatler</u> No. 221 l. 2
67. Run over	1563	<u>Satir. Poems Reform</u> xlii. 536
68. Run through	1449	Pecock <u>Repr.</u> I. viii. 41
69. Run to	1513	<u>Fabyan Chron</u> (1533) 155b
70. Run upon	1300	Cursor M. 3556
71. Run with	1380	Wyclif <u>Wks.</u> (1880)

With adverbs, in specialized uses.

72. Run away	1380	Sir Ferumb 2438
Run away with	13..	Sir Beues 2021
73. Run down	1578	Lindesay (Pitscottie)

74. Run in	1699	Baker <u>Refl. Learning</u> 58
75. Run off	1683	D. Granville <u>Letters</u> (Surtees suc.)
76. Run on	1593	Shakespeare <u>Rich. II</u> v. v. 59
77. Run out	1300	Cursor M. 15177
78. Run over	1526	Tindale <u>Luke</u> vi 38
79. Run through	1400	<u>Song of Roland</u> 936
80. Run together	1225	Ancr. R. 80
81. Run up	1390	Gower Conf. I. 173

Four of the dates for these entries are after the year 1600, leaving the remaining sixteen to be, without question, of English rather than American origin. Actually, whenever a combination is of American origin, such has designation in entry:

71 Go ahead

1868 Nat. Encycl. I. 618/2 Go-ahead is of American origin and is used... where the British would say "all right".

That the charge of "Americanisms" can not ring true seems evident, and one now proceeds to examine a few opinions on the development of combinations.

To go back to the early seventeenth century, there is for consideration Doctor Johnson's strenuous objection to Milton's use of combinations. This dissension appears to have consummated with Johnson's unaltered disapproval of the usage, but also his acknowledgement of the forcefulness of combinations.⁶ Setting master against master, then, and again accepting Smith's freeing America of influencing Milton's usage, one is hardly presumptuous in concluding that if England has had friction within its own boundaries, the combination, despite native objection, has flourished therein by way of its own merits and popularity.

⁶Ibid., February 13, 1933.

More recently, Horwill has said that England constantly naturalizes American usage, including the adoption of those combinations of verb and adverb "which Americans prefer to a single verb or to a more roundabout expression." The adverb, he feels, is more important to Americans in its intensifying quality for verbs than it is to the British; but concerning prepositions in combinations, he says the real difference lies in the choice of preposition--to name for (not after), to want of (not with), playing on (not in) the eleven.⁷ Along the same trend, Eric Partridge praises the "terse expressiveness" of American slang and says it receives a faintly reluctant welcome in England. He includes in his examples: close up, fade out, bump off, put on the spot, take for a ride, bark up the wrong tree, go over big, to reel off, and wade in.⁸ Within these two opinions, one recognizes the fact that England accepts American usage on its own through "naturalization" and a "faintly reluctant welcome." America's extensive use of combinations is never to be denied; America does not force the usage upon the English.

As an accusation of the English, the mortal sin of crudity, "Americanisms," seems mild in comparison with the most recent charge, found by the investigator, of one Henry George Strauss, Baron Conesford of Chelsea. According to Lord Conesford, Americans are guilty of "murder" of the language and "pretentious illiteracy." His examples include using one word in lieu of another (alibi for excuse,

⁷H. W. Horwill, "American Variations," S. P. E., Tract XLV (1936), 194-195.

⁸Eric Partridge, "Slang," S. P. E., Tract LV (1940), 195.

underprivileged for poor), inventing inferior words (motivations for motives, objectives for objects), and much more seriously, "destroying the simple, strong transitive verb by pointless additions of adverbial particles." The latter he terms "a deplorable American habit."

Admitting a few words later that some phrasal verbs can enrich the language and show versatility by adding a preposition to the verb, (to be noted is the Baron's change of terminology for the particle and his examples for such: take to people, take them down, take them off, or take them in; play up, knock out, carry on, keep off), he says that today the trend is to weaken the language by adding unnecessary particles...merely for the sake of verbosity.

Are you sure that "face up to" is better or stronger than face? Is it really better to "meet up with" a man than to meet him, to "visit with" friends than to visit them, to "study up" on a subject than to study it? "Soften up" is inferior to soften, "drown out" is inferior to drown, "lose out" is inferior to lose. You "pay off" an army when you discharge it, but to say some policy has "paid off" when you simply mean that it has proved profitable, seems to me deplorable. Soon, I suppose, American parents will teach their children that "honesty pays off"! ⁹

There are several answers to Lord Conesford:

1. Use of and composing of new combinations, deplorable or otherwise, is not solely American. It is true one may find a list of slang terms to include some thirty-four combinations compiled by Fred Newton Scott for the English in order that they might better understand the works of Sinclair Lewis.¹⁰ Likewise one may read an article on British slang terms offered to America to include five combinations

⁹Lord Conesford, "You Americans are Murdering the Language," The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXX (July 13, 1957), 71.

¹⁰Fred Newton Scott, "American Slang," S. P. E., Tract XXIV (1906), 118-127.

(belt up--be quiet; scupper up and jug up--drink liquor or beer; chuck the snouts over--pass a pack of cigarettes; ride out (of a place)--leave). This article ends with the comment of American visitors in a London bar upon receiving an explanation of terms, "We said thanks and rode out [left] of the clinic [pub] feeling like a round box [somebody who doesn't dig jazz. A square.] but convinced English is a living language."¹¹ The ratio of thirty-four combinations in the works of Lewis to five in a short list of terms (approximately thirty-five) in a newspaper article is not an unbalanced one to consider.

Another newspaper article of interest is the following:

BRITISH TERMS FOR CARS, PARTS
ARE CONFUSING TO U. S. MOTORISTS

DETROIT (INS) -- If you are "flattening out" in your "saloon" or "drophead," you'd better make sure your "de-misters" and "silencer" are in good working condition.

Double-talk? No, just the King's English! But in the United States you'd probably hear: "If you are speeding along in your sedan or automobile, you'd better make sure your defrosters and muffler are in good working condition."¹²

Also one may observe William Craigie's examples of blaze away (1776) and bang away (1840) as synonyms of fire away, English from 1775.¹³ Should one say the deplorable combinations are an American or English habit? Jespersen says, "Where an Englishman says, 'I shall catch you up' or 'I'll catch up with you,' Americans know only the latter phrase."¹⁴

¹¹Chicago Daily News, August 25, 1958, p. 2.

¹²St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 26, 1957, p. 1A.

¹³William Craigie, "The Growth of American English," S. P. E., Tract LVI (1940), 221.

¹⁴Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar, p. 271.

Certainly it is quite questionable whether one can say America is murdering the English language, for England must interpret its "Englishisms" simultaneously with America explaining "Americanisms."

2. As to the charge of verbosity, there is some sympathy with Lord Conesford's declaration, and this point could cause dissension from now on. Nevertheless, verbosity has a very firm status in both England and America. Also one must again consider Arthur Kennedy's "feeling a nice distinction." Kennedy notes the purists' objection to redundancy and says the particle has been added in the first place to give emphasis, or perhaps to round out the speech rhythm, and such combinations of verb and particle express more than a simple verb. Following several examples comparable to Lord Conesford's, Kennedy states, "we feel a difference between bowing and bowing down, leaking or leaking out."¹⁵

3. Before becoming so critical, Lord Conesford should perhaps clarify his understanding of the adverbial or prepositional nature of the particle. In his examples under adding a preposition to a verb, if one is to divide the particle into two categories, up in play up, out in knock out, and on in carry on are definitely adverbial, not prepositional.

4. Margaret Nicholson, who has done years of extensive research resulting in a dictionary on American-English usage, offers this conclusion:

My feeling is that good English is good English, whatever the nationality of the writer. In every community there are local meanings, terms, and constructions, arising from circumstances and environment

¹⁵Kennedy, The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination, p. 4.

of that particular locality. Some of these should be treasured, some should be eschewed in formal speech and writing. There is no essentially American-English or English-English. There are only not-too-important regional variations.¹⁶

Hence one feels that the charges against America have been entirely too severe in that England has had its share in originating and using the verb-adverb combination. The investigator has found no evidence wherein America denies the cultivation of such usage; America courts it freely in many levels of speaking and writing. Such prevalence is presented in the ensuing chapters.

¹⁶Margaret Nicholson, "What is Good English?" The Atlantic, CXCIX (May, 1957), 73.

CHAPTER VII

THE COMBINATION IN MASS MEDIA

Lord Conesford might possibly have some concern about Americans teaching their progeny the principle underlying "honesty pays off," but as for the construction, he worries unnecessarily. American youth need not depend upon parental guidance to inculcate use of the combination, for it becomes frequent in one's usage, not as a result of any direct teaching or learning effort, but rather, because of the multiplicity of appearances in modern writing and speaking, as a process of assimilation. Mass media are illustrative of this fact. Herein are examples and observations of frequency in advertising, the newspaper, television, and radio.

Occurrences in Advertising

Advertising capitalizes on the use of the combination. That specialists in the field are incapable of employing a more distinctive and concise wording is not true; they realize what is eye-catching and consequently effective in selling-power. The use of "pays off" receives encouragement via ads such as the following:

OLD SPICE
STICK DEODORANT
the Social Security
that pays off
every day

How Pure Oil's "pint-size" refinery
pays off for you at the gas pump

The habit of combining up with a verb certainly does not diminish when a lad sees his prototype in an ad with this wording:

HE CAN
 PICK UP
 A SNEEZE
 FROM
THIS GLASS
 BUT NOT
 FROM A
 DIXIE CUP

His teen-aged sister, naturally figure-conscious, no doubt is impressed when she sees,

ARE YOU MEASURING UP?

Libby's Tomato Juice

and no less are her interests in make-up and romance. She reads a combination linked with a poetic phrase, each presenting its respective charm to one her age:

She never looks over made up...her skin glows
 with the softness of candlelight!
 Revlon "Touch and Glow"

The brother and sister, because of their concern for the household pet, may be "off" and "away" to the drugstore as a result of these ads:

Sensational news for dog lovers!
 See fleas drop off within minutes
 Sergeant's

Start Your Puppy Right
 Worm him at home
 in ten seconds with
 Sergeant's Worm-Away

How important in must become to the girl who reads,

LE ROI Socks to listen in...
 ...or to walk in, or
 play in, or dance in
 ...or do anything she
 fancies

and out in,

Look
Out
MISS
your
buttons
are
showing
Costumakers

Up, in, and out assume importance when a group of young people attend a movie at the "Drive-In" and later go to a restaurant bearing the sign PIZZA PIC-UP. Inside they may see the poster,

Orders
Put Up
To Take Out

For the latter, "Orders to Go" would suffice; actually "to go" is an expression for the service advertised. One can not help but see, however, the commanding, even though redundant, property of the verb forms.

It is erroneous to believe that all the influence rebounds on the young ones. Adults, even though they are generally unaware of the extensive combination usage in advertising, likewise receive the impressions which automatically transfer into their speaking and writing. Techniques for enhancing the attraction of combinations include quotation marks, underlining, and the derivative adjective:

NO DRY
"SMOKED-OUT"
TASTE!

NO FLAT
"FILTERED-OUT"
FLAVOR!

Pall Mall Famous Cigarettes

AUTO-LITE POWER TIP
"fires up" winners
in 1957 Mobilgas Economy Run

Aunt Abigail Loves to "Eat Out"
Syracuse China

Today's Clorox
gets out dirt suds leave in

PRES-IT-ON
FLY KILLER

Revolving Shelves,
Magnetic Door,
Big Roll-Out Freezer
Frigidaire

Other ads enforce the power of the combination by format:

Clears Up
the severest
dandruff
Thorodan

Rolls Away
ironing strain!
Arvin MET·L·TOP
IRONING TABLE

Then there are those which use combinations for the sake of rhyme:

Only WESTINGHOUSE brings you an air conditioner
"fashion-thin to blend in"

Fresh Up
With 7-Up

For the latter, gone is the word refresh which lacks the power of the quite sub-standard fresh up. The nursery rhyme arrangement amounts to more in dollars and cents. Satisfaction comes to a more discerning reader in an ad for a product which practically sells itself:

Coca-Cola
the pause that refreshes

or

BE REALLY REFRESHED.....PAUSE FOR A COKE!

Of special appeal to the man of the house in maintaining the one, two, or three family cars are ads such as the following:

PENNZOIL
Shows your engine
how to step out in style

Zing-Up Gasoline
Phillips 66

Because of the many deadlines he must meet in a day, he is most interested in,

DRIVE-IN BANK DRIVE-ON
Belleville National Savings Bank

The wife and mother quite naturally reads this type of ad:

Speed up your meals with stainless steel
PATRIOT WARE
by Revere

SMOOTH BIRD VINYL FLOORING ALWAYS COMES UP SMILING

Long-Lasting...REAL-KILL
 Kills the bugs you have now...
 kills others that hatch out
 or come into your home
 even weeks later

How to pretty up a picture
 Carter's (Baby clothes)

Easy to see, then, is the influence of combinations through advertising on the family as a whole. With the construction ever before them, they will not so often use one-word verbs or, as the purist would say, more distinctive expressions.

To further note the importance of combinations in this field, the investigator has made a survey of ads in a popular magazine.¹ Within the two hundred and four advertisements there are two hundred and eighteen combinations. Number of occurrences per ad are from none to twelve, but the total number is greatly decreased by the many small ads found at the end of the magazine. The tendency seems to be that the smaller ads with their limited wording have scantier chance for the combination; however, there is a ratio of better than one occurrence per ad. This survey has covered ads offering commercial goods and services and not those advertising schools or the magazine itself.

Prestige, however, seems to diminish the usage. A magazine² devoted to promoting advertising of fine clothes, excursions, investments, and so forth, has in its two hundred and fifty-five ads, one hundred and five combinations. Herein one may find a glorified combination derivative: the "comeuppance" to be received by a new investor.³

In both magazines it is safe to say that in the more commanding

¹Good Housekeeping, CXLVIII: (March, 1959).

²The New Yorker, XXXV (March 14, 1959).

³Ibid., p. 168.

ads of a quarter-page or larger, the verb-adverb and its derivatives figure with great importance.

Occurrences in the Newspaper

Another abundant source of combinations is the newspaper. A complete study of these would make a thesis in itself; therefore, this survey is limited to a study of frequency in comic strips, of prominence in headlines and captions, and of expressions peculiar to some specialized types of journalistic writing.

Lord Plushbottom says, "The blast-off weight-reducing plan at the shape-up gym sounds intriguing, Mamie." Dennis the Menace shows the habit of adding a particle apparently for the cause of merely adding same. An aggregation of children are gathered in his mother's kitchen, and he says, "The kids decided that you were the mom we have the MOST FUN PLAYIN' IN THE HOUSE OF." Again he says to a neighbor lady, "Can I stay here while my mom gets over a busted vase?" Peanuts, upon losing a library book, writes, "I will come to the library and turn myself in." Mayor Barlow says that he can't make up his mind whether to run fer mayor ag'in...or try fer governor. He inquires of Loweezy, "What do you think I ought to run fer?" and she answers, "Th' Creek..."

Time after time the construction appears. A Sunday comic section⁴ contains thirty strips, three of which have no conversation. In the remaining twenty-seven, there are eighty-six combinations. These figures show an average of three-plus combinations per comic strip.

⁴Comic section in Sunday St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 15, 1959.

In another Sunday paper,⁵ carrying a different set of comics, twenty-three in number, there are seventy-three combinations, again giving an average of three-plus per strip.

Newspaper headlines and captions often contain combinations. For a top front page headline one may see,

IKE SCOUTS A PITCHER PIRATES SIGN HIM UP ⁶	PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER BATTLE IS SHAPING UP ⁷ IN CALIFORNIA ⁷
GEN. TAYLOR SAYS BERLIN CAN BE DEFENDED IF U. S. IS WILLING TO GO ALL OUT ⁸	SAYS TEEL KILLING SET UP ⁹

In the first section of a Sunday newspaper,¹⁰ there is a count of twenty headlines, sub-heads, and captions to present some twenty-four combinations. They appear as follows: (Page number in parentheses)

CARPENTER BOSS CRACKS DOWN ON LEADERS OF FESTUS LOCAL (1)	GEN. TAYLOR SAYS BERLIN CAN BE DEFENDED IF U. S. IS WILLING TO GO ALL OUT (1)
Sets Forth General Principle--Says REA Should Serve State If Its Prices Are Be- low Others (1)	BACKDOWN BY FRENCH ON FLEET ANGERS NATO (2) IRISH PRESIDENT, SEAN O'KELLEY SET FOR TOUR OF U. S. (2)

The German freighter Vormann Rass, smoke billowing from its hold after catching fire off Briton's Devon coast Wednesday, being taken under tow by Royal Navy minesweeper Jewel (right foreground) with minesweeper Acute standing by. (2)

⁵Comic section in The Chicago Tribune, March 15, 1959.

⁶St. Louis Globe-Democrat, April 13, 1958, p. 1.

⁷St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 26, 1957, p. 1.

⁸Ibid., March 15, 1959, p. 1.

⁹The Evansville Press, March 31, 1959, p. 1.

¹⁰Section A of Sunday St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 15, 1959.

Pulling Down Mill Creek Walls

Demolition now in progress in Mill Creek Valley is relatively easy because old buildings are so weak many can be pulled down. (3)

At Same Time Number
of Cases Cleaned Up
Showed Increase of
48.7 Pct. (3)

\$75,000 GRANT TO SET UP
ORAL PATHOLOGY PROGRAM (3)

CANDIDATE ELBERT WANTS
TRAFFIC SETUP CHANGED (3)

ENGINE CUT OUT, AIRLINER
FORCED TO LAND AT JOPLIN (6)

RACE HORSE BITES
OFF FINGERTIP OF
ELIZABETH ARDEN (10)

11 COMPLAINING
OF PLANT CLOSING
CHAIN SELVES IN (18)

4 TASK FORCES
SET UP TO WRITE
G. O. P. PROGRAM (23)

LIBBY CHARGES
SOVIET A-TESTS
WERE SOURCE OF RECORD FALLOUT (24)

JAIL CELLS PUT ON SALE (27)

PRISONER PLUGS
IN THE PLUGS AND
LOSES RADIO JOB (27)

Runaway Train's Path of Destruction

Workers cleaning up debris yesterday left in path of runaway freight train that rammed through the Union Pacific depot (lower right), rolled across the main street of Olympia, Wash., and plowed into a restaurant... (28)

RUNAWAY RAIL CARS
DESTROY BUILDINGS (28)

EXPERTS DETONATE BOMBS
TURNED IN BY CYPRIOTS (28)

For the busy individual with time to read only headlines, sub-heads and captions, the prominence and frequency of the verb-adverb undoubtedly are strong in impression. The avid newspaper reader further exposes himself to the usage through reading various newspaper jargons. For instance, a typical market page column has these headlines:

PROFIT-TAKING WIPES OUT EARLY GAINS ON MARKET

Air-Missile Issues
Withstand Sell-Off

Within the six-inch column there are five additional verb-adverbs:

wiped out, sell-off, stacked up, sprinted ahead, tapered off.¹¹

Sports lingo consists of a multitude of combinations. To mention some, there are the touchdown, kickoff, kickback, set-up, line-up, sit out (the season, or the game), runnerup, lay-up, guard-around (plays), playoffs, strike out, called out, pickoff (throw), time-out, bounced off, batted in, and so forth. Sports writers naturally use such terms and are prone to using combinations other than technical terms. One writer includes eighteen combinations in a twenty-two and a half-inch column: came down, playoffs, puts in, run down, worry about, play-offs, went on, come into, asks for, point out, playoff, talking about, setting up, popping away, came along, playoff, pack in, and get in.¹²

Occurrences in Radio and Television

The verb-adverb is ear-commanding as well as eye-catching, and radio and television play their parts in promoting the construction. The materials in the two media are alike; therefore, the choices for survey are radio commercials and television scripts.

A one-minute R. C. Cola singing commercial contains these phrases built around the verb-adverb:

How do you account for your rise to the top?
Brighten up the R. C. Cola way.
 Better taste calls for R. C. Cola.
 Why settle for lift without lightness? (twice)¹³

¹¹The Evansville Courier, March 19, 1959, p. 40.

¹²Bob Broeg, "Sports Comment," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 19, 1959, p. 1D.

¹³Compton Advertising, Incorporated. Master 788.

Shell Oil Company gives the same average in a straight commercial to include the following:

toting [totalling?] up gallons
going into the tank
 actually brings back lost power
 really add up
 hills, getaways, in passing¹⁴

For the television drama, the selection is the detective story series, "The Lineup." One script, "The Chloroform Murder Case," offers eighty-seven combinations.¹⁵ By allowing twenty-five minutes of actual playing time for a thirty-minute program, a combination sounds forth each twenty seconds. "The Frederick Freemont Case" of the same series contains seventy-seven combinations, or one each nineteen seconds.¹⁶ Typical expressions in these two scripts are spouting off, beat her up, paid off, latched on, gets me off, picked him up, set it up, pushover, stakeouts, lining up contacts, and get up my bail.

A television program, "Years of Crisis," is a news broadcast presenting a summary of the year's news concerning foreign relations.¹⁷ The panel consists of Edward R. Murrow and eight foreign correspondents --Howard K. Smith, David Schoenbrun, Alex Kendrick, Winston Burdett, Ernie Lester, Pete Kolischer, Dan Schorr, and Eric Sevareid. In this program there are one hundred and forty-six combinations or an average of one for each twenty-five seconds in the hour-length program. One

¹⁴House Brand Radio Commercial #5806, January 17, 1958

¹⁵Fred Eggers, story ed., "The Lineup," Script #178-182. CBS Television Network. (With special permission from Mr. Eggers, script to be used only in connection with this thesis)

¹⁶Ibid., Script #170-175.

¹⁷CBS News Broadcast, 4:00 to 5:00 P. M. EST, December 29, 1957.

must realize that the frequency, even though it does not seem so according to numbers, is much less in this program than in the plays. Whereas there is much time devoted to action in the plays, the news broadcast is continuous conversation.

Another avenue of influence in radio and television is popular songs and their lyrics. While there has been no survey of frequency, one can readily see the force of the record-breaking record, "I'm All Shook Up." As a result of this song's popularity, the people of the nation are no longer disturbed, disconcerted, nervous, or upset, but are all shook up.

Thus one can realize the selling-power and eye-catching property of the verb-adverb and its derivatives in advertising and the most popular of all reading materials, the newspaper. The combination is no less popular in radio and television. With some idea, then, of the verb-adverb's place in mass media, the intent now is to note frequency according to levels of speaking and writing and to show additional situations conducive to the origin and popularity of combinations.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COMBINATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING

Occurrences in Conversation

The verb-adverb has its greatest frequency in oral conversation. Directed attention toward occurrences in almost any interchange of words reveals that the construction occupies a far greater percentage of conversation than can otherwise be imagined. The more frequent appearance in the lower levels of speaking is an accepted fact, but the verb-adverb also has a place in the more elevated discourse. What are the causes for the origin and development of the combination in speaking? What are its effects? These questions receive consideration prior to the survey of frequency.

Logan Pearsall Smith has devoted extensive attention to the many sources of combinations. He classifies and provides examples of those concerned with special occupations and popular forms of sport; from the sea; from farm animals, wild animals, wild nature, and out-of-door scenes; from house, furniture, and kitchen; from drinking, sewing, garments, machinery, arts, theatre, medicine, law, business, auctioneering, shop-keeping, bookkeeping; from religions and the Bible; from Shakespeare's plays; and most significant of all, from the human body, particularly the hand.¹ To the material presented in this highly

¹Smith, "English Idioms," pp. 16-45.

interesting article there are the following influences to be added:

1. Combinations, like other expressions, are regional.

Drayton's Additions:

Carrying Down a Dance. One of the Boston peculiar phrases. I. D. [clipping pasted in margin] From the Boston Daily Advertiser, Nov. 30, 1815. [year supplied by Drayton]

The following melancholy event happened in this town on Tuesday evening to interrupt the festivity and gayety of a ballroom. A young lady, apparently in perfect health, while carrying down the dance [underlined by Drayton], fell upon the floor, was taken up nearly lifeless, and in a few minutes expired...This distressing event is supposed to have been occasioned by the tightness of her dress. It cannot fail of inspiring a salutary caution against the excess of a too prevalent fashion.* [*Wearing a corset]²

A lady from Kentucky says she "sure was scared up" when she had her operation (heard by investigator). "You're a 'fade-out' in the East when you don't keep a promise you promised to keep."³ "You've 'lucked out' in the Far West usage if the class bell rings just as you're about to goof on a Latin translation..."⁴ For the purpose of squelching, "Pick up your toys and go to your room!" is a Texas expression.⁵ In the West there is a softer expression for necking, "making out," supposedly less immoral than necking (told to investigator).

2. As can be seen from the last three examples, teen-agers are prone to coining combinations or new meanings for the existing ones. "She was all pushed out of shape!" means the girl was angry.⁶

²Hennig Cohen, "Drayton's Notes on Pickering's list of Americanisms," American Speech, XXXI (December, 1956), 270.

³Jan London, "The Date Line," Good Housekeeping, CXLVI (April, 1958), 20.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 20.

⁶Ibid., p. 21.

3. Some combinations disappear from use after a time; others expand to meanings aside from the original; some become standard English.

Disappearance: carrying down a dance

Expansion: "Blow-out (1892-) in the West, a hollow made by the wind in an area of loose sand, or on the top of a 'butte.'"⁷ Today the combination may mean an accident with a tire or a big party.

Standardization: Many combinations are standard today; for instance, for the verb fall, there are fall back, fall in, fall off, fall through, fall to, fall upon, and others.

4. Combinations are more fraternal than they appear to be under classifications of industry, sports, and so forth. They have an "old buddy-buddy" quality aside from the bond of common interest. David Mauer says,

...[pickpockets] avoid argot in general conversation...eliminate it when being observed by anyone not in the rackets. This applies to the higher levels who develop real interest in literary language and who have a high degree of linguistic awareness; the lower levels think, speak, and live the argot.⁸

The pickpocket's love for the combination appears in the following passages and a list of a few of his pet expressions: "One class cannon of my acquaintance has trouble filling in with good mobs because he has a tendency to argue with the sucker too much."⁹ "Some mobs visit

⁷William A. Craigie, "The Growth of American English," S. P. E., Tract LVI (1940), 206.

⁸David W. Maurer, "Whiz Mob," Publication of the American Dialect Society, No. 24 (November, 1955), 42-43.

⁹Ibid., p. 43.

a moving picture once or twice a day and there in the security of darkness, turn over the leathers, divide the knock up (the day's take) equally."¹⁰ Expressions containing combinations are as follows: putting up for the mark, putting his hump up, playing for a mark, digging in, rooting in, or batting away, stick and split me out, a pop up, a come on, cop in your hat, and chippy around.¹¹

A list of hot rod terms in Pasadena reflects the social, local, and teen-age influences simultaneously. In the two hundred and seventy-five terms there are thirty-five combinations which compose one-seventh of the entire list. A few of these are back off, burn out, choose off, hopped up, souped up, peel out, rev up, and wind out.¹²

In considering the truth of the more abundant appearance of the construction in the lower levels of speaking, one must realize, at the same time, that the usage within a group with a common interest does not necessarily throw one of that group in the lower level speaking class. Whereas one might say that the pickpocket society is, in general, uneducated, one can not make the near blanket accusation against a hot-rod group wherein some members come from homes of culture and have the education required of their ages. To add an illustration, the glossary of Air Force slang has one hundred and fourteen entries, to include twenty-four combinations, or practically

¹⁰Ibid., p. 119.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 58-77.

¹²Don Mansell and Joseph S. Hall, "Hot Rod Terms in the Pasadena Area," American Speech, XXIX (May, 1954), 93-104.

one-fourth of the total entries. Examples are auger in, clobber in, bug out, booger off, and stooge along.¹³ Crass it would be to say the Air Force members are of the lower level, for most of them are well-educated. The point is that be a person a pickpocket, a hot-rod "addict," or a member of the Air Force, the "palship" quality enters into a method of speaking for his particular group, that method to contain a good portion of combinations. With little reservation, one may pronounce the combination an important binding device in a set group, thereby serving to exclude outsiders who do not understand terms peculiar to that group.

Hence, the region, the age of a group, time, and a fraternal element are important factors governing the appearance, modification of meaning, disappearance, and frequency of the construction under study.

To note the frequency in conversation, the investigator has studied five one-act plays plus the two television drama scripts observed for hearing frequency in the previous chapter. Those combinations appearing in incidental material (introduction, instructions, and so forth) have not received count. Table I presents the results of the survey. The higher number of occurrences in some scripts does not necessarily place the material on a lower level, but rather accommodates the educational level of personifications. To be noted is the diminishing of the usage as characterizations portray more learned people.

¹³Leo F. Engler, "A Glossary of U. S. Air Force Slang," American Speech, XXX (May, 1955), 115-120.

TABLE I
FREQUENCY OF THE COMBINATION IN PLAYS

Play and Playwright	Speaking Level	Total Words	Total Combinations	Ratio
"The Chloroform Murder Case" Fred Eggers-- Story Editor	Includes at least five very uneducated persons	2374	87	1--27
"The Happy Journey to Trenton from Camden" Thornton Wilder	Family using substandard English	2951	79	1--37
"Ile" Eugene O'Neill	Men on whaling ship using crudities in speaking	3204	85	1--38
"The Frederick Freemont Case" Fred Eggers-- Story Editor	Much better level than "The Chloroform Murder Case"	3185	77	1--41
"Where the Cross is Made" Eugene O'Neill	Sea captain and family speak very well--one character speaks on low level and has a sizeable part.	3845	79	1--44
"Enter the Hero" Theresa Helburn	Educated young people--some slang	3780	68	1--55
"There Shall be No Night" Robert Sherwood	Refined and educated people	2576	28	1--92

Occurrences in Educated Informal Speaking and in Formal Speeches

Informal speaking among highly educated persons sees a decrease in frequency. "Years of Crisis," presented in the previous chapter for television survey, illustrates this fact. Examples of combinations within this panel discussion are as follows:

...that we could set up some kind of American Protectorate...
 ...asked the Arabs to line up on our side...
 ...left-wing regime took over...
 ...they can also cancel out with their ICBM's our European bases.
 Why don't you sum up now the political repercussions of Sputnik?
 ...they might opt out of the next war...
 ...was the trumped up crisis...
 ...to try to cast up a sort of national balance sheet...

The number of combinations diminishes further in formal speeches. Those chosen for survey are Carl Sandburg's address to a joint session of Congress¹⁴ and President Eisenhower's State of the Union message.¹⁵ Instances wherein Sandburg quotes Lincoln do not receive tally. His own include calls for, took to himself, property was taken away from, wiped out as by fire, and stands for. President Eisenhower uses calls for, rests upon, depends upon, point up, account for, open up, take up, and so forth.

Prior to presenting the table on these types of speaking, it is proper to note the improved quality of verb-adverbs over those appearing earlier in the chapter, such as the Air Force "booger off," or the pickpocket's "chippy around." In the higher level, then, one not only sees a smaller amount of occurrences, but a decidedly improved quality. The higher level verb-adverb has reached its status through its being more widely used. Trumped up, for instance, may well have been sub-standard at one time, but the expression has approval today as standard English. One can easily see its effectiveness over and above "a fabricated crisis" or "an unfairly devised crisis."

¹⁴"Abraham Lincoln the Incomparable," Vital Speeches of the Day, XXV (March 1, 1959), 293-294.

¹⁵"As Eisenhower Sizes Up 'State of the Union,'" U. S. News & World Report, XLVI (January 16, 1959), 60-64.

TABLE II
 FREQUENCY OF THE COMBINATION IN HIGHER LEVEL SPEAKING

Selections	Total Words	Total Combinations	Ratio
"Years of Crisis"	10418	146	1--73
"Abraham Lincoln the Incomparable"	1872	18	1--144
"State of the Union"	4290	16	1--268

Occurrences in Writing

Choices to illustrate the frequency of the verb-adverb in writing are the short story and the essay, the latter to include a study of the humorous essay, newspaper editorial, literary review, and feature, each of which are of the more educated level.

To be understood is that the short story presents levels of education in its characters, and the frequent appearance of the combination therein does not indicate that the story itself is substandard but that the frequency "points up" the atmosphere, along with the educational level.

The study of the essay reveals that the combination is quite prevalent in a humorous selection. As the essays become more serious or factual in tone, combination usage decreases in frequency.

Tables III, IV, and V reveal the figures computed for this phase of the survey. Table III concerns the short story, IV, a special study of Drew Pearson's The Merry-Go-Round,¹⁶ and V, the essay.

¹⁶ Syndicated feature on editorial page of The Evansville Courier.

TABLE III
 FREQUENCY OF THE COMBINATION IN THE SHORT STORY

Short Story and Author	Speaking Level	Total Words	Total Combi- nations	Ratio
"Two Soldiers" William Faulkner	Uneducated (first person)	6441	209	1--31
"Split Cherry Tree" Jesse Stuart	Uneducated except for teacher (first person)	5210	137	1--38
"Flight" John Steinbeck	Uneducated (third person)	8150	200	1--40
"In Another Country" Ernest Hemingway	Educated (first person)	2128	37	1--57
"The Pacing Goose" Jessamyn West	Quaker dialect but not unedu- cated (third person)	5642	95	1--58
"Champagne Waltz" Robert Henderson*	Educated (first person)	2182	24	1--87

*The New Yorker, XXXV (March 28, 1959), 28-30.

TABLE IV
FREQUENCY OF THE COMBINATION IN THE EDITORIAL

Editorial and Date	Total Words	Total Combinations	Ratio
"Appointment Revives Dixon-Yates Fight" February 13, 1959	862	16	1--54
"Anti-Franco Spanish Forces Grow Bolder" February 19, 1959	850	10	1--85
"Jordan's King Used to Brushes with Death" March 26, 1959	856	7	1--122
"Dominican Dictator Remains Tough at 68" March 27, 1959	845	9	1--94
"Ike Rescues Lame Ducks" March 28, 1959	845	10	1--84
Total	4258	52	1--82

TABLE V
FREQUENCY OF THE COMBINATION IN THE ESSAY

Essay	Total Words	Total Combinations	Ratio
"The Tooth, the Whole Tooth, and Nothing but the Tooth" Robert Benchley Humorous Essay	2800	49	1--58
<u>The Merry-Go-Round</u> Editorial	4258	52	1--82
"Portugal: Arcadian Dream" Feature*	2153	23	1--93
"Lawrence Durrell Impresses Greatly With His New Novel" Review**	846	7	1--121

*Sybille Bedford, Vogue, CXXXVIII (January 15, 1959), 82.

**Thomas B. Sherman, Sunday Post Dispatch, March 29, 1959, p. 4B

The short story survey reveals that the higher speaking level of educated characters and the atmosphere of the story which surrounds them result in a decrease of frequency in comparison with occurrences in stories centered around uneducated characters and their environments. Conversation is, of course, conducive to the usage. Thus, familiar by nature, the short story shows a high frequency in most instances, the number of occurrences in some stories concerning educated people comparing favorably with the number in the more informal essay. Essay surveys accent the fact that degrees of formality affect combination usage. The term formality here concerns association with and approach to others. Seemingly one can define the verb-adverb the "chatty" type construction, figuring importantly in the informal approach.

One can note, as a result of the entire survey, the important place the verb-adverb and its derivatives hold in several levels of speaking and writing. Where selling power and sociability are desired, the combination serves as a means of securing and holding the attention of the reader or listener. The more highly educated do not so frequently rely on the construction; consequently, attempts at higher level speaking, informal and formal, and factual writing show a decrease in combination usage. But the combination is ever present, no matter what the type of material or situation.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The objective of this thesis has been to show the verb-adverb as characterized in the introduction, and to answer pertinent questions set forth in the problem.

The first chapter offers an analysis of the verb-adverb combination through definitions and examples, to include both the verb-preposition and verb-adverb. Such analysis has as a basis opinions of grammarians which the investigator has examined preparatory to writing the thesis. As has been mentioned, they do not represent her ultimate opinion, but rather the over-all picture of the grammatical conception. Some of her own ideas and criticisms appear throughout the thesis.

Opinions of various grammarians appear in the next two chapters, with points of acceptance and rejection indicated by the investigator. The third chapter shows the change in trend of thought during the past century as to the nature of the particle; that is, from terming the particle a preposition to terming it an adverb. This transition of thought is the cause for the trend toward one classification for the two types of verb combinations, the verb-adverb. Observations herein, the investigator believes, constitute an altogether new discovery concerning the history and analysis of the combination.

Examination of opinions in both chapters reveals quibbling and confusion among the scholars. The conclusion here is that much of the tumult on the one hand, and evasion on the other, is unnecessary. For

scholars to contend about whether one should pull the particle in with the verb or let it function in a modifying phrase when that particle logically goes with the verb; for them to offer the many names for the combination ranging from the "kind of a unit" to intricate terminology; for them to offer vague statements that a certain word is "more or less" a certain part of speech; for some to rebel, so to speak, against combination usage; or for others to make little of the import of analysis and force of the construction--all of these seem unreasonable and unconstructive.

A great majority of verb-adverb occurrences appear to have an easy solution. One should make a positive statement: Because of the adverbial nature of the particle which in meaning, and consequently in syntax, is associated with the verb, the verb and particle assume the function of a verb. The result is a unit known as the VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION. Now some will ask, "What is to be done with the less cohesive verb-adverbs?" The answer to this is that it would be most appropriate to have a satisfactory presentation of the more indisputable ones, an analysis and name on which grammarians might agree. This at least would be a step forward. Less cohesive verb-adverbs may receive analysis either as a unit, or if it meets one's pleasure, through classification of each component word.

Following presentation of opinions and criticisms therein, the investigator has given recommendations as to the best opinions and most suitable terminology. Also included here is an evaluation of the combination.

The survey begins with freeing America of accusations concerning the prevalence of the verb-adverb. Then there is a survey of the

frequency of combination usage in various speaking levels and types of writing, along with a review of influences which cause the verb-adverb to appear and flourish.

As a result of this survey, the investigator feels she has reached perhaps her most important conclusion. Because of the incongruity which exists between the meager or confusing treatment of the construction and its popularity in the language, there is, on her part, a pronounced awareness of a pressing demand for clarification of the construction and inclusion in both elementary and college level texts. The investigator has never found the verb-adverb discussed in elementary texts; some college works offer an analysis; others do not.

Combination usage is, of course, too prevalent, but how can one expect otherwise when comparatively meager recognition of the construction exists? The investigator, therefore, suggests that someone very much interested in the field of grammar attempt a simplified but thorough treatment of the verb-adverb with the view of its possible integration into grammar study. Only then will students have a true analysis of the structure of a sentence containing a combination, and moreover, become judicious in their choice of that type of expression. To support the idea of need for the study, the investigator wishes to relate an actual situation in her teaching experience.

A more intelligent eighth grade student observes class discussion of the sentence, "Old Uncle Billy locked the doors and put out the lights and Nurse put us children to bed."¹ He hears put classified as

¹Ruth H. Teuscher, Eleanor M. Johnson, and Ethel K. Howard, Junior Language Skills (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1935), p. 100.

a verb, and out as an adverb. He frowns, raises his hand, and upon being recognized, says, "It seems to me that put out is the verb." The teacher, feeling that as questions arise, they should be answered, explains to the near genius that in higher levels of study, put out is a verb-adverb combination with lights serving as the object. The student is pleased because now he has an answer to his problem, and perhaps four more students with companion minds will nod their heads or assume an expression of satisfaction that they likewise understand. But for the great majority of this heterogeneous group, put is a verb and out is an adverbial modifier because that is the way they have been instructed at this level of study. Therefore, the teacher can note more expressions of confusion than of satisfaction. Certainly her duty is to clarify and not to confuse; as a result, she makes as little mention as possible of the construction.

It is reasonable to assume that teachers and writers of texts have taken the easy route--namely, ignoring the fact that this study must occur in elementary grammar. The eighth-grader has presented it to the teacher. This is, indeed, a quite splendid situation. The erudite, so to speak, have been put to shame; they are running away from the cunning combination character; they are afraid of this charming, antagonistic, sometimes awkward, many times convenient, terse, sometimes redundant, but colorful and emphatic verb-adverb fellow who is "very much with us," to plague and to please.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Abraham Lincoln the Incomparable." Vital Speeches of the Day, XXV (March 1, 1959), 293-294.
- Aiken, Janet Rankin. A New Plan of English Grammar. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
- Anthony, Edward Mason. "Test Frames for Structures with Up in Modern English." Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1954.
- _____. "An Exploratory Inquiry into Lexical Clusters." American Speech, XXIX (August, 1954), 175.
- "As Eisenhower Sizes Up 'State of the Union.'" U. S. News & World Report, XLVI (January 16, 1959), 60-64.
- Bedford, Sybille. "Portugal: Arcadian Dream." Vogue, CXXXVIII (January, 1959), 82.
- Benchley, Robert. "The Tooth, the Whole Tooth, and Nothing but the Tooth." Literature and Life in America. Ed. Dudley Miles and Robert C. Pooley. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1948, pp. 473-478.
- Broeg, Bob. "Sports Comment." St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 15, 1959, p. 1D.
- Bryant, Margaret. A Functional English Grammar. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
- Chicago Daily News, August 25, 1958, p. 2.
- The Chicago Tribune, March 15, 1959, Comic Section.
- Cohen, Hennig. "Drayton's Notes on Pickering's List of Americanisms." American Speech, XXXI (December, 1956), 270.
- Compton Advertising, Incorporated. Master #788. Radio Station WEOA, Evansville, Indiana.
- Conesford, Lord. "You Americans are Murdering the Language." The Saturday Evening Post, CCXXX (July 13, 1959), 30, 71.
- Craigie, William A. "The Growth of American English." Society for Pure English, LVI (1940), 206.

Curme, George O. A Grammar of the English Language. Vol. II. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1925.

_____. English Grammar. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1955.

"Current English Forum." College English, III (January, 1942), 410.

_____. V (October, 1943), 42.

_____. IV (December, 1942), 196.

Earle, Samuel C., Howard J. Savage, and Frank E. Seavy. Sentences and Their Elements. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.

Eggers, Fred, story ed. "The Lineup." Script #170-175. "The Frederick Freemont Case," final shooting, May 19, 1958.

_____. Script #178-182. "The Chloroform Murder Case," final shooting, June 23, 1958.

Engler, Leo F. "A Glossary of U. S. Air Force Slang," American Speech, XXX (May, 1955), 115-120.

The Evansville Courier. Evansville, Indiana. March 19, 1959, p. 40.

The Evansville Press. Evansville, Indiana. March 31, 1959, p. 1.

Faulkner, William. "Two Soldiers." Adventures in American Literature. Ed. Rewey Belle Inglis et al. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952, pp. 64-74.

Fowler, W. C. Fowler's English Grammar. New ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1868.

Gibson, Strickland, ed. Ben Jonson's English Grammar. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, LTD., 1928.

Good Housekeeping, CXVIII (March, 1959).

Grattan, J. H. G., and P. Gurrey. Our Living Language. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, LTD., 1925.

Helburn, Theresa. "Enter the Hero." The United States in Literature. Ed. Robert Polley et al. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1952, pp. 655-662.

Hemingway, Ernest. "In Another Country." The United States in Literature. Ed. Robert Pooley et al. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1952, pp. 655-662.

Henderson, Robert. "Champagne Waltz." The New Yorker, XXXV (March 28, 1959), 28-30.

- Hook, J. N., and E. G. Mathews. Modern American Grammar and Usage. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.
- House Brand Radio Commercial #5806, January 17, 1958. Radio Station WEOA, Evansville, Indiana.
- Jespersen, Otto C. A Modern English Grammar. Vol. III. Heidelberg: Carl Winters, 1927.
- Kennedy, Arthur G. The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination. Stud. in Lang. and Lit., Vol. I, No. 1. Stanford University Publications: 1920.
- _____. English Usage. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1942.
- Kruisinga, E. A Handbook of Present-Day English. 5th ed. Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1932.
- London, Jan. "The Date Line." Good Housekeeping, CXLVI (April, 1958), 20.
- _____. (February, 1958), 20-21.
- The London Times. Editorial Page, February 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 1933.
- Mansell, Don, and Joseph S. Hall. "Hot Rod Terms in the Pasadena Area." American Speech, XXIX (May, 1954), 93-104.
- Maurer, David W. "Whiz Mob." Publication of the American Dialect Society, No. 24. Anderson Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville. November, 1955.
- Myers, L. M. American English. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1952.
- The New Yorker. XXXV (March 14, 1959).
- Nicholson, Margaret. "What is Good English?" The Atlantic, CXCIX (May, 1957), 71-73.
- O'Neill, Eugene. "Ile." The United States in Literature. Ed. Robert Pooley et al. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1952, pp. 644-653.
- _____. "Where the Cross is Made." Literature and Life in America. Ed. Dudley Miles and Robert C. Pooley. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1948, pp. 622-633.
- Opdycke, John B. Harper's English Grammar. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.
- The Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Partridge, "Slang." Society for Pure English, Tract LV (1940), 195.

- Pearson, Drew. The Merry-Go-Round. Editorial page of The Evansville Courier, February 13, 19, 1959; March 26, 27, 28, 1959.
- Pence, R. W. A Grammar of Present-Day English. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.
- Poutsma, H. A Grammar of Late Modern English. Parts I and II. Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1904.
- Roberts, Paul. Understanding Grammar. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.
- St. Louis Globe-Democrat, April 13, 1958, p. 1A.
- St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 26, 1957, p. 1. March 15, 1959, p. 1, Section A, and Comic Section.
- Scott, Fred. "American Slang." Society for Pure English, Tract XXIV (1906), 118-127.
- Sherman, Thomas B. "Lawrence Durrell Impresses Greatly with His New Novel." Sunday St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 29, 1959, p. 45.
- Sherwood, Robert E. From "There Shall Be No Night." Literature and Life in America. Ed. Dudley Miles and Robert C. Pooley. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1948, pp. 603-609.
- Smith, Logan Pearsall. "English Idioms." Society for Pure English, Tract XII (1923), 16-45.
- Steinbeck, John. "Flight." Adventures in American Literature. Ed. Rewey Belle Inglis et al. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952, pp. 84-95.
- Stuart, Jesse. "Split Cherry Tree." Adventures in American Literature. Ed. Rewey Belle Inglis et al. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952, pp. 75-83.
- Sweet, Henry. A New English Grammar. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1892.
- Teuscher, Ruth H., Eleanor M. Johnson, and Ethel K. Howard. Junior Language Skills. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1925.
- Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged. 2nd. ed. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam & Company, 1957.
- Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged. 2nd. ed. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1957.
- West, Jessamyn. "The Pacing Goose." Adventures in American Literature. Ed. Rewey Belle Inglis et al. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952, pp. 18-29.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. "Grammatical Categories." Language, XXI (1945), 1-11.

Wilder, Thornton. "The Happy Journey to Trenton and Camden." The United States in Literature. Ed. Robert Pooley et al. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1952, pp. 655-662.

"Years of Crisis." CBS News Broadcast, December 29, 1957. CBS Television, New York.

VITA

Gladys Welker

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: AN INVESTIGATION OF OPINIONS CONCERNING THE VERB-ADVERB COMBINATION AND A SURVEY OF THE PREVALENCE OF THE COMBINATION IN PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tonganoxie, Kansas, May 24, 1915, the daughter of Roger F. and Bernice M. Shields.

Education: Attended grade school at Ralston, Oklahoma; graduated from Ralston High School in 1932; received Bachelor of Science degree from the Oklahoma State University with a major in Education, in May, 1951; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree in May, 1959.

Professional Experience: Taught English and music at Grainola High School, Grainola, Oklahoma, from 1939 to 1942, the last year principal of the high school; English at Cleveland High School, Cleveland, Oklahoma, 1951; music at Stillwater Junior High School, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1952; English at Newcastle High School, Newcastle, Wyoming, from 1953 to 1956, the last two years Dean of Girls; and English at South School, Wabash Community District #348, Mt. Carmel, Illinois, from 1957 to 1959.