

# PHRASAL VERBS AND ASSOCIATED FORMS IN SHAKESPEARE

N. F. Blake

*University of Sheffield*

This paper focuses on three aspects of phrasal verbs. Firstly, to what extent examples of phrasal verbs and associated forms in Shakespeare's works provide evidence for how phrasal verbs could have arisen and developed in English.<sup>1</sup> It is suggested that there were enough internal developments in the language to indicate that there is no need to look to other languages to explain the origin of phrasal verbs in English. Secondly, there is a discussion of what makes up a phrasal verb is, but accepts that their nature in Early Modern English is much more flexible than today. Finally, it offers some examples of how Shakespeare exploited this new development in the language and some of its benefits compared with forms consisting of prefix + stem.

Current scholarship on phrasal verbs is characterised by two features: firstly, the bulk of the work deals, naturally enough, with Present Day English (PDE) and, secondly, they are treated in isolation, for associated forms are hardly mentioned in the scholarship. By associated forms I mean the extension of phrasal verbs to form adjectives or nouns, so that *to sit in* gives a noun *a sit-in* and participial adjectives like *a sitting-in strategy*. Historically the first phrasal verbs appeared in English after the Norman Conquest, though they remained relatively scarce until the fifteenth century that are found in any number. Phrasal verbs are colloquial in nature. In view of their growth from the fifteenth century and their link with a colloquial register, they not unnaturally occur frequently in Shakespeare's works. In addition to their rhetorical exuberance, his plays create a sense of ordinary conversation in which phrasal verbs are at home. But they also occur in Shakespeare's poems, especially the Sonnets, in which compression and adaptability are important. However, little has been published on the phrasal verb in Shakespeare or his contemporaries.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper Shakespearian quotations are from the appropriate Quarto or First Folio, but the lineation is keyed to Wells & Taylor 1988, except *Hamlet* Q1 is keyed to Irace 1998. The following abbreviations are used: AW *All's Well that Ends Well*, Cor *Coriolanus*, Cym *Cymbeline*, Ham *Hamlet*, H8 *King Henry VIII*, HL *History of King Lear*, KJ *King John*, KL *Tragedy of King Lear*, MN *Midsummer Night's Dream*, MV *Merchant of Venice*, MW *Merry Wives of Windsor*, RJ *Romeo and Juliet*, R3 *King Richard III*, Tem *The Tempest*, TG *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 1/2H4 *King Henry IV Part One/Two*, 1/2/3H6 *Henry VI Part One/Two/Three*.

Denison (1985) reviewed the various possible explanations for the rise of the phrasal verb, using completive *up* as his anchor. He highlighted the inherent weakness of prefix marking in English, and the way phrasal verbs echo the structure of verb + adjective in such examples as *to look black*, a form also popularised in Early Modern English (EME). The role of *up* in its completive sense, as in *to drink up* compared with *to drink*, may have been the catalyst which encouraged the formation of phrasal verbs at that time. He considers the influence of Old Norse, a language with a significant impact on English, and although the rise of the phrasal verb in Middle English may result from the influence of Old Norse, the evidence to prove this is lacking.

The only work devoted to phrasal verbs in Shakespeare is an article by Concha Castillo (1994). This syntactic study is devoted to the ordering of the verb and particle elements within the overall sentence structure. However, the study is restricted to the old canonical 37 plays. Some plays now considered part of the canon, such as *Edward III*, and all the poems are excluded. Equally it is not clear which texts Castillo worked from, but I assume from the quotations that it was a modern edition. This means that only one version of a play is examined for the data so that, for example, the two quarto versions of *Hamlet* are not considered. When she notes that the corpus of Shakespearian phrasal verbs "amounts to 5744, although from a semantic point of view —i.e. combinations with distinct meanings— this number is reduced to 1855" (439), the number 5744 cannot be a true reflection of Shakespeare's total use of phrasal verbs. Equally given that some texts are excluded from the count and since there is no definition of what is meant by "combinations with distinct meanings", 1855 for the total number of types used by Shakespeare can be no more than approximate.

From this brief survey several points emerge which could benefit from further consideration: can Shakespeare's use of phrasal verbs help to shed any light on their origin and development; can we decide from his work what we might include within the category of phrasal verb; and why did he use so many of them and how did he exploit this additional feature of the language? These points are inter-related, but in what follows I treat them separately.

Phrasal verbs "are often informal, emotive, and slangy, and may often contrast with Latinate verbs", (McArthur 1992: 774); in other words, as noted above, they arise at a colloquial level. Typically they consist of a monosyllabic lexical verb like *put* and the particle like *up* which may be an adverb or a preposition or both. Their origins in colloquial language suggest that we should be cautious about looking for a foreign source for their formation in English and concentrate more on developments within the language itself. While what was happening in the language at Shakespeare's time may not be any guide as to how they arose in English, they should show why they developed and were so popular with Shakespeare, which could be indicative of what happened in earlier periods. This is significant only in the lack of any realistic data about colloquial English in earlier periods; see Blake 1981.

The particle element of the phrasal verb acts as a kind of adverb, although many started life as prepositions. What is noticeable about these particles is that in Shakespeare's language many operate on their own and in this capacity take on the force of a verb, often as if they were imperatives. This can arise when there is repetition which omits some of the first element. In HL sc.11.21 Edgar sings *come ore the broome Bessy to mee.*; but a few lines later the Fool responds *Why she dares not come ouer to thee.* (sc.11.24), leaving *come ouer* as an independent form constituting a phrasal verb. A word like *away* is used independently meaning either "get out of here" or "let's all depart", though other meanings are also possible. It can anticipate a verb form, as in *Away, get thee away:* (KL 4.1.15) or it occurs without any such linguistic prompt. When Hamlet and Laertes wrestle in Ophelia's grave, the First Folio (F) has *Away thy hands.* (Ham 5.1.260), by which Hamlet demands that Laertes remove his hands, presumably from around his neck. Here the adverb *away* has the force of a verb and, somewhat unusually, takes an object. From a grammatical point of view it might be difficult not to classify this form as a verb. Here the Second Quarto (Q2) has *hold off thy hand* emphasising the verb nature of *away*. Naturally, *away* also appears as the particle in a phrasal verb, as when Fortinbras in the First Quarto (Q1) of *Hamlet* commands his troops: *go, march away.* (sc.12.5).

Because of the difference between F and Q2, Ham 5.1.260 is particularly significant in revealing the verb-like force of the adverb, other particles are used in a similar way. In one of his monologues Hamlet says *About my Braine.* (2.2.590). Neither F nor Q1/2 has a comma after *About*, though this is commonly found in modern editions (Wells and Taylor 1988: 669). Editors interpret *About* as "get going, set about it", so the comma which follows it suggests that *my Braine* is a vocative, with Hamlet addressing his own brains. But the earlier example with *away* suggests rather that *my Braine* may be the object of *About* and the clause should be understood as "get my brain going", addressed to himself rather than to his brains.

In scene 3.3 Hamlet comes upon Claudius praying and thinks about killing him there and then, but decides against it because it will enable Claudius to go to heaven in a state of penitence. So he says *Vp Sword,* in F (3.3.88), which again has no comma after in F or Q2, but one usually appears in most modern editions. Here Q1 has a different reading, which has the full phrasal verb rather than simple *up* treated as a verb, for it has *No, get thee vp again.* (sc.10.22). Without the F and Q2 readings, it might be difficult to know to what *thee* referred, but it presumably refers to his sword, but as *get up* is not otherwise attested for sheathing a sword, it may be addressed to Claudius to get off his kneesso that Hamlet can kill him.

Other particles are used independently: Polonius urges Laertes to set sail with: *Aboord, aboard for shame,* (Ham 1.3.55); Mrs Quickly as the Fairy Queen orders her fairies to search Windsor: *About, about: Search Windsor Castle* (MW 5.5.54-5), and the plebeians of Rome stirred up by Antony demand that the conspirators be sought out and killed with: *About, seeke, burne,* (JC 3.2.200), where *about* is joined to two verbs. In these examples both *aboard* and *about* fulfil the same grammatical function as the imperative.

The verb nature of these adverbs also occurs where they are dependent upon a modal verb without any lexical verb being present or even necessarily understood. Thus Parolles says: *Ile about it this euening*, (AW 3.6.74), meaning "I'll tackle it this evening", with *about* meaning "tackle", and the Duke of York says: *What sayes Lord Warwicke, shall we after them?* (2H6 5.5.32), meaning "shall we pursue them?" with *after* having the sense "pursue". Almost all the particles which form the second element of a phrasal verb can be used in both these ways—something found already in Middle English (ME). In the syntactic environments considered so far, the particle element has a definite verb sense which might have encouraged that element to become more prominent so that the lexical verb becomes more like an intensifier to the particle rather than the dominant element. The stress which the adverbs acquired when used alone could easily have been transferred to situations in which they occur as the particle of a phrasal verb, and this may well have encouraged both the development of phrasal verbs and their diversity.

Another feature of Shakespeare's language is the order of the verb and dependent prepositions within relative clauses. Relative clauses showed considerable development in ME with *which* and the paradigm forms of *who* becoming more prominent. Although forms like *wherein* continue strongly in this period, as in *thine owne faire eyes Wherein I see my selfe*. (MV 5.1.242-3), they give way to forms like *in which*, and these in their turn often end up with *which* at the beginning of the clause and the preposition on which it depends at its end. This leads to the following situations: preposition before the relative pronoun, *I cannot tell good sir, for which of his Vertues it was*, (WT 4.3.87-8); preposition and the relative pronoun at the beginning, and the preposition repeated at the end, of the clause, *An eye, at which his foes did tremble at*, (Ham sc.11.26, Q1); the preposition at the end of the clause with the relative pronoun at its beginning as in *To think to the teene that I haue turn'd you to* (*Tempest* 1.2.64); and the preposition at the end with the relative pronoun omitted, *this is the letter he spoke of*, (KL 3.5.10, Q, where F has *which hee spoake of*;) and *That thing you speake of*, (KL 4.5.77).

It is natural that forms like *wherein* should be replaced by *in which* since that reverses the order of the elements to provide an analytic order, though it tends to give *in* less stress. Perhaps to make sure that the elements like *in* received sufficient stress, it was repeated at the end of the sentence, and although it is found in Shakespeare it is not common. The next logical step would be to leave out the first *in* and simply keep the one at the end of the clause, which would then with the lexical verb have most of the characteristics of a phrasal verb. This would then allow particles which had never been prepositions to adopt the same syntactic frame, *that still would manage those authorities that hee hath giuen away*, (HL sc.3.17-18).

Other syntactic features are not dissimilar in their impact. Thus passive forms increased in popularity from the end of ME. When a verb forms the passive, the object of the active clause becomes the subject in the passive one; and if that verb had a prepositional phrase dependent on it then the head of that prepositional phrase becomes the subject of the passive clause leaving the preposition stranded. Thus *We sent for him* becomes *he was sent for*, and that occurs in *KL* 1.1.20-2: *the knaue*

came somewhat saucily into the world before he was sent for, leaving *sent for* with the characteristics of a phrasal verb. Such passive forms are common in Shakespeare's language. Even less common lexical verbs can fall into this pattern, as when Laertes says to Claudius *Ile not be Iuggel'd with* (Ham 4.5.131) referring to the death of his father Polonius. One might understand an active form "You will not juggle with me" to lie behind this passive, but in other examples it is less clear what the active form was, as when Hamlet says *My head shoud be struck off*. (Ham 5.2.26). The agent who would decapitate him is uncertain so that "struck off" seems to be a verbal phrase in its own right.

Finally we might consider the development of verbal nouns or gerunds. These developed in several ways but ended up as formations with the final bound morpheme <-ing> —a morpheme it shared with the present participle which could also act as a verbal adjective. This verbal noun is so called because it retained some of the characteristics of the verb while operating as a noun. In its verb character it could take an object as in *Goe to th'creating a whole tribe of Fops* (KL 1.2.14), where *creating* is clearly a noun because of its determiner *the*. But its noun character is more noticeable when it is followed by *of* rather than by an object, as in *Did my Father strike my Gentleman for chiding of his Foole?* (KL 1.3.1-2). Here *chiding of* operates almost like a noun derived from a phrasal verb *to chide of*, for *of* whether in verbal noun or phrasal verb often adds little to the meaning of the lexical verb. Indeed, some verbal nouns are best interpreted as formed from a phrasal verb because of their structure in the clause. Thus when Guildenstern says *there ha's beene much throwing about of Braines*. (Ham 2.2.359-60), *throwing about* fulfils a noun function and is followed by *of*, but it appears to be derived from the phrasal verb *to throw about*. What is important is that verbal nouns increase in English during ME and EME.

These are all syntactic features which, though illustrated through their use in Shakespeare, are found in earlier periods and could have influenced the development of phrasal verbs. As the language underwent profound changes, these syntactic features may be a guide to the kind of influences which allowed phrasal verbs to multiply, even if they do not necessarily explain how they originated. I would suggest that they do illustrate that phrasal verbs could easily have originated and developed from within the language itself and that it is not necessary to look outside English to explain this development.

The question whether it is possible to determine what constitutes a phrasal verb is difficult and it is probably impossible to provide a definitive answer for EME. Castillo (1994) isolates the following particles as part of phrasal verbs in Shakespeare: "*abed, aboard, about, abroad, across, after, again, aground, aloft, along, aloof, apart, ashore, aside, asunder, away, back, before, behind, by, by and by, down, forth, forward, home, home and home, in, off, on, out, over, overboard, over and over, round, round about, through, through and through, to, together, toward, up, up and down, and upon*" (439). This list immediately raises questions.

There are at least three prepositions which are not in this list, *for*, *from* and *of*, which form phrasal verbs today and which probably did so in Shakespeare's English. Indeed, I have just referred to the passive form *sent for* as a possible phrasal verb and to *of* with verbal nouns which may have been formed from phrasal verbs. There are also examples of *for* which have no obvious noun or pronoun in what might be a prepositional phrase: *more diseases then he knew for*. (2H4 1.2.5) with the sense 'to be aware of', and of others with *for* which appear to have a different meaning from that of the individual parts, such as 'to support, back': *I stand wholly for you*, (MW 3.2.55), which is best understood to mean "I support you wholeheartedly" and has little to do with standing in its normal sense.

The case of *of* is interesting, because it is the word which occurs most frequently in gerundial forms and thus appears to have an embryonic relationship to phrasal verbs. It may be its link with these gerundial forms which results in so many phrasal verbs with *of* not having a meaning which is very different from that of the simple lexical verb. A couple of examples from the Sonnets may help to make this point more tangible. In *Crowning the present, doubting of the rest?* (Sonnet 115.12), *Crowning* and *doubting of* are parallel, for the sense would be the same if the line had read *doubting* without the *of*. Some might want to interpret *of* as a preposition, though this seems incorrect as *doubting* is normally a transitive verb, even if it is not possible to be definitive in this matter. The expression *doubting of* is paralleled later in the same Sonnet, where lines 9-10 have: *Fearing of times tiranie, Might I not then say now*. Once again one has to accept that *Fearing of* has the same sense as *fearing* by itself, for it is not possible to understand *of times tiranie* as a prepositional phrase. The problem is that phrases with or without *of* (as in Sonnet 115) have the same meaning, and does that allow them to be verbal adjectives formed from a phrasal verb? The answer must be yes, because there is no definition of phrasal verbs which states that the phrasal verb must have a different sense from the simple lexical verb. As it happens there are several instances where *doubt* is followed by *of*, where together they act as a phrasal verb, as: *why doubtst thou of my forwardnesse?* (1H6 1.1.100), *I doubt not, Vnckle, of our Victorie*. (3H6 1.2.72), and *I doubt not of his Temperance*. (KL 4.6.22). One might argue that in these cases the *of* forms part of a prepositional phrase and means "concerning". Not only is the resulting sense somewhat stilted, but there are examples where *doubt* by itself takes a direct object in contexts which are little different from those just quoted, *you doe not doubt thy faith Sir?* (H8 2.1.143), *But doubt discovery there*. (Tem 2.1.248), *I doubt some foule play*: (Ham 1.2.255). These examples seem sufficiently alike to those already quoted to suggest that there was no difference in meaning between *doubt of* and *doubt*, and the former is a phrasal verb. However, *fear* appears not to have any forms suggesting a phrasal verb *to fear of*.

In addition to the prepositions not in Castillo's list (1994), there are other adverbs which might be included. The list contains *back* but not *backward*, though it contains both *forth* and *forward*; it has both *up* and *down*, but not *upward* or *downward*. Yet there are good reasons to include at least some of these in any list of Shakespeare's phrasal verbs. There are pairs of verb phrases which appear to have

the same meaning and thus both need to be considered as phrasal verbs. Thus with *fall back* and *fall backward*, the following examples suggest they share the same overall make-up: *wondring eyes Of mortalls that fall backe to gaze on him*, (RJ 2.1.71-2) and *thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit*, (RJ 1.3.44). In both examples the sense is "to fall down on one's back", and both share the same grammatical framework. At least one verbal noun formed on *backward* occurs in Shakespeare's English and that is *goer-backward* in: *would demonstrate them now But goers backward*. (AW 1.2.47-8). The sense is "one whose health is declining", but there is no equivalent phrasal verb *go backward* in Shakespeare, although there is a form *goer-back*, where Imogen says: *where I might pricke The goer backe*. (Cym 1.1.169-70) The sense here is "one who returns or retreats" and is not quite comparable with *goer-backward*, but there is enough correspondence to suggest that both *go back* and *go backward* should be classified as phrasal verbs.

As stated above, it seems that Castillo (1994) collected her data from a modern edition. I have already noted that there are differences between the quartos and F, and this difference extends not only to whether there is a phrasal verb or not, but also to the change in the lexical verb or the particle. Castillo includes *aloft* in her total. One example is *stand aloft* with two senses "to stand to one side" and "to stand on high". The first sense is found once: *hence and stand aloft*, (RJ 5.3.1), when Paris in F sends off his page to approach Juliet's tomb on his own. Q2, however, has a different reading: *hence and stand aloofe*. But *aloof* is not one of the particles listed by Castillo, which is understandable if she has followed a modern edition. But if *stand aloft* is a phrasal verb, then one must accept that *stand aloof* is also a phrasal verb in Shakespeare's work, even if it is not in F.

Though phrasal verbs normally consist of a single lexical verb plus a single particle, there may be reasons for assuming that there could be examples where at least the particle consists of two elements, especially where these are closely linked semantically. In fact, Castillo does not include *out of*, though it contains *round about* as well as forms like *by and by* or *up and down*. The inclusion of these types may be linked to the possible freedom in the ordering of phrasal verbs which she regards as characteristic of phrasal verbs in EME as compared with PDE. This means that *by and by*, for example, might be considered the particle with a phrasal verb not only when it follows the lexical verb either directly: *I will come by and by*. (Ham 3.2.372-3) or with some other words, whether object or not, in between: *Then will I come to my Mother, by and by*: (Ham 3.2.371), and *Ile see you by and by*. (AC 3.11.24), but also when it follows it: (*By and by I come*) (RJ 2.1.195) and *And by and by my Maister drew on him*, (RJ 5.3.283). Even *by and by* follows the verb immediately, there is no direct link between it and the verb, and this is even more so when *by and by* is separated from the verb either because it comes before the verb or other words intervene between it and the verb. There seems to be no separate sense for *by and by* as a phrasal verb. In all the cases quoted it is better to accept that *by and by* is an adverbial, meaning "shortly, presently", and not the particle of phrasal verbs.

Despite this it does seem, as Castillo points out, that there was more flexibility in EME in the ordering of lexical verb and particle than in PDE. It is possible to

place the particle before the verb, though when that happens the particle had even more stress than it would have if it followed the verb directly. A few examples which she quotes may illustrate her contention: *Then slip I from her bum, downe topples she*, (MN 2.1.53), *From me do backe receiue the Flowre of all*, (Cor 1.1.143) and *And forth my Mimmick comes*: (MN 3.2.19). It is possible to imagine that these three examples contain the phrasal verbs *topple down*, *receive back* and *come forth*, although only *topple down* is found in Shakespeare's works as a phrasal verb, though with a different meaning. The example is *topples down Steeples and mossegrovvn towers*. (1H4 3.1.30-1 Q1, where F reads *tombles down*), meaning 'overthrows, destroys'. Are examples like this sufficient to prove that the two parts of a phrasal verb could be separated within a clause? Is the stress on the particle such that it really has an adverbial function rather than acting as a particle of a phrasal verb? Furthermore, when other adverbs precede the verb in their clause, should they also be considered phrasal verbs? This would lead to the situation where any adverb in a clause was part of a phrasal verb. To choose what might seem a loaded example, in *Vncharitably with me haue you dealt*, (R3 1.3.273) few would argue that there is a phrasal verb *to deal uncharitably*, though in principle there seems no reason why one should not claim this status for this expression since it has the same structure as others where the particle precedes the verb. In fact, there is no discussion in her article to justify taking examples like those quoted above as phrasal verbs, and so one must remain somewhat cautious about accepting her claim. Theoretically there may seem no reason why phrasal verbs should not be split up in this way, but practically it could cause difficulties in determining what was a phrasal verb. In *Out of your grace, devise, ordaine, impose Some gentle order*, (KJ 3.1.176-7), one might ask whether *out* forms a phrasal verb with any of the verbs in the line, *devise*, *ordain* and *impose*; and the answer would surely be no, for we would take *out of* as a single unit.

The question whether the particle can precede the lexical verb raises another interesting problem, namely how can one tell, if the particle immediately precedes the verb, whether the particle is actually part of a phrasal verb or whether it forms the prefix of the lexical verb. In F Iago complains about Othello's treatment of him and how Othello had ignored representations by three important Venetians:

Three Great-ones of the Cittie,  
(In personall suite to make me his Lieutenant)  
Off-capt to him: (1.1.8-10).

In Q1 the passage appears as:

Three great ones of the City  
In personall suite to make me his Lieutenant,  
Oft capt to him,

Editors choose one reading or the other, but I am more interested in how the misreading (if it is such) arose. If the particle of a phrasal verb can precede the lexical verb, it may be that the compositor of F misunderstood his copytext, which



read *Off capt* (representing a phrasal verb *to cap off* 'to pay court to'), and took it as a single verb (consisting of prefix and lexical verb) and inserted *Off-capt*. This could explain why another compositor using the same copytext misread *Off capt* as *Oft capt* because the phrasal verb was unknown to him. It is noteworthy that in *withholds* (quoted as (1b) below) there is a slight gap between *with* and *holds* so that it could be read either as a phrasal verb or as prefix and lexical verb, as is usually done. There are many verbs with prefixes which could be interpreted in this way, just as there are phrasal verbs with particle before lexical verb which could be interpreted as verbs with prefixes. In

Nay, had I powre, I should  
 Poure the sweet Milke of Concord, into Hell,  
 Vproue the vniuersall peace, (Mac 4.3.98-100)

it would make sense to take *Vproue* as the phrasal verb *up roar* since it would put greater stress on the *up* than otherwise occurs. Indeed, if the particle can precede the lexical verb this might be a further explanation as to how phrasal verbs came to be formed. For with front stress being a feature of English, prefixes would gradually gain more stress and increasingly come to seem like a separate element from the lexical verb itself.

The reverse is also possible, namely that forms which today are interpreted as consisting of the particle followed by the lexical verb might be interpreted as a single verb consisting of prefix and lexical verb. One example quoted by Castillo to illustrate the order particle~verb is: *That downe fell Priest and booke*, (TS 3.3.37). The words *downe* and *fell* are separate in F and it has never been suggested that they form a verb "to downfall", even though not infrequently editors make a single word out of what are two in F. In addition, there is a past participle *downfall* used adjectivally in *I will lift the downfall Mortimer* (1H4 1.3.133, where Q has *down-trod*) and *our downfall birthdom* (Mac 4.3.4), sometimes represented as *downfallen* in modern editions. A past participle suggests that a verb *to downfall* existed, although it does not occur in Shakespeare's English. Shakespeare also uses the noun *downfall* and he could easily have functionally converted this noun into a verb, as he does with so many other nouns. I do not think it can be proved that in this example the two words *down* and *fell* do constitute a single word, but I think it is an option which should be kept in mind. It also highlights the difficulty of trying to decide what constitutes a phrasal verb.

The interpretation of what constitutes a phrasal verb is beset by problems. Modern investigations into phrasal verbs in PDE (Bollinger 1971, Fraser 1976) adopt various tests of what constitutes such a verb, which are difficult to apply to earlier stages of the language, because there are no native speakers to apply the tests to. There was greater flexibility in earlier periods which is reflected in Shakespeare's usage. But this raises the question whether phrasal verbs as such were recognised then for what they were or whether we should accept a transition stage in which the phrasal verb was developing and the boundary of what constituted such a verb was rather more blurred than it is today.

In tackling how Shakespeare used phrasal verbs, we must accept that we cannot be certain that he is responsible for all those which occur through the different texts of his individual works. There are variations between the quartos and F, and often the former have more examples than F. The quartos may have a phrasal verb which is replaced by a lexical verb in F or the quarto and the F may have a different phrasal verb – different in either the lexical verb or the particle. It may be worth considering the quarto of *Richard III* against F to highlight this point, which may provide clues how Shakespeare used these verbs.

- (1) Cases where Q has a single lexical verb and F has a phrasal verb:
  - (1a) 1.3.321 *we will attend your grace.* (Q) — *We wait vpon your Grace.* (F)
  - (1b) 4.5.5 *The feare of that, withholdes my present aide.* (Q) — *The feare of that, holds off my present ayde.* (F)
- (2) Cases where Q has a phrasal verb and F has a single lexical verb:
  - (2a) 1.4.58-9 *a legion of foule fiends Enuiron'd me about,* (Q) — *a Legion of foule Fiends Inuiron'd me,* (F)
  - (2b) 2.2.217 *let not vs two stay behinde:* (Q) — *let not vs two stay at home:* (F)
  - (2c) 4.1.31 *you must go with me to Westminster,* (Q) — *you must straight to Westminster,* (F)
  - (2d) 4.4.187 *And neuer looke vpon thy face againe,* (Q) — *And neuer more behold thy face againe.* (F)
  - (2e) 4.4.446-7 *Hath any well aduised friend giuen out, Rewardes for him* (Q) — *Hath any well-aduised friend proclaym'd Reward to him* (F)
  - (2f) 4.4.449-50 *Sir Thomas Louel, and Lord Marques Dorset, Tis said my liege, are vp in armes,* (Q) — *Si Thomas Louell, and Lord Marquesse Dorset, 'Tis said, my Liege, in Yorkshire are in Armes:* (F)
- (3) Cases where Q and F have different phrasal verbs:
  - (3a) 1.3.335 *With old odde ends stolne out of holy writ,* (Q) — *With odde old ends, stolne forth of holy Writ,* (F)
  - (3b) 1.4.37-8 *the enuious fload Kept in my soule,* (Q) — *the enuious Flood Stop'd in my soule,* (F)
  - (3c) 1.4.69 *I pray thee gentle keeper stay by me,* (Q) — *Keeper, I prythee sit by me a-while,* (F)
  - (3d) 1.4.176 *Are you cald forth from out a world of men* (Q) — *Are you drawne forth among a world of men* (F)
  - (3e) 1.4.196 *And that same vengeance doth he throw on thee,* (Q) — *And that same Vengeance doth he hurle on thee,* (F)
  - (3f) 2.4.66 *Ile go along with you.* (Q) — *Stay, I will go with you.* (F)
  - (3g) 3.3.13 *We giue thee vp our guiltlesse blouds to drinke.* (Q) — *Wee giue to thee our guiltlesse blood to drinke.* (F)

- (3h) 3.5.79-80 *lust, Which stretched to theyr seruants, daughters, wiues,* (Q)  
— *Lust, Which stretcht vnto their Seruants, Daughters, Wiues,* (F)
- (3i) 3.7.20 *And when mine oratory grew to an ende,* (Q) — *And when my Oratorie drew toward end,* (F)
- (3j) 3.7.55 *get you vp to the leads.* (Q) — *Go, go vp to the Leads,* (F)
- (3k) 3.7.173 *These both put by* (Q) — *These both put off,* (F)
- (3l) 3.7.188 *Yet to draw out your royall stocke,* (Q) — *Yet to draw forth your Noble Ancestrie*
- (3m) 4.4.76 *To haue him suddenly conueied away.* (Q) — *To haue him sodainly conuey'd from hence:* (F)
- (3n) 4.4.105 *Thus hath the course of iustice whe'eld about,* (Q) — *Thus hath the course of Iustice whirl'd about,* (F)
- (3o) 4.4.458 *Hoist sale, and made away for Brittain.* (Q) — *Hoys'd sayle, and made his course againe for Brittain.* (F)
- (3p) 5.2.19 *I doubt not but his friendes will flie to vs.* (Q) — *I doubt not but his Friends will turne to vs.* (F)

Several suggestive conclusions can be garnered from these examples. Overall, phrasal verbs account for a high proportion of the changes between Q and F. The occasions when one text has a phrasal verb and the other does not is not extensive, but the fact that Q retains more phrasal verbs than F may be explained by its earlier date and by the possibility that Q represents a memorial reconstruction (Davison 1996:2-4). If phrasal verbs are linked with informal language, it is understandable that a memorial text contains more of them. What is surprising is that there are many examples where both texts have a phrasal verb, which has a different form in either text. More often than not it is the lexical verb which is changed rather than the particle. This suggests that the particle carried more semantic weight than the lexical verb, which to some extent acted as an intensifier. In most cases where the lexical verb changes, there is little or no difference in the meaning of the context. One might argue that there is a formal semantic difference between *stay* and *sit*, but in practice there is no significant difference between *stay by* and *sit by* (3c), for both imply the keeper is to keep Clarence company to prevent him from sinking into despair. Likewise there is little difference between *called forth* and *drawn forth* (3d), for both imply they have been summoned by someone or something to undertake the murder. This is a significant point because we assume today that it is the lexical verb which carries the primary meaning in a phrasal verb, and we are accustomed to see phrasal verbs listed in dictionaries under the lexical verb.

The points in the preceding paragraph tell us is that phrasal verbs were extremely flexible. They consisted of two parts, but either of those parts could be changed within certain limits without detriment to the text. Moreover, those two parts could be separated so that the particle was separated from the preceding lexical verb by one or more phrasal units or it could be placed in front of the lexical verb either immediately or with one or more words between it and the lexical verb. That

it may not be easy to decide grammatically when a phrasal verb is a phrasal verb or an adverbial plus a lexical verb merely increases that sense of flexibility so that a whole range of possible positions and lexical choices became available to the author. One needs to compare that situation with the use of prefixes to verbs. Shakespeare continued to use a large number of prefixes with lexical verbs, but these forms were much more restricted in their choice and flexibility. The different ways of organising a phrasal verb allowed poets more choice in trying to meet the requirements of metre and, where appropriate, of rhyme.

Phrasal verbs are thought to consist of a monosyllabic and common lexical verb usually of Germanic origin, like *come* or *go*, and a simple, usually monosyllabic, preposition or adverb as the particle, like *up*, *for* or *in*. Although in Shakespeare the majority of phrasal verbs fit this pattern, there is a sizeable majority which do not. Some lexical verbs have two or three syllables. In the table above there are two verbs of Latin origin: *environ* (2a) and *convey* (3m) and some lexical verbs which are striking and not necessarily regarded today as material for phrasal verbs, such as *wheel* and *whirl* (3m). In the rest of the play we find bi- or polysyllabic verbs of either Germanic or Latin origin like *attend*, *bustle*, *conjure*, *dally*, *denounce*, *distinguish*, *muster*, *reason*, *reduce*, *scatter* and *swallow* forming phrasal verbs. Even some of the monosyllabic verbs are often unexpectedly striking: *breathe*, *chop*, *frank*, *frown*, *jump*, *lash*, *pent*, *rail*, *scorn* and *stretch*. Even with the particle, as Castillo has suggested, Shakespeare is able to develop the range of phrasal verbs by using particles consisting of more than a single word. Although I am not so convinced by her choice of *by and by*, there are other examples consisting of two elements, like *from forth* as well as those with three elements of which the middle one is *and*, like *up and down*, though in the examples of these types in *Richard III* the particle is separated from the lexical verb so that there may be some dispute as to whether they are phrasal verbs. Example include: *And often vp and downe my sonnes were tost* (2.4.57) and *From forth the kennell of thy wombe hath crept* (4.4.47).

Because phrasal verbs contain two, usually monosyllabic, elements, it is possible to play with them rhetorically within the same line, and this is something that Shakespeare exploits. The effect is not always very sensitive, though on the stage it may be more powerful. My first example is straightforward: *And then againe begin, and stop againe*, (R3 3.5.3), in which the lexical verbs change and the order of particle and lexical verb is reversed. The second consists of a longer rhetorical passage within the complaint by Queen Margaret, in which phrasal verbs play their part:

For happy Wife, a most distressed Widdow:  
 For ioyfull Mother, one that wailes the name:  
 For one being sued too, one that humbly sues:  
 For Queene, a very Caytiffe, crown'd with care:  
 For she that scorn'd at me, now scorn'd of me:  
 For she being feared of all, now fearing one:  
 For she commanding all, obey'd of none. (R3 4.4.98-104).

Each line is built on a contrastive structure, and some exploit phrasal verbs. One line (102) uses two phrasal verbs in opposition, as in R3 3.5.3, though here it is the particle rather than the lexical verb which changes so *scorn'd at* is paired with *scorn'd of*. In other lines a phrasal verb is contrasted with a plain lexical verb in different grammatical guises. Thus we have *sued to* contrasted with *sues* (100), *feared of* contrasted with *fearing* (103) and *commanding* contrasted with *obeyed of* (104). In the first of these there is also a contrast between preterite and present tenses, and in the latter two a contrast between present participle and preterite, though with the order of these two elements changing from 103 to 104. In addition 103 retains the same verb (as is true of 100 and 102), but in 104 there are two separate verbs which have contrastive meanings. Finally one line (101) has a phrasal verb, *crown'd with*, with no grammatical contrast, though it is linked semantically with *Queene*. This passage may not reach the highest levels of Shakespeare's art, but it shows how many phrasal verbs there are within a short passage and how he exploited them. Since phrasal verbs are considered more informal than rhetorical, it reveals how Shakespeare found them very useful even in passages of elaborately formal poetry. The link among the various phrasal verbs supports the role of *For* at the start of each line to provide cohesion and strength in this passage.

It is worth noting how Shakespeare exploits the variety of meaning which many phrasal verbs have. In some cases the particle adds little additional meaning to the lexical verb, and he may play on this feature. When he is wooing Anne, Richard gives his sword to her so that she can kill him; but she is spell-bound and drops it. He then says to her: *Take vp the Sword againe, or take vp me.* (1.2.171), with a direct choice between picking up the sword or taking him as her husband. But he uses *take up* in both clauses to make this contrast explicit. In the second clause one would expect *take* to be used alone, because one 'takes a husband', as still in the marriage service. However, *up* is often without real meaning in many phrasal verbs, though it does have a completive sense in some. The implication of the repetition of *take up* is partly that she must "pick him up from his distressed and lowly situation" as well as taking him in the sense of making a formal and binding commitment. In another passage Shakespeare plays with the variation between the meanings of the simple verb and a phrasal verb using that simple verb. When the two young princes meet Richard after the death of their father they have a witty exchange based around the relative smallness and lightness of the princes.

*Prince.* Vnckle, your Grace knowes how to beare with him.  
*Yorke.* You meane to beare me, not to beare with me:  
 Vnckle, my Brother mockes both you and me,  
 Because that I am little, like an Ape,  
 He thinkes that you should beare me on your shoulders. (3.1.127-31).

This is a very dangerous exchange of witty insults, given Richard's deformity of back and shoulders. One has to appreciate that *with* is a particle which can also be used with little semantic meaning, as in phrasal verbs like *marry with*. But in this case *beare with* means "to tolerate, to put with" and only rarely does it mean simply

"to carry". It was a joke that could easily miscarry, and Buckingham comments on its two-edged nature. The point of noting it here, however, is to show how easy it was (and is) to play with forms involving phrasal verbs.

There are two main strands that can form the conclusion of this paper. The first is how many phrasal verbs Shakespeare used and how difficult it may be to distinguish grammatically some phrasal verbs from associated forms like prefix plus lexical verb. The second is much of what is detailed above is not something that editors of Shakespeare usually think about and certainly do not let it influence their textual decisions. Many may not be aware what a phrasal verb is. For example, in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* a line which reads *Stolne some new aire, or at adventure humd on From musicall Coynadge*; (1.3.75-6), editors do not recognise that *hum on* is a phrasal verb meaning "carry on humming", for *on* in phrasal verbs often has this sense of continuation of action. This phrase has been emended to *hummed one* (Potter 1997) following the reading of a later quarto. Other editors (Tucker Brooke 1918) interpret *on* as "on and on" without necessarily recognised that this is a phrasal verb although his interpretation is the same as taking it as such a verb. In fact, another example occurs in *For burthen-wise Ile hum on TARQVIN still, (Rape of Lucrece 1133)*. Editors need to pay more attention to phrasal verbs and associated forms.

## REFERENCES

- Blake, N. F. 1981: *Non-standard Language in English Literature*. London: Deutsch.
- Bolinger, Dwight 1971: *The Phrasal verb in English*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Castillo, Concha 1994: "Verb-particle Combinations in Shakespearean English". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 95/4: 439-51.
- Davison, Peter 1996: *The First Quarto of King Richard III*. The New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Early Quartos. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denison, David 1985: "The Origins of Completive *Up* in English". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 86: 37-61.
- Fraser, Bruce 1976: *The Verb-Particle Combinations in English*. New York and London: Academic Press.
- Irace, Kathleen O. 1998: *The First Quarto of Hamlet*. Cambridge: University Press.
- McArthur, Tom 1992: "Phrasal verbs". *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 774.
- Potter, Lois 1997: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Arden Shakespeare 3<sup>rd</sup> Series. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson.
- Tucker Brooke, C.F. 1918: *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---

Wells, Stanley and Gary Taylor, gen. eds. 1988: *William Shakespeare The Complete Works: Compact Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.