DETERMINING FACTORS OF SEMANTIC RELATIONS BETWEEN VERB+POSTPOSITIVE STRUCTURES

N. KAMENECKAITĖ

Structural units composed of a verb and a postpositive, irrespective of whether it is an adverb or a preposition[1], occupy a significant place in the vocabulary of Modern English and even constitute one of its typical features. They have been objects of numerous investigations chiefly dealing with the interpretation of the phrasal verb as a lexical structure and the semantic peculiarities of the whole unit in relation to its parts[2]. The object of the present paper is to analyse phrasal verb synonymy and identity in relation to the compositional peculiarities of the phrasal verb.

The phrasal verb has synonyms among lexical units of each vocabulary level: the word (come in — enter), the free word combination (even up — make even), the non-idiomatic phraseological word combination (end off — come to an end) and the idiomatic word combination (be dressed up — be dressed up to the nines). Its own lexico-semantic structure representing every unit except the words the phrasal verb has numerous synonyms of a homogeneous kind (i. e., phrasal verb — phrasal verb) on each level: draw out — pull out (free w. c.), speak up — speak out (non--idiomatic w. c.], die away — die down [idiomatic w. c.].

A study of 4 lexicographical works[3] and a large number of books of fiction permitted us to compile 300 semantically related groups, which

---

[1] Further they will be referred to by the term "phrasal verb".

[2] С. Е. Гурский, Глагольно-наречные сочетания в современном английском языке, Автореферат канд. дисс., Львов, 1962; А. А. Керлин, Составные глаголы в современном английском языке, Москва, 1959; Ю. А. Жлуктенко, Постпозитивные глагольные приставки в современном английском языке, Канд. дисс., Киев, 1953; С. Б. Берлизон, Глагольно-наречные сочетания и их роль в обогащении словарного состава современного английского языка, Канд. дисс., Москва, 1955; J. C. Nesfield, English Grammar Past and Present, London, 1939; B. A. Ilyish, The Structure of Modern English, M. — L., 1965, etc.

[3] The Concise Oxford Dictionary, Fourth Ed., 1956; The Consolidated — Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary, Chicago, 1961; The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, London, 1963; S. Berlizon, English Verbal Collocations, Moscow—Leningrad, 1964.

embrace approximately 800 phrasal verbs. These 800 units are composed of 220 verbs and 26 postpositives.

The corresponding components of a pair of semantically related phrasal verbs stand in relations of either identity, synonymity or dissimilarity. However that may be, in each pair of semantically related phrasal verbs one component is necessarily identical, the general scheme being made up of the following 4 patterns: 1) id. v.+syn. p.; 2) id. v.+dis. p.; 3) syn. v.+id. p.; 4) dis. v.+id. p.

This peculiar variety suggested an investigation of the following questions: Are the semantic relations between pairs of phrasal verbs uniform? If not, can the different types of semantic relations be distinguished by the structural pattern of a pair? What is the role of the identical component in the semantic relations of such pairs? Is the role of the identical verbal components the same as that of the identical postpositives?

These questions were studied separately on each vocabulary level.

A. Determining Factors of Semantic Relations Between Phrasal Verbs Representing Free Word Combinations

In free word combinations each component of the phrasal verb displays its lexical meaning to the full and is independent of the other. This predetermines the possible structure of semantically related pairs, limiting it to patterns made up exclusively of semantically related components:

1) id. v.+syn. p.
2) syn. v+id. p.

Pairs of the first pattern are not numerous because there are few synonyms among the postpositives with which verbs form structures of this kind. Among the most frequent examples are go off — go away, walk off — walk away, run off — run away, etc. In some contexts such pairs can be used interchangeably without introducing any alteration whatever in the meaning of the sentence, as in the following illustrations[4]:

> She still waited until, seeing that Annie wouldn't speak, she turned with her head high in the air, and *walked away*. (Cronin).
> Then they both turned and *walked off*. (Cronin)
> Or:

---

[4] All illustrations are taken from "Semantic Relations of Phrasal Verbs in Modern English", Diploma paper by L. Butkūnaitè, Vilnius V. Kapsukas State University, Department of English Philology, Vilnius, 1967.

She had *gone away* several years before, saying she was going to work in a cotton mill across the river from Augusta. (Caldwell)

"Even the children has got more sense than you has — didn't they *go off* and work in the mills as soon as they was big enough?" (Caldwell)

There are, however, contexts in which each phrasal verb connotes a distinctive shade of meaning. E. g.: "go off" connotes betrayal, letting somebody down by leaving him, whereas "go away" merely states the fact of leaving.

"Do you think I could *go off* and leave Melanie and the baby, even if I hated them both?" (Mitchell)

He was *going away* by aircraft and he wanted certain things of me... (Steinbeck)

From the illustrations it is evident that the pairs of phrasal verbs stand in synonymic relations.

Considerably more numerous are pairs of phrasal verbs made up according to the second pattern, the reason lying in the rich synonymy of English verbs. Among the most frequent examples are go in — walk in, go out — walk out, go away — walk away, come in — walk in, come out — walk out, put down — lay down— set down, draw out — pull out, etc. Such pairs can be used interchangeably without affecting the meaning of the sentence:

"*Go in* and tell them I'm coming", he said ...

Emma knocked at the door and *walked in*. (Maugham)

He had walked past the doorway of his own store without *going in*. (Steinbeck)

Or:

"*Put down* that tray and come and lace me tighter!" (Mitchell)

She carried the tray to the long table and *set* it *down* next to ... the books. ("Woman", July 16, 1966)

In other contexts, however, these phrasal verbs connote nice shades of meaning and style constituting distinctive features of synonyms:

"...he was operated on this morning. How can we *walk in* and say, "Your wife is dead'?" (Miller)

Andrew *laid down* the letter. (Cronin)

In the first example "walk in" has a colloquial colouring that "go in" does not possess, and in the second "lay down" connotes placing down in a horizontal position — a shade not accentuated in the comprehensive meaning "put down".

Theoretically, among free word combinations there could be semantically related pairs of phrasal verbs, composed of synonymous verbs and synonymous postpositives. Such phrasal verbs were found to be dissimilar in meaning (compare: pull out — draw off, go off — walk away, walk off — go away).

Thus, semantically related phrasal verbs representing free word combinations stand in only one type of semantic relations — synonymity, which functions in two structural patterns, where componental identity combines with componental synonymy. Componental identity, irrespective of which component it comprises, has no influence upon componental synonymy.

B. Determining Factors Of Semantic Relations Between Phrasal Verbs Representing Non-Idiomatic Phraseological Word Combinations

The term is applied to word combinations whose components stand in relations of a certain dependence: the verbal component acting in its nominative meaning performs the function of semantic centre; the postpositive acting in its phraseologically bound meaning appears as a partially desemantized word and thus is dependent on the nominative meaning of the verb. The meaning of the entire word combination consists of both: the nominative meaning of the verb and the phraseologically bound meaning of the postpositive.

If the corresponding components of phrasal verbs representing free word combinations stand in relations of either identity or synonymity, the range of semantic relations between the corresponding components of non-idiomatic phrasal verbs is wider. Pairs of such phrasal verbs are built according to 4 patterns:

1) id. v+syn. p. (hide out — hide away)
2) id. v.+d. p. (drink up — drink down — drink off)
3) syn. v.+id. p. (talk on — rattle on — prattle on)
4) d. v.+id. p. (tidy up — clean up)

In these patterns the corresponding components stand not only in relations of identity and synonymity, but also in relations of dissimilarity, even to the degree of antonymy. This, as well as the fact that semantically related non-idiomatic phrasal verbs by far surpass the number of free word combinations, can be explained by the desemantization of the postpositive which constitutes the nature of the non-idiomatic phrasal verb. A synchronic study of postpositives in non-idiomatic phrasal verbs has revealed

that their desemantization is not equal in degree: some have lost so much of their lexical meaning that it is no longer palpable, whereas others have clearly retained a part of it. It is the degree to which the postpositive has lost its lexical meaning and not the semantic relations of the postpositives that proves to be the determining factor of the semantic relations between non-idiomatic phrasal verbs. Both sides of the process of desemantization tell upon the degree of semantic similarity existing between a pair of phrasal verbs: loss of meaning may lead to their semantic equivalence, partial retention — to synonymity. Therefore, it is relevant to proceed treating the material from this point, beginning with pairs composed of id. v. and postpositives desemantized in a high degree.

In the pairs "hide away" — "hide out" the postpositives are lexical synonyms. In the pairs "slow up" — "slow down", "drink up" — "drink down" the postpositives are antonyms. Yet so desemantized is the lexical meaning of the antonymous words that the latter pairs of phrasal verbs, just as the former pairs, have become semantic equivalents. E. g.:

Some day when she was rich and her money was *hidden away* where the Yankees could not find it   she would tell them exactly what she thought of them. (Mitchell)

Everybody   believes he's got millions of dollars   *hid out* somewhere. (Mitchell)

"And it'll be somewhere to *hide out* till Ma has gone to bed"" (Mitchell)

"The spring-time ain't going to let you fool it by *hiding away* inside a durn cotton mill" (Caldwell)

The illustrations show that "hide out" and "hide away" are used interchangeably with identical meaning. The same holds true for "slow up"—"slow down", "drink up" — "drink down":

Several automobiles passed them at high speed   but none of them *slowed up* or s t o p p e d to offer help. (Caldwell)

The car *slowed down,* s t o p p e d   (Christie)

Phyl *drank up* the hot coffee.   (Lindsay)

I *drank* it *down* like beer and felt its dry heat   (Steinbeck)

Thus, the postpositive's loss of meaning in combination with verbal identity results in non-idiomatic phrasal verb equivalence.

A greater number of postpositives, however, have lost their lexical meaning to a lesser degree. They have retained enough for it to transpire through their phraseologically bound meanings. E. g.: In the phrasal verb "clean out" the postpositive has retained so much of its lexical meaning that this phrasal verb characterizes the process of cleaning as "removing

dirt, rubbish etc." and in this way distinguishes it from merely "putting things in order" — the leading seme in the meaning of "clean up"

It's time you *cleaned out* the stable (Hornby)[5].

I slid down into the boat and *cleaned out* the frying-pan with a stick of wood and a tuft of grass. (Jerome K. Jerome)

The phrasal verb "clean up" has a wider meaning, which embraces the meaning of "clean out"; it can connote cleaning by means of dusting, tidying up, putting things in order and so on, because its postpositive appears as a highly desemantized word.

He washed, dressed, folded his blanket and *cleaned up* the cell. (Cronin)

"I'll *clean up* the mess after I've buried him."

"I'll do it with one of the rugs", whispered Melanie, looking at the pool of blood with a sick face. (Mitchell)

In the pair "think out" —"think over" both postpositives appear to have undergone a small degree of desemantization and part of their lexical meaning is palpable in the meaning of the corresponding phrasal verbs. As a result "think out" connotes hard and careful thinking, whereas "think over" connotes reconsideration, giving one's mind once again to a certain question:

However ... she t o o k a l o t o f t r o u b l e in *thinking out* a name for the survivor. (Cronin)

"If you had any sense you'd have married Stuart or Brent Tarleton long ago. *Think* it *over,* daughter!" (Mitchell)

In the case of "hand in"—"hand over" it is due to the still palpable connotations of the postpositives that the first phrasal verb connotes direct delivery without anybody's mediation, whereas the second connotes delivery possible through mediation:

They were told to *hand in* their arms and go home (Aldridge*)[6].

The telegram had been *handed in*   by a small boy. (Christie).

"...I'll take the money and *hand* it *over* to him." (Steinbeck)

I put it (the telegram — N. K.) in my pocket. Ordinarily I should have *handed* it *over*. (Hemingway)

In the above illustrations the corresponding phrasal verbs cannot always be used interchangeably with identical meaning and therefore appear not as semantic equivalents but as synonyms.

---

[5] A. S. H o r n b y, E. V. G a t e n b y, H. W a k e f i e l d, The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, London, 1963.

[6] The sign * indicates that the illustration is taken from S. B e r l i z o n, English Verbal Collocations, M.—L., 1964.

Thus non-idiomatic phrasal verbs with the pattern id. v. +d. p. stand in two types of relations: equivalence and synonymity. Verbal identity is the determining factor of semantic similarity between the pairs but the degree of this similarity is determined by the degree of the postpositive's desemantization, irrespective of whether the postpositives are synonymous or dissimilar in their nominative meaning. In combination with identical verbs, loss of the postpositive's meaning generates phrasal verb equivalence; partial retention of the postpositive's lexical meaning generates phrasal verb synonymy.

Identical postpositives, like identical verbs, combine with synonymous and dissimilar verbs. However, as will be shown, the role of the identical postpositives is different from that of the identical verbs.

Numerically combinations of id. p. with synonymous verbs surpass combinations with dissimilar verbs. Only a small number of postpositives (6) act as components in phrasal verbs of the first pattern. The most "productive" of these six are "up" and "out". The meaning of the postpositives being phraseologically bound, its degree of desemantization varies from combination to combination. E. g.: in "tie up" the postpositive has lost very much of its lexical meaning; in "stay up" it has lost considerably less, just as has the postpositive "over" in "go over" and "walk over", where its lexical meaning is still felt clearly. However in patterns of id. p.+syn. v. the degree of the postpositive's desemantization is of no significance because here, as in the case of free word combinations, the difference between the phrasal verbs depends entirely upon the distinctive connotations of the synonymous verbs, since they are semantic centres and act in their nominative meaning. The identic postpositives determine relations of semantic similarity between the phrasal verbs, but the degree of this similarity is determined by the factor of verbal synonymity. In combinations of this kind the role of the postpositive is more grammatical — it endows the phrasal verb with a certain aspective meaning. E. g.: "call out" — "cry out" — "shout out" — "scream out" are synonyms agreeing in the meaning "utter in a loud voice, exclaim". They all have an equally terminative meaning imparted by the postpositive "out" The connotations distinguishing the verbs remain the distinctive connotations of the corresponding phrasal verbs: "cry out", just as "to cry", differs from "call out", just as "to call", by its connotation of "loudness on particular occasions":

He *called out* each name three times. (Cronin)

"Oh, I can't", she *cried out,* breaking away from him. (Maugham)

"Shout out", just as "to shout", has a distinguishing connotation "call loudly in order to give an alm or draw attention":

And Chenkin pointed to the stain on the boards   and *shouted out:* "ave a look at that, blood!" (Cronin)

"Scream out", like "to scream", means "to utter a shrill, piercing cry in pain, fear or anxiety":

the boy, weak, infuriated like a child teased by its elders, *screamed out:* "Put me down, damn you!.." (Mitchell)

The same holds true for all pairs of phrasal verbs composed of synonymous verbs and identical postpositives, as tire out — fag out, bind up — tie up, talk on — rattle on — prattle on, catch up — snatch up, strike out — hit out, heap up — pile up, warm up — heat up, end up — finish up, etc., etc.

In combinations of identical postpositives with dissimilar verbs the case is different. The general role of the identical postpositives, like the role of the identical verbs, lies in building synonymical means of expression, consisting of non-synonymous components. In comparison with the identical verbs, the role of the identical postpositives is smaller. The identical verbs draw together words as dissimilar as antonyms. The identical postpositives draw together only conditionally dissimilar verbs, dissimilar in so far as they are not synonyms, but words of one semantic sphere or group, as to clean — to tidy, to stay — to wait, to rub — to polish, etc.

Noteworthy also is the fact that the postpositive appears to have lost its meaning to a small degree if not in both, at least in one member of each pair of phrasal verbs. There has not been found a single instance where the postpositive appears highly desemantized in both members of a pair. This constitutes a peculiarity of non-idiomatic phrasal verb synonymy. The phraseologically bound meanings of the postpositives neutralize the distinctions between the dissimilar verbs, thus turning the phrasal verbs into synonyms.

If in a pair of phrasal verbs one postpositive is highly desemantized, it does not impair the influence of the other postpositive, the lexical meaning of which is palpable. If both postpositives appeared as highly desemantized words, there would not be any semantic unit strong enough to draw together dissimilar verbs by neutralizing their distinctions. That is the reason why within the pattern d. v.+id. p. the id. p. cannot be desemantized to a high degree in both members of a pair. Hence, desemantization once more appears as a factor determining phrasal verb synonymy, yet determining it differently than in the pattern id. v.+d. p. Loss of meaning in combination with verbal identity generated equivalence of phrasal verbs;

loss of meaning in combination with verbal dissimilarity destroys synonymy, whereas partial retention of meaning generates synonymy. Examples:

In the pair "stay up" —"wait up" both postpositives have retained a part of their lexical meaning. Neither "stay up" and "to stay", nor "wait up" and "to wait" are identical in meaning. The phrasal verbs have additional connotations in comparison with the verbs:

"Don't let anyone trouble to *stay up* for me. I shall be late, I expect. (Cronin)

"I won't *wait up,* I'm sleepy", she said. (Steinbeck)

Agreeing in the meaning "be, keep, remain at a place, in a position or condition when it is time to go to bed", the above mentioned phrasal verbs appear as synonyms, their distinctions being constituted by the leading semes of the verbal components: "stay up" emphasizes the fact of remaining at a place, in a position etc., "wait up" — the fact of waiting for somebody.

In the pairs "tidy up" — "clean up" or "rub up" — "polish up" the postpositives have retained a part of their lexical meaning only in one member of each pair. "Tidy up" and "to tidy", as well as "polish up" and "to polish", are identical in meaning. The fact that the postpositives turn these verbs of dual aspective character into terminative word combinations is here irrelevant. "Clean up" and "rub up" are not identical in meaning with "to clean" and "to rub". The phrasal verbs have a wider meaning: "clean up" connotes "make clean or tidy or put in order", "rub up" connotes "polish, make something smooth by rubbing"

Jennie *tidied up,* made all the beds. (Cronin)

You should always *clean up* after a picnic. (Hornby)

The ornaments on the mantelshelf were *polished up.* (Greenwood*)

I cleaned out the frying pan *polishing* it *up* finally with George's wet shirt. (Jerome K. Jerome)

My first aim will be to clean down Moor House ..., my next to *rub* it *up* with bees' wax, oil and an infinite number of cloths, till it glitters again. (Brontë*)

These examples again prove that identity of the postpositives and partial retention of their meanings generate phrasal verb synonymy, the leading semes of the dissimilar verbs constituting the distinctive connotations of the synonyms: "rub up" accentuates intense rubbing, polish up — lustre as its result.

Thus between non-idiomatic phrasal verbs there are two types of semantic relations — synonymity and equivalence. These relations are caused

and determined by componental identity and desemantization. The former conditions semantic similarity, the latter — its degree.

Componental identity is not alike in semantic power, the verb playing a greater role in this respect: under the influence of the identical verbs distinctions between words dissimilar to the degree of antonymy are neutralized, whereas under the influence of the identical postpositives are neutralized distinctions only among words that belong to the same semantic group, but are not wholly dissimilar.

In combination with verbal indentity loss of the postpositive's meaning results in phrasal verb semantic equivalence, whereas retention of the postpositive's meaning results in phrasal verb synonymy.

In combination with verbal dissimilarity retention of meaning in the identical postpositives brings about phrasal verb synonymy, whereas loss of their meanings destroys synonymy.

Semantically equivalent phrasal verbs can be distinguished by the pattern id. v.+p. desemantized in a high degree.

C. Determining Factors of Semantic Relations
Between Idiomatic Phrasal Verbs

The term is applied to phrasal verbs that have a clearly motivated metaphoric meaning which is the result of a blend of the meanings of the components. If in non-idiomatic combinations the verb appears in its nominative meaning, so in idiomatic word combinations it cannot be detached from the meaning of the postpositive. E. g.: the notion "to conceal" is expressed by the verb to wrap only in a metaphoric combination with the postpositive up.

Semantically related idiomatic phrasal verbs are rather numerous and, contrary to free and non-idiomatic phrasal verbs, are made up of a large number of verbs. Very few of these verbs appear as components in more than two pairs of phrasal verbs, the majority appearing only in one pair.

Pairs of idiomatic phrasal verbs are composed according to the same 4 patterns as the non-idiomatic (id. v.+syn. p., id. v.+d. p., syn. v.+id. p., d.v.+id. p.). Though the semantic relations between idiomatic phrasal verbs ought to be studied on the basis of the whole word combination, not its parts, the clear motivation of these metaphors renders it possible and even relevant to treat them as previously, from the point of componental identity, synonymity and dissimilarity.

The role of the identic components in idiomatic phrasal verb pairs is different from what it was in non-idiomatic pairs. Here, in combination with verbal identity, synonymous postpositives do not lose their distinctions and do not turn the corresponding phrasal verbs into semantic equivalents. Pairs of phrasal verbs composed of id. v.+syn. p. not only remain synonyms, but their synonymy acquires distinctions not peculiar to the postpositives when they are lexical synonyms. For example, the idiomatic phrasal verbs clear off — clear out have a number of distinguishing connotations: one clears out to evade some work, responsibility and so on, or because of some reason which does not permit one to stay at a place any longer:

"If you're too busy say so and I'll *clear out*." (Cronin)

"Why should that blasted Lewis *clear out* and leave us to do the work?" (Cronin)

"Clear off" is usually used imperatively and applied to unwanted, undesirable persons. One clears off because his leaving is demanded:

We don't give money to beggars. *Clear off!* (Hornby)

As is typical of synonyms, "clear out" — "clear off" can be used interchangeably in some contexts and cannot be used so in other contexts. Yet "clear off" always has a colloquial colouring, whereas "clear out" is literary-colloquial. These stylistic distinctions are not peculiar to the synonyms out — off. Such is the nature of the idiomatic word combination — it can acquire stylistic features that its components do not possess in their nominative meanings.

The distinctions between idiomatic phrasal verbs composed of id. v.+ +syn. p. can be purely semantic. E. g., "go ahead" — "go forward" are only ideographic synonyms. "Go ahead" has a comprehensive meaning embracing such shades as "make an important decision", "come to a conclusion", "do something after a period of hesitation or mistakes", "take a new step towards carrying out a certain plan, one's aim" Only human beings are agents of these actions:

If Jeeter said it would be satisfactory to tie Pearl in bed, then he would *go ahead* and do it. (Caldwell)

He hoped to God that David would pull himself out of it soon, *go ahead* and make a name for himself, do something real   (Cronin)

He had reached the point now where he wanted Jeeter's advice before *going ahead* with the plan. (Caldwell)

"Go forward" implies a gradual, persistent progress, physical or mental, as if overcoming certain difficulties, what is manifest in the results. The agents need not be only human beings:

the work *went forward* night and day. (Mitchell)

as Scarlett settled the heavy basket across her arm, she had settled her own mind and her own life. There was no going back and she was *going forward*. (Mitchell)

Hence, the role of the identical verbal components in combination with synonymic postpositives does not go beyond generating synonymous phrasal verbs.

In combinations of id. v. + dissimilar postpositives, the role of the identical verbs is the same as it was in non-idiomatic phrasal verbs, when id. v. combined with dissimilar postpositives desemantized to a small degree: under the influence of verbal identity dissimilar postpositives undergo a shift of meaning towards closeness and thus form synonymous means of expression. Due to the clear motivation of the idiomatic phrasal verb, the meanings of the postpositives are palpable. E. g.: "die away" — "die down" agree in the meaning "lose strength, become less" "Die away" connotes "become gradually less distinc or perceptible to sight, hearing or smell until something fades or altogether disappears":

The scent of that afternoon had never *died away*. (Galsworthy*)

When the last sound of wheels and hooves *died away,* Scarlett went into Ellen's office (Mitchell)

In contrast to "die away", "die down" connotes only "to grow less, become weak gradually":

My hopes began to *die down*. (Christie)

...the clamour about him seemed to *die down* to a very faraway whisper. (Kipling*)

The postpositives "away" and "down" are dissimilar in their nominative meanings, yet in the given phrasal verbs their role is not different from that of "out" — "off", which are synonyms.

Thus, in pairs of idiomatic phrasal verbs, the influence of the identical verbs does not go beyond generating synonyms, whereas in non-idiomatic pairs it generated semantic equivalents as well. Verbal identity has no power to neutralize the distinctions existing between lexical synonyms.

In idiomatic phrasal verbs it is the identical postpositives that play the greater role. When identical postpositives combine with verbs that are ideographic synonyms in their nominative meaning, the latter tend to lose their peculiar distinctions and the corresponding phrasal verbs become equivalent in meaning. E. g.: "to drop" and "to fall" are ideographic synonyms, but the phrasal verbs to drop off and to fall off are semantic equivalents:

Visitors had *fallen off* to nothing this last week. (Mitchell)

(Many patients)... had consulted Doctor Foy in the past but had gradually *dropped off*.   (Cronin)

His friends *fell off* one by one. (Hornby)

"Fall off" — "drop off" are used interchangeably without any distinguishing connotations.

The verbal components, however, can be synonyms with stylistic distinctions. In that case the corresponding phrasal verbs do not become semantic equivalents· They acquire stylistic and often semantic distinctions. E. g.: the verb to summon has a literary colouring, whereas its synonym to call is neutral in style. The phrasal verbs to call up— to summon up are synonyms with semantic and stylistic distinctions: "call up" means "recall, bring back to the mind usually involuntarily, by means of some associations":

But to Philip her words *called* up much more romantic fancies. (Maugham)

They very tones of his voice *called up* other days... (Mitchell)

If the agents are human beings the action is voluntary:

you shouldn't *call up* old memories that might be painful to him. (Maugham)

Due to the literary colouring of its verbal component "summon up" is narrower in meaning — it connotes only purposeful recalling usually of pleasant things. The agents are only human beings:

...can one ever remember love? It's like trying to *summon up* the smell of roses in a cellar. (Miller)

Hence, under the influence of identical postpositives, verbs that are ideographic synonyms lose their distinctions; as a result, the corresponding phrasal verbs become semantic equivalents, which does not happen under the influence of identical verbs (when they combine with synonymous postpositives).

In pairs of idiomatic phrasal verbs identical postpositives combine with quite dissimilar verbs, as well as with verbs that belong to the same semantic group (but are not synonyms), as to go — to pass, to come — to run, to look — to see, etc. This fact, however, holds no significance, for in all cases the identical postpositives exercise a similar influence upon the verbs, causing a shift in their meaning towards closeness, which results in phrasal verb synonymy. E. g., to look — to see are verbs of the same semantic sphere. The phrasal verbs look to — see to agree in the meaning of "take care of":

The country must *look to* its defences. (Hornby)

Look to your manners, my boy. (Hornby)

This machine is out of order, will you *see* to it, please. (Hornby)

Then she went back home to *see* to her baby. (Cronin)

In spite of their interchangeability in many contexts, each phrasal verb has distinguishing connotations. "Look to" connotes "keep watch over something usually in order to improve it"; "see to" connotes "employ certain means or give certain instructions to achieve certain results".

Among the verbs to drop — to look — to run — to pop there is no semantic similarity. Yet in combinations with the postpositive "in" they form a group of synonymous phrasal verbs which agree in the meaning "pay a short visit". Each has a distinguishing connotation: "Drop in" connotes a casual, short visit as that of an arrival or newcomer:

"I'm staying the week-end out at Montank. Thought I'd *drop in*" (Steinbeck)

"I'll *drop in* to see you when I'm in the district." (Steinbeck)

"Look in" connotes a purposeful, intentional visit:

"Stoney, I wish you'd *look in* on Danny Taylor. He looks awful sick". (Steinbeck)

"Run in" connotes shortness or hastiness:

I'll *run in* and see you this evening. (Hornby)

"Pop in", being colloquial, expresses the least formal visit:

"Just let me *pop in* to leave my things." (Cronin)

Thus it is evident that pairs of idiomatic phrasal verbs stand in two types of semantic relations — equivalence and synonymity, which can be distinguished by the structural patterns of the pairs (equivalents have the pattern syn. v.+id. p.). These relations are caused and determined by the factor of componental identity. However the identical components are not equal in semantic power: the postpositives exercise a greater influence than the verbs, for under the influence of identical postpositives synonymous verbs lose their peculiar distinctions what results in idiomatic phrasal verb equivalence. Verbal identity does not go beyond generating idiomatic phrasal verb synonymy.

The above investigation permits the following conclusions:

1) Phrasal verbs as a structural unit stand in semantic relations of two types — synonymity and equivalence, both representing different degrees of semantic similarity.

2) On each vocabulary level semantic similarity and its degree find expression in patterns of semantic relations existing between the corresponding components of a pair of phrasal verbs.

3) The determining factor of phrasal verb similarity on all vocabulary levels is componental identity. The degree of semantic similarity on each vocabulary level is determined by the influence or the semantic power that each identical component exerts:

a) on the level of free word combinations the verb and the postpositive are equal in semantic power, and identity of either component results in phrasal verb synonymy;

b) on the level of non-idiomatic phrasal verbs the verbal component surpasses the postpositive in semantic power: in certain patterns verbal identity leads to phrasal verb equivalence, whereas identity of postpositives leads only to synonymy;

c) on the level of idiomatic phrasal verbs it is the postpositive that surpasses the verb in semantic power: identity of postpositives in certain patterns results in phrasal verb equivalence, whereas verbal identity results only in phrasal verb synonymy.

FICTION QUOTED

E. C a l d w e l l, Tobacco Road, New York, 1958.
A. C h r i s t i e, Poirot Investigates, London, 1957; Three Act Tragedy, Glasgow, 1962.
A. J. C r o n i n, The Citadel, Moscow, 1963; The Stars Look Down, London, 1965.
E. H e m i n g w a y, Fiesta, Penguin Books, London.
J. K. J e r o m e, Three Men in a Boat, Moscow, 1964.
J. L i n d s a y, Betrayed Spring, Moscow, 1955.
W. S. M a u g h a m, Cakes And Ale, London, 1963; Of Human Bondage, London, 1963.
A. M i l l e r, After the Fall, London, 1965.
M. M i t c h e l l, Gone with the Wind, London, 1939.
J. S t e i n b e c k, The Winter of Our Discontent, New York, 1964.

ФАКТОРЫ, ОПРЕДЕЛЯЮЩИЕ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ МЕЖДУ СТРУКТУРАМИ ГЛАГОЛ + ПОСТПОЗИТИВ

Н. К А М Е Н Е Ц К А Й Т Е

Резюме

В современном английском языке имеется не менее 300 пар фразовых глаголов, обладающих семантической общностью. Цель статьи — показать степень семантической общности и факторы, определяющие ее на каждом отдельном лексическом уровне. Между фра-

зовыми глаголами существуют синонимия и семантическая эквивалентность. Степень семантической общности на каждом лексическом уровне находит свое выражение в моделях семантических отношений, существующих между соответствующими компонентами пары фразовых глаголов. Определяющим фактором семантической общности на всех уровнях является идентичность одного компонента в составе каждой пары. Степень семантической общности на каждом лексическом уровне определяется семантическим весом каждого идентичного компонента: на уровне свободного словосочетания глагол и постпозитив обладают равным весом, и идентичность любого из них порождает синонимию фразовых глаголов; на уровне неидиоматичного словосочетания глагольный компонент превосходит постпозитив в семантическом весе: идентичность глаголов порождает в определенных моделях эквивалентность фразовых глаголов, в то время как идентичность постпозитивов — только синонимию; на уровне идиоматичного словосочетания постпозитив обладает бо́льшим весом, чем глагол: идентичность постпозитивов в определенных моделях порождает эквивалентность фразовых глаголов, а идентичность глаголов — только синонимию.