THE ORIGINS OF COMPLETIVE *UP* IN ENGLISH

SUMMARY — Modern English *up* is frequently used without any spatial component of meaning as an Aktionsart marker of completion and similar notions, as in *use up.* My paper examines the origins of this most typical of phrasal verb usages. Apparent examples in Old English are shown to be spurious, the first clear examples occurring in the mid-twelfth century. I argue that the introduction of completive *up* can best be explained as a confluence of native semantic developments and Scandinavian lexical influence under strong functional pressure. The later development is sketched, and comparison is made with other particles and with other Germanic languages.

1: *Preliminaries*[1]. — I am concerned here with phrasal verbs of a particular type: those in which the particle may be regarded as contributing an Aktionsart value to the meaning of the whole. Compare *chatter* and *chatter away,* where *away* has a durative value, *eat* and *eat up,* where *up* imparts perfectivity or completion or exhaustiveness, *kill* and *kill off,* where *off* implies sequential and completive action. Of course there is much more to the difference between simple verb and phrasal verb in these three examples than I have indicated here: *chatter away* implies a subjective evaluation of the chatterer not present in *chatter* alone, *kill off* is more restricted in its selection of object than *kill,* and so on. Indeed Lipka would argue that it is inadmissible to consider the meaning of a phrasal verb in isolation from the nominals which enter into collocation with it (1972: 72-73). Nevertheless I shall work with the convenient fiction that the meaning of a collocation (or of a whole utterance) may often be segmented and apportioned amongst

---

the words which make it up. It will also be convenient to speak of a particle bearing an Aktionsart value in collocation even where the difference between the 'meanings' of collocation and simple verb is more than mere Aktionsart alone.

To keep the paper within manageable bounds I shall look at the particle *up,* one of the most interesting of the two dozen or so particles which contribute to the phrasal verb pattern. *Up* presents a complex history, possibly including significant foreign influence, and it is the Aktionsart particle par excellence — in fact it is the particle occurring in the largest number of phrasal verbs (Kennedy 1920: 23, Lipka 1972: 14). It is very difficult to classify all of its figurative uses, 'the variety of which is so great that the adverb comes to present a number of highly divergent and even directly opposite senses, e.g. *to bind up* ... in contrast with *to break up*' (*OED* s.v. *up* adv.[1] II, [p.38] note). In the case of *bind up* and *break up* I would suggest that the 'directly opposite senses' have more to do with *bind* and *break* than with *up,* and in fact the real basis of much of *OED*'s classification is (very properly) the different groups of verbs with which *up* collocates rather than the meaning of *up* itself. Following the usual practice of the dictionary, however, particular meanings are often ascribed to *up,* e.g. 'into the hands or possession of another' (sense 13), 'into a close or compact form or condition; so as to be confined or secured' (sense 20). One of the most general definitions is 'to or towards a state of completion or finality. (Frequently serving merely to emphasize the import of the verb.)' (sense 18), and many of the other senses can be seen as variants of this completive or intensive sense. Accordingly, I shall use the term 'completive *up*' as a shorthand label for a whole nexus of Aktionsart values of *up,* possibly incorporating other idiomatic nuances of meaning but not including a component of meaning which is spatial or transparently derived from a spatial sense.

In §2 I check for examples of completive *up* in OE and in §3 I discuss the first convincing examples and subsequent occurrences. §4 deals with the functional pressures for the introduction of completive *up.* §5 provides information on the possibility of origin through internal development and §6 on possible external influence. Thus §§2-6 are concerned with when, why and how the construction arose. §7 reviews the evidence on the origins of completive *up,* and §8 widens the discussion briefly to compare *up* with other particles, and English with other Germanic languages.

According to *OED* and BT there are actually two particles *up*: the basis of BT's distinction is mainly one of form *(up/upp* vs. *uppe)* and *OED*'s mainly one of meaning (direction vs. location). In the present-day language with its single form *up* there is no reason to distinguish separate lexical items — we do not, after all, distinguish directional *out* from locative *out* — and I shall not do so for historical examples either.

Previous work on the history of completive *up*, apart from sporadic comments, is largely restricted to the following. *OED* and to a smaller extent BT provide a good range of data helpfully organised; *MED* has not yet reached the letter *U*. Some detailed analysis of the semantic and lexical history of *up* is to be found in the dissertations of de la Cruz (1969: *passim),* Denison (1981: 285-90) and Hiltunen (1981: 286-92), while Samuels 1972: 164 contributes several points in the course of a brief discussion.

2: *Old English.* — In OE there are a number of occurrences of *up* which may incorporate some Aktionsart value of completion, intensification, or the like. Senses given in *OED* s.v. *up* adv.[1] that are found in OE include 'so as to cause sound to ascend, increase, or swell' (sense 7b), 'into existence, prominence, vogue, or currency; so as to appear or prevail' (sense 11), and 'into the position or state of being open' (sense 16, recorded in *OED* from c1205 but cf. example (1) below and the similar [p.39] ON and LG usage discussed in §6). Under *up* adv.[2], equivalent to BT *uppe* adv. II, there is 'disclosed, made known' (noted at sense 11c). Examples of such usages include:

(1)   *ÆLS* 3.347 þa com færlice mycel wind, and wearp upp þa dura 'Then suddenly came a great wind, and threw open the door'

(2)   *MSol* 234 ðara ðe wile anra hwylc uppe bringan, / ðæt ðu ðære gyldnan gesiehst Hierusalem / weallas blican

(3)   *Hom U 48 = ByrM* (App. II) 248.23 þe læs þe God upbrede þone godspellican cwide

(4)   *ChronE* 183.6 (1052) þær bær Godwine eorl up his mal

There are also many collocations of *up* with such verbs as *ahebban*, *weaxan*, and so on, where a metonymic development of the direction + goal meaning of *up* may lead to some measure of completive or intensive value, e.g.

(5) *Wife* 3 siþþan ic up weox

(6) *Gen* 1375 Sæs up stigon / ofer stæðweallas

(7) *Or* 116.25 On þæm geare asprong up Æþna fyr

(8) *ÆLS* 8.222 ethna up ableow swyðe egeslice ontendnysse 'Etna exploded (lit. blew up) with a very fearful burning'

[n.b. *ontendnysse* is direct object of transitive *ableow*; the collocation is less like ModE than ~~Sweet's~~ Skeat's translation implies.]

[error in original article — DD]

(9) *ÆLS* 23.435 and hi sæton ealle up gesunde 'and they all sat up in sound health'

(10) *ÆLS* 26.191 and gelogodon hi [*sc.* þa halgan ban] upp 'and laid them [*sc.* the holy bones] up'

(11) *HomS* 48 (Tristr App 3) þonne he heom up cleopoð on þan mycelan dæge (quoted from Healey & Venezky 1980)

(12) *Lch* II(2) 65.1.7 [p. 292] genim þone neowran wyrttruman delf up 'take the newer root, delve it up'

In all such cases *up* retains its association with the central notion of vertical movement or direction upwards: it is not what Samuels 1972: 164 calls a 'pure and otherwise colourless completive', because it is not yet being used with verbs where a component of meaning 'upwards' would be inappropriate.

Are there any collocations in GE in which *up* is a pure completive? BT offers two, one of which occurs twice:

(13) *AldV* 13, 78, 2903 euulsum, .i. abscisum, ut alocene, up aliþode

(14) *Or* 43.13 He þæt [*sc.* a vow] mid dædum gelæste & hie [*sc. River Gyndes*] upp forlet an feower hund ea & on lx

[p.40]

(15) *Or* 43.16 he hie [*sc. River Euphrates*] eac mid gedelfe on monige ea upp forlet

(13) and (14) are cited s.v. *up* adv. IV 'marking separation, as in to cut *up*, break *up*'. The meaning suggested for ModE *up* in *cut up* and *break up* is unsatisfactory, but the intended equation of OE and ModE uses of the particle is clear. These are important examples, and detailed analysis will show that they have been misinterpreted. The Aldhelm gloss, (13), takes the form Latin lemma followed by L gloss followed by two OE glosses. Both of the OE verbs mean 'separate, take away'. The direct object of *aliþian/aleopian* in the active

voice is regularly the part of the body which is removed, not the body from which it is removed, so the translation 'dismember' offered by BT(S) for the verb is inappropriate: indeed the original Aldhelm text describes the ripping off of an arm, not the ripping up of a body.[2] Furthermore *aliþian* regularly co-occurs with a spatial adverbial: six examples of the verb in Healey & Venezky 1980 occur respectively with *onweg*, *up*, *ut*, a *fram*-phrase, and an *of*-phrase (twice); the seventh takes a dative. It is evident, therefore, that (13) displays an ordinary spatial use of *up,* albeit with effective value.[3]

The two occurrences of *forlætan upp,* examples (14) and (15), appear within a few lines of each other in the OE *Orosius,* referring to the diverting of great rivers into a number of easily-crossed streams. The collocation appears to correspond to L *comminuit* and perhaps also *concisum deductumque* in (14) and to L *deriuauit* in (15).[4] Accordingly it is generally translated 'divide up', for example by Professor Bately in her glossary. *OED* similarly compares it to ModE *break up*, etc (s.v. *up* adv.[1] 17b), and BT does so too, as noted above. The problem is that *forlætan* on its own never seems to mean 'divide' but rather 'leave, release, abandon' and the like. The only other occurrences of the verb in Healey & Venezky 1980 which look remotely as if they might mean 'divide' are

> (16) *CP* 43.315.6 ðonne ðæt mod bið forlæten & onstyred & todæled ungedafenlice & unendebyrdlice on unðeawas 'when the mind is let loose, and excited, and distracted improperly and unseasonably by vices'

> (17) *Mart 5* (Herzfeld-Binz) 1708 [AU13/A/8] and þa hors forleton þone lichoman 'and the horses left the body'

and several glosses of L *sine intermissione* by *buton toforlætennesse* or *buton forlætincge*. All of these examples are perfectly compatible with the usual senses of *forlætan,* however, as the editors' translations of (16) and (17) show. The common means of expressing 'divide (sth.) into (parts)' in OE is by means of the collocation [p.41] *todælan on,* e.g. at *Or* 45.1. The verb *forlætan* does collocate with *up(p)* elsewhere, but

---

[2] The text reads *evulsum cadaveris lacertum* (Giles 1844: 39.26), translated 'an arm which had been torn from a corpse' by Lapidge & Herren 1979: 93.

[3] This is a term of Curme's adapted by Visser 1963: 597-99, who uses it of particles which 'refer to a state or condition in consequence of the action [expressed by the verb-particle collocation]'.

[4] I take the Latin from Zangemeister's edition (1882: 95.13-96.4). The OE translator apparently worked from a poor Latin text (Bately 1980: lv-lvi).

always with the verb in its usual sense and the particle in spatial meaning (*Gen* 2440, *El* 700, 712, 792, and possibly *HyGL 3* 25.1.).

A better suggestion is that the OE fails to render the Latin exactly (a common feature of this text, see Bately 1980: xciii-c), especially as a collocation *forlætan upp* is unlikely to capture all the senses of four L verbs, including those of division plus diminution or destruction (*comminuere, concidere*) as well as diversion (*deducere, derivare*). If *forlætan + upp* need not mean 'divide up', then *upp* in (14) and (15) may well have a spatial meaning. Perhaps the OE translator meant something like 'let overflow (after damming) into …': (14) is after all cited also in BTS s.v. *forlætan* VIII. (1) 'cease to hold or restrain'. Compare such examples as

(18) *CP* 38.279.13 Se forlæt ut ðæt water 'He lets out the water'

(19) *And* 967 þær rinca sum / of minre sidan swat ut forlet

Another, if weaker, suggestion is that *upp* might have reference to opening a barrier, as in example (1) or the rather later

(20) *Ancrene Wisse* 18b.3 a lute wiht lowsið up ower muðes flod ȝeten

Otherwise, acceptance of the gloss 'divide up' for *forlætan upp* means that we have to suppose not merely the use of *upp* with Aktionsart value but the creation of a highly idiomatic, wholly opaque and quite unparalleled phrasal verb.

As for the chronology, (13) is dated in the mid-eleventh century, the glosses probably copied from the Brussels manuscript glossed early in the century (Ker 1957: nos. 8, 320); examples (14) and (15) are to be dated between 889 and 899 (Bately 1980: xcii-xciii). All three considerably predate the evidence of *OED* for the first completive or totalitive use of *up* with verbs of cutting, opening, breaking, etc, such as *break up* (1483), *carve up* (—), *chop up* (1840), *cut up* (14..), *divide up* (—), *hack up* (?: no citations given), *open up* (1582-88), *rip up* (1565), *slice up* (—), *smash up* (1513), *split up* (1648) — dates where available s.v. *up* adv.[1] 16-18 or the verbs — which are very late ME or ModE. Where *up* retains its connection with a literal, directional sense there are somewhat earlier examples, e.g. c1200 *hew up (a tree) (Orm* 9285*)*, c13.. *break up (a door)* (*Hav* 1960), 1513 *open up (gates) (OED)*.

Apart from the examples offered by BT — wrongly, as I have shown — there are several other occurrences of *up* among the more than 2500 listed in Healey & Venezky 1980 which might suggest that completive *up* existed in OE:

(21) *Jud* 7 Gefrægen ic ða Holofernus . . . eallum wundrum þrymlic / girwan up swæsendo

(22) *Med3* 127.3 [p. 170] & ða tan scrincað up 'and the toes shrink up'

(23) ByrM 100.9 Hawiað … hu boceras awringað up þæne *saltus* on heora cræfte 'Observe … how authors express the leap in their art'

(24) *Ch* 1122 (Harmer 78) 5 & ætforen gewitnesse mid halra tunge Ælfrice þam abb. & þam gebroðran up betæhte 'and before witnesses unequivocally (or *viva voce*) committed it to Abbot Ælfric and the brethren'

(25) *Ch* 1123 (Harmer 79) 6 & atforen Ædiðe þaire hlafdie Æadwine abbyde & þam monecan up hyo betehte 'and in the presence of Queen Edith committed them to Abbot Edwin and the monks'

(26) *BenRW* 2.96 þat he underfeng saule to gyemenne, for hwam hu sceal gewistale upagifen 'quia animas suscepit regendas, de quibus et rationem redditura est'

None of them is very convincing apart from the first, though the reasons for doubt vary. I take them in turn.

Example (21) is the possible occurrence of completive *up* in OE which is hardest to dismiss. Klaeber writes: 'The expression *girwan up* has a curiously modern ring: "dress up" (Gordon; "serve up", Sweet). That is to say, *up* is used in a sort of perfective sense which is exceedingly common in modern verb combinations . . .' (1929: 229-30). The poem *Judith* is usually dated in the tenth century (Dobbie 1953: lxii-lxiv), when a particle following a non-finite part of the verb is still unusual (see Denison 1981: 118-40). The collocation of verb and object is regular enough, cf. for example

(27) *Matt(Li)* 22.4 symbel & swoese min ic gearuade (BT)

but completive *up* does not appear to collocate with this verb elsewhere. I have noted only *gearwian/girwan + up* in a literal sense at *Sat* 286 and the much later use of a related verb in ?c1390 ȝarked vp (of a gate) (*Gaw* 820). *OED*'s citations s.v. *up* adv.[1] 18c 'to or towards a state of completion . . . with vbs. denoting cleaning, putting in order, or

fixing in place' start at 1419-20, although that is probably unnecessarily late (cf. Samuels 1972: 164), while *serve up* is only given from c1440 (s.v. *serve* v.[1] 43). Pure Aktionsart value in the tenth century seems so isolated that I suspect that *up* in (21) must have SOME spatial sense. The Vulgate reading on which the passage in question is based, *fecit cenam* (Judith 12.10), offers no clue. Denise Cavanaugh has suggested (personal communication) that (21) is to be connected with the attested OE sense of *up(p)* 'into existence, prominence,...; so as to appear or prevail' (*OED* sense 11), which is certainly possible.

Example (22) refers to a disease of the feet in which the sinews are distorted, causing the toes to curl up. The meaning of the collocation *scrincan up* is therefore at least as much like ModE 'curl upwards' as ModE 'shrivel up', and we do not have a pure completive here.

Example (23) is more promising: OE *awringan* is being used, as often elsewhere, as an equivalent of L *exprimere* in the linguistic sense of 'express', but here uniquely with the particle *up* reinforcing the prefix *a-*. Although this *up* may well have some [p.43] completive force, as it does in collocation with other *a-* compounds, its use partakes also of *OED*'s sense 7b s.v. *up* adv.[1], 'so as to cause sound to ascend, increase, or swell'. This is therefore a 'mixed' use.

Examples (24) and (25) should really be treated as one, since the preambles of the two writs are very similar in phraseology and can hardly be independent of each other. They probably do contain pure completive *up* (though we might have *OED*'s sense 7b here too). The problem here is the date: *Ch* 1122 purports to date from A.D. 1045-1049 and *Ch* 1123 from A.D. 1049, but they both survive only in the same two manuscripts, one of the late thirteenth and the other of the fourteenth century (Harmer 1952: 295-96, 499-501). Sawyer 1968: 334, following Harmer 1952: 313-16, describes *Ch* 1122 as probably spurious and *Ch* 1123 as of doubtful authenticity.[5] Harmer discusses the

---

[5] Hart, however, describes *Ch* 1123 as one whose authenticity is not in doubt, though available only in later copies (1966: 51), he does not deal with *Ch* 1122. Harmer's discussion is preferred by Dr Alexander Rumble, who 'do[es] not believe that the writs concerned were ever issued in their present textual form' (personal communication, 13 December 1982). Dr Rumble has given me a detailed analysis, in which he shows that both writs begin with a notification of grant, despite the fact that neither actually grants anything new; that much of the wording could have been lifted from genuine writs; and that the forgeries are unlikely to have been made prior to the Domesday Survey (1086), since they would probably have been produced in evidence had they existed then. 'It is difficult to get much closer as to date,' he continues, 'except to note that St Albans and Westminster were in dispute over Aldenham in 1201 (Harmer p.499) and later until 1256.'

vocabulary of both writs in some detail, but her only relevant comment, on (25), is that the 'same verb *betæcan* (without *up)* is used in a Westminster charter of high repute' (1952: 503). The word-order of (25), in which an unstressed pronoun comes late in the clause between particle and verb, is most uncharacteristic of OE. It will be shown below in §3 that *up* is regularly used in ME with verbs of surrendering; in this section I have shown that the use of pure completive *up* in OE would be almost certainly without parallel. When the writs were copied out in the ME period the particle *up* might have been inserted in line with current idiom, although there is no evidence in *MED* of the particular collocation *bitechen up.* Given too that there is serious doubt whether there were any OE exemplars for these writs at all, it would not be safe to accept (24) and (25) as showing the existence of completive *up* in OE.

The case of (26) is very similar: the manuscript was written soon after 1200 (Ker 1957: xix n.2), and the reviser who produced this version has substituted *gewistale upagifen* for the phrase *riht agyldan* used in earlier English versions of the *Rule.* It is likely, therefore, that this example of completive *up* belongs to the ME rather than the OE period.

Reviewing the material discussed in this section, I find no clear OE examples of completive *up,* unless mixed in with a spatial meaning or well-attested metaphorical development of a spatial meaning. (24) to (26) are doubtful on grounds of date, and only (21) is difficult to classify. The paucity of evidence for the pattern in OE makes it highly unlikely that it existed in pre-OE.

[p.44]

3: *The First Clear Examples.* — The first unequivocal examples of completive *up* that I know of occur in the Final Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle,* a text written in about 1155 (Clark 1970: xxv):

(28) *Cont.II* 1132.9 & dide him gyuen up ðat abbotrice of Burch

(29) *ibid.* 1137.9 & dide ælle in prisun til hi iafen up here castles

(30) *ibid.* 1140.26 & sæde heom ðat he uuolde iiuen heom up Wincestre

(31) *ibid.* 1140.41 þat he alle his castles sculde iiuen up

(32) *ibid.* 1140.41 Sume he iaf up, & sume ne iaf he noht

(33) *ibid.* 1140.52 til hi aiauen up here castles

Here we have six examples where there is no plausible spatial meaning to be attributed to *up,* and in a manuscript of known provenance. The same phrasal verb *give up* is attested in later texts, e.g. 1200-10 *Seinte Katerine* 660, c1395 Chaucer, *WBProl* III.427, *MerchT* IV.2312, 1461 *Past.L.* 58.21. *Agive up* occurs in (26), already quoted above. Furthermore the same class meaning of *up* appears in *cweðen up* (1200-10 *Seinte Katerine* 48, 321), *yield up* (c1230 *Ancrene Wisse* 72b.18; c1385 Chaucer, *Tr* I.801; c1385 Chaucer, *KnT* I.3052; a1470 Malory, *Works* 710.37; 1461 *Past.L.* 646.23), *deliver up* (c1340, see *OED*), *resign up* (c1400, see *OED*), *surrender up* (c1590, see *OED*). The *Cont.II* examples are not isolated, therefore, but merely the earliest recorded examples of a well-attested usage.

In examples (28) to (33) this usage appears to be a recent innovation — and not just because no earlier examples are known. The usual verbs for 'surrender (a stronghold, etc)' in OE are compound verbs like *agifan*, *forgifan*, *forlætan*, *ofgifan*; see BT(S) s.vv., and compare from a slightly earlier portion of the same manuscript:

(34) *ChronE* 248.1 (1118) his agene mæn þe ... heom . . . heora castelas ageafon

It is interesting that in (33) the new completive *up* and the older prefix *a-* reinforce each other. This seems to imply that *Cont.II* stands at a transitional stage in the history of the marking of completion, and that *up* is a marker added to the verbs *give* and *agive*, rather than the collocations *give/agive up* being coined or borrowed as a whole. Further evidence that *up* is to be seen as an addition to the simple verb is provided by (32), which proves that simple verb and collocation were felt to be related.[6]

An original derivation from the spatial sense is conceivable, via the familiar and [p.45] universal symbolism of subjection and supplication: something is handed over to someone whose superior power or status requires a figurative movement upwards. (The development of the cognates of *give up* in Dutch and German may have gone this way; see §§6 and 8 below.) But the objects in (28) to (33) are abstract or else are not such as to be physically moved, whilst there is no explicit recipient except in (30); hence any

---

[6] If proof is needed — but in ModE the phrasal verb and the simple verb are more remote from each other. *Give up*, for instance, rarely occurs now with an indirect object, whereas *give* is rarely used without one. Compare example (30) in ME and *Nj* 45.19 *Ek vil gefa ykkr upp búit* 'I wish to hand over the farm to you two' in ON.

connection with a spatial sense of *up* is remote indeed. Nor is there any trace of a semantic transition.

It is noteworthy too that there is no trace of OE verb-particle ordering: in OE one would expect the particle to precede an infinitive, especially in a clause which otherwise displays OE 'conjunctive order' (see Mitchell 1964: 136-37, Denison 1981: 114-24, 136-37).

The examples discussed in this section fall under *OED*'s 'into the hands or possession of another', 'so as to relinquish, abandon, or forsake' *(up* adv.[1] 13, 13b). The usage first appears in mid-twelfth century and is well established in the thirteenth. It has survived to the present day, though probably with a more restricted range of verbs, partly through the obsolescence of some items, partly under the growing ModE phonological restriction of the phrasal verb pattern to verbal formatives which are monosyllabic or disyllabic with initial stress.[7]

Other new completive uses of *up* seem to follow in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As *OED* groups them, they include 'into an open or loose condition of surface', 'so as to sever or separate . . .' (senses 17, 17b); 'to or towards a sense of completion or finality' (18) — with verbs denoting consuming or destroying (18a), with other verbs, denoting progress to or towards an end (18b), with vbs. denoting cleaning, putting in order, or fixing in place (18c); 'by way of summation or enumeration' (19); 'into a close or compact form or condition; so as to be confined or secured' (20). Of course no such classification is watertight: even in the fourteenth century the range of uses of *up* is such that no single listing can do full justice to the network of meanings and collocational possibilities. In particular we may note that most of *OED*'s headings include examples where traces of the spatial sense of *up* are discernible, e.g. *dig up*, *fret up*, as well as uses entirely divorced from the spatial sense, e.g. *cleanse up*, *destroy up*.

Since the ME period the particle *up* has become the particle most freely attachable to suitable verbs, and the number of collocations of *up*, especially in American English, is enormous. The history is not one of pure expansion, since many are ephemeral or at least of limited duration. Some in use in the nineteenth century but not now, for instance, are

---

[7] Even in ModE there are exceptions, but the proportionately large number of counter-examples in the fifteenth-century *Past.L.* suggest that the phonological constraint is a later development, e.g. *parfourme vp* (210.44), *repayre vppe* (266.19), *receyue vppe* (291.17), *acomplyshe vp* (330.31), *engrose vp* (625.3, 902.16), *certified vup* (737.2), *delyuered vpp* (912.18).

breed up, *check up* 'stop', *fire/flush up* 'blush', *goad up, praise/cry/write up* 'praise', *roll up (cigarettes)*. Nevertheless the overall picture is one of growth.

[p.46]

4: *Functional Pressures.* — The reasons for the appearance of completive *up* are functional and lie mainly in the obsolescence of an alternative system of Aktionsart marking, that of verbal prefixation. Throughout I understand the terms 'prefix' and 'compound verb' to refer only to the inseparable varieties.

First one must show that the prefixal particles of the OE compound verb have functions similar to those of the adverbial particles of the ModE phrasal verb. In general terms this is self-evident. Both can be largely spatial in meaning, as in the OE compounds *oðfleon* 'flee away', *wiðstandan* 'withstand, resist' and the ModE phrasal verbs *run away, fall down*. Both can form idiomatic combinations of opaque meaning, e.g. OE *berædan* 'dispossess' (cf. *rædan* 'advise, read'), *understandan* 'understand' (cf. *standan* 'stand'), ModE *make up* 'apply cosmetics' (cf. *make*), *work out* 'calculate' (cf. *work)*. And both can leave the meaning of the simple verb almost intact whilst adding an Aktionsart modification. This property of ModE adverbial particles has already been alluded to. As for the OE prefixes, they can have various values in combination with suitable verb-stems, e.g. intensive (*a-*, *be-*, *for-*), perfective or completive (*a-*, *be-*, *ge-*, *of-*, *to-*), totalitive or destructive (*for-*, *to-)*. In reality one cannot maintain a sharp distinction between, say, Aktionsart modifications and wider lexical meanings. The *for-* of *forbærnan,* for instance, imparts an Aktionsart modification of completion to the verb-stem *bærnan* 'burn', tinged with a meaning which can be glossed 'to destruction', more lexical in character. Prefixation by *geond-* or *þurh-,* on the other hand, frequently imparts lexical senses akin to the related prepositions *geond* 'throughout' and *þurh* 'through', but tinged with intensive or completive or exhaustive senses which belong under the heading of Aktionsart modification. There is a similar indeterminacy in many phrasal verbs: see Denison 1981: 108-110 for examples. These general observations are sufficient to make the point that the prefixal system of OE and the phrasal verb have overlapping functions.[8]

---

[8] For a full discussion of prefixes in OE see Hiltunen 1981: 49-131 and the works listed in the bibliography of Lindemann 1970, supplemented by Mitchell & Kingsmill 1980. On the obsolescence of prefixal marking see also Mossé 1938: 6-26, esp. 23-26, Mustanoja 1960: 446-48, de la Cruz 1975.

I turn now to the obsolescence of prefixal marking. The beginnings of the decline of the prefixal system are probably located in the pre-historic period. Quirk and Wrenn make an important point in this regard, writing of OE word-formation in general:

> In OE, where we can observe a set of word-formation patterns of a complexity similar to that obtaining in Mod.E., it is often impossible for us to distinguish processes that were active and flourishing during the OE period from those that had ceased to be formative before the Anglo-Saxons left the continent of Europe but whose products were still very much in use. (1957: 104)

For some prefixes, productivity survives (or is renewed) into ME or beyond: *for-* and *to-* are forming new compound verbs up to the early ModE period. Others lose [p.47] their productivity earlier and their communicative effectiveness perhaps earlier still. From early OE there are prefixes with indistinct and overlapping meanings, and the prefix *a-* in particular is frequently reinforced by an adverbial particle:

> The frequency with which [the OE translator of *Orosius*] felt it necessary to strengthen a prefix with an additional adverb of the same meaning, e.g. *a-drifan . . . ut,* indicates at the very least that [he] feared that the prefix would be meaningless to the reader. (Hendrickson 1948: 73)

Given that the prefixal system is on the decline during the OE period and greatly weakened by the early ME period, we might expect alternative means of expression to come into use at about the same time, one of them, of course, being completive *up*. The newer prefixes of Romance and Greek origin have not provided a productive system of Aktionsart marking and can be left out of account here.

It is reasonable to associate the decline of the prefixes as a system, albeit with sporadic survivals, with the rise of phrasal (and prepositional) verbs: thus for instance Marchand 1954: 296 = 1969: 130-31.[9] A succinct but important account of the relation between the two systems is given by Samuels in the course of a survey of punctual Aktionsart (1972: 163-65). Characteristically, he demonstrates the confluence of a number of factors: phonetic attrition of some prefixes, loss of information-content and

---

[9] So also Hiltunen 1981: *passim,* and Lindemann 1970: 65, citing Mossé 1938: 24-25 n.2, though Mossé gives less prominence to this point than Lindemann implies. There is also some discussion in a Russian dissertation, Ershova 1951, available to me only in a fifteen-page summary which is difficult to evaluate. The summary does not indicate which texts she studied, and at least one of her conclusions is very dubious: see Denison 1981: 168, 195-96.

grammaticization, loss of regular and systematic relationship between simplex and compound through the substitution of Norse and French forms in the function taken by (usually) the compound forms, the introduction of new verbs from various sources to express point-action, the introduction of phrasal verbs, and 'a noticeable increase in the use of fixed phrases as completives or intensives, as *hew to pieces*, *burn to ashes*, … as well as a more general increase in the use of adverbs like *wel*, *fast(e)*' (1972: 165). The breakdown of the prefixal system and the rise of the phrasal verb are each seen, therefore, as component parts of a wider series of changes, and each tendency helps to reinforce the other. A number of individual functional correspondences between compound verbs and ME phrasal verbs have been collected by de la Cruz 1969: 193-99, 205-19. It is worth pointing out that within OE, at least, there is no evidence of any tendency for simple verbs in an early manuscript of a given work to be replaced in a later manuscript by collocations of verb and adverb, or specifically of verb + *up* (Meroney 1943: 38-39, Hiltunen 1981: 188-89).

The shift from prefixes to free particles is partly due to inherent weaknesses in the prefixal system, mentioned in the summary of Samuels's argument above. In part it may be because adverbs, which can carry full stress, are better suited than the [p.48] characteristically unstressed prefixes to carrying intonational information, including the emphasis often associated in everyday usage with both spatial and Aktionsart meanings, and the flexibility of semantic focus demonstrated by Bolinger 1971: 45-66 for ModE. There is also much plausibility in Marchand's suggestion (1954: 296-97 = 1969: 131) that the rise of the phrasal verb is tied up with the normalising of the position of spatial adverbs in general: a tendency to place them after the verb, brought on by very general changes in the English word-order system, will favour the collocation, which can tolerate verb-particle order, at the expense of the compound, which cannot. Although such an argument applies most forcefully to spatial meanings, the Aktionsart values have always maintained a close connection with them and developed out of them.

In phrasal verbs where the particle maintains an affinity with spatial adverbs, it usually has effective value. This raises the question of kinship with certain verb-adjective collocations where the adjective has effective value. In ModE we may compare the intransitive phrasal verb *come out* with the collocation *go bad*, the transitive *knock down* with the collocation *paint black*: the syntactic analogies are quite close; see also

Lipka 1972: 116-17. Visser has collected data on collocations of copula verbs with adjectives of effective value, and on collocations of transitive verbs with predicative adjuncts of effective value (1963: 191-219, 577-86, respectively). It is clear from his data that both patterns can be found in OE, but that the major growth in usage takes place over the ME period and beyond. I do no more than make the observation that the growth of the verb-adverb collocation may be regarded as part of these wider developments too, and that the verb-adverb collocation is the forerunner of the phrasal verb.

5: *Internal Development.* — In principle there are a number of ways in which the completive use of *up* could have entered the language. It might have been inherited by OE from an earlier, pre-historic stage: the absence of convincing examples from recorded OE makes this highly unlikely. Within the historical period the most obvious explanation is an internal development, presumably related in some way to the original, spatial meaning of *up*.

It is difficult to imagine why the spatial meaning of *up* should ever develop to the Aktionsart value in isolation: common sense suggests that the semantic development, if it occurred at all, must have taken place in the first instance in a collocation of some verb with *up* or even in a whole verb phrase containing *up*. Looking at ModE collocations suggests some obvious possibilities. The directional meaning of *up* often combines with a goal meaning: to pull something up, when the verb is used in its literal sense, is usually to pull it both upwards and to some final, high position (cf. to pull upwards, which is both semantically and syntactically different; see Bolinger 1971: 15-16, 61-62, Palmer 1974: 221, 225). It is easy to imagine that the particle might begin to lose its spatial sense and come to be perceived as an Aktionsart marker of completion, if there were any pressure for such a change. This would be a [p.49] metonymy which would qualify as a 'permutation' in Gustaf Stern's scheme.[10] Intransitives like *grow*, *rise*, *sit* and transitives like *pick*, *raise* could take part in collocations with *up* in which the particle begins to lose its spatial sense and comes to be perceived as an Aktionsart marker of completion or the like, while the simple verb (and indeed the collocation as a whole) retains its usual sense. A completive meaning could then develop alongside the spatial meaning in collocation with verbs that do not incorporate upward motion in their own meanings but which are

---

[10] 'Permutations are unintentional sense-changes in which the subjective apprehension of a detail — denoted by a separate word — in a larger total changes, and the changed apprehension (the changed notion) is substituted for the previous meaning of the word' (Stern 1931: 361).

semantically compatible with it. This includes verbs of motion like *move, put,* and certain other action verbs like *drink*, *fill*. For instance, *drink up* might change from *drink* (usual sense) + *up* (marker of direction with effective value) to *drink* (usual sense) + *up* (marker of totality or completion). It makes no difference whether the collocation as a whole is being used literally or in a metaphorical way, as in OE *ahebban upp (gewinn)* 'raise (war)', ModE *bring up (a child).* If a number of collocations changed in these ways, *up* could develop a class meaning of completion which might later be extended to yet other types of collocation.

Certain stages of this hypothetical development have been illustrated by (5) to (13) and (21) to (23) above, and *OED* arranges its citations for *up* adv.[1] so as to suggest just such a historical sequence. We may safely assume that a development of this kind plays a large part in the history of completive *up*.

6: *External Influence. —* The other explanation which can be offered for the appearance of completive *up* is external influence. I consider various possibilities, starting with the most likely candidate, ON.

In classical ON of the Saga Age there is widespread use of verb-particle collocations in ways that are very reminiscent of ModE practice; see e.g. Denison 1981: 275-79. The particle *upp*, cognate with English *up*, is frequently used as an Aktionsart marker of completion, etc in collocation with such verbs as *brenna*, *gefa*, *telja*; see Cleasby & Vigfusson 1957 s.vv. It is more difficult to establish whether *upp* was used in this way in earlier forms of Scandinavian, in particular the dialects which contributed to English lexis. These were brought to England between the late ninth and the eleventh centuries mainly by Danes and by Norwegians, some of whom had come from colonies in Ireland and in other offshore islands. Björkman (1900-02: 3-24) and others see the major lexical influence on English — apart from early borrowings of legal, nautical and similar words — as dating from near the end of the period of Scandinavian settlement and beyond it, when the languages blended intimately and Scandinavian as a separate language eventually died out. Any syntactic or structural influence would also come late in the period of linguistic intercourse. The Scandinavian dialects spoken in England might by then have undergone their own internal changes.

[p.50]

There is little direct evidence of those dialects (Jensen 1975: 201-202) and there is only limited surviving evidence of the earlier Danish and Norwegian from which they derived. The nearest we can get to them is by consideration of early Scandinavian poetry and runic inscriptions. Verb-adverb combinations are found in both, and prepositional use is broadly like that of classical Old Icelandic but with a greater use of postpositions (Heusler 1964: 145, Wessén 1970: 93 n.8). Idiomatic combinations are less readily found amongst collocations involving pure adverbs than amongst those involving prepositions, often used elliptically, e.g. *göra til* 'deserve'.

I have looked for evidence of the completive use of *upp* in the Viking Age material.[11] *Lúka upp* 'open' occurs in the poems *Fjǫlsvinnsmál, Helgakviða Hundingsbana II, Guðrúnarkviða II*, with the antiquity of the idiom vouched for by the appearance of the noun *upplǫk* 'an unlocking, opening' in *Hávamál*, which is dated prior to 960-70 by Einarsson 1957: 22. The use of *upp* in the sense 'open' is probably very old and partly spatial — cf. the etymology of the related English word *open* — but *lúka upp* may be considered an idiomatic phrasal verb when used of *haugr* 'burial mound' or *hús* 'house', where the object is no longer something which can literally be lifted up to open it. *Segja upp (lǫg)* 'pronounce (the law)' is used by Hallfreðr vandrædaskáld, who was born c965 (Einarsson 1957: 61); compare the OE use of *up* illustrated in (4) above (itself perhaps a Scandinavian borrowing) This is a metaphorical development of the spatial meaning but not yet a pure Aktionsart use. *Brjóta upp (stokka)* 'break open/up/down (boarding, benches)' occurs in *Atlamál in grœnlenzku*, which is of uncertain date: Dronke assigns it to the twelfth century (1969: 111). In this collocation the particle confers a completive sense on the verb, possibly mixed with the more-or-less spatial sense 'open'. I can find no poetic example of the collocation *gefa upp* before the late thirteenth century work of Sturla Þorðarson.

In the runic remains the particle *upp* is surprisingly rare altogether, even in spatial use. One might expect to find it with verbs like *reisa, setja* in the common formula 'X set up this stone', but the whole corpus yields just one example:

---

[11] For poetry I consulted Egilsson 1913-16 and Neckel 1927, 1968. For runic inscriptions I examined the main collections of Danish, Norwegian (not the very oldest), Swedish and Icelandic runes: Jacobsen & Moltke 1941-42, Olsen 1941-60, Söderberg, Brate et al. 1900- , and Bæksted 1942.

(35) *SR* VIII. 785 (Tyllinge kyrka) vifastr … ræisa stæin þenna upp at Guðmund, broður sinn

The editors comment on the uniqueness of *upp* in this inscription, one of the later Christian, runic monuments.

The verb *brjóta* 'break' occurs with a pre-contiguous particle several times in the runic material. Two Danish runestones threaten anyone who desecrates the stone with the following curses:

[p.51]

(36) *DR* 81 (Skern-stenen 2) siþi sa mąnr is þusi kubl ub biruti

(37) *DR* 338 (Glemminge-stenen) uirþi at rata huas ub briuti

Both stones are dated c1000-c1050. Jacobsen & Moltke interpret the word transcribed *ub* as ON *of*, whereas an earlier editor, Wimmer, took *ub* to be ON *upp*. The matter has been argued over at length: see the references given by Jacobsen & Moltke 1941-42: I, 693, and compare runic *ub* in the fragmentary *NIyR* 1.4 (Bjørneby) which Olsen says can be interpreted as any one of *upp*, *of*, or prefixal *of-*. Jacobsen & Moltke, following Dal 1930: 83, adduce *uf briuti* on *SR* V.67 (Saleby) in support of interpreting *ub* as *of* in (36) and (37). They believe it to be an example of the 'expletive particle' *of/um* (both forms occur interchangeably elsewhere), a proclitic particle or prefix which often has a perfective function and which is explained by Dal as a relic of the lost Germanic unstressed prefixes (1930: *passim*). *Of/um* is common in poetry and moderately frequent in runic inscriptions. Further examples include *ufhuln* 'buried' *(SR* III. 164 Spånga) and *skialti ub fatlaþR* 'with shield fastened' *(SR* 11.136 Rök); see also Dal 1930: 43 n. 1, 83.

The perfective function of the early expletive *of/um* is comparable to that of the later *upp,* which can be seen as a functional replacement. Egill Skalla-Grímsson uses both in the same verb phrase in *Sonatorrek* 21:

(38) *Eg* 254.9 Þat mank enn, / es upp of hóf / í goðheim / Gauta spjalli / ættar ask

The adverb *upp* is partly redundant with the verb *hefja* 'lift' and probably has intensive or completive function. Another interesting parallel has been pointed out by Samuels

1949-50, who notes that *ge* in the *Lindisfarne Gloss* behaves much like expletive *of/um* in ON.

The poetic instance of *brjóta upp* is of uncertain date and the possible runic instances of the same collocation are contested. The absence of (other) examples can be explained away by the limited variety and extent of the early poetry and the runic inscriptions, by the economy of expression typical of both forms, and by the rivalry of the expletive particle, which may have been preserved, in poetry at least, as an archaism.

Examples of completive *upp* are difficult to find in early, that is twelfth-century, prose. I have read *The First Grammatical Treatise, Íslendingabók,* and part of *Homiliu-Bók* (pp. 1-92), so far finding only 'mixed' uses such as

> (39) *Homiliu-Bók* 44.31 þa muno guþs englar wekia upp af daúþa alla þióþ þa es . . . 'then God's angels will wake from death all the people who …'

> (40) *ibid.* 50.33 Sa lúke up augom hiarta yþvars 'He may open up the eyes of your heart'

> (41) *ibid.* 84.11 oc hefia sva upp beoner órar 'and thus begin our prayers'

In *Íslendingabók* the only idiomatic use of *upp* is an 'increase of sound' sense, as in [p.52] *segja upp (lög)* 'pronounce (the law)', *bera upp (erindi)* 'deliver (a speech)'. By the thirteenth century examples are more readily found, and completive *upp* is clearly part of idiomatic Icelandic:

> (42) *Eg* 7.15 Hrollaugr konungr . . . gaf upp ríki sitt 'King Hrollaug . . . gave up his kingdom'

> (43) *Nj* 166.16 at hann bœtti þá upp ǫll vígin þegar 'that he (could) pay compensation for all the killings immediately'

> (44) *Nj* 312.4 Skulu vér gjalda upp helminginn gerðarmenn 'We umpires shall pay a half'

The fact that it has also become part of the mainland Scandinavian languages would suggest that the development was an early one, although of course it is possible that each of the languages has responded in the same way to the same functional pressure, or that an innovation in one of them has spread to the others.

The internal developments suggested for English in §5 above are equally possible for ON, and the functional pressures discussed in § 4 above apply to ON as well — in

fact the pressure to replace the prefixal system of Aktionsart marking would have operated more strongly in ON, which lost its Germanic prefixes very early (Heusler 1964: 40-41, Wessén 1970: 117-21, Samuels 1972: 84-85). It has been possible to demonstrate some idiomatic uses of *upp* in early poetry, and the *upp* of *brjóta upp,* if that collocation IS an early one, is not unlike the *upp* of *gefa upp*: both are completive and suggest irreversibility. It cannot be proved that completive *upp* in ON predates completive *up* in English: it may well have done so, given that 'mixed' uses like *brjóta upp* and *vekja upp* predate their English equivalents, and that the functional pressures were operating at full strength at an earlier date in ON. However, the absence of early prose records in Scandinavian makes a fair comparison with English impossible.

Another language whose influence on English must be considered here is Low German. Its similarity to English in the ME period makes it hard to detect what features are due to its influence. Serjeantson finds four LG words altogether in *Seinte Katerine* and *Ancrene Riwle,* two of the early texts which have *up* with a verb of surrendering, and she observes that the LG influence on English is less restricted geographically than the Scandinavian (1935: 171-72). But the LG influence is based on seafaring, trading and small-scale settlement rather than large-scale population movement, and not surprisingly it seems to be confined to lexical words rather than grammatical words or other structural matters. Furthermore the dictionaries of Dutch and other LG dialects seem to show that although the cognates of *up* did develop some idiomatic uses, they did so later than in English and in ways more transparently related to the spatial sense.[12] Thus we find in early LG only such uses [p.53] of *auf/op/uf/up* as the sense 'open', cognates of *drink up* and *eat up*, and the cognate of *give up* with the clear sense of handing over to a superior or of 'giving up the ghost'. There is nothing like the range of uses found in late ME, though admittedly the number of early texts surviving is very limited. On these grounds we must reject the possibility of a significant LG contribution to the development of English completive *up*.

Latin is unlikely to have influenced the phrasal verb directly. Its contribution seems to be confined to the stimulation of OE translators to use verb-adverb collocations as translation-equivalents of L compounds, and secondly to a rather greater use of

---

[12] See e.g. Schiller & Lubben 1875-80 s.vv. *up, uppe* adv. and the various *up-* compounds, and likewise Vries, Winkeln, et al. 1882- s.v. *op*. I am grateful to Dr Martin Durrell for advice on the Dutch, LG, and German material.

compounds, nonce compounds and collocations with particle in pre-contiguous position than would have occurred without the example of L, thus e.g. Rolle 9.47 *vptoke = L suscepit*. However, *up* is not a general equivalent to any one L prefix in the way that *out* corresponds to L *ex*, for instance, and L has no role in the history of completive *up*. The influx of French vocabulary in the ME period has been seen as a factor inhibiting the increase in use of phrasal verbs by providing competing alternatives (e.g. by Kennedy 1920: 13). otherwise it too is irrelevant to the present discussion. A handful of phrasal verbs may have been calqued on German or LG in American English: possible examples include *fill out (a form),* cf. *ausfüllen.* Even the most likely candidates are very difficult to prove (Denison 1981: 157-58), and I know of none involving *up.* Finally here we may note that various languages have contributed lexical items to English which have spawned phrasal verbs: *bung up*, *collect up*, *mangle up*, *psych up*, *split up*, *use up*, and so on. Clearly this kind of contribution is peripheral to the history of completive *up* or of the phrasal verb as a whole.

7: *Conclusions on Origins. —* What I have described as the first unequivocally completive use of *up* is found in the twelfth-century *Cont.II*. Its importance lies in the liberation of *up* from contexts compatible with a spatial sense, for *up* is tied to such contexts throughout OE, whereas by the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the independence of completive *up* from spatial *up* is common, with colourless completive use firmly established (see §§2 and 3 above). The origin of completive *up* with verbs of surrendering is still to be explained. WHEN it appears fits in with the explanation of WHY completive *up* should arise (§4 above), and also with both explanations of HOW (§§5 and 6), since the internal developments could have happened at any time in the history of English, while Scandinavian influence is likely enough in the twelfth century.

In OE, as indicated at the beginning of §2 above, there are several uses of *up* which have developed some measure of independence of the spatial meaning. How much independence is unclear: the 'open' sense is a metonymic development of the spatial [p.54] sense, probably still transparent in OE and early ME, whilst the 'increase of sound' and 'into prominence' senses are transparent metaphorical developments of the spatial sense. None of them is very likely as a direct predecessor of the completive use with verbs of surrendering.

Clark assumes the collocation *give up* in *Cont.II* to be a Scandinavianism (1952-53: 87; 1970: lxix). At best it could be a loan-translation from ON, since the spelling especially of the initial consonant of the verb shows that it descends from OE *gifan* rather than ON *gefa.* The compound verb *aiauen* (example (33), past plural) cannot come from ON. And the use of completive *up* with verbs of surrendering is soon found in dialects where Scandinavian influence is less likely. On the other hand, I argued in §3 that *up* is a marker of completion added to the verbs, and it is quite possible that this marker should be a semantic loan from ON.[13] *Cont.II* is a text which shows a fair amount of Scandinavian influence, including the grammar-words *fra*, *oc*, *til*, *þoh*, and *um* (see Clark 1970: lxix), the inchoative construction *toc to uuerrien him* (1135.21), and the interpenetration of OE idiom and ON lexis in *toc to be rice* (1140.62). In an earlier portion of the same manuscript we find the very Scandinavian-looking *beran up (mal)* (cited in (4) above). Even so, it remains possible that the English and Scandinavian developments are independent of each other.

If they are related, however, we must still consider whether the original use of completive *up(p)* was a purely Scandinavian matter, or whether it actually first arose in England in a *lingua franca* used between English- and Norse-speaking inhabitants. For here there would be an additional functional benefit, in that completive *up(p)* would be compatible with both language systems in a way that the English prefixes and the Scandinavian *of/um* would not. Presumably the successful innovation would then have spread outwards both around England and into Scandinavia. On the basis of the evidence I have collected, I find it doubtful that Scandinavian completive *upp* came from England, since it looks like an early and native development. Exactly how and when it arose cannot be ascertained, but presumably it would have been a combination of metaphorical and metonymic development of the kinds already discussed, and the collocation *brjóta upp* would have been one of the earliest examples.

As for the English history which is my main concern here, although *up* was slowly developing idiomatic and mixed spatial-completive uses in OE, it seems to me most

---

[13] Compare also the claim in Samuels 1949-50 that the syntax of *ge* in the *Lindisfarne Gloss* is the result of ON influence (§6 above). Although this innovation turned out to be a linguistic dead end, it suggests that northern English as early as the tenth century was receptive to ON grammatical/lexical devices which had something to do with Aktionsart.

likely that a pure completive use with verbs of surrendering was borrowed from ON in some midlands or northern dialect, before spreading rapidly across the country.

I would go on to suggest that the well-attested use of *up* with verbs of surrendering (or more accurately, to produce a phrasal verb of surrendering) was the catalyst for [p.55] the extension of completive *up* to new classes of verb. This suggestion runs the risk of being falsified by the discovery of new data from some period between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries, but it seems to me the most plausible and economical explanation of the data presented here. No doubt for some classes of verb the development of collocation with completive *up* was the result of the coalescence of several tendencies, and all under the functional pressure discussed in §4 above: the example at first of verbs of surrendering and later of others too, metonymy of the resultative spatial sense (an ever-productive source of completive *up,* and one without which the success of the construction is unimaginable), and perhaps Scandinavian example. Onions 1966 s.v. *up* states that 'the use of *up* to express complete consumption was prob. adopted from Scand.'. Although there may be much truth in this, note the variation in one line of the two Layamon manuscripts, neither of which is strongly influenced by Scandinavian:

(45) Lay. *Brut* A 7161 Þat maide dronc up þat win; & lette don oþer þer-in.

(46) Lay. *Brut* B 7161 Þat maide drong vt þat win; and lette don oþer þar-in.

Both the *up/out* variation and the context suggest that *drink up* in Lay. *Brut* A has quite a lot to do with ordinary, English, spatial *up.* One example of the growth of a new class meaning of *up* is seen in the series *cleopan up* (OE, example (11) above), *haten up* (1200-10 *Seinte Katerine* 56), *call up* (1389), *summon up* (1588), *conjure up* (1590), and so on;[14] another is the *cut up* series mentioned in §2.

Once the syntactic and rhythmic pattern of the phrasal verb becomes established as a possible vehicle for Aktionsart modification, the extension of the pattern to new collocations becomes progressively easier. Here the uniformity of the *Cont.II* examples may be significant: without exception the particle follows the verb. Now spatial particles in OE and ME can sometimes precede the verb (and in certain circumstances they still can), but from the beginnings of the phrasal verb it has been highly unusual for the

---

[14] Dates of first appearance given without attribution are from *MED* and *OED*. *OED* does not recognise *cleopan up* in OE (*MED* has *clepe up* from c1325 (c1300)), and neither records *haten up* at all.

particle to take pre-verbal position if it is idiomatic or completive, apart from nonce poetic usage. Possible exceptions involving *up* include the following, in addition to (24) to (26) above:

(47) Lay. *Brut.* A 8861 & þe king up drong; & þer þat atter he dronc.

(48) Rolle 40.7 Mercy es trew as any stele, when it es ryght up soght

(49) Chaucer, *Tr* III.340 the chartres up to make

(50) *ibid.* III.516 al this heigh matere . . . were at the fulle up bounde

(51) *ibid.* III.530 This tymbur is al redy up to frame

[p.56]

(52) *ibid.* V.1469 with a boor . . . She made up frete hire corn and vynes alle

(53) *ibid.* V.1835 O yonge, fresshe folkes, he or she, / In which that love up groweth with youre age

(54) Chaucer, *KnT* I.2427 A sweete smel the ground anon up yaf

(55) *ibid.* I.3052 Whan with honour up yolden is his breeth

(56) Chaucer, *ClT* IV.940 Of which the fame up sprang to moore and lesse

(57) Chaucer, *MerchT* IV.2364 And up he yaf a roryng and a cry

(58) Chaucer, *PrT* VII.558 Oure firste foo, the serpent Sathanas ... Up swal

(59) Chaucer, *SecNT* VIII. 122 And from hir cradel up fostred in the feith / Of Crist

(60) *Everyman* 50 For now one wolde by enuy another vp ete

(61) Spenser, *FQ* I.i.15 Her huge long taile . . . was in knots and many boughtes vpwound

(62) *ibid.* I.iv.21 His belly was vp-blowne with luxury

(63) *ibid.* I.ix.47 Is he not just, that all this doth behold / From highest heauen, and beares an equall eye? Shall he thy sins vp in his knowledge fold. . .

(64) *ibid.* II.i.38 and vp her eyes doth seele

(65) Shakespeare, *Sonnet* 52.2 his sweet up-locked treasure

(66) Milton, *Paradise Lost* VII.290 thither they / Hasted with glad precipitance, uprowled / As drops on dust conglobing from the drie

Yet the majority of (47) to (66) do show some spatial component of meaning for *up,* possibly the dominant meaning, all are from poetry, and most are unlikely outside

poetry.[15] (The general process of word-order change by which post-verbal position becomes the norm for particles is too big a topic for the present article; see for instance Denison 1981: 111-145.)

8: *Comparisons.* — Other particles in English have, like *up,* developed idiomatic and Aktionsart values within the pattern of the phrasal verb. None is as productive or as frequently colourless as *up,* though *out* is also very widely used. There are some points of comparison between them. Both particles have 'into prominence' and 'increase of sound' uses, and later both can be completives; *out* tends to carry with it a sense of exhaustiveness or of bringing into the open. As far as I can tell, the semantic development of *out* is a straightforward matter either of metonymy from a [p.57] resultative spatial sense or of the metaphorical use of a particular collocation. Although certain collocations and semantic developments may have received support from Scandinavian, there is no semantic discontinuity as with *up* that would suggest some crucial external factor. Nor need foreign influence be invoked for other adverbial particles in phrasal verb patterns, except for the occasional idiom such as Orm's *stanndenn inn* 'strive, persevere', apparently calqued on L *instare* (*OED* s.v. *stand* v. 95a), and of course the very existence of such particles as *across.*

The antonym of *up* in spatial use is *down,* a younger particle derived from the phrase *of dune* 'from the hill'. It too has developed Aktionsart uses, some of which, as is well known, are not antonyms of *up.* Thus we have transitive *break up* and *break down,* with *up* historically from the 'open' sense and *down* transparently related to the position of the debris of breaking; *slow up* and *slow down,* with *up* a colourless intensifier/completive and *down* from the metaphor of a scale of speed; and so on. In general *down* retains closer links with its spatial sense.

Another particle which has in the past overlapped with *up* is *forth,* although it is no longer productive of new collocations and is probably obsolescent in everyday usage. It too can have an 'into prominence' sense. One possible reason for its decline, at least as an Aktionsart modifier, is the clash between a resultative sense, as in collocation with *bring*, and an iterative or durative sense, as in collocation with *tell.* Furthermore the resultative use is out of line with most other spatial adverbs in that collocation with *be* is rare, so that the particle cannot truly be said to have effective value (on which see note 3).

---

[15] Hence the humour of Evelyn Waugh's *CONSIDER ISHMAELITE STORY UP-CLEANED. … SUGGEST LEAVING AGENCIES UP-FOLLOWS* (*Scoop*, London, 1938; Penguin ed. 1977, p. 127).

The development of *up* in English can also be compared with its cognates in other Germanic languages. ON and LG have already been discussed in §6. High German also makes an interesting comparison. (On the syntactic comparison see Lipka 1972: 16-20 and references there.) The major functional difference from English is that the system of (inseparable) prefixes has survived, and that the prefix *er-* (and also, especially in the west, *ver-*) has as a major function the conferring of an intensifying or completive sense. Despite this, the 'separable prefix' *auf*, related to English *up* (see Onions 1966), has developed some completive functions that look similar to those of *up*, e.g. in *aufessen* 'eat up', *aufgeben* 'give up', *aufrauchen* 'finish smoking'. Possible examples of completive *auf* up to the time of Luther in Grimm's dictionary are all either compatible with a spatial sense or else involve a metaphorical extension of meaning of the whole collocation; nor is *auf* in modern German as freely available for addition to verbs as *up* is in English. The development of completive use is therefore less advanced than in English.

It seems, then, that completive *up* or its equivalent developed first in the Scandinavian languages, later in English, and last in the continental Germanic languages. Similar semantic changes happened independently in all of them, but a crucial stage in the English development — collocation with verbs of surrendering — was probably the result of Scandinavian influence. Further extensions to the collocational range of *up* in English may also have been hastened by the example of [p.58] Scandinavian.

To conclude, the detailed analysis presented here has been descriptive and without theoretical pretensions, and though nothing startling has emerged, I believe it to be of value in itself as a fragment of lexical history not previously given enough attention. Perhaps more important is the fact that the phrasal verb is now a major feature of modern English usage, and completive *up* is one of its commonest and most characteristic components: the history of completive *up* is therefore a microcosm of the history of the whole pattern.

University of Manchester

DAVID DENISON

REFERENCES:

BÆKSTED, A. (1942) *Islands runeindskrifter.* Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 2. Copenhagen.
BATELY (1980) See *Or.*
BJÖRKMAN, E. (1900-02) *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English.* 2 vols. Halle a. S.
BOLINGER, D. (1971) *The Phrasal Verb in English.* Cambridge, Mass.
BT: BOSWORTH, J. and T. N. TOLLER (1898) *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* Oxford.
BTS: TOLLER, T. N. (1972) *Supplement* to BT [1921], with rev. *Addenda* by A. Campbell. Oxford.
CLARK, C. (1952-53) 'Studies in the Vocabulary of the *Peterborough Chronicle,* 1070-1154'. *English and Germanic Studies* 5, 67-89.
——— (1970) See *Cont.II.*
CLEASBY, R. and G. VIGFUSSON (1957) *An Icelandic-English Dictionary,* second edition, with a supplement by Sir W. A. Craigie. Oxford.
DAL, I. (1930) *Ursprung und Verwendung der altnordischen 'Explelivpartikel' 'of, 'um'.* Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1929. No. 5. Oslo.
DE LA CRUZ (FERNÁNDEZ), J.M. (1969) 'Origins and Development of the Phrasal Verb to the End of the Middle English Period'. Diss., Queen's University of Belfast.
———— (1975) 'Old English Pure Prefixes: Structure and Function'. *Linguistics* 145, 47-81.
DENISON, D. (1981) 'Aspects of the History of English Group-Verbs: With Particular Attention to the Syntax of the *Ormulum*'. Diss., Oxford.
DOBBIE (1953) See *ASPR* IV.
DRONKE, U. (1969) *The Poetic Edda,* I, *Heroic Poems.* Oxford.
EGILSSON, S. (1913-16) *Lexicon poeticum antique linguæ septentrionalis: Ordbog over det norsk-islandske skjaldesprog.* Re-ed. by F. Jónsson. Copenhagen.
EINARSSON, S. (1957) *A History of Icelandic Literature.* New York.
ERSHOVA, I.A. (1951) 'Towards a History of the Development of Combinations of a Verb with a Spatial Adverb in English: In Connection with the Problem of Scandinavian Influence on the English Language'. Diss., Moscow State University. [A 'Candidate's dissertation' in Russian; only the 15-page (Russian) summary seen.]
GILES, J.A., ed. (1844) *Sancti Aldhelmi. . . Opera quæ extant.* Oxford.
GRIMM, J., W. GRIMM, et al. (1854-1960) *Deutsches Worterbuch.* 16 vols. Leipzig.
HARMER (1952) See *Ch.*
HART, C. R. (1966) *The Early Charters of Eastern England.* Leicester.
HEALEY, A. D. and R. L. VENEZKY (1980) *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English.* Toronto.
HENDRICKSON, J. R. (1948) *Old English Prepositional Compounds in Relationship to their Latin Originals.* [p.59] Language Dissertation 43 (Diss., University of Pennsylvania). Baltimore.
HEUSLER, A. (1964) *Altisländisches Elementarbuch,* sixth edition. Heidelberg.
HILTUNEN, R. (1981) 'The Decline of the Prefixes and the Beginnings of the English Phrasal Verb: The Evidence from some Old and Early Middle English Texts'. Diss., Oxford.
JACOBSEN & MOLTKE (1941-42) See *DR.*
JENSEN, G. FELLOWS (1975) The Vikings in England: A Review'. *Anglo-Saxon England* 4, 181-206.
KENNEDY, A. G. (1920) *The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination*, Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, I.I. Stanford University.
KER, N. R. (1957) *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon.* Oxford.
KLAEBER, Fr. (1929) 'Jottings on Old English Poems'. *Anglia* 53, 225-34.
LAPIDGE, M. and M. HERREN, transl. (1979) *Aldhelm: The Prose Works.* Ipswich, Cambridge and Totowa, N.J.
LINDEMANN, J. W. R. (1970) *Old English Preverbal 'Ge-': Its Meaning.* Charlottesville.

LIPKA, L. (1972) *Semantic Structure and Word-Formation: Verb-Particle Constructions in Contemporary English.* Munich.

MARCHAND, H. (1954) 'Notes on English Prefixation'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 55, 294-304.

——— (1969) *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach,* second edition. Munich.

MED: Middle English Dictionary (1952-). Ann Arbor, Michigan.

MERONEY, H. M. (1943) *Old English 'upp', 'uppe', 'uppan' and 'upon'.* (Diss., University of Chicago). Chicago.

MITCHELL, B. (1964) 'Syntax and Word-Order in *The Peterborough Chronicle* 1122-54'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 65, 113-44.

——— and A. KINGSMILL (1980) 'Prepositions, Adverbs, Prepositional Adverbs, Postpositions, Separable Prefixes or Inseparable Prefixes, in Old English?: A Supplementary Bibliography'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 81, 313-17.

MOSSE, F. (1938) *Histoire de la forme périphrastique 'être + participe présent' en germanique,* II, *Moyen-anglais et anglais moderne.* Paris.

MUSTANOJA, T. F. (1960) *A Middle English Syntax.* I. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 23. Helsinki,

NECKEL, G., ed. (1927) *Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern,* II, *Kommentierendes Glossar.* Heidelberg. Also third edition by H. Kuhn, 1968.

OED: Oxford English Dictionary (1933). Oxford.

OLSEN(1941-60) See *NIyR.*

ONIONS, C. T., ed. (1966) *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology,* with the assistance of G. W. S. Friedrichsen and R. W. Burchfield. Oxford.

PALMER, F. R. (1974) *The English Verb.* London.

QUIRK, R. and C.L. WRENN (1957) *An Old English Grammar,* second edition. London.

SAMUELS, M. L. (1949-50) 'The Elder Edda and the Lindisfarne Gloss: A Syntactic Parallel'. *English and Germanic Studies* 3, 37-41.

——— (1972) *Linguistic Evolution: With Special Reference to English.* Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 5. Cambridge.

SAWYER, P. H. (1968) *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography.* London.

SCHILLER, K. and A. LÜBBEN (1875-81) *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch.* 6 vols. Bremen.

SERJEANTSON, M. S. (1935) *A History of Foreign Words in English.* London.

SÖDERBERG, BRATE et al. (1900-) See *SR.*

STERN, [N.] G. (1931) *Meaning and Change of Meaning: With Special Reference to the English Language.* Gothenburg.

VISSER, F. Th. (1963) *An Historical Syntax of the English Language,* I. Leiden.

VRIES, M. de, L. A. te WINKELN, et al. (1882-) *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal.* 's-Gravenhage and Leiden.

WESSÉN, E. (1970) *Schwedische Sprachgeschichte,* III, *Grundriss einer historischen Syntax.* Berlin.

ZANGEMEISTER, C., ed. (1882) *Pavli Orosii: Historiarvm adversvm paganos, Libri VII.* Vienna.
[p.60]

Texts cited, in order of abbreviated title
All citations are by (page/book and) line following the edition, except where otherwise indicated.
EETS = Early English Text Society, Ordinary Series except for S.S. = Special Series. *DOE* = *Dictionary of Old English:* see Healey & Venezky 1980.

ÆLS = Ælfric's Lives of Saints, ed. by W. W. Skeat. EETS 76, 82, 94, 114. 1881-1900; repr. as 2 vols, 1966. By life and line.

AldV 13 = Nos. 1 and 13 in *Old English Glosses: Chiefly Unpublished,* ed. by A. S. Napier. Oxford, 1900. By page and gloss.

Ancrene Wisse, ed. by J. R. R. Tolkien. EETS 249. 1962. By folio and line.

And = Andreas, in *ASPR* II.

ASPR = The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records: A Collective Edition. G. P. Krapp and E. van Kirk Dobbie. 6 vols. New York and London, 1931-53.

Atlamál in grœnlenzku. In *Edda.*

BenRW = Die Winteney-Version der Regula S. Benedicti, ed. by A. Schröer. Halle, 1888. By chapter and *DOE* line.

ByrM = Byrhtferth's Manual (A.D. 1011), ed. by S. J. Crawford. EETS 177. 1929.

Ch = Charter, in *Anglo-Saxon Writs,* ed. by F. E. Harmer. Manchester, 1952. By charter (numbering from Sawyer 1968) and line.

Chaucer = *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* ed. by F. N. Robinson, second edition. Boston, Mass., 1957; repr. London, 1966. Individual works abbreviated as on Robinson's p. 647.

ChronE = MS. E in *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. by C. Plummer. 2 vols. Reissued with a Bibliographical note by D. Whitelock. Oxford, 1952. See also next item.

Cont.II = The Final Continuation (1132-54), in *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154,* ed. by C. Clark, second edition. By annal and line.

CP = King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care, ed. by H. Sweet. 2 vols. EETS 45, 50. 1871; repr. 1958. By chapter, page and line.

DR = Danmarks runeindskrifter. L. Jacobsen and E. Moltke, with A. Bæksted and K. M. Nielsen. 3 vols. Copenhagen, 1941-42. By inscription.

Edda = Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. I, Text, ed. by G. Neckel. Heidelberg, 1914.

Eg = Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar, ed. by S. Nordal. Íslenzk Fornrit 2. Reykjavik, 1933

El = Elene, in *ASPR* II.

Everyman, ed. by A. C. Cawley. Manchester, 1961.

The First Grammatical Treatise, ed. by H. Benediktsson. University of Iceland Publications in Linguistics 1. Reykjavik, 1972.

Fjǫlsvinnsmál. In *Edda.*

Gaw = Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, ed. by J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon. Second edition rev by N. Davis. Oxford, 1967.

Gen = Genesis, in *ASPR* I.

Guðrúnarkviða II. In *Edda.*

Hav = The Lay of Havelok the Dane. ed. by W. W. Skeat. Second edition rev. by K. Sisam. Oxford, 1915.

Hávamál. In *Edda.*

Helgakviða Hundingsbana II. In *Edda.*

Homiliu-bók: Isländska Homilier, ed. by T. Wisén. Lund, 1872.

HyGL 3 = Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter, ed. by H. Gneuss. Buchreihe der Anglia 12. Tübingen, 1968. Pp. 265-413. By hymn and verse.

Íslendingabók = The Book of the Icelanders (Íslendingabók) by Ari Thorgilsson, ed. by H. Hermannsson. *Islandica* 20. Ithaca, N.Y., 1930.

Jud = Judith, in *ASPR* IV.

Lay. *Brut = Laȝamon: 'Brut',* ed. by G. L. Brook and R. F. Leslie. 2 vols. EETS 250, 277. 1963-78. [p.61]

Lch = Leechdoms. Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England, ed. by O. Cockayne. 3 vols. Rolls Series. London, 1864-66. By volume, chapter, paragraph, and *DOE* line.

Malory, *Works,* ed. by E. Vinaver, second edition. London, 1971.

Mart 5 = *An Old English Martyrology.* ed. by G. Herzfeld. EETS 116. 1900. Pp. 2-10. Corrections by G. Binz, *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 12 (1901), 363-68. By month, day, saint, and *DOE* line.

Malt(Li) == *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew: In Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions …,* new ed. by W. W. Skeat. Cambridge, 1887. By chapter and verse.

Med3 = Lacnunga. in *Anglo-Saxon and Medicine,* ed. by J. H. G. Grattan and C. Singer. Publications of the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum n.s. 3. London, 1952. Pp. 96-204. By paragraph.

Milton, *Paradise Lost.* In *The Poetical Works of John Milton,* ed. by H. Darbishire, I, *Paradise Lost.* Oxford, 1952.

MSol = Solomon and Saturn, in *ASPR* VI.

NIyR = Norges innskrifter med de yngre runer, ed. by M. Olsen, with S. Bugge, O. Rygh and I. Undset. 5 vols. Oslo, 1941-60. By volume and page.

Nj = Brennu-Njálssaga, ed. by E. Ól. Sveinsson. Íslenzk Fornrit 12. Reykjavik, 1954.

Or = The Old English Orosius. ed. by J. Bately. EETS S.S. 6, 1980.

Orm = The Ormulum: With the Notes and Glossary of Dr. R. M. White, ed. by R. Holt. 2 vols. Oxford, 1878.

Past.L. == *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century,* ed. by N. Davis. 2 vols. Oxford. 1971-76. By letter and line.

Rolle = *English Writings of Richard Rolls: Hermit of Hampole,* ed. by H. R. Allen. Oxford, 1931.

Sat = Christ and Satan, in *ASPR* I.

Seinte Katerine. ed. by S. R. T. O. d'Ardenne and E. J. Dobson. EETS S.S. 7, 1981.

Shakespeare. *Sonnet.* In *Shakespeare's Sonnets,* ed. by W. G. Ingram and T. Redpath. London, 1964; repr. 1967. By sonnet and line.

Spencer, *FQ = The Faerie Qveene.* in *The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser,* ed. by J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt. London, 1912. By book, canto, and stanza.

SR = Sveriges runeinskrifter, ed. variously by S. Söderberg, E. Brate, et al. 14 vols. Stockholm, 1900-. By volume and inscription.

Wife = The Wife's Lament, in *ASPR* III.