Journal of Germanic Linguistics **19.4** (2007):309–347

Greek Textual Influence on Gothic Complex Verbs with Pleonastic Prepositions

Lauren Goetting

Indiana University

The present paper investigates the origin and semantics of complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions in the Gothic Bible in comparison with the Greek and Latin sources from which the Gothic was translated. In these constructions, the same directional information is specified by a preverb and its semantically and formally related preposition in a PP-modifier. It is shown that Gothic preverb-preposition redundancy is largely the result of mechanical translation from the Greek source, with the strong possibility of Latin influence in some cases. While there are co-occurrences of formally related preverbs and prepositions in Gothic independent of Greek and Latin textual influence, directionality is usually only fully specified by the preposition, and so these instances are not truly pleonastic. The considerable influence of Greek on redundant preverb-preposition constructions in Gothic ultimately serves as a caution against taking Gothic morphosyntax at face value.[*]

1. Introduction.

The extent to which Wulfila's translation of the Bible represents native Gothic morphosyntax and to which it merely imitates that of its Greek source has long been debated, giving rise to radically different viewpoints.[1] In one of the earlier studies of Gothic word order, Friedrichs

[*] I would like to thank Kari Ellen Gade, Robert Dennis Fulk, and Tracy Alan Hall for their valuable input on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank the anonymous referees for their helpful feedback.

[1] The Gothic language is recorded primarily in copies of a fourth-century Bible translation attributed to the Visigothic bishop Wulfila. Fragments of Wulfila's translation are found in the following sixth-century codices originating in northern Italy: Codex Argenteus; Codex Carolinus; Codex Gissensis; Codices Ambrosiani A, B, C, D; and Codex Taurinensis (originally part of Codex Ambrosianus A) (Braune 1981:2–8, Streitberg 1920:23–27). The collective contents of the above-mentioned codices include (mostly sparse) fragments of the Synoptic Gospels, the Epistles, the Book of Romans, and the Book of

© Society for Germanic Linguistics

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1891) attributed the correspondences between the Gothic and Greek Bible translations to natural similarities between the languages. This notion was sharply criticized by McKnight (1897:147), who held the view of many scholars of his generation that "for the study of word-order, Wulfila is of little value, owing to the slavish way in which he followed the Greek order." More recent scholarship has tended to minimize the textual influence of Greek and has sought instead to emphasize systematic deviations of the Gothic from its source as evidence of native morphosyntax (see, for example, Klein 1992 and Ferraresi 2005).[2] Research into the subject of Gothic verbal prefixation has been in this vein, suggesting that Wulfila's translation was more idiomatic than slavish.

The aim of this paper is to assess the semantics of and Greek textual influence on Gothic complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions. These constructions feature directional PPs headed by prepositions that are "cognate" (that is, formally and semantically related) with the preverb.[3] This is demonstrated in 1 below, in which the directional preposition *þairh* 'through' modifies the NP complement *þairko neþlos* 'eye of

---

Nehemiah. Nearly half of the extant Gothic corpus is contained in Codex Argenteus, which consists of a large portion of the Synoptic Gospels. Aside from Wulfila's translation, the Gothic language is attested chiefly in fragments of a commentary on the Gospel of John known as *Skeireins* 'explanation', dated to around the fifth century, found in eight leaves of Codex Ambrosianus E and Codex Vaticanus Latinus (originally one manuscript) (Braune 1981:5–6). Though of dubious provenance, *Skeireins* is likely a translation from Greek and may possibly derive from the fourth-century commentary on the Gospel of John attributed to Theodore of Heracleia (see Schäferdiek 1981). Other traces of Gothic are found in fragments of a calendar, two alphabets, a small number of runic inscriptions, two commercial deeds, personal names in Latin and Greek sources, and isolated glosses. A form of the Gothic language may have survived up through the 16th century in the Crimea, though very little is known about it (see Stearns 1978 for a thorough treatment of the subject).

[2] For a list of lexical and syntactic deviations in Gothic from the Greek, see Metlen 1933.

[3] The term "preverb" is used here and throughout to denote either a prefix (bound morpheme) or particle (separable morpheme, which forms a syntactic unit with a verbal stem).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

needle' and is cognate with the verbal prefix *þairh-* 'though' in the verb *þairhleiþan* 'to go through' (literally 'to-through-go').[4]

(1) **þairh** þairko neþlos **þairh**leiþan
through eye of-needle to-**through**-go

'to go through the eye of a needle' (Luke 18:25)

Similar constructions in Modern German have been called "pleonastic" because the same directional specification is expressed by the preverb and PP (Olsen 1996, McIntyre 2001:63–67). In the following, I explore how Gothic constructions with the prepositional prefixes *us-* 'out of, from', *af-* 'from', *þairh-* 'through', and the adverbial particle *inn* 'in', and their cognate prepositions compare to their Greek source. It is shown that while there are some co-occurrences of formally related preverbs and prepositions in Gothic that are independent of the Greek text, these rarely convey the same semantic information (the preverb is usually semantically vague), and so they are not truly pleonastic. Gothic prefix-preposition redundancy closely represents similar phenomena in the Greek source. Ultimately, patterns in the translation of Greek complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions suggest that the Greek influence on the Gothic is greater than has been previously acknowledged. Though very little scholarship has been devoted to this topic, the findings of this study contradict a general trend in scholarship on Gothic prefixation to view Greek influence on Gothic as minimal or insignificant.

The present paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a description of prefixation in Gothic and the theoretical development of prefixes and particles. Section 3 examines the nature of verbal prefixation in Greek and gives a general overview of the use of complex verbs

[4] Here and throughout, the original text is given first, followed by a literal translation and a subsequent idiomatic translation. Streitberg's (1971) edition of the Gothic Bible is the source of the Gothic text. The Nestle-Aland 2001 edition of the Greek New Testament (*Novum Testamentum Græce*) is the source of the Greek text. All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. The following forms are used for books in the New Testament, according to the Gothic sequence: Matt. = Matthew; John = John; Luke = Luke; Mark = Mark; Rom. = Romans; Cor. = Corinthians; Eph. = Ephesians; Gal. = Galatians; Phil. = Philippians; Col. = Colossians; Tim. = Timothy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with pleonastic prepositions in both languages. Section 4 discusses the possibility of Latin textual influence on Gothic, as well as other complicating factors that arise in comparing Gothic and Greek. The remaining sections individually treat pleonastic constructions with the preverbs *us-* 'out', *af-* 'from', *þairh-* 'through', and *inn* 'in', along with their corresponding PPs. The study concludes with a summary of findings and their bearing on the question of Wulfila's translation technique.

2. Prefixation in Gothic.

An overview of the development of Gothic preverbs provides the necessary background for understanding why some may collocate with cognate adverbial particles or PPs more frequently than others. The following principle appears to be in effect in Gothic translations of Greek complex verbs with pleonastic PPs: Gothic preverbs that had become semantically vague through the process of grammaticalization or lexicalization were more frequently used in part-by-part translations of Greek pleonastic constructions because cognate PPs and adverbial particles reinforced their lost semantic content, while Gothic preverbs that were more transparent had less need for reinforcement and therefore were used less often in literal translations of Greek pleonasms.[5] Here, grammaticalization is understood to be a diachronic process by which a lexical item takes on grammatical properties through semantic bleaching, increased syntactic rigidity, and phonetic reduction. Lexicalization, in turn, is understood to be a process by which independent morphemes develop into a lexical unit with a non-compositional meaning.

It is generally believed that prepositions and preverbs in Indo-European languages both descend from adverbs (Kühner & Gerth 1898:448–453, 526–554, Wackernagel 1924:153–248, Kuryłowicz 1964: 171–178, Harnisch 1982:112–117).[6] Prepositions developed from the reanalysis of adverbs left-adjacent to nouns as part of the NP. In turn, adverbs left-adjacent to verbs were gradually reanalyzed as part of the verb phrase and developed into preverbs. Following a grammaticalization path, preverb-verb combinations developed into syntactic units (separable complex verbs). Subsequently, preverbs may have lost lexical

[5] For background on grammaticalization, see Meillet 1912, Hopper & Traugott 2003.

[6] See also Booij & van Kemenade 2003 and the literature cited there.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meaning and taken on more abstract meanings (semantic bleaching), which may have triggered their loss of syntactic status and allowed them to be reanalyzed as morphological units with verbal stems (inseparable complex verbs) (Booij 2002:218, Blom 2005:249–253). The development of Germanic preverbs can thus be summarized as in 2.

(2) adverb > particle > prefix

Van Kemenade & Los (2003:97–99) suggest that Gothic prefixes support this development by maintaining vestiges of their earlier independent lexical status. Gothic prefixes are unique among those in Germanic languages in that they appear to be in the last stages of transition from separable to inseparable morphemes. Though they are otherwise bound to the verbal stem, they may be separated from it by intervening clitics. An example of this is given in 3, in which the clitic particle *-uh-* 'but, and, now' intervenes between the prefix *us-* (here *uz-*) 'up' and the verb *hof* 'lifted'.[7]

(3) uzuhhof
up-and-lifted

'and he lifted up' (John 11:41)

Gothic preverbs may be categorized according to layers of grammaticalization.[8] The most grammaticalized prefixes have the least semantic content and no corresponding adverbial or prepositional counterparts, though it can be presumed that at one point these existed.[9] The following prefixes belong to this layer and are glossed when they have discernible meanings: *dis-* 'apart, asunder', *fair-*, *fra-*, *ga-* 'together, along with', *tuz-* 'with difficulty', *twis-* 'in two, apart'.

[7] For a thorough treatment of the syntax of Gothic clitics, see Eythórsson 1995: 103–142.

[8] For a detailed examination of the semantics of Gothic preverbs, see Curme 1914, Grewolds 1932–1933, and West 1982.

[9] McIntyre (2001:8, note 2) pointed out that preverbal functions often outlast other functions, since affixes are frequently fossilized in morphologically complex words.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A less grammaticalized layer consists of prefixes that have prepositional counterparts. Each of these shows some signs of grammaticalization and lexicalization, though some are often compositional in meaning. Prepositional prefixes are believed to have developed from particles that were unstressed or weakly stressed before verbs but strongly stressed in nominal compounds.[10] Lack of stress led to the phonological reduction of some of the verbal prefixes, and this is apparent when the verbal prefixes *faur-* and *and-* are compared to their respective corresponding nominal prefixes *faura-* and *anda-*. Prepositional prefixes transitivize their verbal stems and are unstressed. Included are: *af-* 'of, from, down from'; *afar-* 'after'; *and-* 'toward, against'; *at-* 'at, toward, down'; *bi-* 'around, by'; *faur-* 'for, before, by'; *hindar-* 'over, behind, beyond'; *in-* (no discernible meaning); *miþ-* 'together with, among'; *þairh-* 'through'; *uf-* 'under'; *ufar-* 'over, beyond'; *und-* 'away'; *us-* 'out, away from, up'; *wiþra-* 'against'.

Some preverbs are both prepositional and adverbial and may be either compositional in meaning or semantically bleached. These result from the homophony of prepositional and adverbial elements and include *ana* 'on, at'; *du* 'to, toward'; *faura* 'before, by'.

The least grammaticalized layer of preverbs consists of the separable particles *inn* 'in' and *ut* 'out', which are always resultative and semantically transparent. *Inn* and *ut* are originally adverbs that did not develop in composition with verbs. Their function as preverbs may be explained in terms of the semantic bleaching of the older prepositional prefixes *in-* and *us-*: it can be presumed that at one point, *in-* and *us-* were resultative but gradually lost this function. As they appear in Wulfila's translation, *in-* has a causative function and little, if any, semantic content, while *us-* has numerous spatial and metaphorical meanings as well as a perfective aspect. It is likely that in time the adverbs *inn* and *ut* were necessary to reinforce the lost resultative function of *in-* and *us-* and that with certain verbs they have already begun to form syntactic units and perhaps even morphological units.

A syntactic analysis of *inn* and *ut* is complicated by seeming inconsistencies in the pattern of separation and composition with their verbal stems. *Inn* and *ut* generally behave like corresponding particles in Old English (OE) and Old High German (OHG) in that they are separable in

[10] See Hirt 1931:145–146 and Bennett 1970:468

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

some contexts and the negative particle *ni* 'not' intervenes between the adverbial particle and its verbal stem (this is the case for *inn*, but it is uncertain whether this also holds for *ut*), pointing to the morphological independence of the adverbial particle. This is shown in 4a, in which *ni* 'not' appears between the particle *inn* and verb *atgaggiþ* 'goes'. While *ni* is right-adjacent to particles, it is left-adjacent to prefixes, as is demonstrated by its position relative to the prefix *af-* 'from' (here lexicalized) in 4b.

(4) a. saei inn **ni** atgaggiþ þairh daur
he-who in **not** goes through door

'he who does not enter through the door' (John 10:1)

b. saei **ni** afqiþiþ allamma aigina seinamma
he-who **not** from-speaks all possessions his

'he who does not renounce all his possessions' (Luke 14:33)

There is a trend of asymmetry in the syntactic positions of *inn* and *ut* in main clauses and subordinate clauses similar to that in Modern German and Dutch: in main clauses they are postponed after the verbal stem, whereas in subordinate clauses they are preverbal (Delbrück 1910). Assuming that Gothic was an object-verb (OV) language, some scholars have interpreted this as evidence that verb-second word order was an innovation in Gothic.[11] The pattern of asymmetry includes a number of exceptions, however, and only appears applicable when *inn* and *ut* combine with complex verbs. For example, *inn* is postponed after the complex verb *galeiþan* 'to go' (formed from the prefix *ga-* and the verb *leiþan* 'to go, pass') in main clauses and combined in subordinate clauses (Ryder 1951). Thus *galaiþ inn* 'went in' appears in main clauses (three tokens), and *inngalaiþ* 'went in' appears in a subordinate clause (one token) (Ryder 1951:210). *Inn* and *ut* do not have the same syntactic freedom when they combine with simplex verbs. Regardless of clause type, they immediately precede simplex verbs in 22 instances and are not postposed after them. Most of these instances (18 tokens) involve the combination of *inn* and *gaggan* 'to go', and it is possible that these

[11] See van Kemenade & Los 2003:101 and Eythórsson 1995:46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

elements formed an inseparable complex verb. Earlier scholarship has indicated that in modern Germanic languages such as Dutch, adverbial preverbs do not develop into inseparable prefixes because they are heavily stressed (Blom 2005:293–294). While in modern West Germanic there is a very strong correlation between stress and separability, it is unknown whether this was the case in Gothic due to lack of evidence.[12] In sum, the syntactic status of *inn* and *ut* is not entirely clear, although it can be said that they generally behave like particles and that it is possible that *inn* had developed into a prefix in composition with the verb *gaggan*.

In this section, the theoretical development of Gothic preverbs was outlined, and it was shown that there is a strong correlation between syntactic status and semantic content in that prefixes have developed metaphorical meanings and grammatical functions, while particles have only spatial meanings. In the following section, a brief overview of the Greek system of prefixation is given, followed by a description of complex verbs with pleonastic PPs in Greek and Gothic.

3. Complex Verbs with Pleonastic Prepositions in Greek and Gothic. The system of prefixation in Greek varies significantly from that in Gothic. Most importantly, Greek contains only prepositional prefixes that are not separable from their verbal stems, while Gothic has prepositional, adverbial, and grammaticalized preverbs, some of which are separable in certain syntactic contexts. A study of the correspondences between Greek and Gothic preverbs in the New Testament demonstrated that there is a part-by-part relationship between Gothic and Greek—that is, one or more preverbs in Gothic corresponds to one or more preverbs in the Greek that it is translating—in about one-third of the instances in which they occur (Rice 1932:135). This figure most likely indicates significant influence of Greek on Gothic and is remarkable when the number of lexicalized complex verbs in Gothic and Greek, which ought to work against literal translations, is taken into consideration.

Despite the marked differences in Gothic and Greek verbal prefixation, both languages contain constructions that feature a preverb and its cognate preposition followed by a NP complement. Baldi (1979) ex-

[12] For a stress-based account of the separability of preverbs in modern German, see McIntyre 2001:53–60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plains the Greek constructions as follows: Greek (and Latin) prepositions are derived from preverbal particles, and as preverb-verb combinations became lexicalized, the preverbal particles were copied before NPs for semantic and functional reinforcement. Prepositions gradually developed from the reanalysis of these particles as part of the NP, and once prepositions took on relational (spatial, temporal, etc.) semantics, the preverbs could be deleted. According to Baldi (1979:58), constructions that contain both a preverb and cognate preposition are an intermittent stage in the copying of functions and semantic content from the preverb to the preposition.

The co-occurrence of complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions in New Testament Greek is more complex than Baldi describes. In some cases the prefix and the preposition function together in the construction, while in others either may be omitted without incurring much semantic change. The former appears to be due to semantic bleaching on the level of both the prefix and the preposition, in which case the presence of both may have reinforced the lost semantic content. An example of this is the construction *eiselthein eis* 'to enter into' (literally 'to-in-go into'), in which *eis-* 'into' is a prefix and *eis* 'into' is the head of a PP. In the New Testament, the complex verb *eiselthein* 'to enter', although it is transitive, rarely if ever modifies direct objects in NP complements but rather relies on the preposition *eis* 'into' to assign case. This is shown in 5, in which the prefix *eis-* 'in' is combined with the verb *ēlthen* 'came' and followed by the PP *eis ton oikon* 'into the house'.

(5) **eis**ēlthen **eis** ton oikon
in-came **into** the house

'he entered the house' (Luke 1:40)

Not only does the preposition *eis* 'into' appear necessary in this construction to assign case, but the prefix *eis-* is also indispensable since the preposition alone does not always fully convey the meaning 'into'. In 6 below, the same verbal stem *ēlthen* 'came' appears as in 5 above. Whereas *eisēlthen eis* means 'entered into', the simplex verb + PP *ēlthen eis* in 6 means 'came to'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(6) ēlthen ... **eis** tēn thalassan
came … **into** the sea
'he came to the sea' (Mark 7:31)

While in some instances both prefix and preposition seem to reinforce one another, in others the prefix or preposition may be omitted arbitrarily. In the pair below, the meaning 'to take, deprive' is expressed equally well by the co-occurrence of the prefix *apo-* [*ap-*] 'from' and the preposition *apo* [*ap*] 'from', as in 7a, or without the prefix, as in 7b.

(7) a. kai hotan **ap**arthē **ap**' autōn ho numfios
and when **from**-will-be-taken **from** them the groom
'and when the groom will be taken from them' (Luke 5:35)

b. kai ho dokei echein arthēsetai **ap**' autou
and that-which seems to-have will-be-taken **from** him
'and that which he seems to have will be taken from him' (Luke 8:18)

Gothic contains similar constructions, almost all of which correspond directly to the structure of the Greek. However, not all part-by-part translations of Greek complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions are pleonastic in Gothic. It is shown below that the Gothic prefix was semantically bleached in some cases, and therefore did not specify the same directional information as its cognate preposition. In the approximately 20 instances in which Gothic features cognate preverbs and prepositions independently of Greek influence, only a handful appear to be truly redundant.

Three basic types of construction are discussed: those which contain a prepositional prefix and a cognate preposition (+ NP complement), such as *þairhgaggan þairh* (literally 'to-through-go through'); those which contain a prepositional prefix and a cognate particle, as in *usgaggan ut* (literally 'to out-go out'); and those which contain an adverbial particle and a cognate preposition (+ NP complement), such as *inngaggan in* (literally 'to-in-go into'). As in Greek, there are instances in which the semantic import of the construction "preverb + verb + PP" (where the preverb and preposition are formally or semantically related)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

does not appear altered by the omission of either the preverb or the preposition. For example, the prefix *af-* 'from' in 8 is cognate with the preposition *af* 'from'. The preposition modifies the personal pronoun *imma* 'him' (3rd person, masc. dat. sg.).

(8) **af**nimada **af** imma
from-is-taken **from** him

'will be taken from him' (Luke 19:26)

The phrase in 8 may also be expressed without the preposition *af*. In this case, the complex verb *afniman* 'to deprive, take' (literally 'to-from-take') modifies the indirect object *imma* 'him' (3rd person, masc. dat. sg.):

(9) **af**nimada imma
from-is-taken him

'will be taken from him' (Mark 4:25)

The same sense 'to deprive, take' may also be expressed by omitting the prefix *af-* while maintaining the preposition *af*. In 10, the preposition modifies the personal pronoun *þus* 'you' (2nd person, dat. sg.).

(10) þamma nimandin **af** þus wastja
the-one taking **from** you coat

'the one taking the coat from you' (Luke 6:29)

Given that the morphosyntax of the Gothic Bible is frequently attributed to the influence of its Greek source, particularly in older scholarship, the question remains as to whether Gothic constructions including complex verbs with cognate prepositions are mere imitations of the Greek, or whether they may have been inherent to the Gothic language. It is suggested below that, with some exceptions, Gothic preverb-preposition redundancy is attributable to Greek influence, and that the semantic bleaching of the Gothic preverb plays a role in facilitating literal translations of Greek complex verbs with pleonastic PPs. Specifically, the vaguer a preverb has become through polysemy, the greater its ability to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

translate its lexically corresponding Greek prefix, but the greater its need for reinforcement from cognate prepositions or particles.

4. Latin Influence and Textual Uncertainties.
In assessing the extent to which Gothic pleonastic constructions may be influenced by Greek, a number of textual difficulties arise. For example, palpable lexical and syntactic influence on Gothic from pre-Vulgate versions of the Latin New Testament is well documented by scholars, and it is generally believed that Latinizations crept into the Gothic from Old Latin versions of the New Testament during the course of its transmission, which were not present in Wulfila's original translation.[13] The question of Latin influence makes it difficult in instances such as 11—in which the structure of the Gothic agrees more closely with Old Latin versions of the New Testament—to determine the motivation behind Gothic pleonasms.[14] (The Latin adverb *simul* 'together' corresponds to *miþ-* and the preposition *cum* 'with' corresponds to the preposition *miþ*, while the Greek has no corresponding preposition.)

(11) a. **miþ**inngalaiþ **miþ** Iesua Gothic
with-in-went **with** Jesus
'he entered with Jesus' (John 18:15)[15]

b. **sun**eisēlthen tō iēsou Greek
with-in-went-3SG the Jesus
'he entered with Jesus'

c. **simul** introivit **cum** Iesu Old Latin
together in-went-3SG **with** Jesus
'he entered together with Jesus'

[13] For an overview of the scholarship concerning the influence of Latin versions of the New Testament on Gothic, see Metzger (1977:375–394).

[14] Jülicher's (1963) edition of the Old Latin New Testament is the source of the pre-Vulgate Latin citations here and throughout.

[15] There is one other attestation of *miþ-* … *miþ* (Col. 2:13) that corresponds part-by-part to the Greek *sun-* 'together with' … *sun* 'together with'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The comparison of Gothic and Greek prefixation is further complicated by uncertainties concerning the Greek exemplar from which Wulfila translated. It is thought that Wulfila based his translation on a Byzantine version of the New Testament, but the exact exemplar is unknown (Metzger 1977:385). Furthermore, Wulfila's original translation is no longer extant, and only copies that date at least several centuries after the original remain. It must be emphasized that these factors make a highly accurate study of Gothic prefixes in comparison to the Greek source unlikely. The present study therefore draws its conclusions from general patterns in Gothic prefixation and prepositional use and is necessarily speculative at times.

In the sections below, constructions featuring the preverbs *us-* 'out', *af-* 'from', *þairh-* 'through', and *inn* 'in', and their respective cognate prepositions or particles, are discussed individually. In addition to these, there is one construction with *faur-* 'before', one with *afar-* 'after', and two with *miþ-* 'with' that are addressed in relevant places throughout the paper. In section 5 below, it is shown that the doubling of the prefix *us-* 'out' and preposition *us* 'out of, from' is attributable to the prefix's semantic ambiguity, as a consequence of which the addition of a cognate preposition or adverb may have helped to reinforce its meaning 'out'.

5. *Us-*.

In this section, two types of constructions are discussed, neither of which is pleonastic: those which contain the prefix *us-* 'out, from' and the cognate PP headed by the preposition *us* 'out, from', and those which contain the particle and prefix combination *ut* 'out' and *us-* 'out, from'. Earlier scholarship has suggested that the prefix *us-* had lost its resultative function and that these constructions arose to reinforce the functionally and semantically weakened prefix (van Kemenade & Los 2003:101–103). This is borne out by a close examination of the contexts in which the doublings occur. Furthermore, because the prefix *us-* was so vague, it could be used by the Gothic translator in many cases to correspond to the Greek prefix *ek-* 'out of, from'. In this way, the semantic bleaching of the prefix helped to facilitate a very literal translation from the Greek into Gothic.

The Gothic prefix *us-* (*ur-* before verbs beginning with <r>), derived from Proto-Germanic $^{+}$*uz* (Kieckers 1928:274), is highly ambiguous in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meaning.[16] It is generally agreed that the original significance of +*uz* was 'out of', from which it developed the secondary meaning 'up'.[17] Although frequently lexicalized, as in the complex verb *usqiman* 'to kill' (literally 'to-out-come'), *us-* can denote 'out of', 'away from', and 'up', and it may also impart the perfective aspect to certain verbs.

The co-occurrence of the prefix *us-* and a PP headed by the preposition *us*, while almost always mirroring the syntactic structure of the Greek source, is also attested independently of Greek. There are at least five instances in which the prefix *us-* (denoting 'motion away from') corresponds to a Greek simplex verb (three tokens) or a complex verb with a prefix that does not correspond semantically to *us-* (two tokens): two with the verb *usniman* 'to take out, to take away' (John 17:15, Col. 2:14), two with *usbairan* 'to carry out' (Luke 6:45, two tokens), and one with *urrinnan* 'to go out from' (Rom. 11:26). Though the prefix *us-* and preposition *us* carry a range of meanings, in these constructions the prefix connotes a general separation from the object, while the preposition further specifies motion out of an object. Thus the preposition seems to have functioned to disambiguate the meaning of the prefix.

In a more emphatic and semantically specific variant of the aforementioned construction, the PP is modified by the adverb *ut* 'out'), yielding *us-* + verb + *ut* + *us* + NP. I have interpreted *ut* 'out' as an adverbial modifier of *us* + NP because *ut us* 'out from' is used as a unit to represent the Greek adverb/preposition *exō* 'outside of' in four out of five instances. While the preposition *ek* is commonly used to express 'motion out of' and is translated by the Gothic prefix *us-*, *exō* 'outside of' is spatially more transparent, and the Gothic reflects this in the translation *ut us* 'out from', which is more specific and emphatic than the preposition *us* 'out of, from' alone. This is shown in 12 below, in which the Gothic prefix *us-* corresponds to the Greek prefix *ek-* (here *ex-*) 'out of, from', and the Greek *exō* 'outside of' corresponds to the Gothic *ut us* 'out from'. The preposition *us* modifies the dative object *þamma weinagarda* 'the vineyard', and *exō* modifies the genitive object *tou ampelōnos* 'the vineyard'.

---

[16] For a discussion of the etymology of *us*, see Gruber 1930, Johannisson 1939:65–67, Lehmann 1906, and Purtscher 1902:20–21.

[17] For a different opinion, see Gruber 1930:13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(12) a. jah **us**waurpun imma **ut us** þamma weinagarda
and **out**-threw him **out from** the vineyard
'and they threw him out of the vineyard' (Mark 12:8)

b. kai **ex**ebalon auton **exō** tou ampelōnos
and **out**-threw him **outside-of** the vineyard
'and they threw him out of the vineyard'

While *ut us* 'out from' is almost always a direct translation of *exō* 'outside of', the use of the particle *ut* 'out' alone with *us*-compounds is less dependent on the Greek. In eight instances, *ut* is in agreement with the Greek structure, and in five instances it is in disagreement. Van Kemenade & Los (2003:101–103) explained the particle-prefix combination as a reinforcement mechanism (the particle *ut* supplements the lost resultative function of the prefix *us*-). This is supported by particle-prefix combinations in Modern Germanic languages, in which only one element (usually the particle) may act as a resultative predicate (Blom 2005:243). An examination of *us*-verbs and the contexts in which they occur provide further evidence of the grammaticalization of the prefix.

The complex verb *usgaggan* (literally 'to-out-go') is sufficient in a number of instances to denote 'to go out, exit', although its most common significance is 'to depart, go forth', as demonstrated in 13.

(13) **us**gaggands galaiþ ana auþjana stad
out-going went-3SG to deserted place
'he departed and went to a deserted place' (Luke 4:42)

Götti (1974:35–37) designates 'to head out, depart' as the usual sense of the complex verb *usgaggan* and suggests that *usgaggan* takes on the spatial meaning 'to go out' when reinforced by the particle *ut* (eight tokens) or a PP headed by the preposition *us* 'out of, from' (23 tokens). The collocation of *ut* and *usgaggan* therefore helps to establish the meaning 'to go out', and thereby to differentiate it from the complex verb's more common meaning 'to depart'. In 14 below, *ut* complements the verb *usgaggan*, because the translation requires the meaning 'to go out(side)' rather than 'to depart, leave.' Here *usgaggands ut* 'going out' describes the act of exiting a house.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(14) iþ atta is **us**gaggands **ut** bad ina
but father his **out**-going **out** entreated him
'but his father came out and entreated him'(Luke 15:27)

Similarly in 15, the semantic distinction between 'to go out' and 'to depart' is made clear through the particle *ut*, which contrasts with the particle *inn* 'in' later in the sentence.

(15) þaruh **us**iddja **ut** sa siponeis anþar … jah attauh inn Paitru
then **out**-went **out** the disciple other … and brought in Peter
'then the other disciple went out … and brought in Peter'
(John 18:16)

The construction *usgaggan ut* resembles the verb-adverb collocation *faursniwan faura* 'to precede, anticipate' (literally 'to-before-hasten before') in which the prefix *faur-* 'before' has numerous abstract meanings and is here lexicalized with the verb *sniwan* 'to hasten'. The adverb *faura* 'before' reinforces the lost temporal meaning of the prefix. Like *usgaggan ut*, this construction is not truly pleonastic because the adverb conveys information that the prefix does not.

(16) bi þaim **faura** **faur**sniwandam ana þuk praufetjam
by the **before** **before**-hastening concerning you prophecies
'according to the foregoing prophecies about you' (1 Tim. 1:18)

The verb-adverb collocation *atsteigan dalaþ* 'to descend' (literally 'to-down-climb down') is similar to *usgaggan ut* and *faursniwan faura*. Like *us-* and *faur-*, the prefix *at-* is ambiguous in meaning: it signifies 'to', 'at', 'toward', and 'down', and also has a perfective function (Gould 1916:16). Although *at-* connotes downward motion in the complex verb *atsteigan*, and *atsteigan* is often sufficient to convey the meaning 'to descend', in three of 15 instances the adverb *dalaþ* 'down' is added, presumably to reinforce the meaning of the prefix.

Thus far, it has been shown that *us*-verbs form constructions with the cognate preposition *us* (+ NP complements) and particle *ut* in a number of instances that do not correspond to the structure of the Greek. These

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instances most likely indicate that the prefix was gradually becoming grammaticalized in Gothic. Competition between the prefix *us-* and the particle *ut* 'out' may further hint at the semantic bleaching of *us-*. Though both *ut* and *us-* correspond to the Greek *ek-* 'out of, from', the former is an adverbial particle and appears only four times in composition with a simplex verb, while the latter is pervasive and prepositional. *Ut* and *us-* also differ in that *ut* exclusively denotes 'out', whereas *us-* has numerous meanings and functions.

The preverbs *us-* and *ut* compete with each other in composition with the verbs *bairan* 'to carry' and *gaggan* 'to go'. *Us-* is by far the more pervasive preverb, and the occasional substitution of *ut* is likely indicative of the progressive loss of the semantic force of *us-*. Whereas *utgaggan* is attested only twice, translating the Greek complex verb *ekporeuesthai* 'to go out, exit, depart' (literally 'to-out-go'), *usgaggan* occurs 102 times in the Gothic corpus, most frequently translating the Greek complex verbs *ekporeuesthai* (twelve tokens) and *exerchesthai* (77 tokens) 'to go out, exit, depart' (literally 'to-out-go'). While *usgaggan* is clearly preferred over *utgaggan* in translating Greek verbs meaning 'to come/go out', it is the more ambiguous of the two and is used additionally to translate the Greek *erchesthai* 'to come, go' (one token), as well as three verbs that mean 'to go up': *anerchesthai* (ten tokens), *prosanabainein* (one token), and *anerchesthai* (one token) (Rice 1932:113).

Although *utgaggan* and *usgaggan* are used synonymously, the former is resultative and substituted for the latter in cases where emphasis is required. In both instances of *utgaggan*, the particle *ut* is used in contrast with the preverb *inn*. The juxtaposition of 'entering' (*inngaggan*) and 'exiting' (*utgaggan*) appears in John 10:9, in which Christ depicts himself as a door through which one may enter (*inngaggiþ*) and exit (*utgaggiþ*). Similarly, in Mark 7:15, Christ preaches that nothing external may 'enter into' (*inngaggando in*) a man to harm him; rather, it is what proceeds 'out of' (*utgaggando us*) a man that may do him harm. A paraphrase of Mark 7:15 is found subsequently in Mark 7:20. It is significant that the same Greek verb and preposition (*ekporeuesthai ek*) are translated differently in the two passages. Whereas *utgaggan us* appears in the former, in which the verb is used in juxtaposition with verb *inngaggan*, *usgaggan us* is used in the latter, in which the verb *inngaggan* does not appear and no contrast is being made. The

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contrastive use of *ut* rather than *us-* with the preverb *inn* indicates that whereas the former clearly denoted 'out', the meaning of the latter was not sufficiently transparent to enable the preverb to stand in contrast with *inn*.

The development of the prefix etymologically related to *us-* in later West Germanic languages is consonant with the semantic bleaching of *us-* in Gothic. In Old High German and Old English, the forms corresponding to the Gothic preposition *us* fell into disuse at an early stage (Lehmann 1906:59).[18] As the corresponding prefix became entirely grammaticalized, the respective particles *uz* and *ut* became requisite in verbal constructions to convey the meaning 'out'. In the OHG translation of Tatian's Gospel Harmony, the semantic distinction between the preverbs *uz* (etymologically related to Gothic *ut*) and *ir-* (etymologically related to Gothic *us-*) is pronounced. Whereas *uzgangan* denotes 'to go out', *irgangan* means 'to go away, happen, pass'. The distinction is clearly illustrated in 17: in 17a, Christ commands an evil spirit to come out (*uzgangan*) of a possessed man; in 17b, Simon Peter implores Christ to go away (*irgangan* [*argangan*]) from him.[19]

(17) a. thu toubo inti stummo geist, ih gibiutu thir,
you deaf and dumb spirit I command you

uzgang fon imo
out-go from him

'you deaf and dumb spirit, I command you, come out of him'
(Tatian 92.6)

b. fiel zi thés heilantes knevvun inti quad: **ar**gang fon mír
fell to the Savior's knees and said: depart from me

'he fell to the Savior's knees and said: depart from me'
(Tatian 19.8)

While neither Old High German nor Old English is a direct descendant of Gothic, the same process of grammaticalization that is attested in these

[18] The prefix persists in the form of Modern German and Dutch *er-*.

[19] Sievers' (1882) edition of the OHG translation of Tatian's Gospel Harmony is the source of the Latin and OHG text here and *passim*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

languages may be reflected at an earlier stage in Gothic. This would support the idea that the impetus to qualify *us*-compounds with the preposition *us* or particle *ut*, and to replace the prefix *us-* with *ut*, stems from the gradual semantic bleaching of the prefix *us-*.

In summary, there are a number of co-occurrences of the prefix *us-* and the particle *ut*, or a PP headed by the preposition *us*, that are independent of any corresponding Greek structure. These have been explained as reinforcement mechanisms for the semantically and functionally ambiguous prefix *us-* and are not pleonastic because the preposition and particle express directional specification that the prefix does not (van Kemenade & Los 2003:101–103). The competition between the preverbs *us-* and *ut*, and the contrastive use of the latter with the preverb *inn*, provide further evidence of the semantic bleaching of *us-* and may indicate that, as with corresponding particles in later West Germanic, *ut* was becoming requisite to express the notion 'out'.

These findings are comparable to those of the pleonastic construction *af-* … *af* 'from- … from' with some notable exceptions. In section 6 below, I suggest that like *us-* … *us*, *af-* … *af* constructions may have been idiomatic in Gothic, but that it is also possible that they arose from the mechanical translation of the Greek preposition *apo* 'from'.

6. *Af-*.

The prepositional prefix *af-* 'from' appears in constructions with the PPs headed by the preposition *af* 'from' in 27 instances. In this section, it is shown that like the construction *us-* … *us*, *af-* … *af* is heavily influenced by corresponding constructions in the Greek source, but also occurs independently of the Greek. These apparently unmotivated instances of *af-* … *af* are not easily accounted for, though the influence of Old Latin versions of the New Testament on the Gothic may play a role. Because there are a number of *af-* … *af* constructions that cannot be explained by Greek or Latin sources, and in some prefix-verb combinations it is the absence of the prefix that is more marked than its presence, it is reasonable to conclude that *af-* was lexicalized or grammaticalized in composition with some verbs. The unmotivated doublings of *af-* … *af* are perhaps most elegantly explained as arising from the combination of idiomatic Gothic complex verbs consisting of *af-* + verb and the presence of the preposition *af*, which may or may not have been motivated by the Greek.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In expressions that convey provenance, separation, or privation, Gothic favors constructions, at times at odds with the Greek source, in which the verb includes a prefix that indicates motion away from an object. In section 5, it was argued that the preposition *us* 'out of, from' and the particle *ut* 'out' were used in constructions with the semantically vague prefix *us-* 'from, out' to reinforce the lost resultative function of the prefix. Like *us-*, the prefix *af-* also appears to be in the process of semantic bleaching. Its basic meaning is spatial and connotes 'motion away from', but it can also have privative and pejorative senses as well as a perfective function. Its weakness is indicated by its interchangeability with *us-* in instances where Greek attests no prefix. As seen in 18 and 19, the Greek simplex *airei* 'takes away, removes' is alternately translated with the complex verbs *usnimiþ* and *afnimiþ*, both of which mean 'takes from, removes'. Both prefixes have a privative sense that the preposition *af* reinforces. In both cases, the complex verbs modify direct objects in the accusative (*þata waurd* 'the word' in 18, and *fullon* 'filling' in 19).

(18) a. **us**nimiþ þata waurd **af** hairtin ize
out-takes the word **from** heart their

'it takes away the word from their heart' (Luke 8:12)

b. airei ton logon **apo** tēs kardias autōn
takes-from the word **from** the hearts theirs

'it takes away the word from their hearts'

(19) a. unte **af**nimiþ fullon **af** þamma snagin
for **from**-takes filling **from** the garment

'for it takes the patch away from the garment' (Matt. 9:16)

b. airei gar to plērōma autou **apo** tou himatiou
takes-from for the filling its **from** the garment

'for it takes its patch away from the garment'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In a little more than half of the *af-* … *af* constructions (15 of 27), the structure of the Gothic mirrors that of the Greek precisely. The Gothic prefix *af-* translates the Greek *apo-* 'from', and the preposition *af* translates the Greek preposition *apo* 'from'.

The most common verb that occurs in *af-* … *af* pleonasms is *niman* 'to take' and the textual uncertainties surrounding the translation and transmission of the Gothic Bible are well represented in the incidence of this pleonasm. To express the concept 'to take from', Gothic uses *niman* + *af* (+ NP complement) 'to take from' six times and *afniman* + *af* (+ NP complement) 'to take from' (literally 'to-from-take from') nine times. *Niman* + *af* corresponds to the Greek simplex verbs + PP *airein*/*lambaneιn apo* (+ NP complement) 'to take from' in all but one instance (Col. 3:24), in which the Greek attests the complex verb *apolēmpsesthe* 'you shall receive' (literally 'from-you-shall-take'). However, the simplex form of the same verb *lēmpsesthe* 'you shall take' is attested here in the Byzantine textual tradition (that is, presumably the same textual tradition as the Greek exemplar from which Wulfila made his translation), and it is likely that this is what the Gothic is translating. *Afniman* + *af* corresponds to the Greek in five instances (Matt. 9:15, Mark 2:20, 7:33, Luke 5:35, 16:3) and disagrees with the Greek in four instances (Matt. 9:16, Mark 2:21, Luke 8:18, 19:26). Three of these instances reflect the structure of the Latin *auferre ab* 'to take from' (literally 'to-from-take from') (Mark 2:21, Luke 8:18, 19:26).

Of the twelve pleonastic constructions in Gothic that do not completely reflect the structure of the Greek, in one instance (Luke 9:33) the prefix *af-* corresponds semantically to the Greek *dia-*, here meaning 'apart, asunder', so that the pleonasm *af-* … *af* may be motivated by the Greek *dia-* … *apo*. Five instances of *af-* … *af* agree with pleonasms present in the Latin Vulgate and are possibly attributable to the influence of pre-Vulgate Latin translations of the New Testament. In 20 below, for example, the Gothic *af* … *af-* construction (20a) agrees with the Latin *a* … *ab-* ('from … from-') in 20b, while the Greek does not contain a corresponding preposition or prefix (20c).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(20) a. aþþan andeis ist anabusnais friaþwa … **af** þaimei
and end is of-commandment love … **from** which

sumai **af**airzidai
certain-ones **from**-strayed

'and the goal of the commandment is love … from which certain ones, having strayed' (1Tim. 1:6)

b. finis autem præcepti est caritas … **a** quibus
end and of-commandment is love … **from** which

quidam **ab**errantes
certain-ones **from**-straying

'and the goal of the commandment is love … from which certain ones, straying'

c. to de telos tēs paraggelias estin agapē …
the and end of-the commandment is love …

hōn tines astochēsantes
from-which certain-ones failing

'and the goal of the commandment is love … from which certain ones, erring'

Latin influence on the Greek cannot be proven in cases such as 20, but the number of exact correspondences is striking. This leaves approximately seven Gothic pleonastic constructions that are difficult to account for through extant Greek or Latin sources. In these instances, the preposition *af* agrees with the Greek preposition *apo*, as expected, while the prefix *af-* corresponds to either no prefix in Greek or a prefix not semantically related to *af-* (such as *meta-* 'along with'). As mentioned previously, the presence of the preposition *af* may be attributable to the influence of the Greek preposition *apo*, but it is difficult to ascertain whether this was the case since there is a very close correspondence between *af* and *apo* in pleonastic constructions (deviation from the Greek may have pointed to idiomatic Gothic, while the lack of deviation does

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not necessarily imply the same).[20] It is therefore unclear whether the use of the preposition *af* in these pleonastic constructions was characteristic of idiomatic Gothic or not.

An analogous case may involve the doubling of the prefix *afar-* 'after' and preposition *afar* 'after' in 21 below, in which the complex verb *afargagga* 'I pursue' (literally 'I-after-go') corresponds to a simplex verb in Greek (*diōkō* 'I-pursue'), while the preposition *afar* corresponds semantically to the Greek *epi*, here meaning 'toward, after'. In this case, it seems that the verb *afargaggan* is lexicalized to mean 'to pursue', but it is unclear whether the preposition *afar* is idiomatic in Gothic or whether it is a mechanical translation of the Greek preposition.

(21) a. **afar**gagga **afar** sigislauna
after-go-1SG **after** reward

'I pursue the reward' (Phil. 3:14)

b. diōkō **epi** [eis] to brabeion[21]
pursue-1SG **after** [into] the prize

'I pursue the prize'

In sum, most instances of *af-* … *af* (about 15 tokens) are faithful translations of the Greek *apo-* … *apo*. Of those that do not correspond to the Greek exactly, five agree with pleonastic constructions attested in the Latin Vulgate, though influence from Latin versions of the New Testament on Gothic in these instances is uncertain. It is possible, but difficult to prove, that the remaining seven pleonastic constructions may arise from a combination of the use of idiomatic compounds in Gothic along with the mechanical translation of the Greek preposition *apo*. It is

[20] The two exceptions (Mark 16:3 and 2 Tim. 1:15) are somewhat dubious. In Mark 16:23, *ek* 'out' corresponds to *af*, though the preposition *apo* is attested in Caesarian and Western textual traditions. In 2 Tim. 1:15, while there is no corresponding preposition in Greek to the Gothic *af*, Latin versions of the New Testament attest the preposition *a* 'from'.

[21] The word *eis* 'into' is bracketed here because it appears in some manuscript traditions rather than *epi* 'after'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perhaps equally likely, however, that there were some complex verbs in which the semantic force of *af-* may have been sufficiently weak as to have required a preposition denoting separation to strengthen its semantic import. If this were the case, the construction *af-* … *af* could be attributed to the grammaticalization or the lexicalization of the prefix *af-*, and the unprefixed verbal forms could be interpreted as motivated by simplex forms in the Greek.

In section 7, I argue that like *af-* … *af* constructions, pleonastic constructions with the prefix *þairh-* 'through' and pleonastic preposition *þairh* 'through' were heavily influenced by the Greek source. This is indicated by the infrequency with which the pleonastic forms in Greek were translated as such into Gothic, the lack of instances that do not correspond to the Greek structure, and the alternation between complex and simplex verbs + PPs in the translation of Greek pleonastic constructions.

7. *þairh-*.

Greek contains pleonastic constructions that include the prefix *dia-* 'through' and its cognate preposition *dia* 'through' (+ NP complement). In these constructions, the preposition is redundant in that it has the same directional meaning as the prefix, is not necessary to assign case to objects in NP complements, and may be omitted without palpably altering the semantic import of the construction. The prefix, by contrast, seems essential for conveying spatiality, and the construction "*dia-* + verb + NP complement" is semantically different from the construction "simplex verb + *dia* + NP complement." This is because in cases of the latter, the preposition *dia* has a metaphorical meaning rather than a spatial meaning.

Greek constructions with the prefix *dia-* and its cognate preposition *dia* are translated literally into Gothic with the prefix *þairh-* 'through' and a PP headed by the preposition *þairh* 'through' in about five of eight instances (Luke 4:30, 17:11, 18:25, Mark 2:23, 11:16). There are no constructions of this type that arise in Gothic independently of the Greek. These instances may be considered pleonastic because the prefix and preposition both contain the same spatial meaning.[22] The number of

[22] Elsewhere *þairh-* is grammaticalized and has a continuative function, which is still attested in cognates of *þairh-* in modern Germanic languages. Compare Gothic *þairhwakan* 'to keep awake' and the Modern German cognate *durchwachen* 'to keep awake'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

constructions in which the prefix is omitted and the preposition is retained contrary to the Greek source suggests that the presence of the prefix in these constructions is probably the result of mechanical translation from the Greek.

There is one instance in which the Gothic deviates from Greek pleonastic construction by omitting the preposition. This is demonstrated in 22 below, in which the Greek prefix *dia-* is rendered by the Gothic prefix *þairh-*, whereas the Greek preposition *dia* is not translated. The complex verb *þairhiddjedun* 'traversed' (literally 'through-went') modifies the direct object *marein* 'sea'. While the Gothic (22a) and Greek (22b) do not match, the Gothic corresponds to the Latin (22c) construction attested in the Vulgate and may show influence of Old Latin versions of the New Testament.

(22) a. jah allai marein **þairh**iddjedun
and all sea **through**-went

'and all traversed the sea' (1 Cor. 10:1)

b. kai pantes **dia** tēs thalassēs **diē**lthon
and all **through** the sea **through**-went

'and all traversed the sea'

c. et omnes mare **trans**ierunt
and all sea **through**-went

'and all traversed the sea'

The following set of textual parallels demonstrates that in pleonastic constructions the prefix *þairh-* may be replaced with another preposition (*ga-*) without altering the meaning of the phrase. In 23 and 24, the Gothic text is identical, with the exception that *þairh*(-) is both a preposition and prefix in 23a, but in 24a the prefix *þairh-* is replaced with *ga-*.

(23) a. **þairh** þairko neþlos **þairh**leiþan
through eye of-needle to-**through**-pass

'to pass through the eye of a needle' (Luke 18:25)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. **dia** trēmatos belonēs eiselthein [**di**elthein]
through eye of-needle to-in-go [to-**through**-go]

'to go through the eye of a needle'

(24) a. **þairh** þairko neþlos galeiþan
through eye of-needle to-pass

'to pass through the eye of a needle' (Mark 10:25)

b. **dia** trumalias rhafidos [eiselthein] **di**elthein
through eye of- needle [to-in-go] to-**through**-go

'to go through the eye of a needle'

In 23b and 24b, both *eiselthein* 'to enter' and *dielthein* 'to go through' are attested as variants.[23] The latter verb contains the prefix *dia-* and would form a pleonastic construction with the preposition *dia*. In 24b, the Greek contains a pleonastic construction with the preposition *dia* and the prefix *dia-*. Further evidence of the semantic equivalence of complex verbs + PPs and simplex verbs + PPs in the translation of Greek pleonastic constructions is found in the set of textual parallels below. In 25a, the Gothic contains a pleonastic construction, while it is uncertain whether the same is true of the Greek exemplar (25b) from which Wulfila translated. The co-occurrence of the prefix *þairh-* and preposition *þairh* may arise in imitation of the Greek prefix *dia-* and preposition *dia*, or, if the prefix *para-* 'across' were in the Greek exemplar, from the tendency of the Gothic translator to render both Greek prefixes *para-* and *dia-* as *þairh-*. Thus, even if the Greek structure is not pleonastic, it most likely motivates a pleonastic construction in Gothic.

(25) a. jah warþ **þairh**gaggan imma … **þairh** atisk
and happened to-**through**-go him … **through** grain-field

'and it came about that he went through the grain field'
(Mark 2:23)

[23] See Götti 1974:58 for further discussion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. kai egeneto auton … **para**poreuesthai
and happened him … to-across-go

[**dia**poreuesthai] **dia** tōn sporimōn
[to-**through**-go] **through** the grain-fields

'and it came about that he went through the grain fields'

A textual echo of 25 is given in 26, although the structure in the latter is not pleonastic. The construction is pleonastic in Greek (26b), but the prefix *dia-* is not translated into Gothic (26a).

(26) a. Jah warþ … gaggan imma **þairh** atisk
and happened … to-go him **through** grain-field

'and it came about that he went through the grain field'
(Luke 6:1)

b. egeneto de … **dia**poreuesthai auton **dia** sporimōn
happened and … to-**through**-go him **through** grain-fields

'and it came about that he went through the grain fields'

In each instance, *þairh*-verbs with pleonastic PPs correspond to similar structures in the Greek. A number of textual parallels in which pleonastic constructions are alternately maintained from the Greek or simplified indicate that there was not an outstanding semantic difference between the two. These factors, along with the lack of independent use, most likely indicate substantial influence from the Greek text.

In summary, it has been shown that the prefixes *us-* 'out of, from', *af-* 'from', and *þairh-* 'through' were often used along with their corresponding prepositions or particles in translations of Greek pleonastic constructions. The frequency of these constructions may reflect the semantic ambiguity of the Gothic prefixes, for which cognate prepositions and particles provided reinforcement. These findings contrast with those concerning the particle *inn* 'in' discussed in the next section.

8. *Inn*.

The preverb *inn* 'in' indicates "motion into a place" and is semantically transparent. As discussed in section 2 above, *inn* is a particle in all cases

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

except possibly when it combines with the verb *gaggan* 'to go'. The lack of separation of *inn* from *gaggan* in main clauses may point to an inseparable complex verb.

Inn forms pleonastic constructions with the cognate preposition *in* 'into' (+ NP complement) in 15 instances. In each of these instances, the preposition *in* is directional and specifies "motion into." Each Gothic pleonasm corresponds to a pleonasm in Greek (formed with the prefixes *eis-* and *en-* [*em-*] 'into' and the directional preposition *eis* 'into'). In the majority of instances (48 out of 63), Gothic does not contain a part-by-part translation of Greek pleonastic constructions, and this indicates a strong tendency toward the simplification of the Greek pleonasms in the Gothic translation. When the Gothic deviates from the Greek model, the Greek prefix is not rendered into Gothic, whereas the preposition is always translated because it is necessary to assign case to an object in the NP complement.

In *inn … in* constructions, the particle *inn* combines with three verbs of motion, here listed along with their incidence: *gaggan* 'to go' (seven); *atgaggan* 'to come, go to, arrive' (four); and *galeiþan* 'to depart, go' (four). In the relatively few cases in which the Gothic translator maintained the pleonastic structure of the Greek (about one out of every five instances), his choice appears arbitrary. This is indicated by a number of parallel passages in which a complex verb + PP is interchangeable with a simplex verb + PP (Mark 2:26, Luke 6:4, Mark 10:23, Luke 18:24, 9:4, 10:5). In the pair given below, the Greek pleonastic construction *eisēlthen eis* 'entered into' (literally 'in-went into') is translated pleonastically into Gothic in 27a, which reads *inngalaiþ in*, but not in 28a, which reads *galaiþ in*. In both instances, the Gothic preposition *in* 'into' modifies the accusative object *gard* 'house'. Likewise, the Greek preposition *eis* 'into' modifies the accusative object *ton oikon* 'the house'.

(27) a. ƕaiwa **inn**galaiþ **in** gard
how **in**-went **into** house

'how he went into the house' (Luke 6:4)

b. [hōs] … **eis**ēlthen **eis** ton oikon
how … **in**-went **into** the house

'how he went into the house'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(28) a. ƕaiwa galaiþ **in** gard
how went **into** house
'how he went into the house' (Mark 2:26)

b. [hōs] … **eis**ēlthen **eis** ton oikon
how … **in**-went **into** the house
'how he went into the house'

Given that Gothic complex verbs + PPs are used alternately with simplex verbs + PPs to render Greek pleonastic constructions in environments that are contextually and grammatically similar, the greater incidence of the latter in Gothic may point to the relatively strong semantic force of *inn*: both the particle *inn* and the preposition *in* are used to express 'motion into', and since the preposition is necessary in these constructions and satisfies the directionality requirement, the particle *inn* would have had a redundant quality.

The arbitrary use of *inn* in translating Greek pleonasms has parallels in OHG and OE biblical translations of Latin. The following discussion serves simply to highlight patterns common to the Gothic translation of Greek and the OHG and OE translations of Latin, which may indicate the textual influence of the sources on the languages translated. Before these are addressed, some background information is necessary.

Old High German and Old English had preverbs etymologically related to the Gothic prefix *in-* and particle *inn*. The form *in* could represent both preverbs in Old High German and Old English, although their functions were distinct: the OHG and OE prefix *in-* (usually *on-* in Old English) is cognate with the semantically empty Gothic prefix *in-* and often has a causative function in all three languages (as in Gothic *inbrannjan*, OHG *inbrennen*, OE *onbærnan* 'to cause to burn, kindle'). The OHG and OE adverbial particle *in* 'in' corresponds to the Gothic particle *inn* and is semantically transparent and resultative in function. The remainder of the discussion focuses on the adverbial particle *in*. There are some instances in which OHG and OE *in* transitivizes the complex verb, indicating that its adverbial function was weakening. In the majority of cases, however, OHG and OE *in* meet the following diagnostic criteria for particles (as outlined in Fischer et al. 2000:182–185): *in* frequently separates from its verbal stem in main clauses, the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

negative particle *ni* 'not' intervenes between *in* and the verbal stem, and *in* precedes the infinitive marker (*zi* in OHG and *to* in OE).[24] The first two criteria are also met by the Gothic particle *inn*, but there are no co-occurrences of *inn* and the infinitive marker *du* by which to judge the third criterion.

OHG and OE pleonastic constructions are formed with the particle *in* and a PP headed by the preposition *in* 'into' in Old High German and *in*/*on*/*into* 'into' in Old English. The particle is optional, while the preposition is necessary to license the object in the NP. Harrison (1970:22–25) attributed the OE pleonasms in the translated works of Bede, Orosius, and Boethius to Latin influence, while Reining (1916:68) suggested that the OHG pleonasms result from the functional weakening of the particle. It is difficult to ascertain what the origin of these constructions is because so much of the OHG and OE corpora consists of Latin translations and paraphrases. It can be said, however, that these pleonasms are rare in early Old High German and Old English, particularly in poetry. Their highest concentrations are in direct translations of Latin.

Prefixation in the Latin New Testament resembles that in the Greek, making a comparison of OE and OHG renditions of biblical Latin comparable to the Gothic translation of Greek. Similarities between Wulfila's rendition of the Greek Bible, the West Saxon Gospels (dated to the late tenth century), and the OHG translation of Tatian's Gospel Harmony (dated to the mid-ninth century) suggest that the incidence of complex verbs with the pleonastic prepositions *in*/*on*/*into* 'into' was likely motivated at least in part by the languages they translate.[25] The rendition of Latin complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions in the West Saxon Gospels and the OHG translation of Tatian resembles that of the Gothic translation of the Greek in the following respects: first, there are no pleonastic constructions in Gothic and the West Saxon Gospels that do not correspond to the structure of the original respective Greek and

[24] See Hiltunen 1983 for an analysis of OE separable complex verbs.

[25] Though there is no complete rendition of the New Testament in Old High German, a translation of Tatian's Gospel Harmony survives from St. Gallen. The text is divided into two columns on the page, in which the Latin and Old High German stand side by side. The need for the columns to correspond to one another line by line facilitated a very close rendition (though less so than in an interlinear translation) of the Latin into Old High German.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Latin texts, and in the Tatian translation there is only one; second, in all three texts, there is variation in the use of complex verbs + PPs and simplex verbs + PPs to render the pleonastic constructions of the original Greek and Latin, stemming from the translators' frequent omission of the preverb in the original. The interchangeability of complex and simplex verbs + PPs in grammatically and contextually similar passages hints at the mechanical translation of the particle.

In the West Saxon Gospels, Latin pleonastic constructions are translated pleonastically in 14 instances (Matt. 8:5, 10:11, 10:12, 12:4, 12:29, 26:41, Luke 9:4, 10:8, 10:10, Mark 7:24, 10:5, 22:10, John 3:5, 18:15), 13 of which are with the verb *gangan* 'to go', and one of which is with the verb *faran* 'to travel, go'. There is little palpable semantic difference in the OE constructions *gangan on*/*into* 'to go into' and *ingangan on* 'to go into' (literally 'to-in-go into'), except that it can be presumed that the latter is spatially more specific. The OE pair in 29 and 30 illustrates the arbitrariness with which the particle *in* was used to translate corresponding Latin prefixes. In 29a, the OE particle *in* translates the Latin prefix *intro-* 'in', and the OE preposition *on* translates the Latin preposition *in* 'into'. In 30a, the Latin *intro-* is not represented in Old English, and the Latin preposition *in* is translated by the OE preposition *into*. While the OE preposition *into* in 30a is semantically more specific than *on* in 29a, *into* and *on* are often interchangeable.[26]

(29) a. hu he **in**eode **on** godes hus
how he **in**-went **into** God's house

'how he entered God's house' (Matt. 12:4)

b. quomodo **intr**avit **in** domum Dei
how **in**-went **into** house of-God

'how he entered God's house'

[26] The Skeat edition (1871–1878) of the West Saxon Gospels is the source of the text in 29a and 30a.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(30) a. hu he eode **into** godes huse
how he went **into** God's house

'how he went into God's house' (Luke 6:4)

b. quomodo **intr**avit **in** domum Dei
how **in**-went **into** house of-God

'how he entered God's house'

As in Gothic and the West Saxon Gospels, there is variation in rendering pleonastic constructions in the Tatian translation, although they are more prevalent in the latter. There are two verbs that form pleonastic constructions with the particle *in* 'in' and a PP headed by a cognate preposition: *gangan* 'to go' and *stigan* 'to climb, ascend'.[27] Similar to the corresponding forms in Gothic, the complex verb + preposition *ingangan in* 'to enter into'—in which the first *in* 'in' is a particle and the second *in* is a preposition that modifies a NP complement—competes with the simplex verb + preposition *gangan in* 'to come/go into' in rendering Latin pleonastic structures. This is demonstrated in the OHG pair in 31 and 32. Whereas the OHG verb *gieng* 'went' in 31a is combined with the particle *in*, corresponding to the Latin complex verb *ingrederetur* 'was entering' (literally 'in-was-going'), in 32a the particle is absent and *gieng* is a simplex verb, despite the corresponding Latin complex verb *intravit* 'entered' (literally 'in-went').

(31) a. inti mittiu her tho **in**gieng **in** sumilicha burgilun
and while he then **in**-went **into** a-certain town

'and as he entered a certain town' (Tatian 111.1)

b. et cum **in**grederetur quoddam castellum
and as **in**-was-going a-certain town

'and as he entered a certain town'

[27] For the sake of brevity, the verb *gangan* also includes the anomalous form *gān*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(32) a. thaz her selbo gieng **in** suma burgilun
that he himself went **into** a-certain town

'that he himself entered a certain town' (Tatian 63.1)

b. et ipse **intr**avit **in** quoddam castellum
and himself **in**-went **into** a-certain town

'and he himself entered a certain town'

Tatian contains 27 instances of *ingangan in* and 36 instances of *gangan in*. *Ingangan in* is used exclusively for the Latin *introire*/*intrare in* and *ingredi in* 'to enter into' (literally 'to-in-go into'), in which there is the co-occurrence of the Latin prefixes *intro-*/*in-* 'in' and preposition *in* 'into'.[28] Though *gangan in* is used predominantly to render *introire*/*intrare in* as well as other Latin verb phrases denoting 'to come/go into', such as *ire in* (literally 'to-go in') (two tokens) and *inire* + acc. object (literally 'to-in-go') (one token), it is also used to translate the Latin *abire in* 'to depart into' (literally 'to-from-go into') (eight tokens), and *exire in* 'to go out into' (literally 'to-out-go into') (one token).[29] The motivating factors behind the translator's choice of either the complex or

[28] The Latin verb phrases corresponding to *ingangan in* are listed here with their incidence, followed by their location within the text:
ingredi in 'to enter into' (literally 'to-in-go into') (1); 2.3.
ingredi + acc. object 'to enter' (literally 'to-in-go') (1); 111.1.
introire/*intrare in* 'to enter into' (literally 'to-in-go into') (34); 4.1, 8.6, 18.1, 44.3, 44.7, 47.1, 62.6, 68.3, 84.6, 84.8 (two tokens), 87.8, 92.6, 93.2, 106.4 (two tokens), 110.1, 113.2, 117.2, 119.2, 133.6, 138.11, 147.1, 149.4, 149.5, 157.2, 180.1, 186.2, 195.1, 197.7, 220.4, 227.2.

[29] The Latin verb phrases corresponding to *gangan in* are listed here with their incidence, followed by their location within the text:
exire in 'to depart into' (literally 'to-out-go into') (1); 70.1.
inire + acc. object 'to enter' (literally 'to-in-go') (1); 126.1.
ire in 'to go in' (2); 28.3, 223.3.
abire in 'to depart into' (literally 'to-away-go into') (8); 2.11, 4.1, 21.10, 54.8, 87.2, 135.31, 136.3, 241.1.
introire/*intrare in* 'to enter into' (literally 'to-in-go into') (15); 25.7, 34.2, 42.1 (two tokens), 46.5, 50.7, 63.1, 69.1, 87.2, 94.2, 106.4, 119.3, 159.4, 180.3, 192.3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

simplex verb + PP to render *introire*/*intrare in* are not clear, and the only distinction between the two seems to be that the complex verb + PP is semantically more specific than the simplex counterpart.

It has been demonstrated that a number of similarities exist in the translation of complex verbs with pleonastic PPs in the Gothic Bible, the West Saxon Gospels, and the OHG translation of Tatian. In all three texts the pleonastic structures in the Greek and Latin originals are frequently simplified by omitting the preverb. When the pleonastic structures are maintained, the translators' choice of complex verb over simplex verb appears to be arbitrary and the product of mechanical translation. With the exception of one instance in the Tatian translation, complex verbs with the pleonastic prepositions *in*/*on*/*into* consistently correspond to the structures of the Latin or Greek originals. These factors indicate that in all three languages into which the translations were made, these pleonasms were highly influenced by the source languages. This is not to say that the pleonastic constructions were unidiomatic, but rather that, as they appear in the texts, they have a highly derivative quality.

In this section, it has been shown that unlike Gothic prepositional prefixes, the adverbial particle *inn* is rarely used in translations of Greek pleonasms. This may be because its strong semantic force did not require much reinforcement. Similar patterns in Gothic, OHG, and OE biblical translations point to a certain amount of mechanical translation as the source of these pleonastic constructions.

9. Summary and Conclusion.

The present study has endeavored to show that the Greek source of the New Testament from which the Gothic was translated had a profound influence on complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions in Gothic. The Greek contains numerous constructions in which the verbal prefix and corresponding PP specify the same directional movement. These are often translated into Gothic part-by-part with the Gothic prefixes *us-*, *af-*, *þairh-*, and the particle *inn* and corresponding PPs. Most complex verbs with pleonastic prepositions in Gothic precisely match the structure of the Greek they are translating. While there are some Gothic constructions in which formally and semantically related preverbs and prepositions co-occur independently of the Greek, only a handful of these are truly pleonastic. In most of these cases, the prefix has been lexicalized or grammaticalized and does not contain the same semantic information as

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

its corresponding PP. Prefix-preposition redundancy in Gothic is thus rare except in part-by-part translations of Greek.

The grammaticalization or lexicalization of an individual preverb generally correlates with how often it occurs with its cognate preposition (+ NP complement) or particle. The more ambiguous the preverb is, the greater the need for semantic reinforcement from a PP or adverbial particle and the more likely the two are to co-occur in translations of Greek pleonasms. At one extreme is the collocation of the prefix *us-* 'out, from', which was shown to be semantically bleached and not resultative, and a PP headed by the cognate preposition *us* 'out of, from'. Since the prefix had developed a range of abstract meanings, it was able to accommodate the semantic nuances of the Greek prefix *ek-* 'out' in most instances. The co-occurrence of the prefix and a PP headed by *us* or the adverbial particle *ut* functioned to reinforce the prefix's lost semantic content, and this is why these constructions are also found independently of the Greek. These constructions are not truly pleonastic, therefore, because only the preposition specifies directionality.

At the other end of the grammaticalization spectrum is the particle *inn* 'in', which has a purely spatial meaning and is assumed to represent a stage of grammaticalization prior to that of prefixes. *Inn* is rarely (that is, about one in every five instances) used to translate Greek pleonasms as such into Gothic, and this may be attributable to its strong semantic force, which required no supplementation from prepositions or particles. The degree of grammaticalization of the prefixes *af-* 'from' and *þairh-* 'through' lies somewhere between that of *us-* and *inn*. As prefixes, *af-* and *þairh-* were semantically weakened through polysemy and the development of grammatical functions. They were nevertheless semantically transparent enough to specify directionality, and so formed pleonastic constructions with their corresponding directional PPs. The construction "*þairh-* + verb + *þairh* + NP complement" represents the structure of the Greek in each instance. Pleonastic constructions consisting of the prefix *af-* and preposition *af* (+ NP complement) are somewhat difficult to account for due to textual uncertainties. It has been suggested either that apparently unmotivated instances of these pleonasms arise from the combination of lexicalized *af*-verbs and the mechanical translation of the Gothic preposition *apo* 'from' as *af* 'from', or that the preposition *af* may have served to reinforce the semantic import of the prefix if the latter

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was sufficiently weakened in its force through close composition with certain verbs.

Grammaticalization alone does not fully account for the incidence of Gothic complex verbs with pleonastic PPs. A number of factors hint that the Greek source was the influence behind many Gothic pleonasms. First, the majority of them corresponds part-by-part to the structure of the Greek. Second, there is variation between Gothic complex verbs + PPs and simplex verbs + PPs in grammatically and contextually similar passages, indicating that the presence or absence of the preverb is arbitrary. Third, there are very few pleonastic constructions independent of the Greek. Similar patterns are attested in OHG and OE biblical translations of Latin.

These findings suggest that prefix-preposition redundancy in Gothic is most often the result of the mechanical translation of corresponding Greek structures. Though little scholarship has been devoted to this topic, the trend in research on prefixation has been to minimize or overlook the influence of the Greek on Gothic. This study endeavored above all to show that the Gothic text should not be taken at face value, but rather in light of biblical Greek and Latin. Nevertheless, a number of deviations in Gothic from Greek suggest a style of translation that, while very closely adhering to the original sources, is far from "slavish." The outcome is a text that carefully preserves the integrity of the Greek original without sacrificing the intelligibility of the translation.

REFERENCES

Baldi, Philip. 1979. Typology and the Indo-European prepositions. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 84.49–61.

Behaghel, Otto (ed.). 1984. *Heliand und Genesis*. 9th edn. by Burkhard Taeger. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Bennett, William. 1970. The stress patterns of Gothic. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 85.463–472.

Blom, Corrien. 2005. *Complex predicates in Dutch: Synchrony and diachrony*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universitet te Amsterdam doctoral dissertation.

Booij, Geert. 2002. *The morphology of Dutch*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Booij, Geert & Ans van Kemenade. 2003. Preverbs: An introduction. *Yearbook of morphology*, ed. by Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle, 1–12. Kluwer: Dordrecht.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Braune, Wilhelm & Ernst A. Ebbinghaus. 1981. *Gotische Grammatik*. 19th edn. (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte, A.1.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
Curme, George O. 1914. The development of verbal compounds in Germanic. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 39.320–361.
Delbrück, B. 1910. Zur Stellung des Verbums im Gotischen und Altisländischen. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 36.359–362.
Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 1995. *Verbal syntax in the early Germanic languages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University doctoral dissertation.
Ferraresi, Gisella. 2005. *Word order and phrase structure in Gothic*. Leuven: Peeters.
Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, & Wim van der Wurff. 2000. *The syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Friedrichs, Ernst. 1891. *Die Stellung des Pronomen personale im Gotischen*. Jena: Frommann.
Götti, Ernst. 1974. *Die gotischen Bewegungsverben. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des gotischen Wortschatzes mit einem Ausblick auf Wulfilas Übersetzungstechnik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Gould, Chester Nathan. 1916. *The syntax of* at *and* ana *in Gothic, Old Saxon, and Old High German*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago doctoral dissertation.
Grewolds, Heinrich. 1932–1933. Die gotischen Komposita in ihrem Verhältnis zu deren griechischen Vorlage. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 60.1–53.
Gruber, Hans. 1930. *Das Adverbale* uz-*Präfix im Gotischen und Althochdeutschen*. Jena: Walter Biedermann.
Harnisch, Karl-Rüdiger. 1982. "Doppelpartikelverben" als Gegenstand der Wortbildungslehre und Richtungsadverbien als Präpositionen. *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, ed. by Ludwig Eichinger, 107–133. Hamburg: Buske.
Harrison, Thomas Perrin. 1970. *The separable prefixes in Anglo-Saxon*. College Park, MD: McGrath Publishing.
Hiltunen, Risto. 1983. *The decline of the prefixes and the beginnings of the English phrasal verb*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.
Hirt, Hermann. 1931. *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*, vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Johannisson, Ture. 1939. *Verbal och Postverbal Partikelkomposition i de germanska Språken*. Lund: Håkan Ohlsson.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jülicher, Adolf. 1963. *Itala: das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Kemenade, Ans van & Bettelou Los. 2003. Particles and prefixes in Dutch and English. *Yearbook of Morphology*, ed. by Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle, 79–117. Kluwer: Dordrecht.
Kieckers, Ernst. 1928. *Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik.* Munich: Max Huber.
Klein, Jared S. 1992. On the idiomatic nature of the Gothic New Testament: A comparative study of prepositional usage in Gothic and New Testament Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90.1–80.
Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*: *Satzlehre*, vol. 1. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Lehmann, Wilhelm. 1906. *Das Präfix* uz- *besonders im Altenglischen*. Kiel: R. Cordes.
McIntyre, Andrew. 2001. *German double particles as preverbs: Morphology and conceptual semantics*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
McKnight, George Harley. 1897. The primitive Teutonic order of words. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 1.136–219.
Meillet, Antoine. 1982[1912]. L'evolution des formes grammaticales. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, 130–48. Paris: Champion.
Metlen, Michael. 1933. What a Greek interlinear of the Gothic Bible text can teach us. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 32.530–548.
Metzger, Bruce M. 1977. *The early versions of the New Testament.* London: Oxford University Press.
Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax*, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon.
Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, & Barclay Newman. 2001. *Novum Testamentum Græce*. 27th rev. edn. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
Olsen, Susan. 1996. Pleonastische Direktionale. *Wenn die Semantik arbeitet: Klaus Baumgärtner zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. by Klaus Baumgärtner, Gisela Harras, & Manfred Bierwisch, 303–329. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Purtscher, Fridolin. 1902. *Die untrennbaren Partikeln im ahd. Tatian*. Chur: Jos. Casanova.
Reining, Charles. 1916. *A study of verbs compounded with* aus*,* ein*, etc*. Stanford, CA: Leland Stanford Junior University Publications.
Rice, Allan L. 1932. *Gothic prepositional compounds in their relation to their Greek originals*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania doctoral dissertation.
Ryder, Frank. 1951. The syntax of Gothic complex verbs. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 50.200–217.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Schäferdiek, Knut. 1981. Die Fragmente der "Skeireins" und der Johanneskommentar des Theodor von Herakleia. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 110.175–193.
Sievers, Eduard (ed.). 1882. *Tatian. Lateinisch und altdeutsch mit ausführlichem Glossar*. 2nd edn. Paderborn: Schöningh.
Skeat, Walter William (ed.). 1871–1887. *The four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stearns, MacDonald. 1978. *Crimean Gothic: Analysis and etymology of the corpus*. Saratoga, CA: Anma Libri.
Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1920. *Gotisches Elementarbuch*. 5th & 6th edns. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Streitberg, Wilhelm (ed.). 1971. *Die gotische Bibel. Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage*, vol. 1. 6th edn. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Wackernagel, Jacob. 1924. *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, vol. 2. Basel: Birkhäuser.
West, Jonathan. 1982. The semantics of preverbs in Gothic. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 87.138–165.

Indiana University
Department of Germanic Studies
1020 East Kirkwood Ave.
Ballantine Hall 644
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-7103
USA
[lgoettin@indiana.edu]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542707000141 Published online by Cambridge University Press