

PREVERBATION IN THE OLD GERMANIC LANGUAGES:
A RESEARCH PROJECT

1. INTRODUCTORY BACKGROUND

Western linguistics remains basically dependent on the assumptions about language and language study that were elaborated in the late Antiquity, on the basis of the Aristotelian philosophy of speech and of science in general. The descriptive approach rests on the practice of description and classification of nature, and takes language as one more among the objects of human experience in relation with the so-called external world. Science aim has thereafter been to provide accurate descriptions of what exists and, if possible, causal connexions between the identified entities in every domain of knowledge.

Despite the fact that the Aristotelian consideration of linguistic categories takes place in the context of the theory of tragedy, i. e., within the framework of literary aesthetics, his terms and concepts were soon taken as parts of a naturalistic account of what language or speech consists of. Such an account was of no immediate practical use, and a descriptive grammar in our modern sense came only several centuries afterwards. The main concern among Greek linguistics was the philological study of their own classics, whose texts show significant dialectal divergences. From the old Greek grammars only two main theoretical works survive: Dionisius Thrax's modest *tekhne grammatike* and Appolonios Dyscholos's discursive syntax, who conceived syntax for the first time as the study of morphological element collocations rather than as the study of their connective properties.

The late Latinity has provided the European scholarship with the model of grammatical activity in two works: Donatus and Priscianus's grammars,

dependent on the Aristotelian logics and based on the subject-predicate utterance core. This paradigm assigns the free use of cases in Greek and Latin, so to say, the protagonism of the whole syntax. A scheme of action soon raised, as the ontological correlate to the grammatical system of case complements (subject, object, receiver, cause, qualitative determination). Within the humanistic tradition, Scaliger's work is a good account of both the grammatical and the ontological basic categories in terms of a general theory of action.

The use of verbs with preverb as a means of conveying meaning not otherwise lexicalized was, to a large extent, dead in classical Latin: verbs and preverbs were rigidly bound into plainly lexical units. Productivity in this domain is word-making, not sentence-making. But in old Greek, Vedic, Sanskrit, Hittite and in modern Germanic and Slavonic languages it is quite the opposite: there is an important linguistic productivity which consists of the syntactic innovation in the verb-preverb connection. Here we can distinguish two main streams of linguistic innovation: a conceptual and more static one, consisting of the finding of new words whether by connecting idiomatic or Greek-Latin roots with existing suffixes or by combining extant words in new composites, and a dynamic, syntactic way of conveying new meaning by a productive combination of rather abstract and unspecific verbs with rather abstract and general, but highly determined, particles. Both ways are in a quite different relation with the concept of time in language: the former aims at getting new entities provided with some ontological consistency (here we surprisingly find the Sanskrit use of nominal composites to express context-bound facts, composites which are, so to say, only *parole* elements, despite the nominalization and substantialization usually implied); the latter, the pre-veneration method, does not point at temporal permanence: it builds the utterance for the momentary occurrence and, in this case, the speakers are immediately creative, even if they make their combinations in a highly codified way.

The role of active preveneration is so central in such languages that in the language acquisition stages children often go through a period of expression building largely based on it: some lexical units are replaced by the preverbs

most frequently connected with them (a lamp is called *an* (“on”) by German children).

But as linguistics is based, as we have seen, on the grammatical habits of a language which lacked productive syntactic preverbation, the dominant syntactical model remains fixed on the nominal-verb core of the verb with its nominal complements. Modern linguistics has to overcome a serious conceptual difficulty when aiming at representing the central role of preverbation in the syntax of some Indo-European languages.

The research team formed at the University of Salamanca for the “Indo-European preverbation Project” has, as its main goal, the comparative study of this syntactical and lexical procedure in most ancient and mediaeval Indo-European languages showing this feature in one or another evolutive stage, as a means to correct the dominant models of describing the central expression patterns in such languages. The Germanic languages considered - Gothic, Old High German, Old English, Old Norse, Old Saxon- play a heuristically important role in this respect, because the Germanic languages show a very strong productivity of that procedure along their whole history and, being spoken by the linguists in the Project, it is possible a direct linguistic sensibility for their immediate appreciation of such constructions meaning.

2. THE EMPIRICAL BASIS

The research is based on an exhaustive case sample of motion verbs with preverb in the Rigveda, Dr. Ana Agud’s previous work. This scholar has also developed the main lines of the Project. Thereafter some verbal roots expressing motion have been selected, following the criterion of taking the main Indo-European motion roots correlates (roots: **er-* “run”; **ghengh-* “go”, “come”; **gʷem-* “go”, “come”; **kʷerp-* “go”, “go back”; **per-* “go”, “travel”;

**steigh-* “go up”, “go down”; **tregh-* “run”; **wendh-* “go back”), and the roots with highest frequency in each language.

Among the extant texts, we have selected those which can be held as the most representative of spontaneous speech: narrative, spoken discourses. Of course, between literary composition and spontaneous oral language there is a fundamental difference which cannot be obliterated by any linguistic method whatsoever. The grammar we are building from our corpus is the one of the written language, depending on that of the oral language in an unspecifiable way. For the Germanic languages we have also taken the Bible, having in mind that the Bible is the only extant text in Gothic.

The chosen texts are as follows:

Gothic: the Bible;

Old High German: *Tatian, Isidor, Die Benediktinerregel*;

Old English: King Alfred’s translation of *Cura Pastoralis, The AngloSaxon Chronicle*, the Bible, Aelfric and Wulfstan’s *Sermons*;

Old Saxon: *Heliand*;

Old Norse: not selected yet.

3. INFORMATION SCHEME

A computerized information card has been designed, containing the following items: textual localization of the sentence, literary gender, metrical scheme, preverb specification (in numeral code) and position feature specification (before-after, joint-separate), verbal root, its morphological characterization (augmentation, reduplication, vocalism state, primary and derivative suffixes, person, tense and modality), main characteristics of the syntactical construction (number and kind of complements, particles, sentence type, dependent clauses). The card also contains the sentence in full and, for some

languages, a suitable standard translation into the nearest language (Sanskrit, Avestan, Hittite, Gothic, Old High German and Old Saxon into modern German, Old English into modern English, etc.). In the case of translations, the sentences are recorded in both languages.

The file is processed by a special program on DBase IV basis, which allows combined searches of part or the whole of the features registered. The program, that we have named Rama-Indra, has been developed by some colleagues of the Faculty of Physics, at the University of Salamanca. It has easy routines for adding and deleting data, consulting and analysing. The card lists, ordered upon various criteria (root, preverb, etc.) are easily reached. The printing of the cards containing the texts renders the philological study of the texts simple.

4. INFORMATION PROCESS: GOALS

First, we are looking for statistically significant correlations among the features selected. The underlying hypothesis is that there must have been an effective influence of the syntactical phenomenon of preverbalion upon the development of the morphological verbal systems themselves. This influence could be indirectly detected by the study of frequency or collocations. We have seen, for instance, that in Sanskrit imperative uses of motion verbs are without exception preverbed. Such correlations could provide meaningful glances at the development of morphological categories occurrences. Here, of course, results can only be rightly evaluated if comparative evidence can be adduced.

Secondly, we are trying to get a “fresh perspective” on the syntactical sense of preverbalion by concentrating attention on it and by considering the rest of syntax as its circumstance. This is certainly onesided, but this change of perspective will be productive, we think, so far as it represents the complementary onesidedness to the usual syntactic and semantic perception.

Catalina Montes & M^a Pilar Fernández

5. INFORMATION PROCESSING: METHOD

Leaving aside the prejudgment against the central role that particles play in the verbal expression structuration, we look at the text series assembled by one correlation or the other and try to find semantic similarities and differences. Here we have no prejudged analysis method: each researcher, facing each language and kind of text, must find the most significant features of the constructions under exam, and then inform the other researchers, in order to undertake corresponding searching processes in cognate languages. The method rests open.

The basis is a systematical analysis of constellations among the features fixed on the cards. First, we play rather freely with them, just to obtain the random significant statistics. Surprises arise: in the Rigvedic research, the most advanced so far, we have observed that one constellation of two preverbs is represented with only one root, and all the occurrences are directly or indirectly related to the god Indra. Such evidences show the possibility of application of this research to plainly philological aims. This is quite consequent: we are not examining oral speech, and the correct approach to the written language is the philological one.

We conceive the available systems of grammatical description as alternative approaches to the linguistic object. The different syntactical frameworks of European or American structuralism, generative grammar, valency and dependence grammar, functional grammar, etc. can be taken as a suitable way of description when the facts observed and the interest they raise just meet into a constellation that suggests precisely one of these frames and not another. None of them is the right one in itself, each is good enough for a given purport. So the methodological definition of the description aims must be a conscious one, because only the aims determine and justify the selection of a conceptual alternative for the description.

In this sense, it is an “open method”, especially open for the philological perspective. We postulate that inguistic descriptions are of little worth in

themselves, and we try to put them at the service of the better understanding of texts. Our comparative perspective has this purpose too.

6. STATE OF THE GENERAL PROJECT

At present only preliminary work has been done in most of the fields. It includes the software preparation, which must be specific for each language processed, the discussion of bibliography about preverbs, and methodological debates regarding the card design. Only the Rigvedic research shows a complete file of the occurrences and some analyses on the preverb *upa-*. This work provides the cues for a better planning of other files which are being composed now.

For the Germanic languages we distinguish between primary and secondary preverbalation, which diachronically represent two complete cycles of just the same phenomenon. Differential research should be done in this domain.

7. STATE OF THE WEST GERMANIC LANGUAGES RESEARCH: GOTHIC

Die Gotische Bibel (The Gothic Bible) is the most advanced study in this particular field of the Germanic languages. Pilar Fernández Aálvarez, who had previously written a grammar of Gothic, is applying her perfect knowledge of the text to this new study. It has been computerized, following the edition of W. Streitberg (Heidelberg, 1971). The card for this language, the same as for the other Germanic ones, includes localization (author, chapter, verse, type of sentence), preverb kind, position and number, verb morphology (tense, person, modality) and sentence or clause type. 21 different preverbs bound to the selected motion verbs (*gaggan* “go”; *galeipan* “go”, “come”; *qiman* “come”; *rinnan* “run”; *steigan* “go up”; *pragjan* “run”; *wandjan* ““go back””) have been found: *af-*, *afar-*, *ana-*, *and-*, *at-*, *bi-*, *du-*, *faur-*, *faura-*, *fra-*, *ga-*, *hinder-*, *inn-*, *mip-*, *pairh-*, *ufar-*, *und-*, *ur-*, *us-*, *ut-*,

wipra-, in alphabetical order, and the occurrences have been fixed, both of these verbs and their preverbs.

So far the results are as follows:

Gaggan occurs 22 times, with the preverbs: af-, afar-, at-, du-, faur-, faura-, ga-, inn-, mip-, pairh-, ufar-, us-, ut-, wipra-.

Qiman occurs 40 times. It appears with: ana-, faura-, fra-, ga-, mip-, us-.
Leipan, which is never found unprefixed, occurs 174 times, with the pre-

verbs: af-, bi-, ufar-, us-, ga-, inn-, pairh-, mip-, hindar-.

Steigan occurs 22 times, with: at-, us-, ufar-, ga-.

Pragjan appears only once, with the preverb bi-.

Rinnan presents 38 occurrences , with the following preverbs: du-, ur-, bi-, ga-, und-, at-, and-.

Wandjan occurs 35 times, with: ga-, us-, at-.

From this point the research is advancing, even if it is too early to offer conclusions.

8. OLD HIGH GERMAN

For Old High German some texts have already been computerized: *Tatian* (E. Sievers's edition, Paderborn, 1892), *Isidor* (H. Eggers's edition, Tübingen, 1964) and *Die Benediktninerregel* (U. Daab's edition, Tübingen, 1959). The research, the same as that in Gothic is being carried out by Mariåå Pilar Fernaåandez Aålvarez, who has also written a grammar of Old High German.

The preverbs found in the corpus, 20 (23 forms), are the following: *ab-*, *ar-/er-*, *bi-*, *fora-*, *fur-/for-*, *furi-*, *fram-*, *gi-*, *in-*, *int-*, *nidar-*, *thuruh-*, *ubar-/obar-*, *uf-*, *ufar-*, *umbi-*, *uz-*, *widar-*, *zi-*, *zuo-*.

The partial results refer only to *Tatian*: This text including the verbs: *faran* “travel”; *gangan* “go”, “come”; *queman* “go”, “come”; *stigan* “go up”, “go down”; *wenten* “go back”; *werban* “go”, “go back”, with the following preverbs and occurrences:

Gangan occurs 207 times, with: *ar-*, *bi-*, *fram-*, *furi-*, *gi-*, *in-*, *int-*, *ubar-*, *uf-*,

umbi-, *uz-*, *uudar-*, *zi-*, *zuo-*.

Faran appears 36 times, with the preverbs: *ab-*, *ar-*, *fur-*, *fora-*, *furi-*, *thu-*, *ruh-*, *uudar-*.

Queman occurs 10 times, with: *ar-*, *bi-*, *fora-*, *fram-*, *obar-*, *uf-*, *uz-*.

Stigan presents 62 occurrences, with the preverbs: *ar-*, *gi-*, *in-*, *nidar-*, *uf-*,

Wenten occurs 17 times, with: *gi-*, *uudar-*.

Werben occurs 9 times, with the preverbs: *ar-*, *gi-*, *uudar-*.

The number of occurrences in each of the preverbs has been fixed, but, the same as regarding Gothic, the doubtful instances must be reexamined before any results can be taken in mind as data.

9. OLD ENGLISH

No Old English text has been computerized yet. Most time has been spent in reading and discussing the numerous studies published, even if none of them covers the field of our research (the reference is given in the bibliography accompanying this paper), and in the careful selection of the texts.

The Bible has been chosen to enable the comparison with Gothic. Alfred's translation of *Cura Pastoralis* allows the comparison with Latin (the same as the texts in Old High German), and is at the same time a good example of the free use of the Latin texts, characteristic in Old English if compared with the other Germanic languages, a phenomenon due in part to the vague

sense of many of the preverbs in the historical time, which enables a choice not determined by meaning. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* allows the study of the preverb evolution in Old English, embracing all the period, including older material than that of the time in which it was written and *The Peterborough Chronicle* going as far as the beginning of Middle English. Aelfric and Wulfstan's *Sermons* are representative of the spoken discourse, the one especially chosen for the Project.

Even as it is, we consider our Project wide and deep enough to be worth of being known by our colleagues. All advice and suggestion will be welcome, and we are open to any farther information on it, if requested.

Catalina Montes Mozo & M^a Pilar Fernández Álvarez
University of Salamanca

REFERENCES

- Abusamra, F. M., *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Elemente ober- und über-, nieder- und unter- in der Wortbildung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Leipzig 1971.
- Balin, B. M.-Zerebkov, V. A., "Aspectuell relevanter Kontext in den germanischen Sprachen", *Linguistics* 117, 1973, 5-13.
- Bammesberger, A., "Die westgermanischen Entsprechungen zu urgerm. *uz(-)", *PBB* 101, 1979, 30-35.
- Bammesberger, A., "Die Betonung der nominales *ga-* Komposita im Urgermanischen", *PBB* 103, 3, 1981, 377-391.
- Becker, D., "Case Grammar and German *be-*", *Glossa* 5, 1971, 125-145.
- Beer, Ant., "Beiträge zur gotischen Grammatik I: *gawisan*", *PBB* 43, 1918, 446-469.

- Bernhardt, E., “Die Partikel *ga-* als Hilfsmittel bei der gotischen Konjugation”, *ZDPH* 2, 1869, 158-167.
- Bloomfield, L., “Notes on the Preverb *ge-* in Alfredian English”, *Studies in English Philology, A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*, Minneapolis 1929, 79-102.
- Bogner, A., *Die Verbalvorsilbe bi- im Althochdeutschen*, Hamburg 1933.
- Borgato, G., “El preverbo tedesco e l’Aktionsart”, *Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica* 1, 1979-1980, 1-75.
- Bradley, F. W., “The Semantic Development of the German Suffix *-zen*”, *Bulletin of the University of South Carolina*, 193, 1926, 1-11.
- Bruce, M.- Kingsmill, A., “Prepositions, Adverbs, Prepositional Adverbs, Postpositions, Separable Prefixes, or Inseparable Prefixes, in Old English?. A Supplementary Bibliographie”, *NphM* 81, 3, 1980, 313-317.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Rasgos tipológicos del inglés en el desarrollo histórico de las estructuras de ‘verbos con partícula’”, *Filología Moderna* 35-36, 1969, 265-285.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “El objeto del verbo preposicional inglés. Análisis sincrónico”, *Filología Moderna* 37, 1969, 47-58.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Nota sobre el diverso grado de adverbialización en las partículas del verbo preposicional inglés”, *Filología Moderna* 39, 1970, 339-341.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “The Latin Influence on the Germanic Development of the English Phrasal Verb”, *English Philological Studies* 13, 1972, 1-12.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Transference and Metaphor in Middle English Verbs Accompanied by a Locative Particle”, *Orbis* 21, 1972, 114-135.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “The Origins of the Germanic Phrasal Verb”, *IF* 77, 1972, 73-96.

- de la Cruz, J. M., “A Syntactical Complex of Isoglosses in the North-Western End of Europe (English, North Germanic and Celtic)”, *IF* 77, 1972, 171-180.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Notes on the Transformational Analysis of Phrasal Verb Structures in Contemporary English”, *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 4, 1972, 61-79.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Notas para el estudio del desarrollo angloescandinavo de los verbos preposicionales. Los datos del inglés antiguo y medio”, *RSEL* 3, 2, 1973, 369-413.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Old English Pure Prefixes: Structure and Function”, *Linguistics* 145, 1975, 47-81.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Context-Sensitivity in Old Middle English”, *Linguistics* 8, 1976, 3-43.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “Synchronic-Diachronic Remarks on the Nature of Prefixation”, *Orbis* 26, 1977, 262-292.
- de la Cruz, J. M., “La ‘consolidación preverbal’ indoeuropea y la ‘consolidación frasal’ del inglés. Nuevos datos referentes al proceso evolutivo”, *REL* 16, 1986, 326-379.
- de la Cruz, J. M., *El verbo frasal con partícula adverbial en el medioevo inglés: taxonomía y traducción*, Málaga 1988.
- Curme, G. O., “The Development of Verbal Compounds in Germanic”, *PBB* 39, 1914, 320-361.
- Dahm, K., *Der Gebrauch von gi- zur Unterscheidung perfektiver und imperfektiver Aktionsart im Tatian und in Notkers Boethius*, Borna-Leipzig 1909.
- Deutsche Wortbildung. Typen und Tendenzen in der Gegenwartssprache*, I; Kühnhold, I.-Wellmann, H., *Das Verb, Sprache der Gegenwart* 29, Düsseldorf 1973.
- Dorfeld, K., *Über die Funktion des Präfixes ge- (got. ga-) in der Composition mit Verben*, Gießen 1885.

- Downs, L. G., “Notes on the Intensive Use of Germanic *te, * to, “to: too”, *JEGP* 38, 1939, 64-68.
- Ehrismann, G., Review of M. Leopold, “Die Vorsilbe *ver-* und ihre Geschichts”, *Germanische Abhandlungen* VII, 1907, 184 ss; *ZfdPh* 42, 362-364.
- Eichinger L. M. (ed.), *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Hamburg 1982.
- Erdmann, O., *Untersuchungen über die Syntax der Sprache Otfrids*, 1, Halle 1874.
- Eroms, H.-W., *Be- Verb und Präpositionalphrase*, Heidelberg 1980.
- Eroms, H. W., “Trennbarkeit und Nichttrennbarkeit bei den deutschen Partikelverben mit *durch* und *um*”, Eichinger L. M. (ed.), *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Hamburg 1982, 33-50.
- Fijn van Draat, P., “The Loss of the Prefix *ge-* in the Modern English Verb and Some of its Consequences”, *ESstudien* 31, 1902, 353-384; 32, 1903, 371-388.
- Fleischer, W., “Grundzüge der Wortbildung des Verbs in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart”, *DaF* 4, 1967, 1 ss.
- Fraser, J., *An Examination of the Verb-Particle Construction in English*, Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- Fraser, T., “The Preverb *for-* and *fore-* in Old English”, *Studies in English Grammar*, Univ. de Lille 1975.
- Fraser, B., *The Verb-Particle Combination in English*, New York 1976.
- Frings, Th., “Die Bedeutungsgruppen der verbalen Kompositionspartikeln *an-* und *auf-* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht”, *PBB* 87, 1965, 392-426; 89, 1967, 277-305.
- Grecoolds, H., “Die gotische Komposita in ihrem Verhältnis zu denen der griechischen Vorlage”, *KZ* 60, 1933, 1-53.

- Gross, H., *Der Ausdruck des "Verbalaspekts" in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache* (Hamburger Phonetische Beiträge 15), Hamburg 1974.
- Grosse, S., "Durative Verben und präfigierte Perfektiva im Deutschen", *Der Deutschunterricht* 15, 1963, 97-105.
- Gruber, H., *Das adverbale uz-Präfix im Gotischen und Althochdeutschen. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Präfix-Komposition* (Jenaer germanischen Forschungen 13), Jena 1930.
- Günther, H., Review in *PBB* 98, 1976, 289-295 of G. Zifonun, *Zur Theorie der Wortbildung am Beispiel deutscher Präfixverben*, München 1973.
- Günther, H., *Das System der Verben mit be- in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. Ein Beitrag zur Struktur des Lexikons der deutschen Grammatik*, Tübingen 1974.
- Günther, H., "Wortbildung, Syntax, *be-*-Verben und das Lexikon", *PBB* 109, 1987, 179-201.
- Haessler, L., *Old High German biteilen and biskerien*, Chicago-Philadelphia 1935.
- Harnisch, K. R., "'Doppelpartikelverben' als Gegenstand der Wortbildungslehre und Richtungssadverbien als Präpositionen. Ein syntaktischer Versuch", Eichinger L. M. (ed.), *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Hamburg 1982, 107-134.
- Häusermann, H. W., *Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittelenglischen* (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 54), Wien 1930.
- Hendrickson, J., *Old English Prepositional Compounds in Relationship to Their Latin Originals*, Lang. Diss. n° 43, Baltimore 1966.
- Hennig, J., "Zum Gebrauch von ir. *fior* als Präfix", *Sprache* 15, 1969, 135-143.
- Henzen, W., "Der heutige Bestand der Verben mit *ver-*", *Festgabe für Th. Frings*, Berlin 1956, 173-189.

- Heringer, H., *Die Opposition von "kommen" und "bringen" als Funktionsverben. Untersuchungen zur grammatischen Wertigkeit und Aktionsart*, Düsseldorf 1968.
- Hesse, H., *Perfektive und imperfektive Aktionsart im Altenglischen*, Münster 1906.
- Hilliard, R. A., *Reexamination of the Separable Verb in Selected Anglo-Saxon Works*, St. John's, Newfoundland 1972.
- Hittmair, *Die partikel be- im mhd. und nhd. verbalcomposition*, Wien 1882.
- Hohensteins, C., *Das altengl. Präfix wið(er)- im Verlauf der engl. Sprachgeschichte mit Berücksichtigung der andern germ. Dialekte*, Kiel 1912.
- Horgan, D. M., "Patterns of Variation and Interchangeability in Some Old English Prefixes", *NphM* 81, 1980, 127-131.
- Hubschmied, E., *Über Präfixverben, besonders im Berndeutschen. Ein Strukturlinguistischer Versuch*, Zürich 1955.
- Hundsnurscher, F., *Das System der Partikelverben mit aus in der Gegenwartssprache*, Göppingen 1968.
- Igel, *Das gi- Präfix als Perfectivierungsmittel in Otfrids Evangelienbuch*, Mannheim 1911.
- Jacob, Th., *Das Präfix er- in der transitiven mittel- und nhd. Verbalkomposition*, Döbeln 1900.
- Johannesson, T., *Verbal och postverbal partikelkompositon i de Germanska språken* [Mit einer Zusammenfassung in deutscher Sprache], Lund 1939.
- Joly, A., "Ge- prefixe lexical en vieil anglais", *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 12, 1967, 78-89.
- Jonathan, W., "Proklitische Verbalpartikel und ihr Gebrauch in Bezug auf das verbale Aspektsystem des Gotischen", *ZDph* 100, 3, 1981, 331-338.

- Josephson, F., “On the Function of the Gothic Preverb *ga-*”, *IF* 81, 1976, 152-175.
- Karsten, T. E., “Zur Kenntnis der inchoativen Aktionsart im Deutschen”, *NphM* 1910, 153-161.
- Kayser, W., “Wandlungen im Gebrauch der verbalen Präfixe in der deutschen Sprache des 18. Jahrhunderts”, in Kayser, W. (ed.), *Die Vortragsreise*, Bern 1958, 9-38.
- Kempcke, G., “Die Bedeutungsgruppen der verbalen Kompositionspartikeln *an-* und *auf-* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht”, *PBB* 87, 1965, 392-416; 88, 1966, 267-305.
- Kjellman, N., *Die Verbalzusammensetzungen mit durch-*, Lund 1945.
- Kluge, F., “Zur altgermanischen Sprachgeschichte. Die Verbalpartikeln in der Zusammensetzung”, *ZVSpF* 26, 1883, 68-82.
- Kolde, G., *Die verbale be-Komposition in Prosatexten des 14.-17. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen 1964.
- Krämer, P., “Zum Problem der Aktionsarten im Deutschen. Versuch einer terminologischen Klärung mit Hilfe der Diachronie”, *Strukturen und Interpretationen. Festschrift für B. Horacek, Philologica Germanica* 1, Wien 1974, 212-225.
- Krámsky, J., “Verbal Aspect in English and German as Compared with Izech”, *Cizí jazyky ve skole*, Praga 3, 1957, 351-352.
- Kuhn, H., Review in *IF* 62, 1934, 159-161 of Gruber, H., *Das adverbale uz-Präfix im Gotischen und Althochdeutschen. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Präfix-Komposition* (*Jenaer germanischen Forschungen* 13), Jena 1930.
- Kühnhold, I., Review in *PBB* 91, 1969, 426-429 of Hundsnurscher, F., “Das System der Partikelverben mit *aus-* in der Gegenwartssprache”, Eichinger L. M. (ed.), *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Hamburg 1982, 1-32.

- Kühnhold, I., “Zum ‘System’ der deutschen Verbalpräfixe”, *Neue Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik*, Mannheim-Wien-Zürich 1969, 94-99.
- Kühnhold, I., “Über das Verhältnis von *auf*- und *er*-”, *Germanistische Studien*, Innsbruck 1969, 327-335.
- Kühnhold, I., “Beobachtungen zu den Verbalpräfixen *ab*-, *aus*-, *ent*-”, *Studien zur Syntax des heutigen Deutsch. Festschrift für P. Grebe, Düsseldorf 1970*, 269-274.
- Kühnhold, I.-Wellmann, H., “Präfixverben”, *Deutsche Wortbildung. Typen und Tendenzen in der Gegenwartssprache*, I, Düsseldorf 1973, 141-362.
- Kurth, R., “Zur Gebrauch der sogenannten *ge*- Abstrakta”, *PBB* 75, 1953, 314-320.
- Lawson, R. H., “The Prefix *gi*- as a Perfectivizing Future Significant in OHG Tatian”, *JEGP* 64, 1965, 90-97.
- Lawson, R. H., ‘*Gi*- as Futurizing Prefix in the Shorter Old High German Interlinear Work, *NPhM* 67, 1966, 234-242.
- Lawson, R. H., “A Reappraisal of the Function of the Prefix *gi*- in Old High German Tatian”, *NPhM* 69, 1968, 272-280.
- Lawson, R. H., “The Verbal Prefix *ge*- in the Old High German and Middle High German Benedictine Rules”, *JEGP* 67, 1968, 647-655.
- Lawson, R. H., “Preverbal *ke*- in the Earliest Old Alemannic”, *JEGP* 69, 1970, 568-579.
- Leden, A., “Bedeutungen und Gebrauchsmöglichkeiten einiger Komposita: *ausgehen*, *herausgehen*, *hinausgehen* und *eingehen*, *hereingehen*, *hineingehen*”, Eichinger L. M. (ed.), *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Hamburg 1982, 183-196.
- Lehmann, W., *Das Präfix *uz*- besonders im Altenglischen, mit einem Anhang über das präfigierte westgerm. *o- (*a-) = ein Beitrag zur germanischen Wortbildungslehre*, Kiel 1906.

- Leinen, R., *Über Wesen und Entstehung der trennbaren Zusammensetzung des deutschen Zeitwortes mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Gotischen und Althochdeutschen*, Strassburg 1891.
- Lenze, J., *Das Praefix bi- in der altenglischen nominal- und Verbalkomposition mit gelegentlicher Berücksichtigung der anderen germanischen Dialekte*, Kiel 1909.
- Leopold, M., *Die Vorsilbe ver- und ihre Geschichte (Germanistische Abhandlungen 27)*, Breslau 1907.
- Lepinoy, P., “Fonctions de la Particule BE-”, *Mélanges pour J. Fourquet*, München-Paris 1969, 163-175.
- Lindemann, J. W. R., “Old English Preverbal *ge*-”, *JEGP* 64, 1965, 65-83.
- Lindemann, J. W. R., *Old English Preverbal ge: Its Meaning*, Charlottesville: Univ. Press of Virginia 1970.
- Lipka, L., “Ein Grenzgebiet zwischen Wortbildung und Wortsemantik: die Partikelverben im Englischen und Deutschen”, *Interlinguistica. Festschrift für M. Wandruszka*, Tübingen 1971, 180-189.
- Lorusso, A. M., “Aspetto e modo dell’azione nella struttura funzionale del verbo gotico”, *Annali, Facoltà de Lettere, Univ. Perugia* 4, 1966-67, 559-583
- Lorz, A., *Actionsarten des Verbums im Beowulf*, Würzburg 1908.
- Lüngen, W., *Das Präfix on(d)- in der AE Verbalkomposition mit dem Anhang über das Präfix od-/ud-*, Kiel 1911.
- Marache, M., “Die gotischen verbalen *ga*- Komposita im Lichte einer neuen Kategorie der Aktionsart”, *ZfdA* 90, 1960, 1-35.
- Marchand, H., “Notes on English Prefixation”, *NPhM* 55, 1954, 294-304.
- Marchand, H., On the Analysis of Substantive Compounds and Suffixal Derivatives not Containing a Verbal Element”, *IF* 70, 1965, 117-145.

- Marchand, H., “Die Präpartikelverben im Deutschen: Echte Präfixbildungen, synthetische Präfixbildungen, Pseudo-Präfixbildungen”, *Sprache und Geschichte. Festschrift für H. Meier*, München 1971, 313-326.
- Marckwardt, A. H., “The Verbal Suffix -ettan in Old English”, *Language* 18, 1942, 275-281.
- Marcq, P., “Un point particulier du système des prépositions spatiales du gotique: les rapports entre *faur, faura; wipra; afar, hindar*”, *Mélanges pour J. Fourquet*, München-Paris 1969, 209-220.
- McLintock, D. R., “Über germanische Abstraktbindungen vom Typus *gas-kota-*”, *PBB* 91, 1969, 1-27.
- Mirowicz, A., *Die Aspektfrage im Gotischen*, Wilno 1935.
- Mungan, G., *Die semantische Interaktion zwischen dem präfigierenden Verbzusatz und dem Simplex bei deutschen Partikel- und Präfixverben*, Frankfurt-Bern-New York 1986.
- Niwa, Y., “The Preverb *ge-* Added to *niman* in the OE Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels”, *Studies in English Literature* 1966, 65-79.
- Niwa, Y., *Old English Preverbal ge-*, Tokyo 1973 (in Japanese).
- Niwa, Y., “On the Collective Meaning of OE Preverb *ge-*”, *Studies in English Literature* 1974, 155-167.
- Öhmann, E., “Beobachtungen im Umkreis der Homonymie. Das deutsche Verbalpräfix *ver-*”, *Festgabe für U. Pretzel*, Berlin 1963, 327-337.
- Pietsch, P., “Einige Bemerkungen über *ge-* bei Verben”, *PBB* 13, 1888, 516-518.
- Pilch, H., “Das ae. Präverb *ge-*”, *Anglia* 71, 1953, 129-139.
- Pilch, H., “Der Untergang des Präverbs *ge-* im Englischen”, *Anglia* 73, 1955, 37-64.
- Pollak, H. W., “Studien zum germanischen Verbum I. Über Aktionsarten”, *PBB* 44, 1920, 417-419.

- Pollak, H., “Über *ga-* beim gotischen Verb”, *PBB* 96, 1974, 1-28.
- Pollak, H., “Über gotische Verben mit doppeltem *ga-*”, *PBB* 96, 1974, 12-16.
- Pollak, H., “Zur Methode der Ermittlung von Bedeutung und Funktion der altgermanischen Vorsilbe *ga-*”, *NPhM* 76, 1975, 130-137.
- Purtscher, F., *Die untrennbaren Partikeln im ahd. Tatian*, Leipzig 1902.
- Pusch, L. F., ‘*Smear=schmieren/beschmieren*: Bemerkungen über partitive und holistische Konstruktionen im Deutschen und Englischen”, in Nickel, G. (ed.), *Reader zur kontrastiven Linguistik*, Frankfurt 1972, 122-135.
- Ramat, A. G., “A proposito dei composti germanici con *ga-*”, *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonar R. Palmer*, Innsbruck 1976, 65-76.
- Raven, F. A., “Aspekt und Aktionsart in den althochdeutschen Zeitwörtern”, *ZMF* 26-27, 1958-1960, 57-71.
- Recha, C., *Zur Frage über den Ursprung der perfektivierenden Funktion der Verbalpräfixe*, Dorpat 1893.
- Reddick, T. J., “Reason Adverbials and Syntactic Constraints in Early West Saxon”, *Glossa* 15, 1, 1981, 17-52.
- Reifferscheid, “Lexikalisch-syntaktische untersuchungen über die partikel *ge-*”, *ZDPh*, 1874, 319-446.
- Reinhardt, W., “Der semantische und syntaktische Wert der verbalen Präfixe in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart”, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der pädagogischen Hochschule Potsdam* 1964, 47-58.
- Renicke, H., *Die Theorie der Aspekte und Aktionsarten unter besonderer Be- rücksichtigung des Neuenglischen*, Marburg 1949.
- Renicke, H., “Ein deutscher Aspekt”, *FuF* 28, 1954, 27-30.
- Richter, G., *Die ahd. missa-Bildungen und ihre Entwicklung zum Neuhoch- deutschen*, Leipzig 1961.

- Richter, G., "Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte der ahd. *missa*-Bildungen", *PBB* 85, 1963, 313-334.
- Rice, A., *Gothic Prepositional Compounds in Their Relations to Their Greek Original*, Lang. Diss. n° 11, Philadelphia 1966.
- Röhling, M., *Das Präfix ofer- in der altenglischen Verbal- und Nominalkomposition mit Berücksichtigung der übrigen germanischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg 1914.
- Rolffs, Fr. W., *Gotisch dis- und du-*, Breslau 1908.
- Romm, S. M., *Die Kategorie des Aspekts und die Semantik der verbalen Präfixe in der modernen deutschen Sprache*, Moskau 1951.
- Rooth, E., "Das Verb *eratmen* bei Goethe und seine Stellung im System der Verben mit er-Präfix", *Mélanges de philologie offerts à M. J. Melander*, Uppsala 1943, 161-197.
- Rooth, E., *Über die Ausdrucks Kraft und die Aktionsarten der deutschen Verbalzusammensetzungen mit er-*, Saltjö-Duvnas 1964.
- Rosen, H., *Old High German Prepositional Compounds in Relation to Their Latin Original*, Lang. Diss. n° 16, Philadelphia 1966.
- Rothwell, W., "A Study of the Prefix *de / des* in Anglo-Norman and Some Considerations Arising Therefrom", *TPhS* 1966, 24-41.
- Russell, P., "Preverbs, Prepositions and Adverbs: Sigmatic and Asigmatic", *TPhS* 1988, 144-172.
- Saltveit, L., "Präposition, Präfix und Partikel als funktionell verwandte Größen im deutschen Satz", *Linguistische Studien IV, Sprache der Gegenwart 24. Festgabe für P. Grebe*, Düsseldorf 1973, 173-195.
- Samuels, M. L., "The *ge-* Prefix in the Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels", *TPhS* 1949, 62-116.
- Scherer, Ph., "Aspect in Gothic", *Language* 30, 1954, 211-223.

- Scherer, Ph., “Aspect in the Old High German of Tatian”, *Language* 32, 1956, 423-434.
- Scherer, Ph., “Aspect in the Old English of the Corpus Christi MS”, *Language* 34, 1958, 245-251.
- Scherer, Ph., “The Theory of the Function of the Gothic Preverb *ga-*”, *Word* 20, 1964, 221-245.
- Scherer, Ph., “Tense Modification in Gothic”, *Festschrift J. Alexander Kerns*, The Hague 1970.
- Schlachter, W., “Ein Aktionsartkriterium der Neuhochdeutschen”, *ZDW* 17, 1961, 1-51.
- Schmidt, G., *Studien zum germanischen Adverb*, Berlin 1962.
- Schmitz, W., *Der Gebrauch der deutschen Präpositionen*, München 1968⁵.
- Schröbler, I., “Bemerkungen zu Bedeutung und Funktion von *after*, *ana*, *ānu*, *ander*, *aba*. Aus der Werkstatt des ahd. Wörterbuches”, *PBB* 66, 1942, 278-291.
- Schwarz, H., *Präfixbildungen im deutschen Abrogans. Analyse und Systematik*, Göppingen 1986.
- Seibold, E., “Gt. *gasinpa* “Reisegefährte” und *gasinpi* “Reisegesellschaft””, *PBB* 96, 1971, 1-11.
- Seip, E. , “Die gotischen Verba mit dem Präfix *and-*”, *Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie* X, Gießen 1923, 1-24.
- Senn, A., “Verbal Aspects in Germanic, Slavic and Baltic”, *Language* 35, 1949, 402-409.
- Sizova, I. A., “Morfologiceskoj status gotskich preverbov i ich klassifikacii”, *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 33, 1980, 535-540.

- Sprengel, K., *A Study in Word-Formation: The English Verbal Prefixes fore- and pre- and Their German Counterparts*, Tübingen 1977.
- Stanley, E. G., “The Prenominal Prefix *ge-* in Late Old English and Early Middle English”, *TPhS* 1982, 25-66.
- Steinhauser, W., “Die ahd. Vorsilbe *uo-* im Kreise ihrer Lautverwandten”, *ZMF* 27, 1960, 101-115.
- Streitberg, W., “Perfective und imperfective Actionsart im Germanischen”, *PBB* 15, 1891, 70-177.
- Streitberg, W., “Zum gotischen Perfektiv”, *IF* 21, 1907, 193-196.
- Streitberg, W., “Zum Perfektiv”, *IF* 24, 1909, 311-314.
- Swaay, H. A. J., *Het prefix ga-, gi-, ge- en zijn invloed op de “Actionsart” meer bijzonder in het Oudnederfrankisch en het Oudsaksisch*, Utrecht 1901.
- Tellenbach, E., *Vergleichende Untersuchung nhd. und nnl. Bildungen mit dem Präfix ver-*, Leipzig 1971.
- Trinka, B., “Some Remarks on the Perfective and Imperfective Aspects in Gothic”, *Donum natalicum Schrijnen*, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929, 496-500.
- Vañó-Cerda, A., “Die adverbiale Modifikation durch das Präfix *zer-*”, *Sprachwiss.* 12, 1987, 293-310.
- Wedel, A. R., “The Verbal Aspects of the Prefixed and Unprefixed Verbal Forms of *standen*, *sizzan/sezzan*, *lickan/leckan* in the Old High German Benedictine Rule”, *JEGP* 73, 1974, 169-175.
- Wellander, E., *Die Bedeutungsentwicklung der Partikel ab- in der mittelhochdeutschen Verbalkomposition*, Uppsala 1911.
- West, J., “Proklitische Verbalpartikel und ihr Gebrauch in Bezug auf das verbale Aspektssystem der Gotischen”, *ZDPh* 100, 1981, 331-338.
- West, J., “The Semantics of Preverbs in Gothic”, *IF* 87, 1982, 138-165.

- Wilmanns, W., *Deutsche Grammatik*, II: *Wortbildung*, Berlin-Leipzig 1930², 115-174.
- Wolf, A., *Das Präfix -uz im Gotischen und im deutschen Verbum*, Breslau 1915. Wolfrum, G., “Studien zu ahf. *bî* und zur Problemgeschichte der Präpositionen”, *PBB* 92, 1970, 237-324.
- Wolfrum, G.-Ulbricht, E., “Syntaktische Studien zu ahd. *avur*. Aus der Werkstatt des ahd. Wörterbuches”, *PBB* 81, 1959, 215-241.
- Wrenn, C. L., “Gothic *usqiman*”, *Donum natalicum Schrijnen*, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929, 492-495.
- Wunderlich, D., “An Investigation of Lexical Composition the Case of German *be-* Verbs”, *Linguistics* 25, 1987, 283-331.
- Wuths, *Actionsarten der Verba bei Cynewulf*, Weida i. Thür. 1915.
- Yoshida, K., “A Study of the Gothic Preverb *ga-*”, *GK* 78, 1981, 85-113. Yoshiota, J., “The Influence of the Latin Version on the Gothic Version in the Case of Prepositions”, *JIES* 14, 1986, 219-229.
- Zifonun, G., *Zur Theorie der Wortbildung am Beispiel deutscher Präfixverben*, München 1973.
- Zintl, J., “Zur Syntax von *hinaus/hinein, heraus/herein*”, Eichinger L. M. (ed.), *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, Hamburg 1982, 135-172.
- Zutt, H., “Bedeutungsdifferenzierung durch Präfigierung in den Übersetzungen Notkers des Deutschen”, *Litterae Medii Aevi* 1988, 93-100.

* † *