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Introduction

This dissertation is a study in the syntax of those Germanic particles associated closely with the verb in a distinctive set of grammatical patterns in such a way as to form a class of verb-adverb combinations or separable compounds. The term "verb-adverb compounds" has been used in the title in order to cover as much of the Germanic fields as possible. For some dialects, the term "separable compounds" might be more fitting. But the other is serviceable.

In the main, the problem is to discover to what extent there is a recognizable class of particles, connected with the verb, but different from inseparable particles and bound forms on the one hand and from free adverbs on the other - then to determine the distinctive patterns of such particles.

There is surprisingly little help in past studies. Confusion has arisen because authors set up hypothetical patterns and then sought examples, instead of looking over a whole body of material for all possible patterns. It has also come in part from the prejudice involved in applying the viewpoint of a modern dialect (NHG, ModE, etc.) to the older materials.

Basically the method applied, which I hope is adequate, is first to prepare the way for syntactical analysis by determining the pertinent lexical, phonetic, and semantic characteristics of the forms involved, then to examine all forms that for special reasons should be excluded or questioned in the final syntactical analysis. The syntactical study is thus greatly simplified and
the results clear. Because of the rather astonishing lack of previous interest and study, the preparatory part necessarily occupies a disproportionate space.

Standard terminology is adequate especially because the results are based on contrasting syntax patterns and the latter are the important consideration. The results of the study do indicate that certain terms have been too broadly used—e.g., adverb, prepositional-adverb. I have tried to show how these might be more meaningfully applied.

A couple of technical matters need mention. I have underlined Gothic and OHG words in pencil, avoiding the typed underline, as recommended by Language. I have used p over b for \( \bar{b} \), d with - for \( \delta \), h and v for \( \nu \). These are not in line with the recommendations of Language, and in the event of publication I shall change them.

References between chapters are indicated by superscript numeral after the page, for example: p. 100\(^2\) in a reference in the first chapter would mean page 100 of the second chapter.

The present study is confined to Gothic and OHG. I hope to continue with other dialects as time permits.

I particularly want to thank Professor Norman L. Willey for his help and advice throughout the writing of this paper.
CHAPTER I

GOTHIC

A. The General Situation in Gothic

In the field of compound verbs, the lexical possibilities open to the Gothic translator must have been very impressive. In the restricted scope of the extant Gothic, which presents a vocabulary of only 3,000 words or so, there are by Rice's¹ count 28 different verbal prefixes, and these are used in compounds involving 448 simple verbs. This compares favorably with the 18 prefixes and 320 simple verbs of the parallel passages of the Greek Bible — even considering the extreme frequency in Gothic of ge- (240 compounds, including denominatives; or 2516 gross occurrences² out of a gross total of 5948 instances of compound verbs in Gothic³). Besides this display of quantity, Gothic has, in comparison with the Greek, expanded strikingly the lexical variety of the compounding forms. While in Greek every one of the 18 compounding forms is a regular preposition with its own clear lexical identity, we find in

¹ Rice, p. 126.
² Ibid., chart pp. 124-5.
³ There is no such concentration upon a single prefix in Greek, where kō- leads the list but represents only one-fifth of the gross total (799:4047); v. Rice, loc. cit. In the OHG Tatian, however, gi- accounts for more than half (1934:3760) of the total occurrences of verb compounds; v. H. Rosen, OHG Prepositional Compounds in Relation to their Latin Originals (Language Dissertation No. 16, Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia, 1934), p. 75 ff.
Gothic not only several prefixes which are not lexical entities, but a complication among those which are lexical entities. This complication is produced by the first stages of the breakdown in the distinction between preposition and adverb and by the intrusion of non-prepositional forms as compounding elements. It is in this change and expansion in the Gothic system that one finds developments paralleling the situation in OE, OHG, etc. and most germane to the subject of separable compounds.

B. The Lexical Situation

1. Introductory Remarks

The most obvious division to be made among the Gothic compounding forms is at the line of lexical identity. The following occur only as compounding forms, never in extant Gothic as independent words:

- dis- (17 verbs, 33 occurrences)
- far- (6, 18)
- fra- (29, 329)
- ga- (240, 2516)

---

In these figures I am simply giving, for the sake of a general impression of relative frequency, the figures of Grewolds (60, p. 6 ff.) for the number of simple verbs connected with each prefix singly, and of Rice (pp.124-5) for the total occurrences (out of 5948 for all prefixes) of each prefix. Grewolds (q.v.) excludes all denominative or "secondary" verbs. This seems a little risky, methodologically speaking, as there is always the possibility that congruity (with regular
Of the other prefixes which belong here (as bound forms) only tuz- (hapax in Mark 11, 23 ni tuzwérjai) and id- (in idwéitjan, 6 occurrences) appear in finite verb forms. Both are denominative, however (v. OHG zurwāri, Gothic idwéit). unba (in unbapluian, used twice, viz. II Cor. 11, 33 and I Thess. 5,3) belongs

compounds) of morphemic features in such verbs as fairwéitjan, awhugjan would play a greater role in determining their morphological and syntactical use than any consciousness of their derivation. There is no evidence one way or the other in Gothic, so practically considered, it makes little difference, but in Greek there are instances of treatment of such verbs according to the pattern of primary compounds. Augment and reduplication, which regularly follow the preposition in primary compounds, often do so in definitely secondary compounds, e.g. ἀπολογίομαι (from ἀπολογείσαι), ἀπολογισμόμαι (from ἀπολογείσαι) ὑποτεύω (from ὑποτεύομαι) ὑποτεύω (from ὑποτεύομαι) ὑποτεύω (from ὑποτεύομαι) /graphql: πεπίστευς suspicion, these in turn being from ὑποποιμιάζω (these latter forms in Herodotus, the verb being otherwise regular; v. W. Veitch, Greek Verbs (Oxford, 1879), p. 660); ἐπιορκέω (from ἐπιορκεῖος perjured), ἐπιλύω (from ἐπιλυόμαι), etc. The real complication of such a situation, where the Sprachgefühl hesitates in its judgment of the nature of these compounds, is shown by those Greek verbs which have augment concurrently in both positions, e.g. ἀνεκχώρικε endure, ἀνεκχώρικε; etc. (v. A. N. Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar (London, 1897), p. 192.) Another type of confusion: some definitely prepositional compounds have come to be regarded as simple verbs, e.g. καθέω sleep, καθεύδω (beside normal καθήκων); v. A. N. Jannaris, op. cit., p. 193. It is well to bear these possibilities of development in mind, especially in the other Germanic dialects.

A note on the figures themselves. Rice, in his enumeration, includes several verbs postulated for Gothic on the basis of extant nouns, adjectives, etc., which of course Grewolds seldom does. I have adjusted the figures only in cases of very rare forms and have noted such changes. Rice's figures also include instances in which the prefix enters into double compounds.
etymologically with und-, \(^5\) q.v.i. missa- and twis- occur in non-finite verb forms only, missa- once and twis- twice. fri- in verb forms occurs only in gafrisahtjan and gafrisahtnan, both from the noun frisahts. Grewolds gives a full list of Gothic denominative or "secondary" verbs in his article.\(^6\)

The remaining Gothic compounding forms are lexical entities. For the purposes of this paper it seems best to divide them into a) forms used alone as prepositions, b) forms not used alone as prepositions. This may, in effect, be a) prepositions, b) adverbs; but, as was mentioned above, one of the interesting developments in Gothic is the beginning of a change in the distinction between prepositions and adverbs, and compounding forms. It seems wise, then, to keep as one separate group those compounding forms which are, ab initio, prepositions and thus correspond to the Greek compounding forms; and to let the other group remain nameless until its nature can be studied.

2. "Prepositional Adverbs"

The following compounding forms are used separately

---

\(^5\) unpa- may bear the same phonetic relation to und- as faura- does to faur-, anda- to and-, etc. v. Mourek, p. 198 and Walde-Pokorny (under the appropriate entries).

\(^6\) Grewolds 60, pp. 46-47 and p. 53. See also Wilmanns II, pp. 119-120.
as prepositions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{af} &\ (52 \text{ verbs}, \ 222 \text{ occurrences}) & \text{hinder} \ (1,2^8) \\
\text{afar} &\ (2,10) & \text{in} \ (27,176) \\
\text{ana} &\ (33,231) & \text{mip} \ (20,61) \\
\text{and} &\ (26,465) & \text{pinm} \ (8,28) \\
\text{at} &\ (31,311) & \text{uf} \ (23,147) \\
\text{bi} &\ (50,228) & \text{ufar} \ (20,33) \\
\text{du} &\ (3,67) & \text{und} \ (3^9,10) \text{(unpa – v.e.)} \\
\text{faur} &\ (11,35) & \text{us} \ (93,905) \\
\text{faura} &\ (10,61) & \text{wipra} \ (2,2^10) \\
\end{align*}
\]

The following compounding forms are not used as prepositions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inn} &\ (\text{inngaggan used 18 times, innwairpan used once)} \\
\text{ut} &\ (\text{utgaggan used twice, utbairan used once)}
\end{align*}
\]

Grewolds has two groups for the above prepositional group, one for prepositions and the other for "pre-verbs used alone not only as prepositions but also as adverbs."  

\[\text{7fram} \text{ as verbal element appears only in Luke 19,23 (v.1. p. 41), but most writers derive it not from this form, but from Phil. 1, 25 framgattal, assuming a verb *framgaggan. II Tim. 3, 14 framwairpis is an adverbial genitive and is interpreted by Rice as derived from *framwairpan. Walde-Pokorny does not give it.}\]

\[\text{8Omitting Rice's four nominal forms representing a verb *hindarwitan. Cf. Rice, p. 106.}\]

\[\text{9undredan in Skeir 6, 13 is not given by Rice, who of course does not include verbs from the Skeireins, hence lists only two verbs, 9 instances.}\]

\[\text{10Omitting Rice's four instances representing *wiprawairpan. Cf. Rice, p. 119.}\]

\[\text{11Grewolds 60, p. 7.}\]
A division of this sort is, in its main features, one toward which any careful investigation will strive, and Grewolds is the first systematically to make the distinction and apply it to the verb compound system.\footnote{This is an opportunity to remark that Grewolds' article is distinguished in offering substantially new viewpoints on important aspects of a language which has been worked over as have few others.}

It seems to me that there is, however, another and sounder way of arriving at what is also a sounder division. First of all, the division as given by Grewolds rests partly on evidence drawn from the division itself, in a sort of spiral argument. The same fact is used as evidence for the setting up of the group and as a test of the behavior of the group. For example, the reason for putting \textit{faur} in the second division is that \textit{faur} (besides being a preposition) occurs as an "adverb." But it occurs as an "adverb" only in Luke 19,4 \textit{jah bibragjands faur usstaig ana smakkabagm} and in Mark 8,6 \textit{jah atgaf (sci. hlaibans) siponjam seinaim el atlagidedeina faur}. Then in analyzing this same set of compounding forms ("pre-verbs used alone not only as prepositions but also as adverbs") Grewolds uses the same two instances to show\footnote{Grewolds 60, p. 13.} "dass wir für ... faur- prinzipiell auch mit der Möglichkeit trennbarer Komposition zu
rechnen haben." Secondly, the distinction (in these compounding forms) between preposition and adverb on the basis of meaning is generally difficult and on the basis of syntax so sparsely attested that a more straightforward division would be welcome. There seems to be such a one, but first it would be in order to examine all of these prepositions which seem to have adverbial uses to discover whether there are any indisputable adverbs among them.

3. Examination of "Adverbial" Uses

Listing of adverbial uses for the following prepositions seems universal: afar, ana, du, faur, faura. Thus Grewolds, Streitberg, Bernhardt, Balg, Stamm-Heyne (where first members of double compounding forms are also listed as 'adverbs'; e.g. du atgaggan) and Mourek.

The reasons for devoting space to this questioning of the above adverbs, which may seem not to warrant all the attention they receive, are actually several. One reason is methodological and stems in part from the very paucity of instances of so-called adverbial use. This leads - to repeat the argument presented above - into the illogical procedure of saying that a word is an adverb and then saying that the adverbial form of the word is used in possible compounding, when actually the only "adverb" is the one or ones used in possible compounding situations! The statement that adverbs are used in
possible compounding is a significant one, and it demands the presence of clear evidence. But this evidence can't come from the same cases that are being analyzed! It must come from outside to be convincing or even logical. So the few existing instances must be very carefully examined.

Other reasons for placing so much emphasis on this inquiry into the nature of presumed adverbs have to do not with methodology but with the consequences of such assumptions. Because if one says without further ado that some or all of them were adverbs, one is also apt

1) to assume a ready-made pattern of word order (the adverbial pattern) for other compounding forms to fall into - for example prepositional preverbs when they separate from the verb

2) in an unguarded moment, to let the designation "adverb" extend to all likely forms in separation and, thinking they are all adverbs, fail to recognize a compounding form when it shows up - in, for example, the syntactical difference between inn and dalap

3) to ignore entirely the possibility of isolated or postponed prepositional uses.14

14 These are not theoretical possibilities, but very
All these points are discussed at some length later. Now it is in order to examine the "adverbs" in question. 

_afar_ appears as an adverb\(^{15}\) only in Skeir III, 15 afaruh pan "and afterwards then." This is its temporal meaning which it also has as a preposition. As a compounding form, however, it is obviously spatial or directional. The two uses are quite distinct, and distinct in such a way as to isolate the compounding form _afar_- from the one adverbial _afar_. This appears quite clearly in the prepositional uses. All instances involving expressions of duration of time and with one definite exception (I Tim. 4, 14 afar analageinai handiwe) all involving points in time (i.e. events) take the accusative. The borderline, as always in semantic matters, is the scene of a certain amount of confusion. But it is definitely here with the time expressions that Skeir 3, 15 afaruh pan finds its only close analogues, viz. Mark 16, 12 afaruh pan _pata_ and the same in Luke 10, 1 and Luke 16, 4 μετέ _ἀκεὶ ἀπὸ_; I Cor. 15, 5 _jah_ afar _pata_ εἰκακ and the phrase in Matthew 8, 5 which corresponds only to _ἀκεὶ_ in the Greek: afaruh pan _pata_. All these, as noted, actual ones, especially the second. Leinen, acting on precisely this assumption, came to the indicated result and misled other scholars in doing so; v.i. p. 51.

\(^{15}\) Grewolds 60, p. 7, note 9; Streitberg WB, p. 1 "afar"; Mourek, p. 23.
have the accusative. afar with dative pronouns appears only with personal pronouns (v.i.).

All instances involving the physical act of following, i.e. spatial or directional relationship (as well as several other uses; v. Mourek, p. 25) clearly takes the dative. Here the afar- of afargaggan and afarlaistjan (the only verbal compounds) finds its analogues. v. Matthew 8, 23 afariddjedun imma siponjos is ἡκολούθησαν ἀντὶ and compare this with the semantically similar Matthew 9, 9 iddja afar imma ἡκολούθησαν ἀντὶ, etc.¹⁶ Note also that both afargaggan and afarlaistjan take dative objects.

Thus it seems reasonable to say that the compounding form afar- is fairly distinct from the one adverbial afar, and that characteristic adverbial uses similar to Col. 4, 5 du baaim uta ἓξω, etc. or even John 11, 43 Lazaru hiri ut ἓξω do not occur. It is also important that afar appears in no such separated positions as mentioned above for faur. That is, we have no sentences like *iddja afar Paitrus. Grewolds himself has some doubts about afar (v. Grewolds 60, p. 14, note 1).

ana has primarily simple spatial meanings.¹⁷ It is

---

¹⁶There is one case of repeated afar, viz. Phil. 3, 14 afargaggan afar sigislauna.

¹⁷v. Mourek under ana, p. 39 ff.
listed by Streitberg, Bernhardt, Stamm-Heyne and Balg (glossaries under "ana") as an adverb in II Cor. 8, 7. This is the verse: ἀκεῖ σωα ραϊτίσα in allamma managnip, galaubeinal jah kunpja jah in allai usdaudein jah ana pizai us izwis in uns frijabwai, ei jah in pizai anstai managnalp καὶ τῇ ἐκ υμῶν ἐν υμῖν ἀγάπη. This ana is hardly an adverb, but simply the preposition which the translator added just as he added in (in the same passage — in allai usdaudein, where the Greek, as with ana ..., had only the dative καὶ πᾶση στοουδη). All the other cases are either prepositional or directly connected with the verb, as was faur; v.i., p. 79.

du is given as an adverb (Streitberg WB, p. 28; et al.) in Luke 8, 44 and Mark 10, 13; but both are connected with the verb, as was faur, or are prepositional; v.i., p. 80.

faur (v.g.)

faura causes the most trouble in the interpreting but gives the most interesting results. Like afar, it has both temporal and spatial meaning. The most significant entry is given by Streitberg WB (p. 33) under "spatial adverb," namely Phil. 3, 14 παῦμ αφτα υφαρμμύνονδας ἵπ δύμπαυμ ποεί faura sind mik uφπανγάνδας τα μεν.

This sentence, with its entirely different translations of two exactly parallel Greek phrases, points to a very necessary division in that class of Gothic words rather indiscriminately labelled "adverbs." Faced with these two exactly corresponding forms τὰ μὲν ὄντα ... τοῖς δὲ ἐμπροσθεν Wulfila renders the first intact paim afts, but for what may have been reasons of grammatical exigency does not translate the second by *du paim faura. It seems scarcely necessary to explain the assumption that he probably would have if it had been possible. 19 And in view of the absolute parallelism of the two Greek phrases it would have been done, I think, if this faura were an adverb in the sense that afta is.

At first glance this apparent impossibility of using faura by itself, as afta was used, is in conflict with the two cases where faura is definitely used by itself and adverbially, viz. I Tim. 1, 13 ikei faura was wajamerjands γὰν πρῶτερον ὄντα βλασφημοῦνεν though I was before a blasphemer, and Skeir I, 18 òc faura ju

---

19This argument is somewhat vitiated, it is only fair to admit, by the fact that Wulfila sometimes does insert a form of wisan where it is, to judge from his general usage, possible to leave it out; e.g. the two translations of πρὸς τοὺς δὲ ὀντα in Col. 4, 5 du paim uta and in I Thess. 4, 12 du paim paieti uta sind. (In the latter example, he may simply be responding to a more natural impulse of his Sprachgefühl; v.i. p. 44, note 65.) But the instances cited above are, after all, from one and the same passage.
us anastodeinal garaidon garehsan "the plan which was (always) determined before, from the beginning." Actually, though, this contrast is a perfect example of clear differentiation in Gothic syntax between two faura's. Here, more than in the similar case of afar (y.e.), the lexical antithesis is very clear. The adverb faura of I Tim. 1, 13 and Skeir 1, 18 is strictly temporal and refers to a previous, past time. It is the one that stands alone, just as did temporal afar in Skeir 3, 15. It is not to be equated with the primarily spatial (but sometimes temporal) faura of Phil. 3, 14 which obviously refers to something ahead or in front and, if applied temporally, not to a previous time but to the opposite, a future time.²⁰ The second faura is, I believe, the one we have in verb compounds, not the first. I am quite convinced that this is a very real distinction and no case of hair-splitting or syntactical wishful thinking. Some objection might be raised if the distinction had to rest on the Gothic alone. But it is convincingly confirmed by the OHG (y. fora, p.92²). It is, moreover, a very productive distinction, because

²⁰The same split in meaning as in ModE 'before', when applied to time, e.g. "what was before" (past) and "the things which lie (are) before" (future).
it demonstrates the primarily spatial nature of compounding forms and points to a needed skepticism in dealing with other "compounds" with temporal preverbs as well as with many assumed adverbs.

If this assumption is correct, then Phil. 3, 14 faura (note its future meaning) plus sind should be interpreted not as two separate words (as does Streitberg B ad loc.) but as a compound, just as fauraist of II Cor. 8, 11 is always interpreted\(^\text{21}\) swaswe fauraist muns du wiljan καθὼς γενομένη τοῦ θελείν RV as there was the readiness to will; i.e. "was present" (a derived spatial meaning), Streitberg "vorhanden ist." In the light of this distinction, the other instances cited variously for adverbial and for compound use of faura take on a clear, if somewhat different, complexion. The following seem, like I Tim. 1, 13 and Skeir 1, 18, to refer to a previous time and should, I think, be left as temporal adverbs and standing alone: II Cor. 8, 6 swaswe faura dustodida καθὼς προγεγέεικτο RV as he had made a beginning before; II Cor. 12, 21 ἤπαιν faura fauraukjadane τῶν προγεγραμμένων RV that have sinned heretofore; II Cor. 13, 2 ἤπαιν faura fauraukjadam τοῖς προ-

\(^{21}\)Thus, ad loc., Bernhardt, Balg, Stamm-Heyne.
Streitberg has all the above as separate adverbs, noting that they correspond to Greek προ - but listing them separately from his "temporal" and "spatial" categories; Mourek has them all as compound with the verb; Grewolds likewise; Rice includes none; of the other editions Baig lists none in the vocabulary in any way but writes all separately in the text; likewise Bernhardt; Stamm-Heyne lists them separately and notes that they are temporal. (This is another of those instances in which word separation in the Gothic texts would be most revealing.) Without any word division and without stress marks, the argument for two fauna's has a tendency to seem hypotheticoal, to seem restricted to semantic considerations, which alone can never suffice to indicate a homonym. But functional difference does appear, if only in Phil. 3, 14, with its avoidance of an adverb form. The real functional evidence appears in OHG.

There are two cases which are difficult to judge, as either interpretation seems possible, viz. Luke 14, 24 πίστε faura haitanane τῶν κεκλημένων RV (those men) which were bidden; I Tim. 1, 18 θεί paim faura faursniwandam ana puk praufetjam κατά τὰς προφητείας ἕνα ὑπ' ἑνα προφητείας RV according to the prophecies which went before on thee (or, as in Canne's note: led the way to thee).
To sum up - an examination of the "adverbial" uses of certain prepositions, which prepositions also enter into verb compounding, reveals that ana, du and faur have no extant uses requiring their listing as adverbs, though the separate use stemming directly from their compounding with the verb or from prepositional uses (v.i., p. 79 ff.) definitely characterizes the beginnings of the breakdown in the distinction between preposition and adverb. afar and faura, on the other hand, show obvious uses as separate adverbs, but in situations semantically (and syntactically) different from their use in verb compounds, thus enabling us to eliminate with reasonable justification a class of forms in compounding that would have to be called "prepositions or adverbs." I think this a very important step in the analysis of the Gothic situation. Naturally, it still does not change in the least the observation that afar and faura (and others like nehva, for that matter) may function separatin either as adverbs or as prepositions. Nor does it diminish the significance of the fact that ana, du and faur may occur by themselves in other than pure prepositional uses. Rather it places this fact in better focus. And these two points taken together demonstrate clearly the difference between the incipiently complex Gothic and the nicely systematized Greek (where there are plenty of preposition-adverb pairs like εκ-εξω,
but where only the preposition functions in compounding and almost never wanders into adverbial or similarly separated uses. Whether Gothic, or Primitive Germanic, ever represented such a generally clear dichotomy in form and function as existed in Greek (later Greek anyway) is scarcely demonstrable.

What is said above does not, to repeat, eliminate the advisability of making a distinction among the prepositional compounding forms. We find a more meaningful and useful distinction, I believe, in the purely mechanical aspects of the double compounds (those in which two pre-verbs come before the verb).

C. Double Compounding and Indication Through It of a Classification of Gothic Compounding Forms


22 Homer has a fair number of separated prepositions in striking exception to the general rule of later Greek texts. The development of Greek syntax was away from such uses, but their existence is certainly significant in the general picture of compounding. Examples like (Iliad B, 699) ῥοτε ἄρην ἔθαν κατὰ μᾶτα μελανὼν are cited by M. Roberts, "The Antiquity of the Germanic Verb-Adverb Locution," JEGPh 35, p. 470. (His example for New Testament Greek - ἀπὸ χειρός - is on quite a different level, being no preposition.)


24 No triplets in the Greek of the New Testament, but
If the analysis above (p.13ff.) is correct, faura-du-, faura-fra-, and possibly faura-faur- must be dropped from the list, as they appear only in the passages which were mentioned there. One form (ga-mip-) has apparently been judged and found wanting, but nevertheless belongs here, I believe (v.i.).

Definitely doubtful ones are the following: at-ga in atgaraihtjan (Titus 1, 5 atgaraihtjaia πενδορθῶν); ga-ga- in gagahaftjan Eph. 4, 16 gagahaftip συμβαλόμεθα, gagaleikon (II Cor. 11, 13-14-15 all translating a form of μεταξύμεταβαλ), gagamainjan (Mark 7, 23 gagamainjan κοινοκαταλαμμένοι), gagatilon (Eph. 2, 21 and 4, 16 each translating a form of συναρμολογός), gagawairpjjan (I Cor. 7, 11 gagawairpjjan καταληγόμενοι), gagawairpnan (II Cor. 5, 20 gagawairpnan καταλήγομεν); in-ga- in ingaleikon (II Cor. 3, 18 ingaleikonda μεταμορφούμεθα); pairh-ga- in pairhgleikgon (I Cor. 4, 6 pairhgleikonda\(^{25}\) μεταξύμεταβαλ); wipra-ga- in wipragamotjan (John 12, 13 wipragamotjan εἰς ἐπάνωποιν). (It is apparent that only one of these 13 translates a Greek double compound, viz. atgaraihtjans - πενδορθῶν.) All these verbs are generally ruled out as being secondary compounds. While from a purely external and - to the extent that the

\(^{25}\) Streitberg B, ad loc., note.
Sprachgefühl forgets its own derivations — from a potentially syntactical view they are double compounds, the evidence in extant Gothic is that they are obviously secondary. They probably were even distinguished by stress. The ga in these cases is assumed to have borne the stress. The pertinent evidence is perhaps worth reorganizing and repeating. The semantic relation is straightforward except as noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doubtful Compd</th>
<th>Simple Verb</th>
<th>ga- Compd</th>
<th>Substantive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atgaraihtjan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>garahtjan</td>
<td>(raihts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagahaftjan</td>
<td>haftjan</td>
<td>gahaftjan</td>
<td>(hafts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagaleikon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>galeikon</td>
<td>galeiks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingaleikon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pairhgaaleikon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagamainjan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>gaminjan</td>
<td>gamains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagatilon</td>
<td>(andtilon)</td>
<td>gatilon</td>
<td>gatils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;fit together&quot;)</td>
<td>&quot;hold on to&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;obtain&quot;)</td>
<td>(&quot;fitting&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagawairpjan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gagawairpjan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wipragamotjan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>gamotjan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus with the exception of gagahaftjan and possibly gagatilon (through and-tilon, the etymological relationship of which is not clear), there is no evidence for a simple verb anywhere. And in the latter, the importance

---

26 v. p. 4, note 4, above.
27 Streitberg Gr, p. 160.
28 Grewolds 60, p. 7 cites OE gemot as evidence for denominative composition. The situation was probably very complicated, however. It should be noted that OE had, besides gemot, the nouns mot, gemet and the verbs metan, gemotan (Vespasian Psalter), gemetan.
of a possible simple verb is far outweighed by the presence of gatils. In any case, the point is definitely assured that these compounds with at, ga, in, pairh and wipra added to ga- forms are not on the same level as the other double compounds. An important piece of further evidence is the use here of in- (ingaleikon) instead of inn-, which latter is the regular form for the first member of all true double compounds, y. inn-at- (bairan, gaggan, tiuhan), inn-ga- (leipan), inn-ul- (sliupan), mip-inn-ga- (leipan), while in is used only with simple verbs (-aljan, aljanon, brannjan, etc.). This falls in with the notion of differing stress in the two positions of double compounding (v.i.p. 28).

It is quite a different matter with ga-mip-. The form in question is II Cor. 8, 18 B gappanmipsandidedun imma bropar συνεπερμάμεν δέ μετ' αὐτοῦ τον αδελφόν. The form evidently caused the scribes some worry for in A (v. Streitberg B, p. 311) Wilhelm Braun29 had noted that another ga "steht, halb erloschen, am Anfang der folgenden Zeile" (the verb is split, the first line ending with the mip), thus giving gahpanmip (ga)-sanditedun. The form gappanmipsandidedun seems almost

always to be listed - in so far as it is listed with any clarity - as an example of tmesis caused by the group -uh-pan-mip-. How this can possibly be, I do not understand. Tmesis always consists in unaccented (or "tief-tonig") particles drifting inevitably to a position after the first relatively stressed (or "hochbetont") unit of the sentence - Wackernagel's Gesetz (IF 1, p. 333 ff.) in its most obvious aspect. Hirt says Partikeln können stark- und schwachbetont sein. ... Im Laufe der Zeit sind gewisse Partikeln zu regelmässig schwachbetonten geworden. Sie stehen daher nie am Anfang. Umgekehrt können wir eine Unbetontheit erschliessen, wenn eine Partikel nie am Anfang steht. Von solchen enklitischen Partikeln sind im Germanischen nur wenige erhalten."

Hirt naturally does not include -uh-pan-mip- (giving only uh, u, nu, pan, ba, uh-pan), though he mentions Grewolds' article. mIP after all does come first - hence has stress - in Gothic sentences (v. II Cor. 12, 18 bap Teitu Jah

---

30. Grewolds 60, p. 4; Streitberg Gr, p. 161; Stamm-Heyne, p. 367. Bernhardt and Balg seem to call it an inserted adverb. Mourek, however, lists the form with the mIP verbs (p. 179) and does not show mIP as part of the tmesis in the discussion under ga (Mourek, p. 111).


32. ibid., p. 216.
mip insandida imma bropar; and further examples in Grewolds 60, pp. 5-6). The stress range of mip is fairly great. In prepositions, of course, it is to be considered as having little stress. But the stress of real enclitics is obviously less than that of prepositions, as may be seen from John 19, 12 framuh pamma, etc. So the whole matter of stress separates mip from uh-pan and leaves us only one possible conclusion, namely that it is, after ge-, the first unit in this sentence with appreciable stress.

The question of translation is significant, too. I can find no instance of a tmetric particle in Gothic which translates more than a particle (or expanded particle, e.g. nu for τοίνυν) in Greek. But here it is the only thing to render the prepositional part of the phrase μέτ' αὑτοῦ, if not the συν- prefix as well.

Finally, the case of imma seems pertinent. A verb gamipsandjan would naturally take the dative, but it seems unlikely that a tmetric particle mip would govern a following case.

If these points are valid, we must be dealing with a verb gamipsandjan. Streitberg WE, p. 117 does indeed list the verb, though he also gives uh-pan-mip as tmetric in Gr, p. 161 (g.y.). There are, as far as the usual analysis of Gothic goes, two unique features of this
compound, viz. the order of the prefixes contrasting with the usual mip-ga- in mipgadaupnan, mipgasatjan, etc. and the presence of tmesis between two particles. Concerning the latter, one wonders where else the tmesis would go. There is, to be sure, the instance of I Cor. 14, 23 atuh pangaggand inn, but this inn is separable (v.i. p. 56ff.) while the mip of gamipsandjan, one presumes, is not. The former feature (unusual order of compounding forms) seems to be the tacit reason for avoiding the verb. But precisely at this point we find an excellent argument for admitting the form, namely parallels in other dialects. Otfrid offers a perfect OHG parallel, giänabrechon (IV, 19-64 mohtin giänabrechon); giän is inseparable in OHG, but ana is not. 33

This leaves us with the following double compounding forms out of the original list: 34

- ana-in- (one verb, one instance) 35
- du-at- (3, 14)
- du-ga- (1, 1)
- faur-bi- (2, 3)
- faura-ga- (9, 14)
- ga-mip- (1, 1)
- inn-at- (3, 11)
- inn-ga- (1, 8)

33 It ought to be added that Grewolds seems not entirely satisfied with the notion of mip in tmesis (though he always so refers to it), for he says later (60, p. 19) "der Tmesisfall ... beweist, wie mir scheint, in unanfechtbarer Weise, dass mip neben dem Kompositum gasandidedun eine gewisse syntaktische Selbständigkeit besitzt."

34 I have omitted faura-faur as being too uncertain (v.g. p. 17).

35 These are my own figures. I am omitting any cases
One immediate observation is that the two non-prepositional forms inn and ut never occur as second members, but are well represented in first position. 36

Thus we have the following used as second members:
at, ana, bi, fra, ga, in, ut, us, and mib. 37 fra and ga are bound forms. The rest are prepositions.

The following are used as first members: ana, du, faur, faura, mib; inn, ut; ga. The first five are prepositions; the second group, non-prepositions; the bound form ga is quite alone. Only ana and mib occur in both

where the pre-verb is other than directly before the verb; e.g. Luke 15, 28 usgagganda ut is left out. This of course greatly reduces the figures for the inn and ut verbs.

36 Here again, separation of words in the Gothic text would be most revealing. Luke 14, 35 ἦξω βαλλοντιν αὐτοί is given as ut usgairpand imma by Streitberg, and Rice omits it from his discussion. Matthew 27, 53 εἰς ἔγγλον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πῶλιν is given by Streitberg as innatgaggandans in po weihon baurg, and Rice includes it. The only reason for differentiation of the Gothic forms lies in the Greek, and that is hardly sufficient. Grewolds writes all such inn and ut double compounds with the inn and ut as separate words in order to indicate the separable nature of the compound. I include in the above count all forms in which inn and ut appear in pre-verb position and write them together for reasons which will be apparent.

37 John 18, 15 mipinngalaip does not, I think, require putting inn in this group, as the word consists of inngeleipan with inn-ga-, and then mip- added in such a way as to be exactly parallel to inn. This proliferation of pre-verbs has been noted for Greek. But note also the equal treatment of the first two members ὒτο - and ἦξ - in the verbs ὅπεξανασῶναλ and ἦξησανασῶναλ.
positions (first as well as second in doublets), mip as second member only in the unusual verb gamipsandjan. faura is used only with following ga, the least individual of the prefixes.

It seems that the Gothic compounding forms have, in the double compound type, separated themselves into two groups on a fairly clear basis. The situation at its most striking—and most germane to the problem of separation—is this: Whenever two compounding forms, both lexical entities, are used together before a verb, the separation of Gothic pre-verbs according to position is virtually complete as follows:

First: inn, ut; ana, du, faur, mip38

Second: at, ana, bi, in, uf, us

With the exception of ana, the groups are exclusive, which even with the restricted amount of extant Gothic is surprising and, I believe, significant.

The distinction could be left on this purely external basis, but the fact that all instances of separability or isolated use in Gothic happen with those forms that may

38Note how the second part of this group (ana, du, faur, mip) compares closely with the usual list of "prepositions also used alone as adverbs" (afar, ana, du, faur, faura). Yet it is derived from quite different considerations.
occur as first of two compounding forms and that, in turn, all such forms except apparently mip (v.i., p. 34 and 38) actually are so affected indicates that there were other factors than simply their word order which allowed them to stray from their usual position. It is my opinion that stress difference is a principal factor. Stress in Gothic verb compounds has been investigated and argued at some length. 39 It seems to be the general consensus doctorum that verb compounds had, originally at least, relatively unstressed pre-verbs in Gothic. This probably was true for single compounds, but it seems that for these double compounds, especially where both compounding forms are lexical entities, greater stress as well as a greater feeling of separateness because of meaning may be assumed for the first member.

The very fact that single inn and ut are never separated (v.i., p. 48 ff.) while inn and ut as first members of doublets are regularly separable (v.i., p. 56 ff.) is a salient indication of this differentiation of first members of double compounding forms from single compounding forms, even though they be the same morpheme (or word).

It may seem that a rather considerable amount of space has been given to this argument, especially since, in

39 V. Streitberg, Gr, p. 160 and the literature there.
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considering the separated prepositional forms actually extant in Gothic (v.i., p.73 ff), separability of a compound verb is denied or questioned for most of the forms. But I believe that some lever must be found to explain the start of separability for verb compounds in general, to locate a group of prepositions sharing some mechanical features with the obviously separable inn and ut, and thus perhaps to explain why the separated or isolated uses of prepositional forms (even including those clearly originating in prepositional uses) are restricted to a certain few words. There are after all a lot of prepositions in Gothic. Why should only ana, du, faur and mip exist separatim? Why not at, bi, in, uf, us and others compounded with verbs, or even andwairbis, inuh, undar and others not used in compounding? I think the greater stress and probably less distorted or weakened lexical nature assumed for the first members of double compounding forms is significant here, and it is the only such classification I can imagine which corresponds to the group to be explained.

We are, to recapitulate, dealing with the following groups of compounding forms (which will be referred to by these numbers):

One Compounding Form before the Verb

1. Not lexical entities: dis-, fair-, fra-, ga-;
   id-, tuz-, unpa-, missa-, twis-, fri-
2. Prepositions: af, afar, ana, and, at, bi, du, faur, faura, (fram), hindar, in, mip, pairh, uf, ufar, und, us, wibra

3. Not prepositions: inn, ut

Two Compounding Forms before the Verb - Both Lexical Entities -

4. First: a) inn, ut  b) ana, du, faur, mip

5. Second: at, ana, bi, in, uf, us

D. Separability in Gothic Compounds

Since the plan of this paper is to discuss, primarily, the sort of compound in which separation of some kind is possible, rather than the invariable preposition-verb sort typified by the Greek, and to a great extent the Gothic, some account is needed of possible separation; and there should be a brief indication of what sure evidence there is that a Gothic "compound" is really a compound.

Separation of the most invariable nature is caused by reduplication and by tmesis.

The evidence of reduplication is very similar in Gothic and Greek. In Greek, reduplication (and augment), of course, regularly comes between the preposition and the verb in all "primary" compounds, e.g. ἀποβαίνω, ἀποβεβάς ἦπτε, (ἀπεβέβας ἦπτε). In Gothic, instances of

---

40 Credit for the first systematic study of separability in Gothic goes to Grewolds, whose thorough work deserves the most sincere praise.
reduplication separating compounding form and verb are found in groups 1 and 2 (above), e.g. Nehemiah 5, 16 Jah baurp ni gastaistald and I Thess. 4, 14 pans paieí anasaïslepun pairh Issu. Other instances appear for ga- and fra- in group 1, for af, ana, and, at and us of group 2. One double compound shows reduplication, viz. Eph. 1, 5 fauragarairop. No instances of reduplication occur with pre-verbs of group 3 (inn and ut), but ana, which appears with inn and ut in group 4, is separated from its verb in six instances. 41

Tmesis, like reduplication, gives largely negative evidence. It too affects even the forms of group 1. The total evidence is easily found. 42 Separation by tmesis (e.g. John 7, 32 inuhsandidedun and Mark 16, 8 dizuhpansat) appears with the following simple compounding forms: dis, ga; ana, at, bi, in, uf, us. Of the double compounds, only gamiõsandjan is separated (by ub-pan-, y.e.). One seemingly simple compound, however, is an example of what may have been the usual treatment of regular separable double compounds, viz. I Cor. 14, 23 atuppangaggand inn eɪ ⚘ ʃ ʌ ω v v ʃ ʌ ər ʃ s. 43

---

42 Streitberg Gr, p. 161 or Grewolds 60, p. 3 ff.
43 y. Grewolds 60, p. 4.
The absence of any such evidence on inn and ut is unfortunate. If, as suggested above, such forms had considerable stress, one might assume that the tmesic particles like -uh- would necessarily follow the inn or ut, if the latter were first in the sentence. With different word order a type of tmesis does apparently occur in John 10, 1 saei inn ni atgaggip pairh daur (Y.1., p.60, n. 80).

It will be noted immediately that this is a relative clause and that it is not a case of initial ni. For, in contrast to the strongly stressed initial particle, ni in other positions is often a weakly stressed element - even a proclitic - in the older Germanic dialects, and there are, for example, numerous instances of second position (hence characteristically unstressed). 44

Besides the lack of stress to be assumed for ni, there are other reasons for regarding saei inn ni atgaggip as a type of tmesis, rather than separation in the strict sense. First, it turns out (Y.1., p.63 ff.) that inn and ut regularly come directly before the verb in subordinate clauses, and this rule would be best subserved by assuming tmesic separation here. Secondly, though Gothic is the only dialect in which tmesis is a regular feature, other Germanic dialects show unstressed ni in the same position,

44 Y. Behaghel Syntax IV, p. 12.
e.g. OE in Luke 11, 52 ge in ne eodun; OHG in Tatian 133-6 thie than in ni get thurah duri qui non intrat per ostium. This latter form is especially significant (quite aside from its startling surface resemblance to the Gothic example) since the translator of the Tatian never has in separated from the verb in dependent clauses. Leinen (p. 62) says in reference to this, "Das unbetonte ni trennt die Partikel vom Nebensatzverbum..." See also Grimm II, pp.873-874. He cites, among others, the Glosses with nidar ni riśīt, ẑ ni wirfo (v. i., p. 38²). Thirdly, there is the parallel order of mīnīqam (v. i.), where an even stronger general rule (inseparability of verbs with one compounding form) indicates tmesis separation for this particular instance.

The same form of tmesis separation by ni occurs similarly with mīp, which also belongs with the presumably stressed forms of group 4, but in this case with a simple verb, viz. John 6, 22 jah patei mīnīqam siponjam seinam

45 v. Curme Compounds, p. 326. Curme says of this sentence, "Altho the parts are felt as one, the prefix is at the same time felt as a modifying adverb, for the negative is put in between prefix and verb." Subsequently he even compares it directly with Gothic uzuhiddja.

46 Tmesis separation by unstressed ni is surely, I believe, on a different level from separation by -uh-, etc. I would not expect it with di- or ga- verbs, for example. I feel that it is tmesis, but I realize that there is hardly enough evidence to describe it accurately.
Assumption of tmesis separation in a syntactically inseparable compound miqiman\textsuperscript{47} rather than an instance of straight separability\textsuperscript{48} rests on several rather compelling reasons (apart from the general fact of unstressed ni).

It would be very odd to begin with to find a simple compound separated at all (\textit{v.i.}, p. 38 ff.) and most unusual indeed to find the unique instance in a subordinate clause (\textit{v.i.}, p. 63). It would also be (with the exception of its parallel saeq inn ni atgaggib) the only case in Gothic of a preposition— or compounding form of any kind— separated from the verb in a position other than following.

All the evidence given above for separability in Gothic compounds (reduplication and tmesis) is on an entirely non-syntactical level. It speaks only for the general feeling of the compound nature of these verbs. By itself, it would only prove that Gothic had not forgotten its compounding patterns as later Greek did, when augment, for example, was more and more indiscriminately applied to the beginning of any verb regardless of its composition.

\textsuperscript{47} Mourek, p. 177. Mourek definitely gives it as tmesis.

\textsuperscript{48} Grewolds 60, p. 13. For Grewolds, this instance "erweist... Trennbarkeit wenigstens von miqiman." He thus separates the mip- compounds in two groups, separable and inseparable (the latter proved by the cases of mip- verbs after initial ni; \textit{v.i.}).
Reduplication and tmesis do not change Gothic word order in any case, the only points of possible doubt being the last two examples cited above.

Evidence for the second proposition of this section — that Gothic compounds are really compounds — is furnished most obviously by their occurrence after initial ni. Assimilation also appears (mainly with us, e.g. urresan), but this is apt to be a retention of older assimilation and not so pertinent to the question. There is actually less Sandhi in compound verbs than one would expect, especially in view of its widespread appearance in tmesis; e.g. anuhkumberi vs. anaaukan; ubuhvopita, uzuhhof vs. usanan; uzuhiddja vs. usiddja; dizuhpansat. 49 Note that phonetic changes in the above examples are restricted to the cases of tmesis and are apparently resisted in the compounds. This latter fact actually speaks for a feeling of separateness in the compounding forms.

The evidence of ni is fairly conclusive. It is presented in complete form by Grewolds. 50 On ni as originally stressed initial, characteristically followed by the verb, y. Behaghel 51 and Hirt. 52 The evidence is almost complete.

49V. A. Meillet, "Notes sur quelques faits gotiques," MSLP 15, pp. 36-97.
50Grewolds 60, pp. 9-15.
51Behaghel: Syntax IV, p. 12.
52Hirt Urgermanisch III, p. 223.
for group 1 (appearing with dis, fair, fra, ga, umba) and for group 2 (with af, ana, and, at, bi, du, in, fair, mib, uf, ufar, us). On mibniqam, v.s. There are two cases generally cited as showing initial ni with mib- verbs, viz. I Cor. 5, 11 ni mibmatjan53 and Skeir 5, 6 ni mibqipaina. The fact that there is this evidence for ana, du, fair and mib is significant, for it shows, at least, that simple verbs with these compounding forms were still felt as units, although it is in these forms which also appear in group 4-b that we find the first evidence of separated prepositional forms. The implication of this situation in regard to Gothic stress patterns is, I think, quite important. Further discussion of the stress of main clause verbs appears in the OHG chapter on p.193.2. The main point is simply that the verb was very weakly stressed and that this accounts for its presence after ni - almost as an enclitic. Of course there is no system of stress marks in Gothic as there is in Otfrid’s Evangelienbuch, but some conclusions are indicated by just such situations as these. Streitberg Gr., p. 112 says,

53 Full phrase: pamma swaleikinna ni mibmatjan. Thus it is valid as an example of initial ni only if this is interpreted as unechte Mittelstellung. v. Hirt Urgermanisch III, p. 219.
"Der Wortakzent ruht bei den Nominalkompositis auf dem ersten, bei den Verbalkompositis dagegen auf dem zweiten Kompositionsglied." He writes and-háfjan, faura-gággan, etc. I am sure that this was the case with all simple compounds in Gothic except possibly inn and ut compounds. The absence of cases of ni plus these forms may be an accident. Certainly it is a stumbling block in the way of our analysis. On the other hand, I feel equally sure that certain double compounds (specifically, those with both compounding forms lexical entities; v.g. pp. 22-3) did not have this weak initial stress, and that the absence of cases like *ni utuswairpa is no accident.

Initial ni with a double compound occurs only once but gives conclusive evidence of the separability of ut in a double compound and supports the notion that this form (together with inn) had greater stress than the other compounding forms. The instance is: John 6, 37 ni uswairpa ut ενυµι δεκαλω εξω. This also shows the typical separability of ut in the main clause (v.g. p. 63ff). It is clear, I think, that the ut had too great stress to occur in the characteristic weaker stressed position after initial ni. (The form utuswairpand in Luke 14, 35 is an example of the unseparated forms.)
E. Syntax of Separability in Gothic Compounds

1. Inseparability of Verbs with One Compounding Form

a. The Prepositional Type (Group 2)

The presence directly after ni (speaking for their practical equivalence with simple verbs) of verbs representing almost all the compounding forms of group 2 has already been mentioned.

One possible argument for separation derives as noted, from the verb in John 6, 22 jah patei mibniqam ... The reasons for regarding this as tmesis separation rather than as proof of separability on a syntactical level have also been given. One surprising fact does need mentioning, however. This is the only instance of mibqiman, there being no trace whatever of this verb elsewhere in spite of what seem to be numerous translation opportunities. Once, indeed, Wulfila seems to avoid it when it would give his presumably favorite literal translation. The case is found in John 11, 33 Iudaiuns paeis qemun mip izai τοὺς σωματίωντας αυτήν.

The verb mibqiman (though not its separability)

The "usual" tmesis is non-syntactical and is not germane here for the further, patent reason that is applied without apparent differentiation even to verbs compounded with forms of group 1.

The same verb σωματίωντας is rendered once by mibinngaleiban; σωματίωντας once by qiman; σωματίωντας twice by mibgaggan. σωματίωντας is the common original of simple qiman. Evidence of this sort is anything but convincing, however, and particularly so in the light of the restricted amount of extant Gothic.
seems definitely established if only by the one instance cited, but the other possible examples of separation in the forms of group 2 are a somewhat sorry pair. They are:

1) Mark 10, 13 ἀπερύματος ἦν τὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστόν καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ... ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς προσφέρονσιν.

The translation of the Greek compound seems to speak for the close relationship of ὁρύματος to bairandam, but it is to be noted that atberun du translates the same verb. The presence of a verb *du*bairan elsewhere would be relevant evidence, but Wulfila seems to have no such verb. ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΩΝ is translated three times by bairan plus du, eight times by atbairan (and once by saljan). In examining the situation, we find that ἔπηειν is the only original of bairan which is used in Greek compounding and that ΠΡΟΣ is by far the most frequent original of ὁρύματος (as preposition or as compounding form - 16 out of 20 in the latter). The close parallel of Luke 18, 15 ΠΡΟΣΕΦΕΡΟΝ ἐκ αὐτῶν καὶ τί βρέθη is rendered by berun pan ὁρύματος bairande.

The further question of aspect arises here. If one assumes that, in general at least, compounding had the

---

56 *Rice, pp. 53-54.*

effect of making the verb perfective\textsuperscript{58} - this is of course a much disputed point - predication of a verb *dubairan, here separated, would involve a rather definite change of meaning. The idea of the men being "in the process of bringing the children" would then be gone, and that idea seems to be the one indicated by the text. The matter of aspect apparently comes up only in this instance, at least as a crucial point, but it is worth remembering that all the really clear cases of separation in Gothic occur with a compounding form and an already compounded verb. In these cases there would be no formally dictated change of aspect resulting from separation.

If one regards this evidence as indicating that no verb *dubairan is to be assumed for this passage, that leaves two courses of interpretation, namely, to resign oneself to calling it an adverb, which in view of the discussion above (p. 9 ff.) seems meaningless unless in turn its unique "adverbial" nature is then explained, or (and I think this the more reasonable) to find in the sentence in point a case of the preposition du with object omitted (anticipated and understood from the context). To be sure, this does not conform to the one clear example

\textsuperscript{58}Behaghel (II, p. 118) says, "du ist als räumlich-imperfektiv nicht belegt."
in Gothic of an anticipated object - in Matthew 27, 7 akr...
... du usfilhan ana gastim RV field, to bury strangers in (v.i.p. 79) - but we cannot be sure, with the restricted evidence, just what were the possibilities of such a construction in Gothic. 59 ON, which carried the syntactical independence of prepositions even further than does ModE, gives several instances which support the notion that this could well be an isolated preposition in Gothic, 60 e.g.
vig hefe ek at segia þér ... en fyrer hefer orpet Suartr (literally "a murder have I to report to you, but to - i.e. to it - has fallen Suartr"), parallel to which would be a literal translation of the above passage as "reproached those bringing to (soi. him, Jesus)."

2) Luke 19, 23 jah qipands þata idja fram ἐπορεύετο ἐμπροσθεν RV and when he had thus spoken he went on before. A verb framgaggian is often assumed from Phil. 1, 25 du ... framgahtai εἰς τὴν ... προκοπὴν, but if there is such a verb, it is not only restricted to these two exceptional cases, but it is also the only compound verb with fram. On the other hand, if fram be taken as an adverb

59 On this general problem v.i.p. 73 ff.; where, with the fuller evidence of prepositions with already compounded verbs, it is discussed more completely.

60 v. Heusler, p. 151.
this is the only adverbial use of fram, otherwise a pure preposition. And I see no possible prepositional origin (such as suggested above for du) for this instance of fram. There is obviously not enough evidence in Gothic to give any satisfactory conclusion.

The other dialects show, along with the generally common prepositional use, a verb corresponding to *frangaggan or a noun corresponding to framgahta or both, and clear adverbial uses also appear. For example: OHG apparently has the verb (frangangan) and the noun (Gloss: frankenkiu - processu), and the adverb fram is frequent. In Otfrid, to be sure, the connection of fram with the verb gangan precludes any notion of compounding. OE shows the noun (fromgonga, fromgeonga), but I cannot find any example of the verb unless it be AS Chronicles 755 Budon hie þat hiera mecum þat hie gesunde from eodon. OE also has a clear adverbial use in Battle of Maldon 317 fram io ne wille. For OS, fram, it would seem, is a hapax legomenon in Heliand 3931 that imu mahlidin fram modaga wiht.

---

61 Y. 1.p. 190², 203², etc.
62 Here the same question (compounding or adverb ?) arises as in Gothic. But with other verbs fram appears to compound rather freely in OE, e.g. fromgewitan, fransidian - franskid.
63 Y. E. Malthausen, Altsächsisches Elementarbuch. (Heidelberg, 1921) p. 184.
it is either an adverb or a postposed preposition, depending on one's analysis.

Of course, if fram in this Gothic sentence be interpreted as separated from iddja, then we have a single instance to disturb the whole pattern of inseparability in simple compounds. But it is fair to say that this is really the only case of the three under examination which does not have, in itself, immediate symptoms of non-separation (mipqiman) or serious doubts about compounding plus a good and different explanation (bairan with du). I can find no real answer to the problem.64

These few and - as "separable verbs" - unconvincing exceptional cases given above stand alongside an impressive number of simple verb forms compounded with such prepositions (group 2), in none of which does a breath of separation stir. There is no need to give examples.

The reticence of these prepositional compounding forms to appear separated from their verbs contrasts directly with the great mobility of their nearest relatives, fairra, nehva, and nehv. This contrast shows definitely that they are not, as Grewolds has it,65 "syntaktisch gleichwertig" with any...

—-64-Each of these three cases is, in one or several ways, unique. The relative difficulty of doing a great deal with their analysis contrasts with the considerable ease of analyzing the inn and ut double compounds and even with the still somewhat bothersome task of explaining separate ana, du and faur with compound verbs. v.2.

65Grewolds 60, p. 8, note 3.
part of group 2. Grewolds states his point in such a way that one judges he may mean to include in this syntactical equivalence only the instances of pre-verb position of fairra and nehva. But then the equivalence would lose its usefulness, for in the entire picture of the behavior of the semantically and, to an extent, syntactically related fairra, nehva, and nehy we find a significant contrast indicating first the identity as a group of the prepositional compounding forms listed above, secondly their general inseparability, but also as a third point, it seems to me, one of the forces which might give impetus to separation in these compounds.

Mobility is shown by the following instances (with simple verbs only) of position after the verb.

**fairra:** Eph. 2, 13 jus juzei simle wesup fairra \( \varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\iota\pi\iota\varepsilon\ \delta\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\ \mu\omicron\rho\kappa\rho\dot{\alpha}n. \)

**nehva:** Eph. 2, 13 waurpup nehva in blopa Xristaus \( \varepsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\tau\varepsilon\ \varepsilon\nu \ldots \) John 6, 4 wasuh \( \pi\alpha\nu\phase\) nehva

pasxa \( \nu \delta\iota\varepsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\alpha\chi\) John 7, 2 wasuh \( \pi\alpha\nu\phase\) nehva
dulps \( \nu \delta\iota\nu\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \nu\epsilon\theta\tau\iota\) (Note the direct reversal here of the thesis found in true compounds.)

Separate position before the verb is found in:

**fairra:** Luke 14, 32 fairra imma wisandin \( \pi\omicron\sigma\rho\rho\nu \alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \delta\iota\varepsilon\varsigma\).

Definite adverbial use independent of any verb - another contrast to the forms of group 2 - appears in:

**fairra:** Eph. 2, 17 iwis juzei fairra \( \varepsilon\rho\nu\ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \mu\alpha\pi\rho\dot{\alpha}n\)\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{66}This might be interpreted as ellipsis (form of
nehva: Eph. 2, 17 [jag gawairpi paim ize nehva καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς.

Function parallel to words of group 2 occurs, on the other hand, when these words are used as prepositions, e.g.:

fairra: Luke 1, 38 [jag galaip fairra izai sa agglus καὶ ἀπὸ λόθεν ἀπ' ἄνω θῆς καὶ ἀγέλεος; etc.

nehva: Luke 5, 1 standardis nehva saiwa ἄν ἔστως παρὰ τὴν λίμνην; etc.

nehv: Luke 15, 25 [jag qimands atiddja nehv razn ἡγίσεν τῷ ὀλίκε; etc. (If nehv, nahvva and fairra were to be considered as compounding forms, this could, of course, be reckoned as a compound verb atiddja nehv plus direct object, but the reasons are against, not for, such an assumption.)

Parallel word order appears when fairra and nehva are used before verbs. But note even here the predominance of wisan, the verb which admits most easily the interpretation of prepositional or adverbial use (rather than compounding) for fairra and nehva.

fairra: Mark 12, 34 [ni fairra is piudangardjai gudis οὐ μακρὸν ἐὰν ἄν ἡ βασιλείας ἡδον. Luke 15, 13 in wisan omitted); v. Behaghel III, p. 480 ff. (Behaghel does not regard this as a native Gothic construction.) We have seen, though, that Wulfila does not hesitate to insert a form of wisan in some cases; v.s.p. 14, note 19.
land fairra wisando c'is Xapav maXpav. Luke 15, 20 nauhpanuh
pan fairra wisandin gasanh ina atta is έτε δέ αὐτὸ μακράν
άπείχοντος... Luke 7, 6 ni fairra wisandin pamma garda o'd
μακράν' άπείχοντος αὐτοῦ αὐτὸ τῆς συκίας. Mark 7, 6 ip hairto
ize fairra habalp sik mis πῆραν άνεξα από ἐμοῦ.

nehva: Phil. 4, 5 frauja nehva ist δ Κύριος Ἠγγύς
(Sim. Luke 19, 41; Luke 19, 37; Mark 13, 28). (With case
form only:) Luke 18, 40 bipe nehva was pan imma Ἐγγύς
ς αὐτοῦ (Sim. Luke 7, 12; Luke 18, 35; Luke 19, 29; Mark 11,
1) (With preposition:) Mark 13, 29 kenneip patei nehva
sijup at ... γινώσκετε ὅτε Ἡγγύς ἐστίν ὑμῖν ... (With verb
other than wisan:) Mark 2, 4 ni magandans nehva qiman
imma ἐρώθηκαν αὐτῷ.

Whether these last forms (those before the verb)
are to be written together depends, of course, on one's
decision as to whether they are compounds. Against such
a decision for fairra, nehva and nehv as a class are the
above instances (totally different from the regular preposi-
tions in compounding with simple verbs) of 1) definite
adverbial use, 2) great mobility of position, and 3) en-
tirely different treatment with tmetric particles, i.e.
particles which in real compounds would cause tmesis.

It is definite, then, that fairra, nehva and nehv
are to be considered as separate prepositions or adverbs,
not under any circumstances as compounding forms. The
influence of such words, however, may be presumed in the
development of prepositional compounding forms into greater
syntactical independence. For here are words used as prep-
positions and also standing before verbs, which at the same
time can appear in other (independent) positions in the
sentence. It is in precisely this direction that the prepo-
sitional compounding forms begin to move in such exceptional
cases as those noted below for ana, du and faur as well as
those suggested above for du and fram.

b. The Adverb Type (group 3)

If the forms du, fram and mib as mentioned previously
were indeed separated compounding forms, one would certainly
expect to find separation in the simple compound verbs formed
with inn and ut. Particularly so as separability here would
be in accord with the possible lexical independence of inn
and ut. (In addition close composition of this group is
not supported by the evidence of ni, there being no cases
whatever with ni.) Yet there are no instances of separa-
tion of any kind.

As far as their lexical standing goes, there is no
indisputable indication that inn and ut are strictly adverbial
in the sense that they can stand alone, even quite independent
of any verb (as can, e.g., afta in Phil. 3, 14 pain afta;
Y. Streitberg Gr, p. 70 and p. 152 (with references).
Note the contrast with fa'aira and nehva.
Luke 8, 16 (*pate* innaggandans ob *eisoporeuomevos*). John 10, 2 sa innaggands pairh daur ob de *eiserchrumevos* did tis *Oupos*. Luke 17, 12 *jah* innaggandin imma in summa haimo kai *eiserchrremevos* auttou eis tina kaphyn Luke 19, 30 in pizaiei innaggandans bigittata fulan *eisoporeuomevos* Mark 7, 15 *ni* waihst ist atapro *mahn* innaggando in ina patei magi ina gamainjan, ak pata utaggando us mann *pata* ist pata gamainjando mannann *eisoporeuomevon*... ti *ekporeuomeva*. Mark 7, 18 all *pata* utapro innaggands in mannann (Greek: *sim*.). Mark 11, 2 innaggandans in bo (*baurg*) *eisoporeuomevos*. Mark 5, 18 *jah* innaggandan ina in skip kai *eisoporeuomevos*. Mark 1, 19 *jah* jainpro innagganda framis letitil profas ekeidev olion. innaggan (infinitive): Luke 15, 28 *ni* wilda innaggan ouk *thelev* *eisoelethen*. Luke 8, 51 *ni* fralailot aimohun innaggan ouk *aphkeven* *eisoelethen*.

innwaipan:

John 12, 6 *pata* innwaipano *tai* *ballemeva* (past participle)
utgaggan:

John 10, 9 y.g. inngaggan (main clause). Mark 7, 15 y.g. inngaggan (participles).

utbairan:

Luke 7, 12 sai, utbaurans was naus ἐξεκομίζετο τεθυκὼς. (past participle).

Two points on word order are apparent. First, even in main clauses (where separation is the rule in double compounds with inn and ut; v.i. p. 63), the inn and ut in these simple compounds always precede the verb. There are, to be sure, only three instances, but these seem very convincing in view of the great regularity of the separation of inn and ut with double compounds — only three (unseparated) exceptions against nine cases (of separation) directly opposed to or independent of the Greek order, not to mention numerous others corresponding to Greek. Secondly, in six instances of participles the same invariable position obtains, contrasting with eight separated and five unseparated in the inn and ut double compounds (only participles in "verbal use" are considered; v.i. p. 62).

This evidence, and the total absence of contradictory forms, indicates that we have in group 3 (inn and ut compounds with simple verbs) instances of strict composition
in which the incipient trend to separability does not intrude. I have given the evidence in full partly because the principle of separability of inn and ut in the double compounds has a tendency to tempt one into regarding inn and ut per se as separable, whereas the separability seems actually to be determined more by compounding and stress patterns than on lexical lines. This separability in the other type of inn and ut (group 4-5) is a well substantiated contrast and is rather to be used as evidence for the opposite assumption, namely that inn and ut of group 3 are probably not separable. The fact that compounds of the latter group have a total instance of 22 times (18 forms of innaggan alone), which is a respectable number for extant Gothic and should allow for a few exceptional separated forms if the tendency were present at all, precludes to a very reasonable degree objections on the basis of insufficient evidence.

Further evidence by contrast lies in the observation that of the most closely related adverbs aftra, dalab, inna,

---

69 As in Grewolds 60, p. 15; 61, p. 176. Failure to differentiate between simple compounds and double ones led Leinen into a worse mistake, viz. a denial of any laws of word order applicable to inn and ut (v. Leinen, p. 32).
iupa, samana and samap, three occur not only before simple verbs (like inn and ut) but also after them or otherwise separated from them (unlike inn and ut), viz: 

aftra: Luke 9, 62 jah saihvands aftra καὶ βλέπων
cis τὰ ὑπίσκο

dalap: Luke 4, 9 wairp ὅπου παρο dalap βάλε σεαυτόν
ἐντέθηκε κατὼ

samana: Luke 17, 35 twos wairpand malandeins samana
δύο ἐσονταὶ ἀληθοῦσα ἔπε ποιῶσα I Thess.

70 The relationship is largely semantic, but potentially syntactical (in so far as inn and ut may develop into separated forms and, possibly, adapt their word order in separated position to that of these adverbs). I am citing cases only for the above adverbs because they seem to be the ones which are usually confused with inn and ut. Other adverbs occur in position parallel to inn and ut (pre-verb position), e.g. Matthew 26, 69 ἵπ Παιτίου ὁτα σατ ἀνα rohsna. Indeed, all such adverbs, especially directional ones, should be examined for word order, for there is no telling whether they might influence compounding forms by their order in the sentence.

71 This example of samana, I think, almost certainly belongs below with the "strict adverbial use," but I shall leave it here, as it is sometimes taken with the participle. (It is a clear contrast with inn and ut either way.) Note after all the Greek original and the RV (Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left.). If samana goes with malandeins at all, it also goes with the whole phrase, because it really delimits the ideas of twos... malandeins. The distinction is not as tenuous as it sounds. It can give rise, in some languages at least, to a very concrete semantic difference, as one can easily see if one changes (through the necessary stress and sentence pitch alterations) the English "two women shall be grinding together" from its meaning in the Bible verse to its obvious sentence-pun.
5, 10 samana mîb imma libaina ēµa σὺν ἄυτῷ ζήσωμεν. Col. 4, 3 bidjandans samana προσευχόρευσον ἡµα. Luke 15, 13 jah afar ni managans dagans brahta samana allata sa juhiza sunus Σύναγαρ ἦν ἡμῶν ἡμῖν ἐντὸ καὶ νέωτερος νῦν. (The latter is especially important because it is independent of the Greek and shows a transitive verb with its object.)

Here again, as with fairb et al. versus the prepositions, we must make as clear a distinction as possible between what may seem to be virtually identical groups. Grewolds uses the evidence of atra, inna, iupa, samana and samap - these being considered, apparently, "völlig gleichwertig" with the "pure adverbs" inn and ut - to help demonstrate the separability of inn and ut. But we have already noted the practical absence of pure adverbial uses for inn and ut, compared with the considerable frequency of (invariably unseparated) compounding uses. Since the two groups are also different even in their relation to verbs, the distinction may be considered proven.

It is perhaps well to repeat here what was said in the introduction, namely that one should for clarity of

72 v. Grewolds 60, p. 15.
analysis distinguish compounding forms (regardless of position, which may be separated and similar to adverbial position) from adverbs.\textsuperscript{73}

Of the adverbs aftra, dalap, inna, iupa,\textsuperscript{74} samana and samap, strict adverbial use (again unlike inn and ut) is established for:

(aftra only in temporal uses)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{dalap:} Matthew 27, 51 and Mark 15, 38 \textit{dis(s)kritnoda}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item in twa, iupa pro und \textit{dalap} \textit{από} \textit{κνωθεν} \textit{κως κάτω}.
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{inna:} I Cor. 5, 12 \textit{παντα inna} \textit{τούς κόσω}.
  \item \textbf{iupa:} Phil. 3, 14 \textit{πίζος iupa latonas} \textit{τής κυρ κληρεως}.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Gal. 4, 26 \textit{ιπ so iupa Iairusalem frija ist} \textit{η} \textit{δε άνω η. λευχέρα ζωτίν}.
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{samana:} I Tim. 5, 13 \textit{appan samana} \textit{δεμά} \textit{δε} RV and withal. Skeir 1, 2 allai uswandidedun
    \begin{itemize}
      \item samana unbrukjai waurpun; RV (Rom. 3, 12)
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

... they are together become unprofitable.

Parallel word order (but not therefore compounding, of course) appears in:

(aftra, as far as I can discover, only in time expressions\textsuperscript{75})

\textsuperscript{73}Only as long as the distinction is useful and clearly indicated, certainly; but it definitely is so in Gothic.

\textsuperscript{74}For iup, which does not appear with simple verbs, \textit{V.1.p. VI.}

\textsuperscript{75}Cf. Grewolds 60, p. 8, note 4.
inna: II Cor. 6, 16 patei baua in im jah inna gagga
kai émerpaterhsw.

iupa: Col. 3, 1 & 3, 2 poesi iupa sind ἢκα ἄκω (Note
added sind.) Skeir 2, 5 ustai'mida pana iupa
briggandai in piudangardjai gudie wig.

samana: Mark 12, 23 gahausjands insa samana sokjadans
ἀκούως αὐτῶν συνηγούντων. Phil. 1, 27
ainai saiwalai samana arbadjandans µiµ
γυνή συναλθοῦντες. II Cor. 7, 3 du
mipgaswiltan jas-samana76 liban (B du gas-
wiltan jah samana liban) kai ὑπηγε

samap: I Cor. 5, 4 samap gaggandam izwis συναχθείσων
γυν. Mark 9, 25 gasaihvanda patei samap
rann managei וטי ἐναντρέξει άχλος.

The same conclusion seems warranted here as was indi-
cated for fairra, etc., namely that these are true adverbs
(and to be written separately) and do not enter into com-
position but do associate freely with verbs. This latter
association obviously includes the pre-verb position, and
it seems likely that this factor and the semantic similar-
ity of the two groups (group 3 -inn and ut;: and the adverbs

76 The assimilation apparently gives no clue to the
nature of the connection of samana with liban, as such
assimilation (y.Streitberg Gr, p. 53) occurs before simple
verbs, compound verbs, and adverbs.
aftra, inna, etc.) plus the evident separability of inn and ut in double compounds might soon lead to instances of separation in the inn and ut compounds with simple verbs.

***

2. Separability in Verbs with Two Compounding Forms
   a. Those with Non-prepositions First (group 4-a)

Most of the evidence in Gothic for the very interesting notion of separable compound verbs on lines of development approaching the German situation lies in the field of verbs compounded with inn and ut. Some factor in the compounding of these forms with already compounded verbs, such as their stress (e.g.) must have given them the initial ability to stand in positions other than the immediate pre-verb location - a characteristic which, as far as our evidence is valid, distinguishes them from their non-identical twins in the simple compounds. Grewolds is the first, to my knowledge, to give a systematic review of the evidence for separation. 77

The following are all the cases of separation, together with the contrasting cases of pre-verb position.

77 Grewolds 60, p. 16 ff. He is not, however, primarily interested in the syntax of the separated and unseparated forms, nor does he note the vital distinction between simple and double compounds.
Equivalents across the line are on a basis of morphology, the groups for each verb being finite forms first; then non-finite, with participles in "verbal function" listed before the strictly nominal uses.

**Luke - Intransitive Verbs**

Luke 4, 16 jah gaiatip inn bi bihtja seinamja in daga sabbato in awnegogin; kai eiselpion ... eis ... Mark 5, 40 jah galaiatip inn parei was pata barn kai eiselpion.

Mark 15, 43 anamanpja dis gaiatip inn du Pellatau eiselpion pros 

Luke 6, 4 ni pata ussuggwud... hvaia inngalaiatip in gard gudis ois eiselpion eis ... Matthew 7, 21 ni hvaizhu saeri qipi mi; frauja, frauja! inngaleleipa in piudangardja himine eiselpion eis ... Mark 14, 14 jah badei inngaleipa kai Sou ean eiselpion Rom. 11, 25 und badei fullp piudo inngaleipa epou ois u ... eiselpion Luke 18, 24 hvaia agluba pai faihu habandans inngaleipa in piudangardja gudis pros ... eiselpion eis ...

Luke 1, 28 jah gaiatipands inn sa aggilus du izai gapi kai eiselpion o aggelos pros 


I Cor. 14, 23 jabai gaqimip alla aikklesjo samana jah rodjand razdom allai, atup- pangaga kai jah unweisai ... ean ... eiselpion de eiselpion ...

Luke 7, 45 ip ai, fram pammei innatiddja, ni gawai bikukjan fotuns meinans ap ... kai eiselpion I Cor. 14, 24(jabai)ip innataggai hvas ungalaubjands eiselpion de tis ...
Matthew 9, 25 έπανος έπαν υδρήμα τηλοσ εν ἡμαίαν ἱπατον ἵπτων...

Mark 5, 39 έπαν ἄνναταγγαντάς έπαν ναμάτιν αὐτοῖς εἰς εἰς θεοῦς...

Mark 6, 22 έπαν τακτάκαταντάς ἐν ματριάν καὶ εἰς εἰς ὑπάτης τῆς

Matthew 27, 53 έπαν ἀσεγαγγεντάς ὑλήννας αὐτοῖς ἑαυτοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐν ἢμαίαν

Matthew 8, 5 έπαν ἄναρχα παρά έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν ἢμαίαν αὐτοῖς εἰς τοίχον

Matthew 8, 23 ἐν ἢμαίαν ἰπατον ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Luke 14, 23 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Luke 1, 29 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Mark 4, 19 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Gal. 2, 4 γαλιγαμαρόπρε παλείν εἰς εἰς ἀναταγγαντάς

inn - Transitive Verbs

John 18, 16 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Luke 2, 27 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Luke 5, 18 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Luke 5, 19 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

ut - Intransitive Verbs

John 19, 5 έπαν ἀναταγγαντάς ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

Matthew 9, 32 έπαν τιμάρον τιμάρον ἐν τοίχον ἐν τοίχον

79. Streitberg B ad loc. cit.
John 18, 16 baruh usiddja ut sa giponeis anbar eζηθεν ον
δ ραησ τις
Mark 11, 19 usiddja ut us bizzai baurg eζεπορευετο eζω της πόλεως
Mark 1, 25 pahai jah usagg ut us pamma eζελθε eζ αυτων

John 18, 4 usaggands ut qab im eζελθων eίπεν
Luke 15, 28 ιπ atta is usaggands ut bad im eζελθων παρεκάλει
Matthew 26, 75 jah usaggands ut gairot bairaba και eζελθων eζω

John 19, 4 atiddja aitna ut Pei-
latus jah qab im eζηθεν παλιν
John 18, 29 baruh atiddja ut Pei-
latus du im eζηθεν ον δ ραησ τρός

John 13, 30 suns galaib ut a pan galaib ut eζηθεν
Jonn 18, 38 galaib ut du Iudaim eζηθεν τρός...

ut - Transitive Verbs

John 9, 34 & 9, 35 uswarun imma ut έκβαλον αυτον eζω
Mark 12, 8 jah uswarun imma ut us pamma weinagarada και eζεβαλον
 αυτον eζω του κυπελίων
John 6, 37 jah bana gaggandan du mis ni uswarpa ut obη έκβαλον eζω
John 12, 31 nu sa reike bis fair-
hvans uswarpada ut έκβληθηκεν eζω
John 15, 5 uswarpada ut swe weinaTaina έκβληθη eζω

Luke 14, 35 utuswarpand imma eζω ράλλουσων αυτο

Luke 20, 15 jah uswarpandans ina ut us pamma weinagarada usgemun και eκβάλωντες αυτον eζω το κυπελίων

John 19, 4 saI attiuha izwis ina ut eζω αγω υμιν αυτον eζω
Analysis of this evidence gives a most interesting picture of the inn and ut forms.

Definite compound nature (for the full double compound) is not established for these verbs by any case of ni followed by the verb with the inn or ut first, but this situation is natural (v.g. pp. 35-37). That they are compounds can only be inferred - from the regularity of their word order pattern in clauses, from the presumably invariable preposed order in the infinitive, and from their clear differentiation from the ordinary directional adverbs (v.i.). But I think the reasons are more than sufficient, and I hope that the following paragraphs will demonstrate the point.

---

80 ni in initial position - or the equivalent thereof - appears only in John 6, 37 ni uswairpa ut. The other case of ni, John 10, 1 saei inn ni atgaggip, is best regarded as an example of thematic separation only (v.g., with miphqam, p. 34 ff.). In the light of word order analysis (v.i.) it will be seen that these compounding forms are in their normal position for main and subordinate clause, respectively. Tmesis of the usual type, in I Cor. 14, 23 atuppangaggand inn, shows the inn separated. On the word order of the latter phrase, v.i.
Parallels within the Gothic and the evidence of translation equivalence indicate that, though inn and ut are often separated, the forms with the pre-verb position and those with separation are actually identical in meaning. For example:

Participial forms: jah galeipanda inn sa agilus) - εἰσελθὼν
jah inngaleipanda pairhlaip l.)
   atgaggands inn habaida... - εἰσελθὼν
   innatgaggands Ḫap

Absolute participle: atgaggandein inn dauhtar) Greek
      innatgaggandin imma in { absolute
      skip } constructions

Main clause: uswauppun imma ut εἰσῆβαιν αὐτῶν ἔξω
      utuswaipand imma ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτῷ

The instance of utuswaipand imma in the main clause is actually exceptional, but this group of parallels alone is enough to indicate that we are dealing with a cohesive set of verbs, not one set with double compounding and another with simple compounding and a more or less loosely attached adverb inn or ut. This becomes all the more clear when we discover that the distribution of separated and unseparated forms is not accidental but substantially systematic, depending on morphological and syntactical conditions.

---

81 In all the following discussion only the pertinent part of the passage will be cited, the reference and the full text being in the table.
82 Y.i. p. 65.
There is one probable distinction on morphological lines, though the evidence is scanty. Of the non-finite forms, the infinitive and the verbal noun appear only in unseparated form, *viz.* ja naupe1 innatgaggan; ni mag inngaleipan; bi innatgahtal is. 83 It is likely that this order was regular in Gothic, especially in view of the OHG situation (v. 1: p. 1812). In the other non-finite form extant, namely the present participle, there seems to be a distinct division into two types of order on a very natural line. Participles used as nouns appear only unseparated, *viz.* pai inngaleipandans; pai bi pata anpar lustjus innatgaggandans. Participles with "subjects" or predicates or otherwise substituting for one verb of a compound sentence appear with both types of word order:

**Transitive**

is udesreibands allans ut...
uswairpandans ina ut us...

**Intransitive**

jah geleipands inn sa aggilus...
atta is usgaggands ut bad
ataggands inn habaida
usgaggands ut qap
usgaggands ut gaiqrot

**Absolute Construction**

ataggandein inn dauhtar

inngaleipands pairhlaip...
inngaleipands pairhlaip...
inngaleipands pairhlaip...
inngaleipands pairhlaip...
inngaleipands pairhlaip...

83 Including the verbal noun may seem odd, but different order is possible; v. ModE the outcome, the come-on.
When Delbrück first noted a possible word order pattern of the **inn** compounds in the main and subordinate clauses, he indicated also his belief that the same pattern is valid for participles as well: "Wenn aber das Participium als Nebensatz empfunden wird, steht **inn** nach."

The most important distinction in these **inn** and **ut** compounds, and the one which speaks most eloquently for both separated and unseparated forms belonging together in a system of "separable compound verbs" is the word order pattern in clauses. Delbrück, giving the evidence on **inn**, makes the observation "dass das Adverbium **inn** im Gotischen... im Hauptsatz nach dem Verbum Finitum zu stehen pflegt, im Nebensatz aber vor ihm." The complete evidence, including **ut** verbs, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Clause</th>
<th>Subordinate Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>inn</strong> Transitive</td>
<td><strong>mippanei innattauhun berusjos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(usiddja ut sa siponeis) jah</td>
<td><strong>bata barn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attauh inn Paítrú</td>
<td><strong>sokidedun hvaiwa ina innatbereina</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ni bigotandans hvaiwa innatbereina ina</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84B. Delbrück, "Beiträge zur germanischen Syntax," PBB 36, pp. 359-360. But for the fact that he failed to notice any difference between simple and double compounds, Delbrück would doubtless have set up the whole pattern.

85Ibid.

86Delbrück includes John 10, 9 jah **inngaggip** jah utgaggip as an exception. For his explanation, see the article cited. It is not necessary to include these forms or Matthew 7, 13 **inn-gaggip bairh aggwu daur** (which would also constitute an exception), simple **inn** and **ut** compounds being inseparable under all circumstances. *(e.g. p. 48 ff.)*

87The table includes only the regular cases which
The remaining (9) ut forms in regular order for the main clause (see the first table) all have ζω in the Greek and are therefore not as strikingly significant as the above - independent - examples, although they are no less regular in word order.

The pressure of this word order rule must have been very strong, for in nine instances (all the cases in the left hand column of the last table) Wulfila is at least independent of, if not contrary to, the Greek order.

The three exceptions to the Gothic rule for the main clause may possibly be ascribed to the pressure of the Vorlage. The exceptions are: 1) hvaiwa agluba pai faihu habandans inngaleiband in piudangardja gudis εισελεύσονται εἰς establish the rule. The exceptions, actually only three in number, are discussed immediately below.
and 2) ni hvazuh salei qipip mis: frauja, frauja! inngalaip
in pludangardja gudis ēōdeśēsetaē ēīs. Delbröck 88 explains
these, as well as John 18, 15 jah mipinngalaip mīp Iesua in
rohan biis gudjins kū ēwēlēgēleēn τῷ Ἰησοῦν εἰς... in the same
fashion, namely the avoidance of repetition (inn in). 89 This
would not apply to the one further exception, viz. 3) utus-
wairpand imma ēwē pēndiēsēn ēūēs. The evidence is so sparse
that it is hard to reach any conclusion, but close following
of the Greek is always possible. Considering the degree of
Greekishness generally found in Wulfila, it is actually sur-
prising that there is so little in this construction. The
regular instances for these same verbs (inngaleipan and utus-
wairpan), after all, outnumber the above exceptions decisively.

A further possible explanation for the two exceptions with
inn is the very interesting one of preposed particle with late
verb in the main clause. This principle is regular in OHG
(y.i. p. 1982). It is typified by the following contrasting
cases with the compounding form nidar: Otfrid IV-30-17 stig
nu nidar and III-17-41 er sīh sar nidar neigta. It would not
apply to the utuswairpand, though.

There is one seeming exception in the subordinate clause.
The verse (I Cor. 14, 23) is complicated, and the English will
help make the clause construction clear: jabai qaśimip alla
aiklesjo samana jah rodjand razdom allai atuppangaggand
inn jah unweisai aippau ungalaubjandans niu

88Delbröck, loc. cit.
89Previously the form mipinngalaip has been mentioned
only in passing (y.s. pp. 19,22; 26, note 37). It is an odd
form in point of word order, since inn is definitely separable
and mīp, belonging with inn in group 4, might be expected to
separate. On the other hand, it is possible that the presence
of mīp keeps the inn from separating as it would be expected to
in the main clause. But a single instance is no basis for
much analysis.
qipand ACHINE dwalmob RV If therefore the whole church be
come together into one place, and all speak with tongues,
and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers,
will they not say that ye are mad? The atuppangaggand
inn is probably a natural Gothic construction, as the Greek
has only εἰς ἐὰν θωσεῖς δε. Delbrück90 finds this form
an exception and explains it as avoidance of "Häufung
einsilbiger Wörter vor dem Verbum." There are the fre-
quently mentioned cases of gappanmipasandidedun and saei
inn ni atgaggip on the opposite side of that argument,
however. I suspect, though I cannot document the sugges-
tion very well at present, that this bit of main clause
order in the subordinate clause is actually no strict
exception but a general Germanic tendency to forget what-
ever regular word order may currently prevail in the
subordinate clause by the time a parallel clause is added
on (without repeating the conjunction) and to use in its
stead the main clause order. It is certainly very common
in Modern German. Curme91 gives the following sentence
which may serve as a typical example: Wenn der Vater
heute abend nach Hause kommt und er hat (or - hat er)
nichts mitgebracht, so ... Another, from Hermann Hesse's

90 loc. cit.
91Curme, Grammar of the German Language. (New
Fabulierbuch (p. 13): Und selig ist, wer ihm dient und opfert ihm sein Leben. For an OHG example, v.i. p.221\textsuperscript{2}, n.426.

It seems to me that a further interesting point of word order (in spite of the little evidence) may be made in examining those cases in which an object appears with separated inn and ut. They indicate that Gothic observed a presumably widespread Germanic rule of order which continues, for example, into Modern English. The observation is that pronominal (i.e. relatively unstressed) objects occur only between the verb and the separated compounding form (or adverb), while noun objects with their heavier stress may follow. The cases: uswaerpun imma ut; jah uswaerpun imma ut us...; uskuysun imma ut us...; attiuha izwis ina ut; but jah attaah inn Paitru.\textsuperscript{92} It is possible that the noun object may take either position, as in ModE: 'he ate up the cake' or 'he ate the cake up', but always 'he ate it up.' v.i. iup, p. 41.

Two participles appear with pronominal objects in the expected order: usdreibands allans ut ἔκβαλον τάντας ἔξω and uswairpandans ina ut us... ἔκβαλοντες αὐτόν ἔξω (τοῦ)...

\textsuperscript{92}In the instances with pronoun(s) the Gothic follows the Greek (v.s.) but this is only natural. The case with noun object is independent.
It should be noted at this point that the above are the only instances of complete separation (i.e., by an intervening word) of inn and ut from their verbs (unless saei inn ni atgaggip be so regarded - but the latter is in any case not on the same level, being a case of tmetic separation by ni only, and in a subordinate clause). The point is that there are no instances of remote separation, as there are for aftra, etc. (y.i.).

It is now in order to look over the examples of compound verbs occurring with the adverbs aftra, dalap, framis, inna, iup, samana, samap\(^93\) (these being the principal ones which also occur in the most ambiguous position, that is, directly before compound verbs). Grewolds seems to regard this group as equivalent with inn and ut.\(^94\) Since inn and ut with already compounded verbs are separable and since the separated position is of course apt to correspond with the normal adverb position, we must expect less striking contrast here than in the comparison of these adverbs with inn and ut in simple compounds.\(^95\) Yet the following decisive differences turn up.

\(^93\) On the adverbial nature of aftra, dalap, inna, samana, v.g. p. 54. framis and iup occur only in the passages cited here. There is no unambiguous adverbial case of samap.

\(^94\) Grewolds 60, p. 9, note 1 and p. 18, note 1.

\(^95\) V.g. p. 52 ff.
Order in the subordinate clause is definitely freer among the adverbs. In three cases we find the adverb after the verb and only three times (v.1.) in the order which is regular for inn and ut. After the verb: Luke 19, 15 bipe atwandida sik aftra ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθείν αὐτῷ;
Luke 2, 43 mippane gawandidedun sik aftra ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν αὐτοῦ; 96 and I Cor. 14, 23 jabai gaqimip alla aikklesjo samana ἐὰν ἃν συνέλθην η ἐκκλησίας ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ.
The deceptively compound-like appearance of the latter led to its citation by M. H. Roberts97 as an example of the "post-removed order," which is "rarest in Gothic." Actually there is ample reason a priori for rejecting this as a verb-adverb compound (samana just does not seem to function in this way). In addition, such word order in a subordinate clause is in direct contrast with the regular pattern as established above, which would presumably apply here if this were a compound.

There is one instance of separation in a main clause which is likewise entirely at variance with inn and ut, being both in front of the verb and separated from the verb by a phrase: Matthew 11, 23 dalap und halja galeips ἐως ἄνθου

96 Note that in neither of these cases with aftra could Greek order be held responsible.
κατάβηθι. It is worth noting here that this may be regarded as a phrase made up of adverb plus preposition plus object ("down to...") and that, while sentences like usiddja ut us ḫizai baurg might also be so considered, the ut, even in such situations, never is removed from the normal position of a compounding form. In keeping with the development of OHG ûz as an adverb, such phrases (ûz fon ...) are both obvious and common (v.i.p. 100.2).

(The two examples of separation in absolute participles, dalab ðan atgaggandin and dalab ðan atgaggandam in Matthew 8, 1 and Mark 9, 9 respectively, are not, I think, the same sort of forms as the dalab und halja galeipis mentioned above, but parallels among the adverbs to saei inn ni ataggip, and they may like the latter be interpreted as position before the verb.)

Different word order for the main clause also appears in Luke 19, 5 Zakkaui, sniumjands dalab atsteig Z. ἐπεσεύξ κατάβηθι, cf. ni uswairpa ut; and in Rom. 13, 12 nahta framis galaip ἥ νῦν προσέκοψεν; and in I Cor. 7, 5 ἑβρον-ðan samap gawandjaið kai πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ κύτο σωπρέπεσθε.

98 Thus Grimm IV, p. 938.
99 v.i.p. 32-33.
The only case of a finite verb with a noun as direct object is interesting: John 11, 41 Ἰησοῦς ἀνεύειν ὠμός ἰπ ὁ θελόν τοὺς ἀβαλμοὺς διὸ. This form might well be interpreted as the normal position of the strongly stressed adverb, the invariable first position (noted above, p. 67) of the lightly stressed pronoun being the indication that of two such forms after the verb - compounding form and noun or pronoun; adverb and noun or pronoun - the more heavily stressed one is second. Then attauh inn Pa'itrú would indicate that inn has less stress than the noun, while uzuhi'of augona iup would show that iup has, potentially at least, greater stress than the noun. This stress relation would accord entirely with the greater mobility of all these "real" adverb forms like daláb in comparison with compounding forms (inn and ut). The evidence, again, is so scanty that this can be made only as a conjecture.

There is one case of negation after ni: Luke 17, 31 ni atsteigai daláb niman po ῶ μὴ καταβάτω ἡμεῖς ἀυτές, similar to ni uswairpa ut.

Parallel word order (but not therefore parallel syntax!) also occurs in the following instances: 1) Matthew 8, 1 daláb ἦν ἀτταγγανδίν ἔμμα' af ... καταβάντας δὲ αὖ ἐστὶν ... 100Curme Compounds, p. 325 says that the "prefix iup ... is commonly separated." The evidence given here precludes the idea that iup is a separable prefix - or a prefix at all.
and Mark 9, 9 dalap pan atgaggandam im af ... kataβαινοντων
σε αυτων αμη... (v.s. p.70) 2) Infinitives: Rom. 10, 6
hvas ussteigip in himin ? pat ist Kristu dalap attiuhan
τουτοι εστεν Χριστων καταβαίνων and Rom. 10, 7 hvas gasteigip
in afgrundipa ? pat ist Kristu us daupaim iup ustiuhan Χριστων
εκ νικηφων αναφευειν. 3) Participles: (No examples
of participles used as nouns.) Position after verb in
Luke 6, 17 Jah atgaggands dalap mip im gastop kai kataβας
μετ’ αυτων; Mark 1, 19 Jah jainpro inngaggands framis
λειτίλ kai prophe’s εκείθεν διήγον; Luke 19, 5 insaihvands
ιου Ιησους πασαθα ina αναθεύησα δη ειδενονα. Position
before verb in the dalap examples of Matthew 8, 1 and
Mark 9, 9 (v.s.) and in Luke 9, 37 dalap atgaggandam im
af fairgunja kataβαινοντων αυτων αμη... The past participle
(none with inn and ut) in II Cor. 3, 3 inna gamelida ni
swartiza εγγεγραμενη ou μελανα. 4) Subordinate clauses:
I Cor. 14, 26 pan samap garinnaip εσταν συνεχομαι; I Thess.
4, 16 unte silba frauja ... dalap atsteigip af himina ote
αυτων δι κυριον ... καιμηβουμεν απ’ ουρανον; Col. 1, 29 bi
waurstwa sei — ... inna uswaurkeip in mis kata την ενεργειαν αυτω
την ενεργουμενην εν εμοι(This latter is doubtless a case
of scribal omission of a relative pronoun
101) 5) Main

101v. Streitberg B ad loc. and Gr, p. 229.
clauses: Matthew 7, 25 & 27 jah atiddja dalap rign kai kat-

ē ̃η τ ᵃ προκ ᴵ ; Luke 17, 31 ni atateigai dalap (v.s.);
John 18, 6 jah gadrusun dalap kai ἐπτεσον χαρι; John 9, 6
pata qibanda gaspawi dalap ἐπτεσον χαρι; John 11, 41 ip
Iesus uzuhhof augona iup (v.s.). (If Mark 3, 5 jah gasstop
after so handus is kai ἀπεκατεστάθη ἤ ἥ χαρινωσ not sim-
ply a time expression with after, it also belongs here.)

The same order with pronoun objects (though with excep-
tional word order for subordinate clauses; v.s.) is found in
two instances: Luke 19, 15 (bipe) atwandida sik after and
Luke 2, 43 (mibpane) gawandidadum sik after.

To sum up – in this group of words where we expect the
greatest possible correspondence of use with inn and ut we
still find important differences (word order in subordinate
clause, word order in main clause, remote separation) and
these differences are numerous enough in comparison with
the correspondencies so that we must keep these words dis-
tinct from the compounding forms inn and ut. They can be
explained throughout as regular adverbs. Thus it seems
natural to write the two differently, as has been done in
anticipation of this argument, with inn- and ut- written
together with the verb whenever they occur directly before
it and the adverbs like dalap written separate.

b. Those with Preposition First (group 4-b)

There is a large body of prepositional compounds, and
they are discussed fully by Mourek and Rice (q.v.). The ob-
viously inseparable ones are relevant only in so far as they
give comparative evidence on the question of possible sep-
arability. The essential cases for this discussion are
those in which the prepositions of group 4-b stand alone.
Such instances, though few, are extremely significant. The
cases of separate du (and fram) discussed above (pp. 39-43)
should also be borne in mind here.

The origin of these cases of separation is far more
complex than the development of separable inn and ut, for
separable inn and ut are certainly a part of the verb system,
regular in word order and not marked, as far as the evidence
goes, by other independent uses. In Gothic we have for some
of the prepositional instances direct parallels in the form
of unseparated verb compounds indicating that these separ-
ated prepositions may already have been felt as a part of
a verbal unit. It is evident from an examination of the
whole body of instances (separated and unseparated), how-
ever, that there is no regularity in these prepositional
compounds which would justify setting up a syntactically
consistent class of separable prepositional compounds,
parallel to the inn and ut compounds.

Before giving the extant instances and attempting to
explain them, it should be remarked that there is one other
and quite different (i.e. non-verbal) fashion in which otherwise purely prepositional forms may come to stand entirely alone in the sentence. This is the preposition in isolation as a result of anticipation of its object. As in ModE \(^{102}\) ‘the box to put the books in’ or ‘the box (that) I put the books in’; ON hann hörpe alt pat er hann skaut til \(^{103}\) (‘he hit everything that he shot at’), etc. The same sort of anticipation seems to appear in sentences other than those with relative clauses or modificatory infinitive phrases (like the above); e.g. it may well be regarded as appearing in such a sentence as ‘he bought a box and put the books in,’ etc. (but y.i.). We have already mentioned the definite possibility of just such a situation in Gothic, viz. atberun du imma barna ... ip pai siponjos is sokun paim bairandam du. Now the question inevitably arises: First, is there any way to distinguish such forms as ‘the box \(\text{to} + \text{he} + \text{put} + \text{the books in}’\) which are cases of anticipated objects and hence still prepositional uses, from real separable verb forms (such as ‘put in’ – “to submit” – in ‘he put an application in’ or ‘pull in’ in ‘pull your stomach in,’ where only a tour de force will

\(^{102}\) Y. Gurme Syntax, p. 566, Heusler, p. 149 ff.

make the 'in' a preposition and complete it with an object). Secondly, where does such a sentence as 'he bought a box' and put the books in' belong between the two extremes ('a box to put the books in' - prepositional; 'pull in your stomach' 'pull your stomach in' 'he ate up the cake' 'he ate the cake up' - verb-adverb compound). Naturally, such questions are not meant to be asked only of English, but also of any dialect including Gothic which contains such forms. The English examples are used only to clarify the issue.

To the first question we may say definitely: At least some Gmc dialects make a distinction, e.g.:

ModE.1) 'the box (to) put the books in' (prepositional type) always has the preposition after the direct object if such object is present, while the verb-adverb type generally may have the adverb either before or after (v.g.)

2) Prepositions which otherwise never occur alone may do so in this type of isolated use, e.g. 'the man I bought the books from' 'the man he spoke of,' while there are no verb-adverb combinations with 'from', 'of', etc. 3) Stress difference even with parallel word order seems probable: 'the box he put the books in' but 'pull your stomach

---

104 And, for general discussion, the most vexing question - which came first? That is, what was the first break in the serene consistency of the prepositional system (inseparable preposition-verb compounds; prepositions otherwise only with objects) represented by later Greek and almost by Gothic.

105 Retaining the usual lack of stress of the preposition.
in' (or: 'pull your stomach in').

ModGm colloquial speech: Prepositions which never appear in verb compounding may be used in isolation: der Brunnen wo die Leute von trinken; da kann ich nichts für, etc.

ON, on the other hand, has either order in the relative clause: Rön åtte net þat er hon veidde í menn alla (literally: "Ron had a net that she caught in all people") or kona manz sú er hann á börn með\(^{106}\) ("a man's wife that he has children with"). It must always be remembered that ON prepositions are even freer than those of ModE.

As to the second question (where do such sentences as 'he bought a box and put the books in' belong?) it seems clear that ModE places this, in spite of its seeming omission of the (anticipated) object, with the verb-adverb compounds. The reason for this assumption is that, different from relative clauses, not all prepositions may so occur, but only those which appear in regular verb-adverb compounding. For example, we cannot say "I went to the man and bought the box from." Yet the possibility of such a construction in Gmc is assured by ON in such sentences as hann hafpe skáto ok á þrið tego manna (literally: "he had a ship and on 30 men") and konungr sende skip ok fekk til

\(^{106}\)Heusler, p. 167.
styrea man \(^{107}\) ("the king sent a ship and acted as the helmsman for"). Of course, ON shows the greatest freedom in the use of prepositional forms, \(^{108}\) both \(\acute{a}\) and \(\text{t}i\), for example, appearing as preverbs and in adverbial uses. \(^{109}\) In Gothic it would seem that there is, proportionately, more evidence for the sort of use represented by the above ON examples and by the already mentioned sokun \(\text{baim bairandam du (soc. imma)}\) than for the use of prepositions as separable compounding forms. See below.

With this background in mind the Gothic examples should seem clearer — or rather the difficulty of analysis should at least be plain.

The one obvious instance (with an already compounded verb) of a preposition with object anticipated\(^{110}\) is Matthew 27, 7 usbauhtedun us \(\text{baim pana akr kasjins du}
usfilhan ana gastim ήγρασων α\(\acute{e}\) αυτών των ήγρον των κρατέως
α\(\acute{e}\) ταξίν των ξένως (where, in view of the independence of the Gothic from the Greek original, we have beyond doubt a

\(^{107}\)Heusler, p. 151.
\(^{108}\)An extreme example being rekkia ein ok klaepe \(\acute{f}\)
(Heusler, p. 151).
\(^{109}\)Cleasby under \(\acute{a}\) and \(\text{t}i\).
\(^{110}\)Grewolds 60, p. 3 notes this form with the other examples of ana, du and faur without differentiation, calling it a compounding form (anausfilhan\(?)\). Streitberg (WB under ana) gives it as an adverb; sim. Stamm-Heyne-Wrede, Bernhardt, Balg. A. M. Sturtevant, "Gothic Syntactical Notes," in: Studies in Honor of Hermann Collitz. (Baltimore, 1930),
natural Gothic construction). If any explanation is needed for the odd dative gastim, it can be found in the Greek.

The remaining instances of isolated prepositions in conjunction with compound verbs are:

ana:

1) Mark 8, 23 jah fairgreipands handu pis blindins ustauh ina utana weibsah jah speiwands in augona is atlag-jands ana handuns seinos frah ina gauhvasehvi ? επιθέεις τῶς χειρὰς αὐτῶν (Note again the independence of the Gothic construction.)

Compare this 1) with the following compound verbs (there being no extant verb *anaatlagjan*):

Luke 4, 40 ὅς is ainhvarjammeh iza handuns analag-jands gahailida ins τῶς χειρὰς επίθεεις ... and Luke 10, 30 ... palei jah biraubodedun ina jah banjos analag (Jandans - not clear in MS111) πληγὰς επιθεύτες. Note that these are compounded with simple verbs.

And 2) with the following preposition plus object forms: Matthew 9, 18 akei qimands atlagei handu peina ana ija επίθεεις τήν χειρὰ σου ἐκ, αὐτῆς; Mark 15, 17 jah atlagidedun ana ina

pp.101-102, calls it "an adverbial modifier of the verbal substantive usfilhan," making no mention of possible prepositional origin. Sturtevant also discusses Friedrichsen's idea that ana is a plain preposition.

llly. Streitberg B ad loc.
θαυμείναια wipja ... καὶ ἑρεκεθάσαυν αὐτῷ
... ἀκάθανον στέφανον.

2) Mark 11, 7 jah brahtedun þana fulan at Iesua jah
galgidedun ana wástjos seinos jah gasat ana inall2 καὶ
ἐπέβαλον αὐτῷ τὰ ἰματά κύτων καὶ ἔκάθισαν
ἐπὶ αὐτῷ.

Compare this 1) with the compound verbs given
above from Luke 4, 40 & 10, 30 (there being no com-
pound verb ἔνασγαλαγιάν).

And 2) with the following prepositional forms:

John 9, 15 fani galagida mis ana augona πυλὰν ἐπέθηκέν
μου ἐπὶ...; John 19, 2 jah galagidedun (scil. wipja)
imma ana haubid ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ...; Mark 8, 25
ἐπροχ αφρα galagida handuns ana þo augona is ἐπέθηκαν
τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ...

du:

1) With simple verb in Mark 10, 13 (v. g. pp. 39-41)
2) Luke 8, 44 atgaggandei du aftaro attaitok skauta

wástjos is προσελθοῦσα ἐπίσθεν.

Compare this 1) with the compound verb in

Matthew 9, 20 qino bloparinnande1 .ib. wintruns

112 Streitberg (B ad loc.) insists that ina should be
added after the first ana to correspond with the Greek, the
"omission" being a scribal error. But of. Curme Compounds,
pp. 350-1 for a contradiction of this suggestion.
duatgaggande aftaro attaitok skauta wastjos is

113

prosclhoukos vespoden, etc. 114

And 2) with the prepositional forms: Luke 18, 14

atiddja sa garaihtoza gataihans du garda seinamma katêby

oûtos dedikaménos eis ... and Luke 9, 12

atgaggandans ban du imma pai twalif prosclhontes de oî

dêbeka

faufr:

1) Luke 19, 4 jah bibraggjands faur usstaig ana smakka-

bagn k ai prosba emprosbaden

Compare this 1) with the similar compound verbs

(there being no extant verb *faubrbibragnjan* in Mark

10, 32 jah *was* 115 faurbigaggands ins Iesus kai ën

proaiâv kai eis 6. (sim. Mark 16, 7) and (without

the direct object construction) in I Tim. 5, 24 sumaize

manne frawaurhteis swikunbos sind faurbisniwandeins

du stauai probrloi eisw proanouai eis krôiwn

There are no extant instances of the preposition

faufr used with this particular verb.

113 One can hardly refrain from thanking Wulfila for this

faultless pair of contrasting examples.

114 Forms of duatgaggan appear 12 times in Gothic. Citing

others would be supererogatory.

115 v. Streitberg B ad loc.
2) Mark 8, 6 Jah atgaf (sci. hlaibans) siponjam seinaim ei atlagidedeina faur jah atlagidedun faur po managein ἐν τῷ παραθέσει καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ἔχλῳ.

Compare this 1) with the following compound verb (there being no extant verb *fauratlagjan*): Luke 9, 16 nimanda pan pans fimf hlaibans jah twanas fiskans ...
jah gaf siponjam du faurlagjan pizai managein ἐν τῷ παραθέσει τῷ ἔχλῳ.

And 2) with the prepositional use in the original passage.

It is possible, in spite of the small number of extant cases to examine these prepositional forms with roughly the same lexical, syntactical and morphological criteria as were used in considering inn and ut. On this analysis rests not only our judgment of these prepositional forms but also, of course, our decision on the status of the Gothic prepositional compounds in relation to the matter of separability.

The following points of parallel lexical evidence may be noted:

1) Parallel **compound** *verba* occur for the one instance of du (a complete parallel) and, almost as convincingly though not with the same verb, for one of the examples of faur. No equivalent **double** compounds appear for the two instances of ana, none for the second example of faur.
Single compounds (faurlagjan, analagjan, atlagjan) cannot be regarded as equivalents, since their pre-verbs must in any case be regarded as inseparable (v.s. p. 38 ff).

2) Parallel preposition plus object forms appear for the two ana's, for du, and for the first example of faur, but not for the second example of faur. This latter lacuna is of no consequence, there being, of course, many examples of faur used with verbs quite similar to bipragjan. Among the naturally very large number of prepositional instances, the really significant ones are the repetition in the same sentence of atlagidedeina faur and atlagidedun faur po managein, and the partial equivalence in the same sentence of galagidedun ana and gasat ana ina.

(There seems to be complete semantic agreement on both sides.)

Syntactically, the isolated forms naturally admit of being construed as prepositions of some kind (especially if one is going to resort to inserting objects, as Streitberg does with ina; v.s.). The principal syntactical question is - do these forms, by following the "regular" word order of separable compounding forms as outlined for inn and ut, admit of being interpreted as compounding forms? The answer seems to be a qualified 'no'. (Among the simple verbs with
isolated preposition, пам bairandam du would be itself an exception to the observation that in participles used as nouns a separable compounding form always precedes; *e.

p. 62.) The clear prepositional form (ду usfihan ana gastim) supports this negative answer in that the ana appears after the infinitive, while inn and ut always pre-

cede. Of the five forms under principal consideration, all show the preposition directly after the verb, all of them either in direct contrast to the Greek or independent of it, hence doubtless in natural Gothic order. This much is quite like inn and ut for four of them (being in parti-
cipial constructions or in main clauses), but the remaining one – еi atlagideinea faur – is a subordinate clause and should, if faur were a compounding form following the well substantiated rule for inn and ut, be *еi fauratlagideinea, which would, in addition, correspond directly to the Greek and thus be a "painless" translation. We seem, therefore, to have rather unsatisfactory evidence for supposing these instances, as a group, to be separable compounding forms analogous to inn and ut. On the other hand the regularity of word order, the parallels in preposed compounds, and the semantic nature of at least two of these cases support the significant decision that they may already represent sepa-

rated compounding forms. These cases are, of course,
atgaggandeii du and bipragjands faur. This is not meant to deny the possibility that these two might also have been felt as prepositions¹¹⁶ rather than as elements intimately associated with the verb. For the most rational explanation of the situation, in view of the patent absence of any regular separability in prepositional compounds (v. i.), is to say that these could be either prepositions or separated compounding forms. But, as the feeling for separable compounding grew, all these forms would probably be incorporated by the linguistic consciousness of the speakers of Gothic into the pattern of separable verbs.

The other numerous double compounds of this type (those compounded with forms of group 4-b) show, as I just mentioned, no signs of separability. Under consideration would be especially ana-in-, du-at-, faur-bi-, mip-ana-, mip-in-, mip-us; but possibly also those in which the second member is not a lexical entity, viz. du-ga-, faura-ga-, mip-fra-, mip-ga. Considering the large number of unseparated instances (from which would be subtracted as ambiguous those with infinitives, some participles and those in subordinate clauses, even compounding forms preceding the verb

¹¹⁶The context, as in all the other cases, admits of prepositional interpretation. Admission of this is assumed throughout the discussion. It is perhaps of importance, though, that the faur in particular has a rather remote "anticipated object."
here) and the very few instances which are like inn and ut, one is constrained to describe the compound verbs of this group as characteristically inseparable.

The following, for illustration, is the evidence of lack of separability in the principal scene of separation (the main clause) of what should be the most susceptible group (both compounding forms lexical entities): 1) du-at-: Matthew 8, 5 duatiddja imma hundafaps; Matthew 9, 28 duatidd-jedun imma pai blindans; Matthew 26, 69 jah duatiddja imma aina piwi; Mark 6, 53 jah duatsniwun. 2) mib-ana-: Mark 2, 15 jah managal motarjos jah frawaurhtai mipanakumbidedun Issua. 3) mib-in-: II Cor. 12, 18 jah mipinsandida imma bropar. 4) mib-us: Eph. 2, 6 jah mipurraisida.117

It seems clear, then, that the evidence is not sufficient to indicate that these isolated prepositions are all true compounding forms like inn and ut and also not sufficient to warrant the establishing of a syntactically cohesive

117 Leinen (p. 41) and Stamm-Heyne (v.g. p. 9 ) both consider all first members of double compounds as adverbs. This applies equally to the du-at type and the du-ga type. The objection to this is the obvious one, namely the almost invariable preverb order. The cases in the paragraph above are only a small portion. In addition there are the participles, where some separation is expected (v.g. p.62), as well as the large number of both main clause and participial examples from the du-ga type. If these preverbs are adverbs, they certainly have a very special word order. After all, one of the characteristics established for adverb order is relative freedom.
group of separable compounds to include the ana, du and faur instances.

This does not, I think, drive us back to the assumption that any such forms are precisely like ordinary prepositions or that they are ordinary adverbs. Looking back to the general discussion of Germanic prepositions in isolation, one may more reasonably assume that these instances of ana, du and faur represent a growing syntactic characteristic of a group of prepositions, which, through isolated use made possible perhaps by stress changes and arising in some cases quite independently of any direct verbal connection, came to disrupt the previously existing syntactic class (inseparable preposition-verb compounds). It seems the only reasonable conjecture that the process was still in the initial stages in the Gothic of Wulfil. Though this sort of development reaches a state of some regularity only in other dialects, it is likely that these uses of Gothic prepositions showed characteristics of their own, such as heavier stress.

A source, or at least a point d'appui, for heavier stress and for the growth of separability in verbs compounded with these prepositions has been discussed at

\[118\text{With the possible exception of the two cases (with du and faur) just discussed - if one is willing to say that they have gone all the way to the compounding side.}\]
length under the heading of double compounding forms (p. 23-25). As was mentioned there, the fact that only a certain group of prepositions comes to stand alone demands explanation. (This applies not only to Gothic, of course, but also, for example, to OHG.) The explanation may be stress.

Certainly, as I shall try to show below, the semantic effect of some of these isolated prepositions is practically the same as fairly advanced types of verb-adverb compounds in, say, Modern English. But I still think it important not to set up a class of separable preposition-verb compounds or even to say that these particular Gothic instances are necessarily cases of sporadic separation of preposition-verb compounds. Some of them, I think, may be; but the syntactic situation simply does not seem to warrant treating them as a class. What we have is (to risk repetition) the fascinating early stage of a new class (comparable perhaps to the compound verbs of Modern German or the verb-adverb combinations of Modern English), with its syntactic pattern as yet indefinite. Various currents flow into its main stream, viz.: 120

119 One would scarcely expect the most advanced type to appear in Gothic. That is, Gothic would have no parallels for those English verb-adverb combinations where the adverb has lost all its original directional or spatial sense, e.g. 'up' in 'they bought up the entire supply;' 'he sawed the stump up,' etc.

120 In saying this I am, to an extent, adding another opinion to those (actually rather few) already available
1) Prepositions in isolation by anticipation of object in infinitive or relative clause type of construction, e.g. ak... du usfilhan ana gastim.

2) Prepositions in isolation by anticipation of object in other types of construction, e.g. sokun paym bairandam du.

3) Prepositions in isolation possibly by omission of normal object, possibly from a preposition-verb compound (an important type), e.g. atlaglanda ana handuns seinoa.

4) Prepositions in isolation probably from the equivalent preposition-verb compound (true separability), e.g. atgaggandai du.

A cohesive syntactic pattern for such a class of fairly diverse origin would probably develop later. It would be interesting to know the syntax of the language of Busbecq’s Goths.

The following points, partly in recapitulation, may also be noted in connection with these prepositional forms:

1. ana, du and faur all fall in the group 4-b, for which we have assumed greater stress, greater lexical

on the "ultimate origin" of separable or separated forms. These theories, with no exception known to me, run to the extremes and deal largely with hypothetical, not actually documented, stages of development. The two poles are represented by Schlachter and Curme, the first saying categorically that all separated "prepositional adverbs" came from pure prepositional uses, the other, with careful explanations, saying that they all came from compound verbs. These theories are discussed in the chapter on OHG (v.1. p. 78)ff., etc.) where more separate forms are available for reference. But it is my opinion that right here in Gothic we find evidence (and it is evidence, not hypothesis) for the actual beginnings of separation, and it certainly does not indicate one source but several. The Gothic forms, which may look rather inadequate here, will appear in better perspective when we consider a dialect with numerous separated forms, whose origin may well have been about the same as that of the Gothic cases.
independence, and hence greater possibility of separation. If this is true, original verbal compounds with this group of prepositions would have the way open to separability once the precedent of isolated use were set by anticipation or omission of the object with such prepositions as ana, du and faur. This is of course only one possibility, another being that the greater stress to be assumed for the forms of group 4-b was in itself sufficient to allow for ultimate separation.

2. The fact that originally certain separated prepositional forms may have come from direct anticipation of the object, as in akr...du usfilhan ana gastim, does not preclude the chance that such forms themselves might well come to be regarded by the Sprachgefühl as compounding forms and help the trend toward separability.

3. The separated or isolated preposition, unlike a true adverb but like inn and ut, is in every case immediately after the verb. There is no sign in the extant examples of remote separation. This speaks for close relation to the verb and would facilitate the incorporation

121See Curme Compounds, p. 323 and passim on the general significance of stress and the important notion that the stress of a given separated preposition (or compounding form) might well influence the same form when it is preposed, thus opening the way to separation.
of these forms into the system of separable compounds.

4. The syntactical character of such a group of forms is apt to be somewhat difficult to analyze. There will not be an immediate shift from one existing category to another (from preposition to compounding form, for example). No complete overturn of the established Gothic situation is to be expected. That is why any explanation of such phenomena must be somewhat tentative.

5 and 6. Two further matters of importance—the question of relative stress and the distinction of a prepositional object from the object of a verb with a prepositional compounding form—may be illustrated by proceeding from the unseparated mīp-in- form cited above, viz. II Cor. 12, 18 jah mīpinsandida imma bropar. This verb has an object which is in a relation of Objektvertauschung¹²² with mīp and would be, if separation were possible and took place, * jah insandida mīp bropar—a direct parallel to Mark 8, 23 atlagjands ana handuns seinos. In such a (hypothetical) sentence as * jah insandida mīp bropar, of course, the case form of bropar would show that it was not the object of mīp, but atlagjands ana handuns seinos, per se, could mean either "laying on his hands (the book, etc.)" or "laying on his

hands (on the man, etc.)," where in Modern English only
the greater stress of 'on' in the second sentence can dis-
tinguish between the two forms if they are not completed
by the rest of their sentences. We are probably justified
in assuming that approximately the same was true in Gothic
and that, say, atlagjands āna hânduns seinos would have
meant "laying on his hands ...," while atlagjands āna
hânduns seinos was the pattern for this verse referring to
the laying on of hands. Further, the fact that the typi-
cal separated position of the compounding form and the
position of a preposition must often be the same means,
in absence of stress evidence in Gothic, that in a sen-
tence "compound verb - preposition of group 4-b - noun"
definite identification of the preposition as an isolated,
heavily stressed preposition (that is, an incipient com-
pounding form or a fully developed one, depending on which
stage of development we assume) is possible only if the
noun clearly does not belong with the preposition, for
which there is only one mechanical proof, namely - the
noun is in the wrong case for the preposition. Of this
there is no extant example. The above * jah insandida
mip brobar would be typical. Any other cases will be
identifiable only if the noun, though in the right case,
cannot, within the meaning of the particular sentence,
be the object of the preposition. Examples would be atlag-
jands ana handuns seinos and galagidedun ana wastjos seinos.

7. It should be noted finally that there are several
different levels among these prepositions if one regards
them all from the point of view of a possible compounding
system. The last two examples (with ana) cited in the pre-
ceding paragraph would, if generalized into a regular pat-
tern of syntax, represent an advanced stage of separable
compounding forms or of verb-adverb compounds (there is no
way of telling which way Gothic may have been headed; these
two forms are, after all, directly comparable to their
obvious Modern English translations, and Modern English
represents primarily a verb-adverb system). They contain,
as they stand, a transitive verb plus preposition plus a
direct object of the verb-preposition combination.

A different construction with a transitive verb is
found where no object at all is expressed. In the extant
examples an object of the preposition and an object of the
verb-preposition combination both suggest themselves from
the context. Referring to hlalibans as object of atgaf,
Mark 8, 6 reads: jah atgaf siponjam seinaim ei atlagidedeina
faur jah atlagidedun faur po managein. Here one might posit
managein or its pronoun as the omitted object of the first faur (as
in RV to set before them). This would mean that we have here not
a compounding form but a preposition in isolation. (Even though managein is not directly before this clause, it appears earlier in the verse as well as after the following verb.) If, on the other hand, hlaibanas were assumed after faur (or rather: assumed as the referent of ei atlagidedeina faur), we should have the same type of construction as in atlagjands ana handuns and galagidedun ana wastjos (v.g.). If the former interpretation is correct, as I think probable partly in view of the word order and partly because of the exact parallel sokun baim bairandam du, then this faur is still an isolated preposition. In the other case it would be, like the ana forms, approaching the category of compounding. (The fact that these instances are in a translation to begin with certainly makes it no easier to assay their place in the Gothic Sprachgefühl.)

In two other cases the verbs are intransitive, and the preposition here may be considered in such relative innocence of any likely object that these cases may represent an advanced stage of the development to separable compounding forms. The instances are: atgaggandei du aftaro; jah bipragjands faur.

123 v.g. p. 84.
124 Where, for even more definitive reasons, du was judged an isolated preposition and not a compounding form. Y.s. pp. 39-41.
F. Summary of Results for Gothic

The main interest of this study is comparative, but it contains what I believe to be important results in the field of Gothic syntax. There are:

1. The establishing of a pattern of separable compounding with inn and ut.

2. Demonstration of the inseparability of simple compounds.

3. Clear distinction of compounding forms from adverbs.

4. Indication of the multiple origin of later separable compounds.

5. Emphasis of the importance of the isolated preposition.

6. Questioning of the validity of the common group "prepositional adverbs."
A. Introductory Remarks

The aim of this chapter is essentially the same as that of the first - to find out whether the dialect in question has a class of compounding elements in the verb system which warrants the setting up of a class of verb-adverb compounds (or "separable compounds") and to distinguish among adverbs, compounding forms and inseparable preverbs, if such a distinction is warranted.

Previous procedure has too often been to set up a hypothesis or a theoretical set of patterns for OHG word order and then go about finding "examples." But it is the unhappy truth that you can find virtually anything in OHG, if you look long enough - any word order, any sentence type. This gives a semblance of validity to the suggested patterns, but it is actually worse than no theory at all.

The only logical procedure is to take an entire document - preferably, of course, the whole corpus of OHG - and analyze all of the relevant word order patterns. Thus and only thus is it possible to separate the general, common patterns from the sport mutations and the translation howlers, which seem so frequent in OHG.
Covering the entire body of OHG seemed quite beyond the reach of this work. So a choice was imperative, and the choice was crucial. Only the satisfactory results of the study gave the final confirmation of the soundness of the choice. Otfrid von Weissenburg's Evangelienbuch is an excellent source, as OHG goes, for this type of study.

The possibility and practicality of using a poetic text for this particular syntactical study will be apparent if it is realized that we are not, fundamentally, trying to set up absolute word order patterns. We are trying to find differences between the behavior of one group of words and the behavior of another. That is, we are establishing largely relative word order patterns. A poetic text can do this just as well as a prose text, if it makes the necessary distinctions at all. For example, if in Otfrid the behavior of heimortsun is systematically different from the behavior of thuruh and the volume of evidence is sufficient on the two forms, it may safely be assumed that they should be assigned to different classes of words. A text does not have to be prose to show this. As a matter of fact, a free poetic text is going to be better here than most translated prose texts, because the differences it shows will at least be native.
The type of observation that cannot always safely be made from Otfrid alone concerns, for example, the absolute position of the verb in the subordinate clause. But Otfrid can be expected to show the relative position of compounding form and verb in the subordinate clause. And further, while there may be some disturbances of the latter (relative) pattern because of poetic exigencies, it must, conversely, be admitted that Otfrid may give good evidence on many points of absolute word order, including this same matter of the verb in the subordinate clause. Certainly no one is going to say that all poets always use strange word order. The old doctrine, too often unhonored, of judging according to the individual case is much better than a stultifying blanket prejudice. There are, syntactically speaking, poets and poets.

Past scholarship certainly suffers from no dearth of heated utterances on the subject of Otfrid's "Germanity," ranging from Erdmann's defense to Behaghel's rejection. This is scarcely the time or the place for a review of the controversy. I prefer to use the Evangelienbuch, with a weather-eye out for likely cases of unnatural word order, in the same spirit that, for example, Kuhn\(^1\) or, long before him, Jakob Grimm regarded

\(^1\)Kuhn, passim.
Otfred - largely reliable in sentence structure, original in composition, and very helpful in matters of stress. I have no intention of ignoring other OHG materials, of course, because they are the only check on the validity of Otfred. The general picture which results should be reasonably reliable.

Otfred offers the further pleasant advantage of having a vocabulary almost exactly equal to Wulfila's. No other OHG work is within 1,000 words of the Gothic Bible. Thus a direct comparison of word and pattern frequencies is possible with no need for further adjustment of figures.

2Nother's 7,900 (total according to Prof. E. H. Sehrt in his Linguistics Institute lecture at Ann Arbor, Aug. 3, 1943) is the only OHG with a larger vocabulary.
B. The Lexical Situation

1. Introduction

As in the case of Gothic, the lexical nature of the preverbs is the first question. Unfortunately, the existence of compounding is itself a major problem in OHG, and not until all of the syntactical factors involved have been carefully analyzed will it be possible to identify any compounding forms in Otfrid. For the purpose of initial completeness, however, it is certainly fair to list and examine all those forms which occur directly before verbs in such a way as to admit of at least prima facie interpretation as compounding forms.

The total picture of the extent of these preverbs in Otfrid matches the surprising number of the Gothic forms. In a total vocabulary³ practically the same as Wulfila's Otfrid uses no less than 11 inseparable prefixes, as well as about 15 other forms appearing directly before verbs as well as separately. These latter constitute approximately the total repertoire of forms from which various scholars select, apparently at random, 10 or so as the "prepositional-adverbs" of Otfrid's OHG.

³By Kelle's count, 3,163 words (1,500 of which are compounds!); v. Kelle II, pp. 430–31.
This makes a total of 26, which are approximately on the same level as the 28 cited for Gothic (v.s. p.41ff.). In addition, Otfrid uses at least 8 forms which are so closely connected with verbs that excluding them all from the list of compounding forms would at least be anticipating the rest of this study. Clearly, the OHG situation is too complicated to allow a simple enumeration and totalling of compounding forms.

2. Bound Forms

The lexical division in Otfrid is roughly analogous to that of Wulfila. The series of inseparable prefixes which are at the same time bound forms is dominated by the standard German group of gi, ir, bi, fir, in(t) and zi, although the last is well behind the others in frequency. The number of different verbs\(^4\) compounded with these forms is of interest, especially for the sake of comparison with the "separable" compounding elements, and with Gothic.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gi forms} & \text{ 68 strong verbs, 210 weak. Total 278}^5 \\
\text{ir} & \text{ 38 } \\
\text{zi} & \text{ 78 } \\
\text{Total} & \text{ 116}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\)The counts are based on Kelle's glossary and grammar.
\(^5\)Comparing with a total of 240 ga verbs in Gothic.
bi forms 41 strong verbs, 49 weak. Total 90
fir 35 : : 28 : : 636
in(t) 25 : : 17 : : 42
zi 6 : : 4 : : 10

The only other bound form occurring in Otfried's verb composition is hintar, in the one verb hintarqueman ("be startled, surprised, etc."). hintar, as a preposition, hardly appears at all before Notker and Williram. Its semantic field in the older documents is taken care of by after.

If one is going to speak of "OHG in general" hintar would not be considered a bound form, and it is, in any event, on an obviously different level from gi, ir, etc., which are true bound forms throughout the Germanic languages at all periods.

There is one well-established compounding form which would be a bound form for OHG but for one instance

---

6 Comparing with a total of 35 verbs for Gothic fair and fra.
8 Other bound forms which are not really verbal compounding forms but occur only in denominative verbs (v. Gothic id, etc.) appear in OHG (v. Grimm II, p. 787), but not in Ötfrid. It, for example, occurs only in the noun itwizzi (in Gothic also as the verb idweitjan).
of its independent use in Otfred. This is missi-, which appears in 9 verbs. The adjective missi in Otfred V-25-80 missemo múate, "of different mind," corresponds to the Gothic misso,\textsuperscript{10} but it does not show up in any other OHG source that I know of.

The true bound forms above, as well as hintar and missi-, which really belong below, are absolutely inseparable in Otfred.

Likewise entirely inseparable, though clearly not bound forms, are the following nouns which do not enter into our discussion because their only appearance in denominative compounds: fuaz (-fallôn), hals (-slagôn), muat (-fagôn). The denominative nature of these is established not only by nouns like OHG halsslag and MHG vuoizval but by the obvious fact that, for fuazfallôn and halsslagôn, there is no verb from which they could be derived (fallan and slahan being, of course, strong verbs).\textsuperscript{11}

Sobel implies manslahan as a verb, citing as a compound IV-20-36 thaz sie manaluagin.\textsuperscript{12} Not only would

\textsuperscript{11}Wilmanns, pp. 119-22: has a full discussion of this type of verb.
\textsuperscript{12}v. Sobel, p. 63.
this be an unusual verb - compounded of *man plus alahan* (a strong verb), but there are numerous OHG cases of *manslago*, including one in Otfried IV-20-39, so that the derivative verb would probably be *manslagôn*. Further, all the editions write *mán sluagin*, indicating their interpretation of this instance as noun plus verb.

3. Lexical Entities and Variants

We are left with the following forms which appear as lexical entities (or as variants of lexical entities) in Otfried, including, as mentioned above, all those where compounding seems possible: after, ana, bifora, fora, fram, furí, heim, hera, hina, [hintar], in, ingegin (ingegini), mit (miti), näh, nidar, (nidare, nidere, nidiri), thana, thara, thuruh, ubar, (ubari, ubirí), üf, umbi, untar, ûz, widar (widari), zisamane, zuₐ.¹⁴

¹³Some compounds of this nature (noun plus strong verb) do appear in MHG, and Wilmanns (p. 121) indicates the possibility of such an interpretation for *wint-werfan*. Here, however, the evidence seems all on the other side.

¹⁴This list of 25 forms, excluding variants, speaks well for the use of Otfried as a sample of OHG. Of the at all frequent compounding forms (or possible compounding forms) of OHG, Otfried is missing only az, opa-oba, fona. For apo-aba he uses thana. For samant he uses zisamane. az is quite uncommon; Tatian has forms of azstantan and azwesan; see also Grimm II, p. 876. opa-oba is even rarer; see Grimm II, p. 877. fona is almost non-existent; see Grimm II, p. 877.
A glance at the list reveals the lexical complexity of the OHG situation. Sorting out those forms also used as prepositions is the only simple and obvious task. This gives the following list:

after, ana,\(^\text{15}\) fora, furu, (hinter),\(^\text{16}\) in, in-
gegin, mit, thuruh, ubar, umbi, untar, widar.\(^\text{17}\)

This is a reduction from the 18 prepositional forms of Gothic appearing in the same function, but 10 of these 13 OHG forms correspond directly to Gothic. Only ingegen, umbi, and untar are "new." And conversely only four of the Gothic forms have no analogues in Otfrid's verb system (viz. af, at,\(^\text{18}\) uf, und).

Subtracting these prepositions from the total list leaves a great number of forms corresponding, in this classification, to the Gothic pair inn and ut, i.e. "forms not used as prepositions." To be sure, a fair share of this remainder is made up of forms that will certainly turn out to be the equivalents of Gothic fairra, nehva, etc. - that is, true adverbs - but the OHG situation is so complex that no tacit division can be made. The most difficult and fascinating task in analyzing verb composition

\(^{15}\text{Only in MS F. The prepositional form in the other MSS is anan.}\)

\(^{16}\text{v.2.}\)

\(^{17}\text{Otfrid has no prepositional uses of ûz like Tatian 145-12 uz themo lante, which is a rather rare usage for OHG, anyway.}\)

\(^{18}\text{Still extant in some OHG verbs, e.g. azqueman.}\)
in Otfriid is precisely this one of distinguishing adverbs from compounding forms, and it is by no means so clear-cut as, I hope, the Gothic division was.

Several of the non-prepositional forms in the list are closely related to prepositions, and the difference in phonetic form seems generally to be related to their relative stress. Thus ingegini (preposition: ingegin), miti (mit), ubari-ubiri (ubar), widari (widar), zua (zi). The situation is actually considerably more complicated than that.

I should like to state in this connection what I regard as practically an axiom of compounding - namely, that a compounding form must be the same phonetically whether it occurs directly before the verb or separated from it. If the forms diverge they have become different things - perhaps one a compounding form and the other an adverb. It is unnecessary to say that many writers do not, apparently, believe this. But I think this comes from lack of close reflection, and I also think it presents a picture of the given verb which is distorted and artificial when viewed with the general compounding patterns of the Germanic languages in mind. Kelle, for example, gives widarwisu in his Glossary. The only instance is III-8-10 mihil ūngiuuitiri uuás in harto uuidari. This widarwisu - uuás uuidari seems more than unlikely to me.
Piper's entry widariwesan is far better, if this is a compound at all. Similarly, the inclusion by Kelle of II-14-83 thaz sein liaz thuin dftime mit õtmuati so nidiri under nidarlazu. Kelle says "des Reimes wegen... statt des gewöhnlichen nidar." II-4-55 laz thih nidar hérasun seems to be a parallel - and hence a superficial argument for Kelle's interpretation. On the contrary, the superficial evidence, I believe, makes nidarlazan - liaz nidiri very unlikely. Just as one might expect, there are other compelling factors which make these forms doubly suspicious. For uuás...uufdari it is the double stress (v.i. p. 204), and for liaz...nidiri the strange order in the subordinate clause (v.i. p.193).

There is no explicit statement of this idea, pro or con, that I know of. It is one of those things that everyone makes tacit assumptions about. Lachmann, however, clearly works on the basis of the same axiom I have suggested above, for in talking about ingegin compounds he totally omits all of the ingegini forms.

4. Adverbial Uses

The problem of distinguishing clearly adverbial uses for forms in the OHG list is complicated by the fact that

---

19 Piper in this case follows Kelle. See their glossary entries for this form.
20 v. Lachmann, p. 371.
(to anticipate the further steps of this study) part of the OHG development lay in the direction of freer use of some of these forms as sentence adverbs rather than as parts of a syntactically regular system of verb compounds. In the literature covering these forms, however, they are generally rather hazily classified, and then usually only by tacit assumption, as adverbs, adverbial prepositions, etc. It seems not ill-advised, therefore, to go through roughly the same procedure as in the Gothic chapter, though equally clear results cannot be expected.

The individual forms follow.

after. (Often listed as prepositional adverb.) In III-20-183 sar after we have a clear adverbial use, but it is temporal like Gothic afar (v.g. p. 111). There are no instances of the spatial adverb, and there is only one case of a verb with after, viz. III-11-24...1mo giklagotio after rúaafenti (P áftruafenti). There are the uses with thara, i.e. thar(a)after; v.i.pp.116-7. The evidence by itself is not sufficient for any conclusion. In addition, the prepositional uses are not clearly separated, as were the Gothic cases. OHG after takes the dative both for temporal and for spatial meanings.

ana. (Often listed as a prepositional adverb.) As an adverb it could only be derived from its connection
with verbs. The decision therefore rests on the evidence for or against compounding. The closest approach to adverbial use might seem to be in cases like I-15-5 geist, ther mó ánuuaa (with the verb 'to be', that is). There is one case of clearly adverbial thar(a)ana; Y:i. p. 116.

bifora. It appears as an adverb, I believe, in IV-16-46 gábuun sie mit uuórte thaz selba zi ántuuru; thaz selba sie imo sågetun, sie hiar bifóra zelitun (P hiar). As Kelle makes quite clear, the context shows this to mean not 'predict,' but "the same thing they said to him here previously." 21 The impossibility of even considering this as a verb *biforazellen is clear if we compare the Tatian praedixi translation (145-17) Senu ih sågetaz iu bifora, which, like Otfrid's biforalazu and biforauuari, (y.i.), must be examined with the idea of compounding in mind. In any case, this bifora is a temporal adverb, and it is worth noting that both of Otfrid's verbs have distinctly non-temporal meanings, viz. "prefer" and "excel."

fora. (Often listed as a prepositional adverb.) The adverbial uses are frequent, 22 but they are all temporal and all in the form hiar fora (except one thar

21 Y. Kelle III, p. 35.
22 Y. Kelle III, p. 142; and p. 92 below.
fora). The preposition, like after, has both spatial and temporal meanings, and both with the dative. It should be added that in the case where possible compounding with fora comes up the fora is not obviously spatial in meaning; v. forasägen, pp. 93-8.

fram. It appears frequently as an adverb (once even as an adjective), but its meaning is specialized into, as Kelle puts it, an indication "dass eine Thätigkeit oder Eigenschaft in einem hohen Grade vorhanden ist." Thus it is clearly non-spatial. Examples are: I-8-9 gidar ih löbon inan främ and I-22-61 that kind théh io filu fram. None of the possible compounds seems to have this meaning.

furi. (Often listed as a prepositional adverb.) No independent adverbial uses at all. There is the one thara-furi; v. i. p. 116. Thus, listing furi as an adverb would depend on our judgment of the possible compound verbs (as with ana).

heim. Numerous cases of heime ("zu Hause") are clearly adverbial, but heim ("nach Hause") is naturally so closely associated with verbs of motion that the decision as to adverbial nature must generally rest with

our analysis of these possible compounds. There is however one instance which I consider clearly adverbial - that is one where compounding is almost excluded by the meaning. This case is I-16-31 ob uns in múat gigange thaz unsih héim lange. The impersonal verb langën ("es verlangt") is clearly not a verb of motion, as are all the others used with héim, and though such a decision on semantic grounds is difficult, there seems to be almost no possibility, in the nature of Otfrid's compounding system, of a verb *heimlangën. If this notion is correct we have here the first instance of a clear-cut spatial adverb. 24

héra. This form shows definite instances of independent adverbiai use, viz. V-8-28 uuio er uuárd ouh héra funs "became apparent, manifested himself here (to us)"; similarly with funs, though in the combination héra in uuórolt, in II-2-32. Also III-6-52 ther kínftig héra in uuórolt ist (P héra); I-3-43 héra (P héra) in uuórolt zþ uns quam, uuúntarlichen thingon, héra untar ménnisgon. It is conceivable that the second héra could be interpreted with the verb quam, but I find this form fairly

24 The term 'sentence adverb' (Satzadverb) might be used here, indicating that the affinity of the adverb héim in this last case is not restricted to the verb alone, but I am afraid that the term is used too generally for compounding forms (e.g. by Leinen).
conclusive evidence for the independence of here. An even better example of here in clear independent use is Tatian 196-2 inti biginnenti fon Galileu unzan here. This is just like the Gothic ūa lmez nevha, izwis juzei fairra, ūa lupa laponais, etc., and it gives equally clear indication of independent adverbial use.

hina appears far less frequently than here, but it too shows indisputable adverbial uses, viz. H-126 fon āhen zitin hina forn; H-57 hina uuard thiu uuōrolt funs. 26

in. (Often listed as a prepositional adverb.) Possible adverbial use only in connection with verbs. There are several cases of thara plus in; viz. p. 118. The question of length (in or ìn) is obviously related to the matter of adverbial uses, but Otfrid has no macron, and OHG gives, as far as I know, no conclusive evidence on ìn. One virtually certain adverbial use appears in III-10-23 in ni bin...gisentit here in uuōrolt in. The decision rests on syntactical grounds but is practically incontrovertible; viz. p. 188.

ingein. (Often listed as a prepositional adverb.) Possible adverbial uses only in connection with verbs.

25 V.s. pp. 44-51, 54-1.

26 Notker has phrases like (Piper Notker II-280-1) unz hina in alti. See also E. Graff, op. cit., p. 272.
There are several instances of ingegin used with thara; 
y.1. p.119. ingegin is the only (preposed) prepositional 
form. The ingegini instances all occur after a verb and 
frequently separated from it, or in conjunction with 
thara, or in other forms of separation. As far as the 
difference between ingegin and ingegini in the non-
prepositional forms is concerned, separation is clearly 
not of itself the differentiating factor, as ingegin 
also occurs thus, e.g. II-15-4 ther liut ingégin aller 
giang. And if it is not a prepositional use, 27 III-2-3 
ich füar ingegín ímo sar (P ímo) indicates that position 
after the verb is not the criterion either. Piper con-
siders rhyme (menigi rhyming with ingegini) the only 
differentiator. 28 For further discussion, y.i. pp.89-91.

All the above has given no direct information on 
compounding, of course. But if the proposition stated 
on p.11 is correct, ingegin-verb / verb...ingegini pairs 
cannot be true compounds, even though they are so cited 
by Kelle and Piper and treated as such by others, e.g. 
Sobel. The possibility of some verbs being inseparable 
(in this case only ingegin, not ingegini) and the rest 
simple verbs plus an adverb, as indicated by Lachmann 29

27Kelle (III, p. 300) lists it as not prepositional.
28y. Piper II, under ingegin.
29y. Lachmann, p. 371.
must, because of the complexity of the situation, wait for syntactical analysis.

mit and miti. They are so sparsely represented that it is difficult to tell just what their mutual relationship is. miti is not dictated by rhyme certainly, as it never occurs at the end, but the one case of the short form (II-9-43) has the mit rhyming with niuuht. No strict adverbial uses exist, but there is one good example of the preposition mit in isolation as the result of the anticipation of its object (v.i. p. 88). mit and miti, like ingegin and ingegini, must be kept separate as far as verb compounding goes. On thara compounds, v.i. p.120.

nāh. nāh is a definite adverb in II-9-58 so nah zu hérzen gifiang and III-24-15 sus nāh er uns gifiangi. What is more, it has a comparative and a superlative: nāhor, nāhist. The Tatian gives further support for definite adverbial use in 146-1 uuizzit thaz iu nah ist sumar, etc., as well as 4-9 nah thri manoda quasi mensibus tribus.

nidar (nithar), nidare, nidere, nidiri. They are distributed as follows. nidar occurs only with verbs in possible cases of compounding, mostly directly before the verb, but also after it. There are no clearly adverbial uses. nidare and nidere appear to be equivalent and the
weight of evidence indicates that they are adverbs.
Clearly adverbial are II-21-31 οι uuîlo thin hîr
nîdare, οο ερ ister ufn hîmîle; V-1-28 in érdu ioh in
hîmîle inti in âbgrunte ouh hîar nîdare; and V-25-95
and 103, which are both exactly the same as the previous
line except that they have nîdere (F has nîdare). Kelle 30
seems entirely justified in calling the nîdare of
III-17-43 an adverb. unz er thar nîdare tho scrob
reproduces the Greek κάτω κύφας τῷ δακτύλῳ ἐγραφεν
cis τὸν γῆν, Latin inclinans se deorsum, digitō
scribebat in terra. With its reference to the tomb of
Lazarus, III-24-89 stüant er thar tho nîdare, huab thîu
ðugun uf zi hîmîle seems to represent an adverbial use.
nîdare might appear to be simply a rhyme variant of
nidar except for III-17-43, where it is entirely inde-
pendent of rhyme.

Suspicion of the identity of nîdare and nidar finds
some support in the Tatian passage 209-1 zisîlizzan uuas
in zue1 teîl fon obanetic zunzô nîdar usque deorsum
(v.a. Gothic iupapro und dalap, p.541). Further, there
is in the Otfried passage in question the possibility of
separated thArnidar, similar to the other adverb forms

with thar(a) (v.i. p. 108). In that case, there would be no question about the adverbial nature of nidare.

nidiri appears only twice, and both cases are suspect. In II-14-83 thaz sin liaz thiuz sin diuri mit ótmuatí so nidiri, it is in a rhyme pattern with diuri.

All the other combinations with lazaz, separate and proposed, have nidar. The meanings are parallel, but the form is not, I think, to be equated with nidar, for the same reason that mit and miti, etc. are kept separate. The order, too, is very odd (v.i. p. 193). The other case, in II-11-18, is even more difficult: zistiaz er the skrânnon...ioh állaz thaz gisâdili so dêt er filu nîdiri (F nidere). Kelle and Piper both call this a form of the adjective nîdiri "klein, gering, schwach." 31

This agrees with the frequent loss of the characteristic neuter ending -az and the retention of the stem vowel alone, 32 especially in the attributive position. It also is in harmony with the frequent use of a complementary adjective with duan (e.g. duan plus mári, offan, festi). Further the use of filu to modify the nidiri is consistent with adjectival nature. But we must not overlook the fact that the meaning in this passage is

---

far removed from the usual concrete, literal application of such complementary adjectives. For example, with nidira itself, V-23-228 thu uuírdist mir gilóubo, sélbo thu iz bicóbuo, theiz dúit thia mina redina hárto filu nidira (P dúit). Here the nidira is fem. acc. sing., agreeing with redina. Erdmann interprets this in general rightly as: "wenn du es einzelt selbst schaust, so wirst du mir glauben, dass es (die Wirklichkeit) meine Rede tief unten (hinter sich zurück bleiben) lässt,"33 though his translation actually sounds as if he might regard this as a form of nidar! Translating it as "that it (reality) makes my account insignificant" would be much closer, I think. Clearly this nidira is an adjective and its meaning is literal. But a literal translation of this kind makes no sense with ich állaz thaz gisidili so det er filu nidiri. This nidiri, with the verb, means, as Kelle indicates,34 "umstärzen, umwerfen." It does not mean "make small or insignificant." The meaning shows a much closer affinity to the adverb or compounding form nidar with its meaning of "nieder."

There is, I am convinced, at least a possibility that we have here a form of nidari plus the verb duan. Thus

I prefer to hold this case in abeyance rather than to class it with adjectives or adverbs.

This leaves us with *nidare* (_nidere_) as the adverb and requires further analysis of the other forms.

thana. It occurs only with verbs.

thara. This form is used in conjunction with verbs in such a confusing variety of ways that one immediately suspects it of being a fairly free adverb. But these cases with verbal connection must still be considered as possible compounds (and many writers list them as such), and decision as to adverbial nature of the whole body of thara forms must wait for syntactical analysis.

There are a few cases, though, that vouch for straight independent use. Perhaps most striking of all are the instances of the use of thara as a relative. With no particular antecedent:

II-12-41 ther géist ther blasit stillo, thara imo ist múatuillo

V-15-40 ioh giangi thara thu uuólitos

V-15-43 thih leitit filu manno thara thú ni gengist géorno (*P géngist gerno*).

With an antecedent:

III-21-24 (dóufe), thara inan kríst tho uuánta
V-11-29 so gibúrit mánnu thara er so génget thanne
V-16-8 (zitín), thára er tho gimeínta (*P thárə*)
Repetition, as with heir, bespeaks the adverb in III-24-63: quam tho drúhtin unser thara ríaentar, thára zi themo lóben man. And finally, II-14-118 has a thara which even by the greatest stretch of one's semantic and syntactical criteria can hardly be considered as compound with the verb: (uuíbe), thiú erist thára in thia bûrg déta sina künft kund (P thára).

On a different plane, but equally convincing, are the numerous compounds of thara with prepositions and adverbs, viz.: tharaaafter, -ana, -furi, -in, -ingegín(1), -widiri, -zua, -áf, -áz, etc.

thuruh. This form does not appear separately in Otfrid except as a preposition. In OHG in general separate thuruh is very rare. It appears in Notker's dure, e.g. dár dure skfezen; leitta sie dure, etc. But these are of no help in deciding on the possibility of adverbial use for Otfrid's thuruh.

ubär, ubari, ubiri. They present much the same complications as the nidar family. ubar is the prepositional form; in verb compounds it is inseparable,

35 W. Wilmanns, p. 118.
36 Lachmann, pp. 368-369. Also, y.i. p.110, n.189.
37 The Tatian, which has no miti, nidari, ingegini, widari does have ubiri in 116-2 inti inan thara ubiri tatun sizzan and in 89-3 daz dar ubiri uuas uon den aleibun namun sibun sportella uolla (sim. 83-2). The presence of the Gothic adverb ufaro adds to the idea of a long background of phonetically expanded adverbs to go with certain prepositions.
and it is also the only form which appears directly before verbs. ubari and ubiri appear only after verbs. There is very little evidence on these forms, and none of it speaks for adverbial use. Kelle considers both ubari and ubiri simply variants of ubar, for the sake of rhyme. 38 But the inconsistency of this position is apparent when it comes to analyzing verb forms. Even Kelle is unwilling to assume for IV-5-33 sar so iro sito bilidi sie thih gileggent úbari a verb *ubargileggen. He gives ubari-gilegggu (and Piper does the same). Likewise for II-13-38 ich uwót inan úbari gotes ábulgi Kelle gives ubari-wonón. Yet V-23-75 (ubili), thiu únsih geit hiar úbiri he lists under ubar-gän, as does Piper! The only differentiating factor is that there is the form ubargiang in IV-20-30, while the previous two verbs (in IV-5-33 and II-13-38), if verbs they be, are hapax legomena. 39 If that is the reasoning behind the vocabulary listings, it will not bear much examination. Even if one does not accept the axiom that a compounding form must be the same in all positions, there are still the following factors to consider:

38 Kelle II, p. 415.
39 ubari and ubiri may safely be regarded as equivalent forms.
1) _uber_ is always regarded (and correctly so) as inseparable. Lachmann says of _uber, thuruh, untar_ "...diese Präpositionen werden im Althochdeutschen noch nie trennbar vor Verba gestellt."40

2) IV-5-33 and V-23-75 are subordinate clauses. The odd separation is cause for doubting the presence of a compound verb; v.i. p. 183.

3) II-13-38 has both verb and _ubari_ stressed; v.i.pp.194-5.

Points 2 and 3 are the same sort of objections as were noted in the original statement of the axiom on p. 11. They are really syntactical matters, of course, but when there are so many factors against construing a verb as compound the question scarcely need be left in doubt.

 Cf. This form shows no clear cases of independent adverbial use in Otfrid. All forms are closely connected with verbs. There is one _tharf_. For pure adverbial uses we must, as far as I know, go to Old Saxon. The Heliand has, e.g., (903) so hwe so habad trewa up te them alomah-tigon gode, where no direct connection with the verb is conceivable.

40 v. Lachmann, p. 368.
umbi. It occurs as a preposition, otherwise only with verbs. There is the additional strong possibility here, as with miti, of isolated prepositional use. Also, there is a chance that umbi enters into some inseparable compounds; see I. p. 59, etc.

Úz. Except for one thârúz (I. p. 122), this form appears only in relatively close connection with verbs. There is one sentence, however, where the Úz is so far removed from the verb that it is certainly to be regarded as an independent adverb. This is V-20-25 to 27 the selbe instance and the lichamen pälle, also themo fülen légere, iro uuérk zi irgebanne, Úz fon theru ñagu, fon... On I-23-5 and V-9-1, I. p. 101. The Isidor has an even purer example of adverbial use in XXIX-8 uurehhan chifrumida uze fona paradises bliiddnissu "made him an exile out from the joys of paradise." Tatian 132-13 has uz fon theru samanungu uuari.

widar, widari, widiri. These forms are infrequent in Otfred. The situation is further complicated by semantic divergences. The preposition widar means "toward, before;" "against;" "in relation to." The adverb

41V. Leinen, p. 49.
widar\textsuperscript{43} or widari-widiri (the latter apparently rhyme variants) means "again" ("back"). The instances of the adverb are IV-17-24 (so er ruarta imo thaz óra), er sáztaz uuidar héilaz (P uuidar); IV-21-1 giang pilatus uuidari mit imo tho in then sólari\textsuperscript{44} (P giang); and probably II-7-16 er kóta sih sar uuidar zín.

widiri occurs only in H-155 thára uuidiri, where it rhymes with nidiri. This combination, meaning "on the other hand," "in return," has no possible connection with any verb and may safely be discarded as far as compounding goes.

At first glance, this leaves as compounds or possible compounds in Otfrid: (giang...uuuidari), (kerta...uuuidar), uuidarantantan, uuidaruwertán, uuidaruwsatán, (uusas...uuuidari)\textsuperscript{45} — a rather nondescript lot, the discussion of which has much to do with the adverbial nature of widar but must be completed in a later section; \textit{v.i.} pp. 87-8, 226-7.

\textsuperscript{43}Note that widar is the only one of the group hintar, thuruh, ubar, untar and widar (inseparable compounding forms) which occurs alone as anything but a preposition. Diels (p. 145), who calls these prepositional adverbs (!), says "Trennbares ubar, untar wird man...in der alten Prosa vergebens suchen, nur uuidar hat bei T. (Tatian) eine Doppelfunktion als Práp. und trennbares Adverb."

\textsuperscript{44}Compounding is possible here if it means "went back;" "returned." The double stress in P is suspicious, though.

\textsuperscript{45}In III-8-10. Actually this turns out to be a
On a semantic and morphological basis, however, the number of these verbs can definitely be reduced by one. widarwörtôn "oppose" is surely a denominative verb, not merely because its stress is marked uuidaruuerton (III-16-26) in distinction to the other verb with widar meaning "against" (uuidarstántan), but because the noun uuidaruuerto or uuidaruuert, "adversary" (with initial stress in all its many instances in Otfrid) is near at hand, while there is no verb wörtôn at all. The problem is further simplified if we look at the possible compounds from a semantic point of view. Note that all the verbs show widar in the meaning "back" or "again," except uuidarstántan, where it means, like the preposition, "against." The unvarying behavior of this verb, and the fact that its preverb has a meaning entirely different from the rest permits us to say that we have inseparable compounding here.

Thus we are left with giang...uuuidari, kerta...

prepositional use; vi. p. 87. Kelle's listing of widar-wisu is twice dubious. First, it assumes compounding with sin. Secondly, it changes widari to widar.

46v. Sobel, p. 64 and Lachmann, p. 369, both of whom emphasize only the stress.

47 OHG has, of course, wertan, but in a different class. Precisely this situation is typical of denominative derivation vs. straight verbal forms.

48v. Lachmann, p. 370. The inseparable pattern with widar was more extensive in OHG than Otfrid would indicate. Note the forms cited by Lachmann (loc. cit.) from Nötker:
uuidar and uuidarum → to analyze further. (Reference to the prepositional nature of uuás imo harto uuidari has already been made.

zisamane. It is used only in direct connection with verbs.

zua. This form appears only with verbs and with thara-. There is the possibility of postposed prepositional use, which will come up later. All preposed prepositional forms as well as the adverb "too" are zi in Otfrid. The longer stressed form does not become confused with the zi-ze on a large scale until Notker.49

5. Summary and Comparison with Gothic

To summarize, Otfrid has in separate use as

Prepositions only: thuruh, ubar, untar

Spatial adverbs: heim, hera, hina, in, nèh, nidare-nidere, (nidar),50 thara, üz

Adverbs, but not spatial: after, bifora, fram, widar-widari

Preposition-Adverb: fora

habet mir leid widerstozen, daz wirt widerasaget, demo widirchedan wurde, where the absence of -ge- shows the inseparable nature of the verbs.

49V. E. Sehrt, "zie-zuo in Notken": JEGPh 35, pp. 331-5; also C. Carr, "The Oldest Use of the Preposition zu in German": JEGPh 33, pp. 219-21.

50If it belongs with nidare-nidere; v.s. p.19 f.
Doubtful forms (to be classed on the basis of their syntactical behavior):

after, ana, bifora, fora, fram, furi,
ingegîn-ingegîni, mit-miti, nidar, 51
nidiri, thana, ubari-ubiri, of, umbi,
widar-widarî, zismane, zum 52

In comparison with the Gothic, the situation in OHG has obviously become more complex. In Gothic it was possible to make a tacit exclusion of forms like fairra, etc. and dalap, etc., and to demonstrate later by an analysis of their morphological and syntactic behavior the validity of this distinction. This was possible partly because the traditional listings are correct in excluding them, but also because the prepositional compounding forms in Gothic present such a closely knit and nearly unbroken syntactical pattern that fairra, nehva and nehv almost automatically fall beyond the pale—except when enthusiasm for a generalized syntactical system gets the

51 See Spatial adverbs above.

52 Notes: 1. The non-spatial adverbs I have listed again under "Doubtful forms," for much the same reason I thought it wise to separate in Gothic two forms of faura (y.i., p.131). Clearly the possible compounding form is not identical in meaning and may not be identical in behavior with the adverbial form. It is certainly not wise to say, for example, that the compounding form fram is the same as the adjective fram. Again, this emphatically does not detract from the importance these temporal and other adverbs may have had in encouraging separation.

2. fora occurs in two categories because of its doubtful meaning in the compounding form (y.i. p. 93), which may not be identical with its adverbial meaning and function.

3. The above list does not take into account the judgment of the thara forms. On this, y.i.-pp. 103-26.
better of some author's judgment. Similarly, there were so many clear cases of adverbial use with afta, dalab, framis, inna, iupa, iup, samana and samap, and these contrasted so clearly with the inseparability of singly-compounded inn and ut that no confusion was likely - except again in the too enthusiastic setting up of large syntactical patterns. In QHG, on the other hand, both the apparent complexity of the situation and the universal vagueness of the standard lists of compounding forms, "prepositional-adverbs," etc., make it necessary to consider all possible forms. Only such adverbs as heimortes, tharasun, obana have been omitted tacitly (like Gothic dalab, etc.) as it is assumed that no one would be likely to think of them as compounding forms 53 (partly - and justifiably - because of the fact that they and their like do not become compounding forms even in NHG, where the separable prefixes have become both more numerous and more systematized). Perhaps it should be noted here anyway that there is not a shred of evidence for compounding in forms like heimortes.

The comparison of the lists of Gothic and QHG prepositions serving as preverbs has already been made (p. 10).

53 In part, unfortunately, a gratuitous assumption, in view of Piper's listing, e.g., of herasunilen, hinanallen, etc. (Piper II, p. 214).
But note that in Gothic there are only two instances of any kind of separate use of these prepositions along with simple verbs and only six in the company of compound verbs. In OHG, of course, there are so many such cases that it is pointless to count them. And this results in the fact that, of the 12\(^{54}\) prepositions in Otfred's verb system, no less than seven (after, ana, furu, ingegan, mit, umbi, widar) occur in such compromising situations that they have to be relegated to the last group above, the "doubtful forms" whose nature in separation — adverbial or compounding — must be decided on the basis of syntax.

One other form of Otfred's 12 or 13 prepositions shows definite adverbial nature similar to its possible compounding use. This is fora. It was faura in Gothic which caused the most trouble in analysis and came near to disrupting what I believe is still the valid exclusive division of compounding forms (not words; v.s. p.18\(^{1}\)) into prepositions on the one hand and inn & ut on the other. Whether fora has succeeded in disrupting prima facie any such division in OHG rests on the answer to the question: Is it a compounding form? It certainly is both adverb and preposition.

---

\(^{54}\)Or 13, with hintar.
The remaining prepositions, (hintar), thuruh, ubar, and untar (as well as widar in widarstantan) constitute the true inseparable prepositional compounding forms of Otfrid's OHG. They are as inseparable as gi, ir, bi, fir, in(t), and zi.

ubar forms four strong verbs and two weak. untar forms five strong verbs, and thuruh forms two strong verbs. (hintar), thuruh, ubar and untar (and widar) correspond in function to the Gothic prepositions af, afar, and, at, bi, faura, hindar, in, pairh, uf, ufar, und (unpa), us, and wipra, which, if my classification is right, were surely inseparable under all circumstances. Note that the OHG group still has much in common with its Gothic analogues. hintar, thuruh, ubar, and widar are direct etymological correspondencies. untar has taken over the semantic field of uf. And ir, bi, and in(t), now inseparable and bound forms in OHG, correspond etymologically to us, bi, and and, which were inseparable though not bound forms in Gothic. ir and in(t) simply show the

55missi (in 9 verbs) is also inseparable, though no preposition.

56at, bi, in, uf and us because, if they occur in double compounding, they are always in second position, never first (v.s. p. 264), and the rest because they appear only in simple compounds, which are always inseparable (v.s. p. 38 ff.). fram is left out because it is by no means sure that there are any verbs compounded with fram (v.s. pp. 41-34). The remainder (ana, du, faura and mip) were the ones where we expected and found separated uses and possible separability in compound verbs.

Gothic inn and ut in simple compounds are just as inseparable as af, afar, etc.
phonetic deterioration characteristic of bound forms. Since gi, fir, and zi correspond to Gothic ga, fair (fra), and dis, all the OHG inseparables are close cousins to Gothic forms. 57

Analysis of syntactical behavior will decide any other correspondencies with Gothic. Clearly, syntactical parallels for aftra, dalap, framis, inna, iupa, iup, samana, and samap may very likely be found in the group of spatial adverbs or the group of non-spatial adverbs. But if any of the doubtful forms turn out not to be real compounding forms but independent adverbs there will be parallels in that OHG group, too.

Finally, for the true Gothic compounding forms inn and ut (in double compounds) we can expect to find syntactical analogues in the last OHG category (doubtful forms) and possibly in the two adverbial groups. fora, too, might belong here. NHG has separable compounding forms from all the OHG categories.

For any of the forms which are most germane to this study—some type of verb-adverb compounds—we must then wait for syntactical analysis. Only the inseparable forms in Otfried are easily equated with Gothic forms.

57If widar turns out to be inseparable (in at least one of its meanings), it too is taken care of, by wipra.
C. Separability in OHG Compounds

Devoting space to those factors showing separability in OHG might seem supererogatory. Separation is extremely obvious. But any patterns evolved may be of help.

Tmesis and reduplication, which demonstrated a degree of separateness for even the bound forms in Gothic (v.g. p.30 ff.), have disappeared as active factors in OHG.

With the bound forms (gi, etc.) OHG shows the following characteristics: No separability under any circumstances. This means no ge between preverb and verb in the past participle, likewise no interposed zi with the dative infinitive, ge very rare before the past participle. Some of the latter need examination as possible denominatives, e.g. Otfried's gibisemeroter, probably from bismeron (from the noun bismer). hintar, ubar, untar, thuruh (and inseparable widar) show exactly the same character as the bound forms.

For the remaining forms (possible compounding forms) separability is, to say the least, common. But certain types seem to be in a sort of tmesic condition. That is,

---

59 Ibid.
the whole verb tends to "stay together" rather than allowing its compounding form to wander off because of separation. This is not simply an observation based on NHG separable compounds, when used with ge and zu, but one based on OHG. The preposed order is clearly the first broad criterion for compounding. If that preposed position is interrupted by only one (unstressed) element we have a definite pattern which may well be of use as a further criterion in dividing the possible compounding forms into groups. This is, of course, a matter of syntax as well as a question of separability.

The following cases occur in Otfrid:

IV-6-19 thara giládot
V-6-52 thara in zi gánanne
I-1-8 zisámâne gibântan
H-137 zisámâne gifuâgte

Unfortunately these cases are very few and three of them are suspect at first glance. V-6-52 may well be a case of tharain. I-1-8 and H-137 have two stresses marked (v.i.pp. 56-7).

Other OHG sources give ample evidence for this usage, however. From Grimm⁶⁰ aba za snîdanne, ūf za qhušmanne, ana zi liccanne, avar za saganne, and the remarkable form from Notker, ūf und nider ze geohêrenne.⁶¹ Also: dane

---

⁶¹Tatian (54-2) has suothun inan in zi traganne quaerebant sum inferre.
The third type of separation is that by ni. The Gothic has mip ni qam as well as sae1 inn ni atgaggip (v.g. p. 331 and p. 321). OE has ge in ne eodun. Tatian 133-6 has thie thar in ni get. Though Otfried has no examples of this position, it is amply assured for OHG. It even occurs in the glosses, which practically never quote any verb except in the Latin (preposed) order (i.e. no glosses like exire - gân ûz). Grimm quotes nidar ni rîsit, ûz ni wirfo, and the extraordinary double negation in the Kero Glosses ni zô ni wirf non adijia.62 Otfried’s ni causes the other type of possible word order, viz. complete separation, e.g. I-28-17 thaz uuir ni fâren furdir ûz (v.i. p. 63).

The most emphatic sort of separation, again not in Otfried, is that caused by the verb "to be," e.g. ana si kimachôt, furi si kisezit, fora si kedenit, untar si ketân, zua si kitân (all from the Kero Glosses) and ingagan iat

kispreitit from Junius. 63

The evidence is, of course, negative. That is, it simply divides the material into the two classes: 1) inseparable, 2) not inseparable. There is no dearth of evidence for this division elsewhere. But the reverse of the medal may give a more interesting picture. That is, if we were to find forms like

1) *zisamanefuagte 64
2) *zi inganganne (in = "in")
3) *ni ûzfaren

we would have excellent evidence for a feeling in the OHG writer's mind of the compound nature of such verbs, or at the least, a reflex of an older stage or period in which these forms were more closely compounded. Such forms would clearly represent a usage not precisely general or "current," as the regular forms (zisamanegifuagte, in zi ganganne, and ni faren uz or ûz ni wirfo) show. But if such forms were not or never had been compound verbs, there would be no possibility of such uses, as an adverb in any of these positions is unthinkable. (For results of this sort, v.i. p.64ff. and p.68 ff.)

63 V. Grimm II, p. 871.
64 With verbs other than those regularly forming their past participles without ge-, like braht or funtan.
D. Double Compounding

Examination of the cases of double compounding yielded considerable evidence on the classifying of Gothic compounding forms. In OHG, however, for the obvious reason that separation is much more common and hence distinction between adverb and compounding form very difficult, double compounding is a troublesome classification to work with. NHG, to be sure, has many double compounds. In some, the order is just the same as in, e.g. Gothic inngeleipan, the type from which we derived our group (inn, ut; ana, du, faur, mip) where separation was likely. This type is represented by NHG einverleiben, vorbereiten, etc. In the written form, hineingehen, vorüberfahren, etc. might seem to represent a class of double compounds where both prefixes are separable. But the stress on the second element and the impossibility of two equally stressed adverbs at the end (er ging vor bei, er ging hin ein, like er ging hin zu dem Mann) show that NHG has no double separable compounds. English, which has abandoned the alternation of pre-verb and post-verb position, has such double adverbs, of course, e.g.: he went down in (or, for that matter: he went down in under, and all the trick sentences of this school). Modern German is

65 The trick sentence is actually a most valuable guide to a language's syntax. It shows the outer limit of the
down to a few highly dubious cases like ich stehe mit an. Here the mit is probably outside the compounding pattern and is an adverb.

What then was the OHG situation?

It seems unlikely, within the frame of Germanic syntax, that there should be verbs with double separable compounding forms, but this is more of an intuition than an established fact. The Gothic instance of mibinngalaip should give us pause. On the other hand we should expect some reflex of the Gothic words on the pattern: separable prefix - inseparable prefix - verb (innngaleiban, etc.).

Although this is not a matter which can be settled on a purely lexical basis, the forms may, I think, be listed now and any syntactical qualification made later. Possible cases of compounding with two forms, which forms also occur separately, do appear in Otfrid, viz.

II-4-79 thaz ih mih hiar irréke inti hina nidasrickke

IV-30-14 ni mag ni uuédar sar, thes húses uuüht bidíhan, noh hera nidadigán

II-7-72 himil séhet er indán, thie éngila ouh hera nidargan

V-9-2 ...thaz lúb, thaz bi únsih hiar írstår, fon béche hera uuðaruuárâb

syntactical possibilities of any pattern: What did you bring me that book to read to out of up for? Such a sentence is recognized as correct, funny as it may be.

The likelihood of simple compounds with nidar and widar, preceded by the adverbs hina and hera, is obvious. But the importance of these forms in the ancestry of NHG hernieder-gehen, etc. should not be overlooked. The stress pattern is the same as NHG, that is, the first adverb is less stressed, and this in the face of the clear possibility of either pattern in the ordinary compound adverb -hera úz, hera zua. Still, for OHG they certainly do not prove double compounding on this level.

The other type of doubling occurs in Otfrid also. This is the sort where two of the possible compounding forms (v.g. p. 9) appear in the same sentence but both in separation, like Modern English he went down in, e.g. er quam uns sulih hera hēim (P quām). The general pattern of German compounding from the modern period all the way back makes it seem very unlikely that these two forms both belong with the verb in a double separable compound. A close cousin of this sort of usage appears at all stages from OHG to NHG, however. For example, Notker (Boethius) has mīh lūstet taz nīdera ûf. ûnde daz óbera nīder ze gēchērenne, and Keller in Kleider machen Leute exactly

---

68 None is listed as a compound by Kelle or Piper, both of whom are very liberal in the listing of compounds.
the same construction in "...zog seinen fadenscheinigen Rock aus und das Prachtkleid an."\textsuperscript{70} Whatever the difficulties in deciding what verbs these are (aus- und anziehen??), the difference from the Otfried example is clear. The Notker and Keller sentences have an 'und' to separate the two. The only type of NHG parallel for the Otfried sentence is the above (p. 41) ich stehe mit an.

The examples\textsuperscript{71} are:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{fram} / \textit{úz} \hfill \textdagger  \item \textit{hera} / \textit{heim} \hfill \textdagger  \item \textit{hera} / \textit{in} \hfill \textdagger  \item \textit{ingegi} / \textit{úz} \hfill \textdagger  \item \textit{nidar} / \textit{hera}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{70}Vol. 8 of Gottfried Keller, \textit{Sämtliche Werke... ed. J. Fränkel}(Erlenbach-Zürich and München, 1927), p. 44.

\textsuperscript{71}The frequent cases with thanan, herasun, etc., have not been listed, as these are surely adverbs. Any instances of \textit{thara} / compounding form (e.g. \textit{thara úz}, \textit{thara ingegi}i) have been omitted as ambiguous; \textit{v.i.} p.103ff.
Note that IV-30-28 has a parallel in IV-30-14 hera nidarstigan. This is a reasonable indication that in IV-30-28, nidar is the compounding form (if any) and hera is an adverb.

There is no immediate indication which one of the other pairs of forms is the compounding element.

Of possible compounds of the inngeleipan sort Otfrid has a plethora. The cases with the separable form preceding are:

heim III-20-72 ther...thaz licht thir heim ghólot a (P héim).

hera (v.g. hera nidarstigan, hera nidargan, hera uuÍdaruwarb) II-7-30 nih hera gílti zi thír

hina (v.g. hina nidarytikken)

in IV-7-51 so er érist thia árcha ingiáiang (P archa ingiáiang)

thara V-4-27 ní thaz er thara gílti

IV-6-19 (bóto), thie thara giládot uwarun 73

H-160 thara giléite mih

---

72So do other OHG MSS. v. Grimm II, pp. 908-91 for the best list. In summary, these include apa-ir-, avur-ar-, fram-ar-, inpor-ar-, ðf-ar-, ðz-ar-, zuo-ar-, ðz-int-, ana-pi-, umpi-pi-, zuo-pi-, ana-far-, apa-fir-, in-fir-, ðf-fir-, ðz-fir-. Most of course are from the Glosse, which write all compounding forms before the verb regardless of separability, but several are from other sources. Grimm reserves judgment on whether these are compounds. For similar cases in WHG he denies compounding of the first element.

73gilladón appears elsewhere as a finite verb. This is the only case with thara. Kelle and Piper list all these thara forms as compound verbs.
Word division is simply given according to Erdmann's text, as usual. It may be noted here that Kelle and Piper list all of the above as compounds.

The following appear above as first elements: heim,

---

74 Note that if thanan could be interpreted as a compounding form (as it is by some, e.g. Piper) this could be a parallel to Gothic mipinngalaip.

75 These last three forms are non-finite. gifuagen and fuagen both appear in finite forms; likewise gibintan and bintan.
hera, in, thara, ûf, umbî, ûz, zisamane, zua.

The following are used in immediate preverb position: gi, ir, bi.

The instances of such possible double compounding with the "first" member separated from the verb are more tenuous, but both Kelle and Piper list them (with the one exception, as noted) as compounds.

heim  
H-130 thi giléitit unsih héim
I-18-44 er giléitit thih héim (P heim)

hera  
III-21-26 ther héra uuard giséntit76
     (P giséntit)
III-10-23 ih ni bin...giséntit hera in uuórolt in77
II-12-33 thaz hera in uuórolt to gisán

ingegín  
IV-4-56 thaz sélba ingégin ouh_ínqúad
     thiu áftera héríscaf78

thara  
V-23-164 gilaz thir thára thinaz múat
IV-2-3 so er thára iz tho bíbráhta
IV-33-4 ni uuóltæ sì...thara zi ín
     biscouwun

ubari  
IV-5-33 sar so iro súto bilídi sìe thih
     gileggent úbari

76 The participle is the only form of a verb gisenten, if it exists. Kelle and Piper both list heragisenten.
77 This and the following are immediately suspect because of the use of the phrase hera in uuórolt; v.í.pp.98-100.
78 This form is not listed as a compound by either Kelle or Piper, though I cannot see why they would not so list it. I think it is an adverb, too, but I think that others of this group are as well. And I fail to see any further differentiating factor in IV-4-56.
This gives as possible first members: heim, hera, ingegin, thara, ubari, ūf, umbi, ūz, zisamane; and as second members gi, ir, bi, and in.

The lists of first and second members are surprisingly similar for the preposed and the separated forms. ingegin and ubari do not appear preposed. (For ubari this is no accident; v. i. p. 80.) in and zuia do not appear separated. The second members are identical for the 19 preposed and the 21 separated, with the exception of the one case of in (-quad). The unusual unanimity of the first forms is one of the facts about the group that must be
explained, whether we end up judging them as compounds or not. After all, there are many forms which, at first glance might well appear with already compounded verbs. Why no thuruhi-, ubargi, untargi-? Why no anabi-, thanabi-, etc.? Another fact that must be explained is the startling paucity of such verbs, even listing, as we did, all possible cases without recourse to syntactical considerations which will certainly reduce the group radically (v. i. p. 227). There are only 40 of these instances, while, speaking generally, Kelle counts 801 of Otfrid's 1315 verbs as compounds.79 Further, Gothic has 39 indubitable double compounds.

One closing remark may be made about this group. Direct parallels in the two categories (i.e., same verb appearing preposed and separated) occur for ûfirstantam (2 preposed, 4 separated) and zisamanbiuuintan (1 preposed, 2 separated). This is some surface evidence for compounding. However, both are highly suspect (v. i. p.190).

The remaining double compound form is more surely a double compound but also much more exotic in appearance. gianabrechán of IV-19-64, dét er iz then mánnon zi einen fristfrangan thaz sie nan, so ih thir râchon, mohtin

gíanabrechön. This verb has the same meaning of "condemn" that the simple verb ánabrechön of V-20-97 shows. The order of the preverbs is the interesting thing here - an inseparable preceding a separable, and the case has already been noted in discussing Gothic gamipsandjan. It is possible, of course, that this is a denominative verb, like gibismeroter (IV-23-6). The latter verb certainly can not be cited as an example of double compounding, but gíanabrechön certainly can, as the evidence for denominative origin is not convincing.

E. External Evidence of Compounding

1. Stress

So far we have been talking about the possible compounding forms of OHG largely from a lexical and morphological point of view. The discussion has been based on those forms where compounding seems possible, and no effort has yet been made to prove that compounding exists.

80There seem to be very few such verbs in OHG. Schade (I, p. 237) gives ganavenzôn (canavinzôn) cavillari. V. also Grimm II, p. 907, who cites and discusses gâwiocôn, kiantheizôn, geantwurten, kipheizôn, kiumfrewan, keummuaizôn, giuggagên, geunderskeitôn, chiforabôdon, gevurevangôn, piunchuskan, irunganzen.

81If it is a form of gísmerôen (thus Kelle and Piper). But I prefer to regard this as a simple past participle in gi of the verb bismerôn (see IV-25-2 bísmérota). The addition of gi here is not a violation of the rule of no gi with the past participle of inseparable compounds, since the bi is obviously part of a noun and has stress (v. IV-30-4 and IV-22-26 zí bísmere).
The remark on p. 4 that identification of compound verbs must await syntactical analysis is still largely true, but there are two factors not on a syntactical level which must be mentioned and which may aid in our problem. (The obvious drawback is that any of these criteria may only give us the dichotomy: verb forms which are inseparable compounds vs. verb forms which aren't!). These factors are stress, and word order with ni. The latter was a clear indication of Gothic compounding (v.g. p. 351). Stress was an assumed factor (v.g. p. 281) in characterizing those verbs where separation of originally compounded forms was likely. Stress is a much more tangible factor in OHG, thanks largely to Otfriid. What then is the OHG stress situation in inseparable compounds and in those cases where a possible compounding form is directly prefixed to the verb?

The stress of the gi, ir, bi, fir, in(t) and zi forms is so regular as to be almost monotonous. Out of all the extremely large number of these verbs, Sobel cites only the following exceptions82 (that is, stressed prefixes):

---

bi: 5 in P; 1 in V
ir: 3 in V
fir: 2 in P
gi: 2 in P
int: 1 in P83
zi: none

As a check on the accuracy of Otfred's accentuation, I give here the stress comparison of the two verbs ingăn, one meaning "enter" (in /găn; including all possible cases of this verb) and the other "escape" (originally intgăn).

in /găn  ingăn-intgăn (all unseparated)

Separated:

Stress on in marked: Stress not marked at all: None
I-22-33, IV-23-30,
IV-35-5
Stress on in not marked: Stress marked on verb stem:
IV-34-6 (V-6-52 has
stress on gangan, but
probably involves thara-
in)
I-1-48, I-19-15,
I-24-2, II-5-27,
IV-8-8, IV-16-20,
IV-37-11, V-3-17,
V-13-6, V-15-20,
V-19-16

Unseparated:

Stress on in marked: I-
4-19, II-11-5, II-23-21,
IV-15-5, V-6-28
Stress on in not marked:
V-12-26

(Some of these are dubious com-
pounds, incidentally: v.i. p. 118.)

The results are fairly conclusive, especially in a text supposedly subject to vagaries and inaccuracies. They speak well for the accuracy of other verbal stress
marks.
The very lack of consistency between V and P indicates that these are, as Sobel calls them, "Schreibfehler." (Certainly no further evidence for the compound nature of these verbs need be given. For phonetic characteristics of such inseparability, v. Grimm II, p. 689 ff.).

For the equally inseparable hintar, thuruh, ubar, untar the situation is a bit more complicated.

hintar would normally furnish the closest approach to the bound-form compounds, as it is for Otfrid a bound form itself. One immediate exception appears on first examination. Sobel says (of all four - hintar, thuruh, ubar, untar), "Der erste Bestandteil wird nur in erster Hebung accentuiert, sonst immer der verbale."84 The cases are all listed by Sobel. He gives 18 with hintar (including two which appear only in MSS other than V). The remainder (8 cases) have the stress on some form of queanan, including a couple where, if hintar were characteristically stressed it should have the stress in first thesis (e.g. III-16-6 hintarquámun innan thés (P hintarquamun)).85 Therefore we may say that hintar- was

---

84 v. Sobel, p. 62.
85 Cf. Sobel, p. 62, who says this is "durch den Verschluss bedingt." This explanation seems to place too great weight on the metrics and too little on the inherent stress of the word. It also leaves such verses as this same III-16-6 (where P has hintarquamun innan thés) standing between two stools. To follow Sobel - P shouldn't have the stress here because the verse-end situation is the same as in V, and V shouldn't have
relatively weakly stressed, but by no means so weakly as gi- (which, to all purposes, never has stress, even in the area of first thesis). With this weak but still appreciable stress, it sometimes got a stress mark when it fell into certain metrical areas characterized by stress.

thuruh is never stressed.

ubar is like hintar. There are three cases with stressed ubar in first thesis. V-7-26 gives the best indication of the conflict between natural word stress and meter pattern, for P originally had iz úbarstigit noti, marking, I think, both the word stress and the meter. But he found this a bit excessive and erased the first stress mark. 86

Two forms in ubar (V-7-27 and V-23-93) which Sobel has to explain as "durch den Verschluss bedingt" 87 are actually demanded by their presence directly after ni. v.i. p. 63.

untar, like thuruh is never stressed. 88

widar in widarstantan is never stressed.

hintarquámun because hintar usually takes stress in first thesis, as demonstrated by P. I think the above explanation is better, precisely because it reflects the uncertainty of the stress vs. meter conflict. 86 v. Piper I, ad loc. 87 v. Sobel, p. 63. 88 missi is also never stressed.
We have, therefore, clear indication that hintar, ubar (and doubtless thuruh, untar and widar) had greater stress than gi, ir, etc., in spite of the fact that they are equally inseparable for Otfred and most of OHG. Yet they did not have great enough stress to be regularly marked. 89

The situation in the remainder of the possible compounding field is complicated - more so than one might expect. Certainly there is no trace of such unanimity of stress as appears in NHG. From my statistics (on preposed forms only, of course) I give the following summary. No allowance has been made, except as noted, for metrical exigencies, which play a very small role, in my opinion, or for semantic divergencies:

89 Is this not a confirmation of the idea that increased stress is an indication of possible (future) separation (v.g. p. 291, on Gothio) for it is in this group that we find the material for the NHG "prefixes either separable or inseparable."

Of course, there is the possibility that all separated uses are derived from prepositions in isolation, which then became attached to simple verbs, but the semantic nature of the OHG forms makes this unlikely. For example, ubar forms not only ubaruinna (later inseparable) but also ubargangan and ubarfaran (with the type of meaning associated with separable verbs).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Preverb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bifora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fora</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fram</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingegini</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nidar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thana</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thara</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ûf</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ûz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zisamane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zua</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no cases of preposed order for the remainder: ingegini, mit, nân, nidare-nidiri, ubari-ubiri, widari.

I trust that a glance at this table will be sufficient to emphasize the complexity of the situation. Simplicity can be attained only by going at the matter of stress with definite prejudices in the form of tacitly assumed categories - and can be attained thus only by recourse to

---

90 All 7 cases with fora are in the form hiar-fora-verb (or thar-fora-verb) and are doubtless adverbial, but they will be examined later and are hence included here.

91 Including one indubitable case of isolated preposition.

92 widarwerban only.
frequent allegations of mistaken accentuation and by heavy leaning on assumed metrical exigencies, etc. Sobel, having already in mind a category of "Prepositionaladverbia" ("after, ana, fora, furi, gegin (ingegin), in, miti, uf, umbi, uz, widar = retro, zuá") says these are all stressed when they directly precede the verb. 93. He is then forced to assume for this group alone no less than (as I understand his explanations) five erroneous markings, three cases of metrical exigency, four other and doubtful factors (denominative origin, real compounds, etc.), five "exceptions" plus five cases left unexplained. I think this is too high a price for uniformity.

The two MSS are substantially in agreement.

Note that in both MSS equal stress (both or neither marked) is very sparse and scattered - 14 cases in V and 19 in P. Six of each are zisamane plus verb. Since the rest of the equal stress patterns are so hit-and-miss, the presence of six cases of double stress with zisamane - and with no other pattern appearing for this form - is most striking. Here is the first indication of a check on the important question - Is it a compound? The feeling immediately arises that this stress pattern is a highly unlikely one for a compound verb, and I think this feeling correct. The nature

of all regular verbal composition, and of all nominal composition as well, indicates that one member - not both - takes the stress. This is a fundamental IE pattern of composition. It is therefore very doubtful, judging from this stress situation alone, that zisamane is a compounding form in Otfrid's OHG, in spite of its frequent, indeed usual listing as such. If syntactical analysis corroborates this, we can discard zisamane as a compounding form.\footnote{On double stress in other dubious forms, e.g. p. 26, etc.}

There remains the examination of the first two stress categories. These two (mutually exclusive) patterns are the patterns of true composition. The total relationship in V is 126 stressed preverbs and 43 stressed verbs; for P, 120 and 42 respectively. Obviously we have arrived at the opposite end of the stress pattern - at least as far as Otfrid carries it - from the nearly 100\% stressed verbs of the gi (etc.) group. But the main problem still remains - which of these are true compounding forms? If this were NHG our criterion would be simple enough. All true inseparable compounds would show only verb stress, not preverb. No form meets this requirement.\footnote{Naturally there may be, especially in the less frequent forms, semantic factors or syntactical ones which would eliminate one or two forms (as forms where compounding is out of the question) and thus change the picture considerably or entirely. (The one case of miti, with verb stressed, is obviously not enough to judge by.)}
All true separable compounds would show preverb stress only. The rest, if not inseparable, would be more or less chance juxtapositions of adverb and verb. But only fram, furi, nidar (in V, but not in P) and ūf fulfill this latter requirement of stressed preverb, and for fram and furi the evidence is far too sparse. Furthermore, for nidar the contradiction of MS P must be explained. Allowing for the possibility that P could be making a mistake, nidar might be considered as a real stressed form, precluding verb stress, and ūf seems to meet the same test at least as convincingly. Still there is no doubt that stress does not by itself provide any conclusive answers in the problem of composition.

We must be satisfied with a listing of those preverbs which are strongly on one side or the other of the dividing line (remembering that preverb stress is 3-to-1 over verb stress in the group as a whole). This gives the following divisions:

Preverb stress much more frequent than verb stress:

---

96 Confusion or inadequacy of evidence reigns to some degree with after, bifora and miti. They are therefore omitted here.

97 Preverb stress more frequent, but less than 3-to-1 in hera (in V), thara, zua. Zua is rather too infrequent for any judgment of its status. Ana, however, even with a fair number of verb stresses belongs in this class and is given above, as most of the verb stresses are with clear cases of thatana.
ana, fram, heim, hera (in P), in, ingeguin, nidar, thana, ūf, ūz, zuua (in V)\textsuperscript{98}

Verb stress more frequent than preverb stress:

\textit{umbi}

The conclusions which can be drawn from this division are anything but compelling. Most important, though, is the clear necessity of examining umbi for cases - or rather individual verbs - which are inseparable. This is particularly necessary in view of the existence of inseparability in its NHG descendant.

In the other group (ana, fram, heim, etc.) are those forms which will be most interesting in the final decision between compounding forms and adverbs. Since, however, the stress is identical for the two (either adverb or compounding form would or could be stressed before the verb\textsuperscript{99}), the decision rests with the syntactical analysis.

The points just given, plus the indicated likelihood that zisamane is no compounding form, are the only conclusions that the stress patterns alone warrant.

2. \textit{ni}

\textit{ni} is of much less help than it was in Gothic. Perhaps this is the only thing to expect in view of the stress

\textsuperscript{98}MS V's furi would belong here, too. In P there is one form with verb stress to two with preverb stressed. Similarly bifora in P. In general it seems that the evidence of stress alone is too sparse for zuua and furi, but also for after, bifora, fram, hina, miti and widar.

\textsuperscript{99}\textsuperscript{v. Sobel, pp. 105-2.}
patterns as they evolved from the preceding discussion. Preverb stress - at the rate of 3:1 - would, of course, make it unlikely that these verbs in unseparated form would be used after ni (\textit{v.a.} p. 63 ff.), since this position is largely or entirely characterized by weak stress.

But ni may still be used as a criterion for compounding,\textsuperscript{100} and it gives interesting, though largely negative results.

The considerable breach made in the characteristic initial position of ni by the clauses introduced with inti\textsuperscript{101} is the result of the unusual nature of the inti clauses,\textsuperscript{102} a very ancient distinction, which has only in NHG been definitively changed into the pattern of two syntactically similar main clauses connected by und. This characteristic order of the OHG - usually inti plus subject plus ni plus verb\textsuperscript{103} - still does not affect the validity of ni as a touchstone for the question 'what is the verb?'

Examination of Otfrid's examples shows clearly the compound nature of the verbs in gi, etc. The cases of initial ni are:

\textsuperscript{100} On ni followed immediately by the verb and the literature on the subject, \textit{v.a.} pp. 35-71.
\textsuperscript{101} Behaghel Syntax IV, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{102} \textit{v.a.} pp. 197-9. Also Kuhn, p. 56, p. 64 and p. 65, note 1; Ohly, p. 40 f.
\textsuperscript{103} Behaghel, \textit{loc. cit.}. 
III-13-13 ni giuwashin es, druhtin, fûrdir
III-16-45 nirdëilet ûnrehîto (P nirdëilet)
II-21-37 ni firlâze unsih thin wâuara
III-18-23 nirstérbent sîe in ûnuon
V-4-38 dros nintuœurîfet ûuer múat\textsuperscript{104}

But in the other positions the ni is still always followed directly be the verb (v. e.).\textsuperscript{105}

IV-15-12 thés ni miessdrûet (P missidrûet)
II-24-18 fon thinen ni gliacöides (P gliacöides)
IV-1-37 iz drûhtin ni bilîfe

This word order is a descendant of a usage as old as IE, where the negative had apparently greater stress than

\textsuperscript{104} The dros is part of the negative expression as an intensifier. v. Kelle III, under dros.

\textsuperscript{105} There are no cases in Otfried, to my knowledge, where ni (negating a verb or the whole or part of a sentence) is used anywhere but directly before the verb. Other OHG documents give substantially the same picture (v. Diels, pp. 81–84 and p. 143). The pattern of ni plus verb is so strong in Germanic that the ni even displaces other elements which characteristically precede the verb. Wende (p. III) says of the preposition with her, þeer and hwaer (as well as with pronouns, etc.) that it "gehört unmittelbar vor das Verb, nur der zu einer einfachen finiten Verbalform gehörigen Negation ne...muss sie diesen Platz abtreten." See also Wende, p. IV, V.
the verb and this lesser stressed verb followed it, almost as an enclitic (e.g. Latin nescio, etc.). The verb was definitely unstressed in Sanskrit main clauses, and the Germanic verb was similarly characterized by weak stress. Kuhn says, "Die Verben der selbständigen sätze sind überall senkungsfähig und stehen meist im plätze der satzpartikeln..." Sobel says, "Das Verbum hat einen bedeutend niedrigeren Ton, als das Nomen. Es steht über 150 mal im Auftakt, das Verbum substantivum nicht mitgezählt und kommt, besonders nach Nominibus und Pronominibus sehr häufig in Senkung vor." Thus it is perfectly logical for the unstressed gi, ir, etc. to follow the ni. But what is the situation with more heavily stressed preverbs?

hintar, thuruh, ubar and untar had characteristically weak stress but just enough to take the stress if meter required it, as we have seen. But if the position after ni is characteristically weak, these verbs should appear after ni and without stress. There are three cases with these preverbs in Otfrid, and all of them have the preverb unstressed. Since this is the regular pattern for hintar, etc. plus verb, the examples might seem of little significance. But two of the three are in position of first thesis,

107. Kuhn, p. 52.
and as Sobel points out, this position is usually stressed, even with these lightly stressed preverbs (v.g. p. 52).

Here, then, the old pattern of ni plus unstressed preverb plus verb prevails over the metrical pattern, and we have V-7-27 ni ubaruuintu 1h iz mär and V-23-93 thaz ni ubaru- uinten uuir mer. Sobel has to explain both of these as exceptions "durch den Verschluss bedingt." 109 The remaining case is I-1-79 ther sé iz ni untarfälle.

Two cases with possible separable compounding forms show at least that ûz did not precede the verb in negation (ni uz-...), presumably because it was too strongly stressed by nature. The instances are: I-28-17 thaz uuir ni fâren furdir ûz and II-11-44 thaz uuir ni körtin thanana ûz. 110 These examples might not seem to indicate much except for the fact that ûz shows a strong tendency to precede the verb in dependent clauses, at least in some OHG documents.

According to Leinen's count of the Tatian examples, 111 ûz (which appears 26 times after the verb and 24 times before

109 Y. Sobel, p. 63.

110II-6-27 is very odd: thaz er nan ûz thoh ni spe (P spé), but it should be cited here anyway. On the word order, v.g. p. 194. If it were not for the thoh, this could be an exact parallel to the Gothic John 10, 1 saei inn ni atgaggip. The difference is decisive, though. thoh ni can scarcely be called a tmetic particle.

111 Y. Leinen, pp. 54-55. Strangely enough Leinen then cites I-28-17 and II-11-44 as indications that ûz is "auf dem Wege der Composition... mehr oder weniger vorgeschnitten" (p. 55). Since these positions are diametrically opposed to the true compound patterns, precisely the opposite statement would be nearer the truth.
it in main clauses) appears 25 times before the verb and only once after it in subordinated clauses. To be sure, Otfrid is by no means so unanimous (i.e. p. 220), indeed there seems to be some definite difference in the syntax of the two documents on this point. The chances are that ã is not a true compounding form with Otfrid, though it may have tended to be so in other OHG writers or dialects.

The Tatian supports this usage with ni in 27-3 ni ges thu thanan uz; 44-3 inti in burgi Samaritanorum ni get ir in; 141-11 ir ni get in; 220-3 ni gieng thoh widor in. With an already compounded verb it has (82-7) ni aruuirphu ih uz. One case is particularly interesting and significant. This is 147-3 thanne ther der in theki ist ni stiget nidar non descendat. There are only four other cases of separated nidar with finite verbs among the numerous cases of this particle in the Tatian. Apparently the translator could violate whatever part of his Sprachgefühl tended toward separation in ordinary main clauses, but with ni he did not want to write *ni nidarstiget.

The Glosses have (Steinmeyer-Sievers IV, 293-39), : ne duon ik mih der nicht mer ana. Notker has nesuochet die frist imo got zuo (Piper Notker III, 25-3).

An extraordinary exception appears in the Monee Fragments V-20 dese ni uztribit tiubila hic non eicit daemones. This is not even dictated by the Latin and indicates that
Uztriban was "the verb" as far as this writer was concerned. Does this perhaps represent the older stage, when separation was much less common in all such compounds and when the stress of the ûz was as weak or nearly as weak as, say, in Otfrid's ubar of ni ubaruniusatu?

Similarly Tatian has in 92-6 ni ingang in inan na intreocas in eum. The translator was certainly not restricted to the proposed order. He has 10 cases of separated in, 9 of them in direct contradiction to the Latin order. To be sure, these separated forms are greatly outnumbered by the unseparated ones. Yet none of the 10 separated cases appears in a subordinate clause. These facts taken together prove that the Tatian is by no means totally without regard for OHG rules of word order for such particles (as derived from Otfrid; v.i. p. 191), and they therefore add credence to the "correctness" of 92-6 ni ingang. Directly opposed to this example Tatian shows, after all, the above cases in 44-3, 141-11 and 220-3.

The sum of these examples (only two of them showing the order characteristic of Gothic simple compounds) is strongly negative. That is, there is certainly very little evidence - from ni / verb - that OHG compounds are truly compounds. But even the two examples just given from the Monsae Fragments and the Tatian must have some significance. Consider, after all, the alternatives to regarding them as
indications at least of an older attitude toward compounds. The first alternative would mean that ūz and in in these sentences are adverbs (as indeed ūz, at least, may turn out to be in Otfrid's OHG) not compounding forms. Then we would have two virtually impossible sequences of ni / adverb / verb! This almost never occurs. 112 The other alternative would be to regard these as inseparable compounds (like nirdellet, ni firlaze, etc.). Of course the evidence of separation in the same texts makes this impossible. I think that the most sensible attitude is to say that these forms ni ustrībit and ni ingān show that the consciousness of ūstrīban and ingān being - or having recently been - compounds was strong enough to allow two slips in the regular pattern of ni / weakly stressed verb ( / following compounding form, if any).

The last paragraph above is the first small affirmative answer to the question: Are there any proofs of compounding among the verbs with our group of possible compounding forms?

Certainly of simple mechanical proofs there are very few. Otfrid's stress marks must obviously be ruled out.

---

112 ni can negate thoh, etc., but it then stands alone and parenthetical, e.g. I-4-57 ni thoh irbölgono III-14-86 ni thoh zi uuöroltruame III-15-3 ni thōh thuruh thia förahta. Cases like the Tatian 110-2 ni siiumo ziuχit inan uz non continuo extrahet are exceedingly rare and may be instances of Latin influence.
They may – and do – give subsidiary evidence, but not proof. Meaning parallels, not mechanical but simple, are generally as inconclusive as they are easy to find.

I am by no means inclined to ignore the significant parallels of separated and unseparated forms in the same passage, which are in reality good evidence for compounding precisely because they indicate the existence of alternating patterns of word order. Tatian 141-11, for example (ir ni get in noh thie ingangenton ni lazet ingangan intratis neo introseuntes sinitis intrare) does not leave much doubt that ingangan is a compound verb. Nor do I underestimate the striking evidence for compounding, even with the verb separated, that lies in sentences like Tatian 184-6 legitim iro hant in then heilant ana. But even these convincing instances are not on the very concrete level of morphological or mechanical proofs, the like of which we are now asking. Indeed, instances as definite as these still are open to the challenge of "adverbial" nature, as hazy as that possibility may seem. In view of this uncertainty and particularly because of the great discrepancies in lists of OHG compounds, such concrete evidence would be welcome. Whether we get it or not is a different matter.

This form is noted below, p. 85 n.145, in its proper context.
3. Participle and Infinitive

The forms ni uztribit and ni ingang are certainly only a slight bit of the evidence desired. Perhaps they attest antiquity rather than continued vigor. But there are analogous bits of evidence in the other categories mentioned as desirable evidence on compounding (p. 39). Otfred has the form furifarane, a participial adjective, in I-4-51 uns sïnt kind zi bëranne iu dága furiarane (P furifārane) "past", "gone by". This is sure evidence (absence of gi) that furi here is regarded as a real compounding form.

But it must be emphasized that it is not proof that furi was a separable compounding form, in spite of III-20-79 gan furí; v.l. p.184. With ni uztribit there are so many forms like tribit uz, in identical meaning, that there can be no question of inseparable compounding. But with furi precisely that question arises. Lachmann considers furi "tieftonig zusammengesetzt wenn es fort bezeichnet." He cites besides the Otfred example furizimprim obstruutum, furistoppot obturatun, furipudan recondita (all from glosses: Hrabanus, Junius, Kero, resp.). In spite of the very likely inseparable nature of this verb, there is some evidence on the side of separability. Berthold von Regensburg (MHD)

says ir etelicher vert ouch unrehtes todes für, 115 which is
this meaning of furi, not "out, before (as protection), by."
Furthermore, inseparable furi can also mean "before (as
protection), etc.", as in Notker (Piper Notker I-391-23)
unde uuard er füregurtet et praeclinctus est, etc. 116 This
sort of confusion is actually more typical than exceptional
for OHG, and it leaves the general question of furi open.
For the Otfrid form under consideration, however, insepa-
rableness is highly probable, in view of the absence of gi
and the stress on the verb.

Otfrid's ana füntan in III-19-13 cannot be treated here,
if only because funtan is generally used without gi. There
are other difficulties, too; v.l. p. 188, n. 346; etc.

In other OHG sources there are many examples of this
usage without gi which are neither subject to interpretation
as inseparables nor cases where absence of gi is natural.
Notker (Piper Notker II-405-8) has abasnitine precisii; also
(Piper Notker II-548-2) unde uuaz uivirt dir gägenstellet
apponetur; also in the Boethius foresewan praevius. 117
From the Glosses there are: ingagansprochan (Monses), fora
ghuëtan (Junius), fora sezit (Junius), fora soafföt (Junius)
furi worfan (Junius), furi zimprit (Hrabanus), ûz kän egressus

While the Glosses might be suspect as far as word order goes — they never, or practically never, have a compounding form after the verb in any circumstances — there is no reason to believe that the omission of gi was motivated by the Latin original. Allowing for the possibility that several of the above examples may be inseparable verbs from the start, we still have rather convincing evidence for a feeling of compounding in verbs demonstrably separable (e.g. ûzkân, abasnitine).

In the remaining category of hoped-for evidence (zi / infinitive) there is also some indication of compounding, though none of it is in Otfrid. The Monsee glosses have zi vuripringanne ad ruminandum and zi vurigisezanne profuturi.

The first of these, unfortunately, is of very dubious value as a demonstration of compounding in separable type verbs, because the furi may, as we have noticed, be inseparable (though the meaning is certainly not that of the typical inseparable, "away"). But the second form, which is a doubtful reading apparently, is much more interesting. If this is its correct reading, assumption of inseparable  

118bid.  
119Note their regular insertion of zi: e.g. ûf za qhušmanne (Hrabanus).  
120y. Grimm II, p. 870.
compounding of furi would leave us with a double inseparable compound, the like of which is practically non-existent in OHG. (The only such cases that I know of are the Monsee gloss widarinpilotan for rescribere and the Kero gloss duruhinpintamēs persolvamus, which Grimm calls "offenbar fehlerhaft und undeutsch."\textsuperscript{121}) The possibility is therefore open that zi vurgisezanne is another indication of a feeling for the compound nature of separable forms. The meaning of furi in this phrase is also proper for the separable form, incidentally.

4. Intransitive Verbs in Transitive Use

As a final piece of evidence for compounding, there is the transformation of an intransitive verb into a transitive by the use of a possible compounding form. On the surface this seems to be conclusive evidence.\textsuperscript{122} If an intransitive verb suddenly shows up with a direct object,

\textsuperscript{121}v. Grimm II, p. 866. Otfred’s gibismeroter has already been rejected. The rather rare type ich anerkannte (along with ich erkannte an) in NHG is an interesting parallel. But NHG usage scarcely permits an infinitive zu anerkennen (like zi vurgisezanne).

\textsuperscript{122}But it is in just this sort of situation that the difficulties of syntactical analysis become most apparent, and it is here that comparisons (either with past or coming stages of the same language or with other dialects and languages) are so vitally necessary. An absolutely contemporaneous descriptive analysis is possible, but so many cases of multiple paths of interpretation or ambiguities in the classifications occur as to make the results excessively vague.
something very definitive must have happened to the verb.
In Latin, Greek and Gothic and other IE languages an intransitive verb can relate itself to an object by the use of a preposition, of course. But the verb and the preposition do not "go together" in any syntactical pattern. They can be separated by all sorts of words, pause pitches, etc. They can stand separately and alone. E.g. Greek (Mark 8, 10) ἔλθεν εἰς τὴ μερή (could be ἔλθεν...εἰς τῇ μερή, etc.) or Gothic (Mark 8, 10) qam ana fera (qam...ana fera, etc.). But when we get, in the same meaning (or nearly the same meaning), Gothic aggilus fraujins anaqam ins in Luke 2, 9 we surely have a compound verb anaqiman, which is transitive and has the object ins. There is no possibility of this being a preposition ana governing ins unless we are willing to do violence to Gothic syntax to make it so.
For Gothic, though, the answer is easy, because simple compounds are inseparable. What about a language like OHG, where some forms are separable (or appear in separation)? Interestingly enough, Otfred has almost no examples of such a change from intransitive to transitive by the inseparablethuruh, untar, ubar. Nearly all of his verbs of this type have gone the way of semantic specialization, and the cases of thuruhqueman and thurughân (III-8-41 and I-25-11) are inconclusive. Only ubargân in IV-20-30 mit thiu er thaz lánt al ubargiang is a case in point. It
seems semantically no different from IV-16-12 giang...úbar
einan klingon. Other OHG sources offer sufficient fur-
ther evidence, however. Tatian has 7-8 inti thin selbes
ferah thuruhferit suert (cf. 106-4 thuruh loh naldun zi
faranne) and the same in Notker isan durhkieng sina sela,124
etc. Among the other compounding forms or possible com-
pounding forms Otfrid has the following:

I-17-29 so thīsu uuort tho gāhum then hūning
anaquānum (P anaquānum)

V-10-5 uuanta āband unsih ānageit

IV-7-51 so er ērist thia árcha ingigiang
(P árcha ingigiang)

V-23-75 úbili, thiu unsih geit hiar úbiri

II-13-38 ioh uuonot inan úbari gotes ábulgi125

I-1-104 thaz sie nan umbiriten (P umbiriten)

The question of course is: Do these instances prove
compounding for anaqueman, anagān, ingigangan, ubirigān,
ubariuuonān, umbiritan and others of their type?

First of all it should be noted that these constituted
by no means the only form in which Otfrid could express

123But even ubarfaran has specialized into "excel".


125Similar effect with the inseparable compound in
IV-20-30 mit thiu er thaz lānt al ubargiang and V-17-25 thia
sūnnun ioh then mānon so úbarfuar er gāhon; v. Kelle III,
the same idea. Either the simple preposition *anan then kuning quamun or preposition and compound verb *in this archa ingigiang were entirely possible, as numerous similar sentences show. That is, the same possibilities were open as were open to Gothic, viz.

1) Luke 6, 1 gaggan...pairh atisk
2) I Cor. 16, 5 Makidonja auk pairh gaggag
3) Luke 17, 11 jah is pairhiddja pairh midja Samarian

So the construction is a natural one for Otfried.

There is only one other possibility of explaining the OHG forms—that is, other than the immediate explanation that they are the equivalent of type 2 of the Gothic above, and hence real compounds. The other possibility is that they may be postposed prepositions.126 There are two general points to be mentioned. First, such postposition is common in closely related Germanic dialects such as OE, OS. Second, it is by no means so common in OHG. Wende has collected a great body of OE material in prose and poetry, showing the prepositions aifter, ast, be (big), for (fore), from, gean, in, mid, of, ofer, on, to, purh, under, wid.

126 Decision on this question obviously involves syntactical considerations. Since the problem commences with a rather straightforward possibility of a further proof of compounding, however, I think it better to discuss the matter fully now.
wider, ymb (as well as forms like uppan, beforan, etc. and
ongean, betweeh, etc., even inne, ute, etc.), all in post-
position of one kind or another with demonstrative adverbs,
relatives and personal pronouns, as well as some with
nouns. Wende also observes that such instances with
nouns have a strong tendency toward compounding with the
verb rather than independent use, especially in the Bede
translation. There is no such large number of instances
in OHG. Otfried's thara compounds (v.i. p. 103) have a
much stronger tendency to hold together than OE paer plus
preposition, where separation is rife. For the relative
pronoun such uses as Bede's (paere cirican) pe se biscop
in waes, etc., do not appear in OHG to anywhere near
the same extent. Finally, such usage with personal pro-
nouns is rare in OHG. Cases like Beowulf 890 ne waes him
Fetela mid, etc. are practically absent in OHG, unless
such cases as Otfried II-13-38 inan êbari be so interpreted.
There seem to be no cases, however, which do not, on the

127Wende, passim. One caution must be exercised in
using Wende's excellent materials. He has a strong tendency
(with the personal pronouns, that is) to say that any sep-
arated prepositional form is a postposed preposition, tacitly
assuming that it can't be a compounding form. This he does
even when the form directly precedes the verb and when the MS
seems to indicate that the whole was written together. Wende
does indicate a tendency toward compounding when the object
is a noun, however.
128Wende, p. VI.
129Ibid.
130Wende, pp. 37-63.
131E. Hittle, Zur Geschichte der altenglischen
Präpositionen mid und wid. (Anglistische Forschungen 2.)
132Grimm IV, p. 925, note 2.
surface, admit of interpretation with the verb. (MHG falsches âne, etc. of course cannot be interpreted with the verb, but I know of no such OHG constructions.)

The following particulars must also be noted for the Otfrid forms. ana and ubari-ubiri are not prepositional forms (except for MS F, which uses ana). In OE where double forms like bi(g)-be and fore-for exist, the "longer" form exclusively is used in postposition, but either may appear before the object. ubari-ubiri cannot so appear and ana cannot for MSS V and P. Notker and Williram both show the same sort of differentiation with ana. The preposition here is an, the separated form (postposition or compounding form) is ana.

Thus far only a few background factors have been presented. No compelling reasons have been given for either basic interpretation. The fact that postposed use of prepositions is less frequent in OHG than in OE does not prove that it is non-existent. The fact that ubari-ubiri does not appear before any verb might conceivably be an accident. But the original proposition that the change of an intransitive verb to a transitive use might be a demonstration of compounding is clearly to be rejected as an absolute criterion, because all the cases in Otfrid

133 Ibid.
could possibly be explained through the preposition alone (ana, in, ubar, and umbi all taking the accusative).

So we are at the end of our obvious evidences of compounding. The evidence is clearly more of a general indication - compounding is present among these OHG forms - than it is a useful specific test for any given set of forms. This being the case, the decision on the question of which cases represent compounding must rest largely with syntactical criteria.

The evidence we shall then be looking for is the sort which will permit an affirmative to the critical question: Do these possible separable compounding forms (or any set of them) behave in some fashion systematically different from the combination of ordinary adverb and verb? (There is comparatively little trouble in distinguishing the forms in question from the inseparable compounding forms.) If we can find a good body of affirmative evidence on this question, then we surely have the best of reasons to set up a system of separable compounding forms in OHG just as we did for inn and ut plus compound verbs in Gothic and on the same basis. Needless to say, I believe we can, or I would not have gone to all this trouble.
F. The Question of Postpositions

The verb forms just cited, intransitives which become transitives, may have failed as criteria of compounding, but they have raised another important problem in the sorting out of possible compounding forms. This involves the ambiguity of compounding forms and postpositions. It is a problem which must be discussed before we can fairly claim to have dealt with all of the peripheral difficulties.

A degree of uncertainty is, I think, inevitable. No syntax pattern can exist utterly complete and static. Forms are constantly moving from one category to another, and older usages stay on in isolated expressions. I believe that no sure, uniform explanation can be found for all the cases together. It will be fortunate if we can find sure classifications for individual cases among these ana, in, ubari-ubiri and umbi forms. But the following points seem important.

For compounding there is the following evidence.

1. The presence of other ana, in and umbi compounds.134
2. The trend, true even in OE (v.g.), for prepositions

134It is apparently this fact which led Curme to assume in all these cases precisely the opposite position from Wendt's (v. Curme Compounds, p. 34?). Curme considers them all compounds, any case relationship as later. He says, ". . . the adverbs that stood immediately before the verb had become closely associated with the noun before it" and cites Otfried's I-17-29. Sobel simply says that only the forms with unstressed ana are compounds, the others not (v. Sobel, p. 63), but this is obviously too simple and will lead to patent contradictions.
after noun objects to associate themselves with the verb in a form of compounding rather than to maintain the characteristics of prepositions.

3. The apparent absence in OHG of any free uses of noun plus postposed preposition – that is in an independent phrase, not followed directly by a verb, e.g. then kuning ana.

For prepositional interpretation there is the following evidence.

1. The use with thara of all these prepositions, in their present form, too – in cases which clearly parallel the OE daer on, 135 daer in, 136 daer ofer, 137 daer ymb, 138 etc., where no connection with the verb is possible. In Otfrid: thar(a)ana, thar(a)in. In other OHG documents: thar(a)ubari, tharumbi, etc. Such forms demonstrate definitely that the difference in form between the preposed preposition ubar and the cases of ubari–ubiri in II–13–38 and V–23–75 above (or anan and ana for that matter, the preposition being anan in V and P of Otfrid) is no bar to interpretation of these two as prepositional forms. Indeed the absence of *thar(a)ubar in OHG, and the

135v. Wende, p. 27; e.g. daet daer on fules sīe.
136Ibid.; e.g. seo paer in wass.
137Ibid.; e.g. Hi...daer ofer cyrcan araerdon.
138v. Wende, p. 29; de daer ymb stondad.
general use with thara of the extended forms of all prepositions (e.g. ingegini, widari, zuā) shows that ubari-ubiri is the long form or stressed variant of ubar in these positional situations.

2. The presence, likewise in extended form, of other prepositions in indubitable "isolated" use, e.g. Otfrid IV-2-23 in thiu...man ārme miti nēriti (v.i. p. 88).

Thus mit in isolation becomes miti, etc.

3. Most important of all, perhaps, is the evidence derived from parallel uses with another accusative object (and an already transitive verb) that indicates positional, or at least case-governing nature for certain isolated or pre-verb prepositions. Since these forms are also susceptible of interpretation as compounding forms, the evidence is particularly important.

Otfrid has for ana:

I-15-34 er tod sih anauuēntit (P ánaauuentit)
V-11-9 ouh blīas er sia āna, so thu uuēist, then selbon héilegon géist
IV-19-40 thu hōris uuas sie nēnent ich thih ánazellent
III-18-70 (with first object further away) nāmun sie tho stēina... thaz álūmoo sīes gihulfin, ich inan ánauuurfīn.

Other examples, from Notker and cited by Grimm are:

er santa sie ana dia ābolgi sīnes zornes
du legetōst mīh ana dīna hant
ziu lázept du dih ana dehein leid?
ana is by far the most frequent in this use, but a few other prepositions also appear, e.g.: Tatianan fand thiuman iuuih furisezza.

There seems to be no other way to explain the accusative case of siih, sia, thih, inan, sie, mih, dih, sie and iuuih, respectively, in the above examples without the case-governing character of the ana (and fur). One need only consider the NHG "transliterations" of these sentences to see what happens when the an can no longer govern a case. E.g. er wendet sich dem Tode an, er blies ihnen den Geist an. Tatian 101-1 anasazta in sino henti, with the dative pronoun, is a similar contrasting type. Perhaps such cases may simply involve (compound) verbs with a "double accusative" construction. But the supporting evidence of like verbs in OHG is a bit shaky.

The instances cited for point 3 above indicate the possibility of postposed ana (and a few other prepositions) still governing a case, and their parallelism with Otfrid V-10-5 uuanta áband unsiih ánageit is clear. This verse may therefore be unsiih áná, a postposed preposition and

---

139 v. Grimm IV, p. 1045.

140 For other (NHG) examples, and for comments, see Grimm IV, pp. 1047-9.
no compound. But Grimm, who made the first systematic collection of these cases said of the whole group, "Die präposition verwandelt sich oft in ein adverb, d.h. die partikel wird dem bezug auf das nomen entrückt, und tritt in ein freieres verhältnis zum verbo des satzes, welches nun seine intransitive natur mit einer transitiven tauscht und jenen von der präposition abhängig gewesenen casus unmittelbar regiert ..."141 Grimm definitely had the feeling that there was some sort of compounding or approach to compounding, and the indefiniteness of his statement reflects very accurately the indefiniteness of the situation. Otfrid and the other OHG documents, taken as a whole, seem to represent a middle ground between preposition and compounding form here. A more complete picture develops when the syntactical factors are fully analyzed (v.1. p.209ff.).

One item, however, which can be added to Grimm's statement as a result particularly of a study of Wende's statistics on OE, helps to clear up the situation. Wende said (v.s.) that instances of these postposed prepositions with nouns had a strong tendency toward compounding with the verb, a tendency not apparent with the pronouns. Note,

141v. Grimm IV, pp. 1042-3.
now, that all the forms given above (p. 80-f.) have the ana (or furi) after a pronoun. There is no case I know of with ana after a noun in OHG except when the two directly precede a verb (e.g. Otfrid’s then kúning anaquámun), and this is precisely the tendency which the nominal (more than the pronominal) cases have — to look like, perhaps really to be, instances of compound verb and noun object. This same observation applies to thia ároha ingígíang and other similar cases in OHG.

I have located only one case of a separate ana governing a noun object (along with a verb with its object), and that is from Notker’s Psalms: Egyptios warf er ana finstri. 142

By the very nature of this separation of ana, the form fell in with the pattern of ana compounds on two fronts. If it remained after the verb, it came to parallel the ana from separable verbs. If it fell before the verb (in OE its regular position in subordinate clauses and “and” clauses143) it paralleled the unseparated ana compounds. The first happened largely with pronouns (v.i.), the second

142 Grimm IV, p. 1045.
143 Y. Wende, p. IX.
largely with nouns. It must be further emphasized that some of these separated ana’s are very likely from the separable verb itself – not all from prepositions!

There is, then, a definite tendency of the ana forms, even if they were prepositional, to drift toward compounding. Symptomatic of this are the numerous cases where the ana has wandered away from its object and is held in the sentence pattern largely by its connection with the verb.

Examples are:

Hildebrandslied 5 gurtun sih suert ana
Tatian 120-5 ther thie uzan sunta si iuuar
zi eristen sente sia stein ana in illam
lápidem mittat

and from Otfrid:

IV-29-37 so er sih iz ánalegiti
V-12-59 tho er sie hiar thaz anabliás 
II-6-42 thaz ér... thaz uuib iz anazálta.

Here the "objects" of ana are sih, sia, sih, sie and thaz uuib, respectively, all separated from the ana. But note that, with the system in flux, their case is still determined by the remote ana. It would be interesting to see if in OHG there are instances of the modern type of substitute for this almost illogical double accusative. The Tatian anasazta in sino henti is of this sort, but

\[144\] Cf. the above bliás er sie áná...then...geist.
more pertinent would be *sazta in sino henti ana, etc. I know of none like this.

These forms with "prepositional" function retained, in turn, lead to the most obvious compound forms, like Tatian 44-8 thanne ir inganget than hus intrantes autem in domo, where the "preposition" has beyond doubt no individual direct connection with the "object" and is a compounding form. The compound verb has a regular direct object. Whether this is a new development from an isolated preposition or a continuation of old compounds is a matter of speculation. Both factors doubtless contribute.

Applying the above considerations to our original group of Otfrid's forms, we may sum up as follows:

1. I-17-29 then kuning anaquámun (P anaquamun) and IV-7-51 thia árcha ingigiaung (P archa ingigiaung) are most probably compound verbs rather than noun plus postposed preposition.145

2. I-1-104 thaz sie nan umbiriten (P umbiriten) with its pronominal form is ambiguous, but if P's stress is correct may be an inseparable compound anyway.

3. V-10-5 unsih ánageit is ambiguous.

145 The danger of saying that even postposed cases of ana not before the verb are definitely postpositional rather than compounded with the verb is amply shown by the very significant Tatian 184-6 legitun iro hant in then heilant ana manus iniciernunt in Ihesum, where the presence of the preposition in ("Latin" or not) proves that the ana cannot be a postposed preposition!
4. V-23-75 thiú únsih geit hiar úbiri and II-13-38 yuñot inan úbiri are almost certainly postposed prepositions. The highly irregular word order (for a compound verb)\textsuperscript{146} of V-23-75 and the double stress of II-13-38\textsuperscript{147} are convincing corroboration for this judgment.

Nor does this latter decision conflict with points 1 and 2 above (p. 78f.) speaking "for compounding", because the cases of other compounds (point 1) involved not ubari-ubiri, but ana, in and umbi and because neither involves a noun object (point 2) rather a pronoun object which is the typical case with postposed prepositions. (The remoteness of separation in V-23-75 is paralleled by numerous OE instances; \textit{v.g.} p. 106 note 176) and p. 211.

G. Some Individual Forms

A seemingly disproportionate amount of work in such a study as this must, as the above section shows, be devoted to the weeding out of extraneous forms and the sorting of others. Part of this is the fault of previous sketchy listings and tacit classifications. Part of it is a plain reflection of considerable confusion in the OHG situation.

\textsuperscript{146} \textit{v.g.} p. 193.

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{v.g.} (in connection with zisamane) pp. 56-7.
The following paragraphs involve further analysis of certain individual forms. In some cases forms previously doubtful will be much clearer in the light of the foregoing section.

The one remaining case of úbari, for example, may be judged here rather than waiting for the section on syntax. This is IV-5-33 sar so iro sito bilidi sie thih gileggent úbari...so... This is exactly the same as V-23-75 thiu únsih geit hiar ûbiri, except that it is a transitive verb with its own object (bilidi). It even shows the same word order in the subordinate clause, which alone would make it more than doubtful as a compound verb.

Similarly, widari in III-8-10 mihil úngiuuitiri uuás in harto uuidari\textsuperscript{148} (the only remaining case of widari) now appears in its proper light. It is no doubt a postposed preposition, and its order (separated from its object by harto) is no more surprising than the order of IV-5-33 thih gileggent úbari and V-23-75 únsih geit hiar ûbiri.\textsuperscript{149} Its pronoun object makes it all the more likely as a member of this group. The meaning of this form, "against" "opposed to", is of course not that of the adverb ("again" v.g. p. 28)

\textsuperscript{148}Kelle lists widar-wisu, Piper has uuidari-uuuesan.

\textsuperscript{149}For widari v. Wende, pp. 201-2: (e.g. Psalms 143, 4 paet pu him aht wid aefre haeafdest) and pp. 128-7 (e.g. Annals 866 hie him frih wiw namon). For ubari-ubiri v. Wende, p. 194 (e.g. Psalms 89,19 Wese us beorhtnes ofer blidan drihtnes) and pp.117-118. Note Cura Pastoralis (Sweet, p. 119, 1. 19) mid anwalde him moeste oferriosian, where the separated position has led to combination with the verb in the MSS. Wende (loc. cit.) separates them.
and this gives us an interesting hint that postposed prepositions are not necessarily ipso facto to be equated with adverbs. Direct prepositional parallels are frequent, e.g. III-22-57 thaz thiu uuórt min uuidar drúhtine sin. Finally, against any kind of compounding there are the following considerations: 1) wesan is the least likely verb for real compounding, even down to NHG, where compounding is so general; 2) double stress uuáš... uuídari is unlikely in true compounds (v.g. p. 204).

Phonetically like ubari-ubiri and widari, miti in IV-2-23 illustrates a separated prepositional form of quite a different sort – the only one of its kind in Otfried. The sentence refers back to the word "salve" (line 19) and says: in thiu man thaz iruuélti, man árme miti nériti. Judas said they should sell it and said "in choosing that (course), they would save (or aid) poor people with (it)." This is not a postposition but an isolated preposition with its object anticipated, just like Gothic akr... du uschildan ana gastim (v.g. p.78\(^1\)), or its closer parallels in OE: alea mon ða hond of, ðe he hit mid gedyde in Aelfric's Laws\(^150\) or ordono, ðe we mid aliesde siendón in the Cura Pastoralis (Sweet, p. 301, l. 9). These are in relative clauses, of course. But OE also has

\(^{150}\)Cited by Hittle, op. cit., p. 102.
a usage directly parallel to Otfrid's. The Cura Pastoralis (Sweet, p. 455, l. 29-30) has *daet he swa strangne laecodom selle daem seocan, swa he maegge da mettrymmesse mid geflieman*. 151

Thus, although OHG usually uses *tharamit* 152 to express such an idea, Otfrid's *miti* in IV-2-23 is a clear isolated preposition. An instance of the preposed preposition clinches the case. It is IV-25-2 *uuio er õnsih mit thiun nérita*. The meanings are identical.

Note that the expanded form (presumably associated with greater stress) is used here, just as it was for the postposed prepositions *ubahri*-ubiri and *widari* (which had their stress marked). OE *middi* and *mide*, the equivalents of Otfrid's *miti*, appear similarly in postposition with pronoun objects or in reference to the relative. See Wende, p. 14, note 1. Examples: From Cnut *handa pe he past fals mide worhte* and Rushworth Glosses, Matthew 7, 33 *lytel tid iow middy am*.

*Ingegini* shows the same expanded form as the above prepositions, but it is far harder to judge. Wende, who interprets all possible forms of this sort as falling into

---

151 Other examples in Wende, p. 32.
152 Piper calls the form an adverb and translates it as 'damit', v. Piper II under *miti*. It would be much better, I think, to keep such prepositional uses apart from the adverbs, though of course this all depends on one's definitions.
the same category of postposition\textsuperscript{153} as the OE forms, 
lists II-15-9 thie bráhtun imo ingégini sícchero manno 
ménigi; II-15-13 gisah thia ménigi al quéman imo ingégini; 
V-13-16 in quam sar ingégini fisgo mhil ménigi; III-6-8 
fuar, imo thar ingégini mhil uuóroltmenigi; IV-22-15 
riaf imo ál ingégini thes lántliutes ménigi (P riaf).
There is one more he might have cited,\textsuperscript{154} viz:

IV-5-53 slihtit uns ingégini then uuég...

With nouns there are:

III-24-6 ioh ilta kríste ingégini (P ilta kríste)
III-25-4 quam mhil uuóroltmenigi then hēreston 
ingégini (P ingégini)

The cases with pronouns do indeed look very much like postpositions. Unfortunately the situation with 
ingégini is very complicated, and one runs the risk of 
choosing one explanation over another without sufficient 
cause. Certainly the possibility of compounding must be 
considered, and these forms will be reexamined below to 
see which interpretation their syntactical nature supports. 
Remember that in the case of ubari, etc. there was something

\textsuperscript{153} Wende, pp. 273-5. He also lists the above cases 
of ubari-ubiri and widari, but with no further reasons for 
this classification nor any background discussion, since 
this section of his book is meant only as an epilogue to 
the OE material.

\textsuperscript{154} And one he cited, but shouldn't have, I believe. 
This is I-3-49 ther imo ingegingárota. After all, his 
observations on OE show that where there are two forms 
extant the postposed one is the "longer" form, e.g. big 
wrong with every instance from the point of view either of syntax or of stress, something which made compounding more than unlikely. Here, too, there are such factors, e.g., double stress in II-15-9, II-15-13, IV-5-53 (as well as III-24-6 and IV-22-15 in P); also a very odd infinitive in II-15-13 (y.i. p. 184), but some of the sentences could represent compounds.

For thea / ingegini, y.i. p.119 f.

A far more likely set of prepositional cases are those where the ingegini precedes its dative object. It seems odd that these ever should have been regarded as compounds (as they are by Kelle, Piper et al.). The instances are:

IV-16-35 ioh ingegini in quam
IV-16-17 ingegini imo fuar in uuár Unfírsalagan héri thar
III-2-3 ioh fuar ingegini imo sar (P imo)
V-16-6 gibot... thaz uuóla ale iz firnámin ingegini
imo quamin

The stress is quite regular for preposition plus pronoun.155 There are numerous direct parallels with prepositional listings. Finally, the initial position of ingegini in IV-16-17 is odd (y.ip. 172), and V-16-6 is unlikely word order for a subordinate clause with a compound verb!

fora provides, as I indicated in the Gothic chapter, rather surprising support for the contention that the word (Gothic faura, OHG fora) has dual meaning and function. Certainly the evidence could not be more cogent and specific if it were designed for the purpose. The division in meaning and function is the same in OHG as it was in Gothic. One fora is temporal; it refers to past time. It is the one used adverbially. The other faura is spatial; it means 'ahead' or 'in front' and if applied to time it means not past time but future time. This is the one used in compounds! Obviously it would not be enough, just as it was not enough in Gothic, to make this semantic distinction for the sake of sorting out fora compounds to fit some hypothesis. But in OHG there is good evidence in other than the semantic field that the division into two distinct fora's is valid. This is the entire evidence with verbs:

A. I-18-43 húgi uuio ih tharfóra quad
   V-4-6 thiz ungirati... thaz uuir hiar fóra quatun
   IV-22-33 so ih hiar fóra quad
   V-5-12 so uuir hiar fóra zelitun
   IV-27-12 so ih hiar fóra zelita
   V-8-29 so ih hiar fóra zalta
   IV-8-2 giziti, thio uuir hiar fóra zaltun
   IV-33-26 hiar fóra theist gizált
   IV-7-92 so hiar fóra uuard giuuáht (P giuuáht)156

---

All these verbs have the same field of meaning.
B. IV-35-44 so man hier fora sagen soll

Kelle noted the clear semantic split here when he said of the forms in Group A above "zeitlich; vorher, früher...mamentlich zur Hinweisung auf das, was in einer früheren Zeit gesagt, erwähnt etc. worden ist...", while he says of B "wie man zum voraus, der Erzählung vorgreifend erwähnen soll..."\(^{157}\) He also had a clear feeling for the special nature of the temporal forms in A as against the prepositional and spatial hierfora and tharfors.\(^{158}\) Kelle did not, however, draw any further semantic or syntactical conclusions from this pair of opposite meanings.

Notice that, as Kelle says, every fora in A refers to past time. This is the same as Gothic faura, the true adverb. And every form in A, just as we should expect, is stressed. There are no exceptions, not even any variations among the MSS. More remarkably still, though 7

\(^{157}\) Kelle III, p. 142.

\(^{158}\) v-2-11 nist fiant hier in riche, nub er hierfora intuufche and IV-5-61 thaz sélba, thaz thie súngun, thie tharfóra giangun, thaz sélba inquad, in uuára, thiu áftera fúara. On the latter v. Erdmann, p. 201, who cites Hrabanus quod item illi, qui præcibant, et illi, qui sequabantur, clamabant. v, also IV-4-55 thaz sungun... thie fórdorun liuti, thaz sélba ingégin ouh inquad thiu áftera héricaf. The stress on fora in IV-5-61 need cause no alarm. This is clearly the preposition used after thar, and the stress in such situations is highly variable (v. Sobel, pp. 96-97). In addition it has nothing to do with time.
out of the 9 forms are in subordinate clauses (where an adverb may end up in front of the verb, making it very difficult to tell a compounding form from an adverb) there is convincing evidence in both of the remaining forms that these are no compounds, namely the separation of fora and gizalt by theist ( = thaz ist), the double stress in the both verses, and the separation of the fora and the giuuaht by uuard! On such separation, see p. 188. So OHG fora=past time, like Gothic faura=past time, is an adverb and no compounding form.

B, on the other hand, refers to the future. Its time meaning is derived from its spatial meaning "before", "in front", "ahead". It is the faura of Gothic for which we assumed compounding. What better evidence than the stress, foraságen here in the infinitive, neatly differentiating this from all the hiar fora's in A. The only way to negate this evidence would be to assume that this extraordinary split in stress is pure accident. If one does that, one might as well forget all the stress marks in Otfrid.

\[159\] Otfrid's stress marking is the concrete factor which makes the differentiation possible. Because of the lack of stress marks Tatian 158-3 foracundita, 145-8 foralermen, 171-4 foraquad are of help only in indicating the possibility of compounding.
I have written the form as one word, foraságæn, because I believe it is a compound. Lexical support for this idea is not especially common in OHG, but it is by no means absent. The Grimm Dictionary (vol. 12, sec. II, 1433-1457) lists, in addition to the OE foresegæn, the OHG foraságæn "in allgemeiner anwendung, vorhersagen, voraussagen" also "zukunftiges vorhersagen". These are exactly the meanings of the Otfrid form. As late as 1667, according to Grimm, Stieler glosses vorsagen with "vor der zeit sagen".

Graff's Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz (vol. 6, 104-105) indicates doubt as to the compound nature of the Otfrid form, though it lists several OHG instances, including three from Notker, one of which at least is quite similar to the Otfrid form in not meaning strictly "prophesy" but "tell in advance". This is (Piper Notker II-269-22) Vuaž half dā . daz ih iz fóreságæta in prophetis.

The only other possibility is, of course, to call this forma in Otfrid IV-35-44 an adverb, separate like the forma's of A, but different in meaning. Yet all the weight of evidence is against this, for example the stress contrast in Otfrid, the other OE and OHG forms of the compound verb, the noun compounds (v. i.), the similar OHG compounds like forakunden.

There has been no attempt made here to go deeply into the semantic background of this split in meaning. All the
words like "before" having both temporal and spatial meaning tend to develop such a split (and not just in Germanic or even IE) as soon as the spatial meaning becomes applied to time. The whole matter would be a fascinating (and difficult) study in itself. But here the bare statement of the proposition will suffice since it is backed up by a functional difference.

There is further evidence in support of the difference between the two fora's outside of the immediate verb system. If fora = past time is typically not compoundable with verbs, we should also expect it in few if any compound nouns. On the other hand fora = future time (or spatial fora) should appear. This is exactly the OHG situation.

v. Otfrid forasago, forasagin, Isidor forasapel prophetia, Notker (Piper Notker I, pp. 272-273) měnniskôn providentia, dáž uuir héizen fúredâhte, etc. Naturally the nouns are rather confusing, and there are dubious cases.160

If there were going to be any fora = past time compounds, we might expect them with forms of quedan, etc. (in view of hiar fora quad). Thus there might be a noun fora-quad meaning "the aforementioned" or "the previous statement". And this noun fora-quad does appear, but it

means indicia, which it glosses in the Kero, Hrabanus and Paris (Steinmeyer-Sievers I-182-32), thus clearly a future meaning, related to foraságen rather than hier fóra quad.

The meaning feature which all these nouns share is their effect of pointing toward the future, which is the semantic direction of the verb foraságen, too.

Otfried has, unfortunately, no cases of fora with verbs in the meaning "ahead", "in front" (the spatial equivalent and also the origin of this future fora of foraságen). That it was at least separable and possibly an adverb is demonstrated by Isidor V-22 ih faru dhir fora and by the Tatian 133-7, which shows the spatial meaning most clearly: Inti mit diu er thiu eigenun scaf uzsentit, thanne uerit er in uora; inti scaf folgent imo. The spatial meaning is certain. There is the possibility of fora here being a postposed preposition. Diels, however, calls it a separable adverb. foraságen I assume may have been inseparable, not only because of its stress but also because of Tatian foracoandita, etc. But separable uses do outnumber the inseparable in the whole historical picture of vorsagen, as the Grimm Dictionary

---

161 For example, Notker Boethius (Sehrt and Starck, p. 63) indicium futuræ calamitatis uuört-zéichen dero chúnftigūn léidegūngo, which Notker goes on to explain: Táz argumentum héizet ab euentu. hoc est a fine. sive ab effectu. uuánda uuir finem ánæ-séhen sûlen. án dero fóre-tüte.

162 V. Diels, p. 144. Also F. Purtscher, op. cit., p. 39, who in this sentence as well as 4-17 and 116-4 (both in preposed order) sees fora "in trennbarer Verbindung mit Verben der Bewegung."

(y.e.) shows. The majority of separated uses are from later texts, however. Decision is difficult, probably impossible.

hera appears under very suspicious circumstances. Adverbial use has already been shown for this form (y.e. p. 16). V-8-28 uuio er uuárd ouh héra funs, which was cited as a good example of adverbial use, has a direct parallel in II-2-32 iz uuard héra in uuorolt funs (P uuórolt funs). This parallel is typical of a great number of cases of hera, and it makes the question of compounding with hera considerably simpler. After all, if hera in uuorolt is a recognized adverbial phrase in OHG, a phrase which could exist quite apart from any possible connection of hera with the verb (as the above examples show\(^{163}\)), then we are practically justified in omitting from the discussion of compounding those cases where hera is followed by in uuorolt. This does not mean that compounding is absolutely out of the question, but the presence of hera in uuorolt indicates at the very least a surface ambiguity in interpretation. This ambiguity makes such instances poor material for analysis of syntactical patterns. And if further irregularities are found in the behavior of

\(^{163}\) To II-2-32 may be added: III-6-52 ther künftig héra in uuórolt l1st (P hera).
hera, it is a safe assumption that hera, as well as hera
in uuorolt is adverbial, not compounding. 164

The cases of hera in uuorolt are:

Transitive Verb, Main Clause

III-24-96 ioh hera in uuorolt uuantos

Transitive Verb, Subordinate Clause

I-13-5 thaz drúhtin dúan uuolta int iz hera in
uuorolt santa (P hera in uuorolt santa)
IV-19-50 ioh hera in uuorolt santi (P hera)
III-20-14 thes mih zi diu uuanta, hera in uuorolt santa
I-4-61 thi er hera in uuorolt sénit
III-22-55 ...hera in uuorolt santa (P hera) 165
III-21-28 ther fáter nan ni sánti ioh hera in uuorolt
uuanti

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause

IV-21-29 zi thiu quám ih hera in uuorolt in
I-3-43 ioh hera in uuorolt zi úns quam (P hera)
Note: IV-12-61 er quam so risi hera in lánt (P quám) 166

Intransitive Verb, Subordinate Clause

II-12-33 thaz hera in uuorolt io gísán
II-12-87 thaz hera in uuorolt quam
V-16-25 theih sélbo hera in uuorolt quam
V-8-26 uuío er hera in uuorolt quam
III-26-32 thaz drúhtin hera in uuorolt quam (P hera
in uuorolt)

---

164 For analysis of such irregularities, v.i. p. 175, etc.
Many scholars (e.g. Kelle) list most hera (and even the hera
in hera in uuorolt) as compounding forms. Kelle (III, p. 269)
notes an ambiguity in the interpretation of the form, after
listing several cases which he regards as "sicher ...
freistehendes Adverbiun."

165 Construction doubtful, very possibly a main clause.

166 v. IV-4-64 ther thanana hera quam in lánt (P thánana).
This latter example raises the possibility that hera in lant
is not a crystallized phrase like hera in uuorolt, which never
occurs thus separated. It also indicates that these two
III-24-90 thanana er hera in uuórolt quam
III-24-36 thaz...thu hera in uuórolt quam
III-13-4 bi hiu er hera in uuórolt quam (P hera)
I-3-3 uuio selbo er hera in uuórolt quam
II-8-54 sid er hera in uuórolt quam
II-2-14 ther hera in uuórolt sinne (P hera in uuorolt)

Non-Fiibite

III-10-23 ih ni bin...gisentit hera in uuórolt in

The stress pattern seems to indicate a phrase grouping.

On this question, v.a: p.102. The relatively frequent indications of elision (hera) give similar evidence.

The foregoing material on hera in uuorolt makes it advisable, as I indicated above, to restrict the syntactical analysis to cases of hera alone.

The possibility of other such phrases (adverb plus prepositional phrase) and therefore a possible indication that compounding with the verb is not present, arises with ûf and ûz. For ûz we found cases of certain adverbial use in OHG, but for ûf the evidence was restricted to US (v.a. p. 26). Presence in such a phrase as ûf fon... might itself be considered evidence for adverbial use, but compounding of the ûf with the verb is also possible, so further adverbial evidence (such as there is for hera) would be welcome. The cases are:

sentences with lant may contain separate and independent hera. In that case they would belong with the subsequent discussion of hera.
III-24-69 huab thiu ñugun uf zi himile
IV-15-61 úf zi himile er tho sán (P uf)
V-1-19 thaz zeigot uf in himile
II-11-54 tho er úf fon themo grábe irstuant
III-13-58 unz thiu sin guatí uf fon töde irstuantí
(P irstuantí)
V-4-47 er ist fon béliu irruúntan ich úf fon dòde
irșántan (P irșántan)167

V-9-1 tho thaz éuuniqa guat // úz fon themo grábe
irstuant
I-23-5 thaz er fúari thanan frám // úz untar
uúròltman (P uz)

Verse I-23-5 has two possible compounding forms, fram
and úz.

Both these cases of úz are in the same natural pause
group relationship as all the úf zi (in, fon) phrases above
and could well be adverb úz plus prepositional phrase.

Note however the definite contrast between úf and úz
in relation to a following prepositional phrase. In every
such case with úf the word order and the pause group rela-
tion is such that these could easily be adverbial phrases.
But with úz there are only the above two against the fol-
lowing 10 with some sort of separation:

Separated and Caesura: IV-20-3 and II-3-24 ...úz // thár zi...
III-14-53 ...úz // thár zi...
IV-6-3 ...úz // thár zi...

Caesura: II-4-52 and I-14-19 ...úz // zi...
II-11-4 and IV-29-55 ...uz // zi...

After Prepositional Phrase: V-21-8 ...fon himile úz
III-20-165 ... fon in úz

167 Kelle (III, p. 639) gives V-1-19 as adverbial, IV-
15-61 as ambiguous, the rest as compounds, and Piper (II,
p. 541) gives both IV-15-61 and V-1-19 as adverbs, the rest
as compounds!
The evidence, in sum, points to the possibility of combination into adverbial phrases for ἃφ (especially with the three unstressed ἃφ's; v.i.) and perhaps for ἃζ. It shows much more independence from such constructions for ἃζ, but this does not necessarily mean compounding with the verb. They may still be adverbs. Both forms require further analysis on the basis of word order, and the above cases cannot be omitted, as hera in uuorolt was, from that analysis.

Differentiating between hera in uuorolt and the ἃφ and ἃζ cases is further justified by the difference in stress. While only 3 (in P, 4) out of the 21 cases of hera in uuorolt are stressed on the hera, 168 ἃφ is stressed in 3 of 6 (each time along with stress on the noun) and ἃζ in 10 out of 12. In both of the most likely phrases with ἃζ, both the ἃζ and the noun are stressed. Moreover, hera and in uuorolt are never separated, by caesura or otherwise. 169

A final individual reservation concerns zua, which may often be interpreted as a postposition. Wende gives I-19-3 ther engil spráh imo zúa (P zua); I-4-26 ther ángil imo zúaspráh; II-13-13 thes ēr mo zuagispróchit; and II-4-54

168 Full situation: Stress on hera: V 3, P 4  
Stress on uuorolt: V 16, P 17  
(v. also hera in lánt)  
Stress on both: V 2.

169 Hera and in lant are separated in IV-4-64; v.s. p. 99, n. 166.
thar riaf er ímo filu frúa thrato rúmana zúa (P riaf ... zua).  
Incidentally, these are 4 of the 5 cases of zúa, excepting the ones with thara.

All the "objects" in these cases of zúa are pronominal, adding further circumstantial evidence to the assumption of postposition. Also, I-19-3 and II-4-54 have both zúa and verb stressed. But neither of these facts is sufficient evidence, and the matter must be deferred to the section on syntax.

H. The thara Compounds

The thar(a) compounds sum up, in a way, all the foregoing cases of adverbial and prepositional uses. The use of thar(a) (and its analogues in the other Germanic dialects) in combination with prepositions or adverbs is a common phenomenon. The best collection of material is Wende's for OE (with quite a lot on OHG).

Gothic par, parei, paruh do not participate in any such constructions, but the West Germanic dialects have developed a large variety. The question of origin and

170 v. Wende, p. 274. The extreme separation of the last sentence is suspicious. The question, of course, is whether such separation is more credible with a verb than with a pronoun object, or whether the zúa will have to be regarded as quite independent in the sentence.
nature is therefore a very immediate and important one. Wende concludes, largely from the OHG distinction of thara / in (direction) and thår / inne (position), "dass das zweite Adverb ursprünglich nur die räumliche Beziehung genauer bestimmte, die an sich schon durch das Pronominal-adverb zum Ausdruck gebracht wurde. Von Haus aus standen also die beiden Adverbien völlig selbständig nebeneinander, ganz im Sinne der Übersetzung 'dort, nämlich innen', 'dor-thin, nämlich hinein'"... 171 (In later OHG, as in almost all of the OE cases, this distinction was lost.)

If this is the case, the preposition must have existed in separation, as an adverb, before the connection with thara came about. The connection with thara was accidental, so to speak, and later became syntactically and semantically significant. This idea seems to be supported by the many OE and OHG cases of considerable separation of thara and preposition. 172 A good example is (Weissenburg Catechism, Lord's Prayer) endi thar sintun thoh allo mannes thurfti ana bifangano. Here the degree of removal is so great that one would perhaps be justified in saying that we have a case

171v. Wende, p. 281.
of isolated ana, almost like the isolated miti of man árme miti néríti. Even in NHG separation is still possible, e.g. da kämmre ich mich nichts um, and in NHG there is no such thing as a preposition in isolation. These separated instances offer, next to miti (v.g. p. 88), the closest approach to the Gothic cases with ana, faur, etc. For example Otfrid IV-1-46, fráuili, thár uuír ana lágun. Combination of the thara with other adverbs offers no problem at all - for example, OE baer and inne (Gothic inna, adverb) or uppe (Gothic iupa, adverb). The weak stress and weak semantic nature of thara (frequently a "filler") would encourage combination into baer inne, etc.

The advantages of Wende's suggestion are plain. It explains why the only prepositions originally used with

---

173 But note that the ana is directly in front of the verb. This shows the typical situation for the development of a new syntactical pattern, in this case compounding of ana with the verb.

174 V. Grimm IV, p. 1291.

175 Proof positive that thar and its preposition can be widely separated and still belong together is rather difficult to find among the prepositions of motion, because even the most unlikely ones then tend to look like cases of preposition-verb compounds. But such proof does exist in other instances like I-12-25 ich lértun ouh thar sång zua ("in addition").
thar(a) would be prepositions of motion or rest. It also
explains the preference for, if not the exclusive use of,
the stressed or "long" forms, e.g. thar-untari rather than
*thar-untar, thara-zuo rather than *thara-zì, etc.

The only weakness I can see in Wende's hypothesis is
precisely that it leaves the origin of separated prepositions
entirely in the dark. It would appear from the Gothic evi-
dence that Proto-Germanic had its prepositions only in the
positions typical of Latin and Greek — that is, either
before substantives or as preverbs. Whence the "adverbs"
that were combined with thara? Perhaps in Proto-West-Germanic
the Gothic development of separated prepositions from com-
pound verbs and from prepositional uses with object antici-
pated was continued and expanded. (Wende does not discuss
the question.) But still the feeling that a preposition
must have an object, or at least a reference, was so strong
that thara, etc. took up that function. (This is a closer
connection than Wende would admit.) In Otfrid, after all,
there are many cases of thar(a) plus preposition but only
one of a true isolated preposition (man árne miti nérìi). 176

176 thara is not necessarily followed immediately by the
preposition or adverb, though this condition is the prevailing
one in OGH. As was mentioned, the relationship in OE between
the þær and the preposition or adverb was such that consider-
able separation is possible (v. Wende, p. VII, etc.). Several
such instances appear in Otfrid, e.g. III-14-5 thar mahtu ana
findan, uuìo... Needless to say, this ana is not to be treated
as a true isolated preposition, but equally obvious is the
fact that in such cases, all three possibilities of syntactical
analysis touch one another. These possibilities (which also
represent possibilities of future development are: 1) thar /
a na 2) ana alone 3) ana-findan! v.i.pp. lllv2.
As the development of *thar(a)* as a substitute object continued, the usually unseparated *da* preposition of NHG arose, excluding the development of isolated prepositions, but including in its scope even some prepositional uses which originally had little or nothing to do with motion (*thara*) or rest (*thár*), e.g. *danach fragen, davon wissen, damit aufhören*.

The bearing of these compounds on the question of the development of verb compounding is simply this: there is, it seems, a fairly extensive body of separated prepositional forms and adverbs, whatever their origin, which can serve as a source for— or an inspiration to—the development of further verbal compounds. This is facilitated by parallel or ambiguous word order. No better example could be found than Tatian 116-4 *thio menigi thio dar forafuorun inti thio dar after folgetun...* 177 Here in spite of frequent proof for the existence of *tharaf*ter in OHG the first member of the *dar after* sequence may not be part of a *thara* compound but only the frequent sentence-filler *dar*, a word which has little syntactical connection and serves only to refer back to something previously mentioned and thus to knit the sentence together. (The example is especially fitting, since

---

177 [Wende, p. 283, note 4, with a rather unsatisfying explanation: "dar beidemal beziehungslose Partikel ohne eigentlichen Vorstellungsgehalt." Surely this *dar* is more closely connected with its *after* than the Heliand 989 example: After quam thar uuord fon himile; v. Wende, p. 223.]
the first dar is surely such a filler.) So the after could just as well be felt as compounded with the folgetun as with the dar.\textsuperscript{178} Perhaps it would be better to say: It could develop into either, depending on the direction of the language's growing syntactical patterns.

The principle relevance of these thara compounds (or possible compounds) in the syntactical analysis of Otfried's OHG is a monitory one. We should, for the sake of accuracy, reserve judgment on those forms where thara might be the "antecedent" of a preposition which in turn might perhaps be a compounding form, e.g. IV-3-2 quám tho thara ingégini mihil uuóroltmenigi. And we should eliminate all sure cases of thara compounds.

thar(a)\textsuperscript{179} combines in Otfried with after, ana, furi, in, ingegin(i), widiri, zua, üf and üz; and thâr, in addition, with fora, forma, inne, mit(i), nidare, oba, obana, ūfe, üze and widari.

This list presents a couple of interesting points.

---

\textsuperscript{178} Otfried's V-20-52 thara àfter iamer riazent is a definite example of the thara compound in a type of sentence where it would have no influence on compounding. His fólgata thara àfter (IV-4-38), however, could fall in with a separable compounding pattern: *fólgata...after, if such a pattern developed.

\textsuperscript{179} With Otfried's frequent liaison, e.g. MS readings like tharâ, it is often impossible to tell for sure whether thar is shortened from thara or is original thâr.
First, if the forms used with thara are assumed to have had an adverbial feeling about them, we shall have to add to the list of Otfrid's possible compounding forms with adverbial uses: ana,\textsuperscript{180} furî,\textsuperscript{181} ingegnin(i),\textsuperscript{182} mit(i),\textsuperscript{183} ûf,\textsuperscript{184} and zua.\textsuperscript{185} We shall also have, incidentally, a bit of support for the one other adverbial use of in (v.s. p. 17) in V-7-12 luuget áuur do tharin, where there is virtually no doubt of the tharin.

Secondly, the only prepositions in the original list of preverbs (p. 9) with which there are no such constructions are: hintar, thuuruh,\textsuperscript{186} ubar, untar, widar and umbi. Absence of any with umbi in Otfrid is probably accidental.

\textsuperscript{180}A clear use of thara ana (no possibility of interpreting ana with the verb) is II-21-38 thaz uuîr ni misigângen, thara ana ni gifâllen (P tharâna) "that we not fall (into sin) thereby." III-16-17 is actually an equally good example; v.i. p. 117.

\textsuperscript{181}One case only, likewise impossible of interpretation with the verb. IV-35-37 uuûlun se, ér se fuarin hîm, thara-fûri mîhilân stéin (P thara-fûri).

\textsuperscript{182}No question of verbal compounding in I-9-27 uuûntar uuas thia menjî áuîr thara ingegnî. Piper II, p. 472 translates "dem gegenüber, vor solchem Anblick." There is virtually no possibility of compounding with the verb for the ingegnî of II-3-61 or V-20-48; v.i. p. 119, n. 222.

\textsuperscript{183}The perfect example is I-22-60 unsan fâter eren, ioh thia miáter tharmît (P tharmît). Also v.i. p. 116 (on III-6-29 tharmîti) and p. 120 (on IV-9-3 tharmîti).

\textsuperscript{184}The only case, IV-4-15 namun sîe tho iro uuât, legítun tharîf could hardly be a compound verb *ûfleggen, but the example is not so clear-cut as the above.

\textsuperscript{185}Such cases as I-24-8 ...ioh gîb thaz drîntan tharzua, where thar(a)zua means "in addition" are all clearly adverbial, not verbal, uses.

\textsuperscript{186}Piper (II, p. 472) lists thara-thuuruh for III-8-41 theih thuuruhquéme thara zi thîr!
Tatian 80-1 has thiu thar umbli sint. Notker has several. The rest of these prepositional forms, though, are practically innocent of any connection with thara, even in later OHG. Notker has forms with ubere. Tatian has thara ubiri (116-2), just as Otfrid has thara with widiri but none with ubar and widar. hintar, as far as I know, never appears in any form.

It seems clear, therefore, that the use of a preposition with thara is not the "original" form of separate prepositional use. That is, some other form of separation must have preceded use with thara. Else how explain the total absence of hintar, thuruh, ubar, untar and widar? There is certainly no dearth of prepositional uses for these forms. So if the thara compounds were by origin simply prepositional or adverbial (in turn from prepositions) we should expect *thara hintar, etc. This is a particularly

---

187Purtzcher, op. cit., p. 12, considers this an independent adverb.
188E.g. Piper Notker II-111-21 diē in dārumbe ferliēzen; v. Wende, p. 287.
189Notker's three cases with dure are all pretty surely preverbs. Even Wende (p. 285, note 6) hesitates to call these dar combinations. The few scattered cases appearing in exception to this rule are from later documents and presumably represent the growing use of da with any preposition. Thus they hardly disturb the picture of the older period. Examples are: from the Older Physiologus De Vipera sliuffet dar durch and De Lacerta sihet da durch gegen dero suunnun; v. Diels, pp.56-7. These two could be separable durich with the verbs slioffen and sēhen.
190v. Wende, p. 286.
191Tatian 81-3, however, has thara uuidar her tho quad at ipse ait. This is the only early exception I know of. Sig-
valid objection in view of the great numbers of thara compounds, for it is clear that we have, in all likelihood, the full range of OHG possibilities represented. Now these very forms (hintar, etc.) are the ones which are inseparable in verb compounding. Does it not seem very likely that the use with thara is, therefore, an outgrowth of some kind of separation originating from compound verbs or possibly from certain of the isolated prepositional uses the like of which we found in Gothio? To give a hypothetical case history:

1) duatgaggan / par (verb)
   iddja du par or par du (isolated preposition)

2) (at)iddja par du
3) giang thara zua
4) giang tharazua

Gothio

More revealing and important is the sort where the verb would be last.

1) par duatgaggan (verb)
   par iddja du (isolated preposition)

2) thara-zua-gangan

3) a. tharazua gangan
   b. tharazua... gangan
   c. thara... zua gangan
   d. (thara) zuagangan

Every stage in this latter development (except, of course, the second which indicates only the loosening of the pattern) is extant in OE and OHG, and every one is important.

192 Which in turn are related to the verb system through their presumed dependence on the heavy stress of first members of double compounds; e.g. p. 28.
Stage 1 represents the presumably original form, e.g., of Gothic, where anar is only accidentally followed by prepositions or adverbs or compound verbs. When the syntactical boundaries begin to change (Stage 2), the thara and the zua may become closely associated, e.g., Otfrid I-17-59 ioh sar tharan quamun (P tharain)193 (Stage 3a). Then the thara compound may be so strongly felt that it moves away from the verb (Stage 3b), e.g., Otfrid IV-16-10 thaz er ofto tharan giuun uuas gangan mit in.194 The thara compound itself may then separate - or perhaps the loose pattern of Stage 2 is simply interrupted at a different spot - and we have Stage 3c, e.g., OE Cura Pastoralis (Sweet, 217-21) gif...aer wind to come,195 IV-5-58 thar baldo anasezen. Obviously at this stage, the connection of the preposition with the verb (whether it be new, i.e., from separated thara / preposition - or old, i.e., from the situation of Stage 2 borders on compounding and may give rise to new compound verbs or reinforce the pattern of old ones! In that case Stage 3d appears, where the thara, if it shows up at all, is an unrelated sentence filler and

193 The liaison is pretty fair indication of tharain.

194 Separation of the anar / preposition of OE from the verb is very rare (rare enough in OHG) and these cases are usually ones of obviously non-verbal origin, i.e., from isolated prepositions, e.g., Cura Pastoralis (Sweet, 399-19) swa swa Loth funde da lytian ceastre, & hine daeron wid fyr gescilde. This great reticence to leave the verb may indicate that some feeling for the original word order or syntactical attachment still existed, even with thara / preposition used directly together.

195 y. Wende, p. 29.
the preposition is felt to be "with the verb." Bede (Miller, 174-30) be baer aetstodon, which Wende has to amend to aetstodon,196 is a good example, as is the Otfrid verse with anasezen, though Otfrid's word separation is very hazy. Stage 3d haa things back again to the Gothic situation!

There are two main points to bear in mind. First, when a syntactical situation is so obviously fluid, it is unwise to set up absolute classifications or make exclusive decision on groups of words or single instances. Naturally any classification can be made absolute if historical or comparative development is excluded and strict definitions are set up. But the classification that would result from the application of such a method to the OE or OHG thara situation would not be worth having. I think it would be at most a description of word order (not even of word division), and I also feel there is more to the situation than that. Second, and more specific, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that at no stage throughout the story of thara / preposition is the same preposition - if separated from the thara - commonly stirred from its typical position before the verb! Wende's statement has been quoted before, but bears repeating: "Die von ihm (Beziehungswort her, daer,

196. Wende, p. 26. In such situations, Wende, a bit arbitrarily, assumes that the aet must be with the baer, not with the verb.
getrennte Präposition gehört unmittelbar vor das Verbum, nur der zu einer einfachen finiten Verbalform gehörigen Negation ne und dem den flektierten Infinitiv regierenden to muss sie diesen Platz abtreten. Freier ist die Stellung der Präposition zum Verbum, wenn sie unmittelbar hinter dem Beziehungswort steht.197 The implication of this in the matter of compounding possibilities is clear.

Most of the emphasis in the preceding paragraphs has been placed on the origin of thara compounds from connection with compound verbs, which is the point Wende's theory ignores, I think. As I indicated at the start, thara compounds may come from isolated prepositions, too, and the order of such cases is freer, as a glance at Wende's material will show. The latter also applies, naturally, to compounds of thara / ordinary adverbs.

The development just outlined gives us some idea where many of these forms used with thara came from. It has a further outstanding advantage, which is at the same time a corroboration. It is the only way I know of to explain absence of hintar, etc. For if we say that these thara

197v. Wende, p. VII, similarly p. X.
combinations are by origin purely prepositional, we have no explanation for the absence of tharahantar, etc. And if we say that they came from adverbial uses of prepositions, we beg the question of why no adverbial uses of hintar, etc. Now however we can say: hintar, etc. were prepositions all right, but they never separated from verbs with which they were compounded and because of their lack of stress (hintar-quéman, hintar then bóm) they never appeared in any other separated use, hence virtually never became associated with thara - in OHG, anyway.

This does not mean that the well established set of thara compounds could not later have influenced separability in verbs, but it does mean that separability in verbs (and certain separated prepositional uses) preceded these thara forms. Thus it centers our attention even more on compounding and separability as the fundamental factors in the German situation.

If the thara compounds gradually developed, even in OHG, toward their characteristic NHG prepositional status, we may

---

198 They certainly were on the way to becoming prepositional in OHG. That is, the thara serves as the "object" of the preposition in many, many cases (not as one of two parallel adverbs, certainly not in any relation to the verb); e.g. I-22-60 uuir unsan fáter éren ich thia múater tharmit (P tharmit).

199 Many of the forms which combined with thara were of course adverbs to begin with and had nothing to do with compounding (e.g. innen, ubare; y. Gothic inna, ufaro). In general, thara prefers the association of the stressed or "long" forms (ingegini, zua, etc.).
expect to find numerous cases in Otfrid of strongly prepositional use, therefore cases where there is no possibility of compounding with the verb. Such cases are:

V-20-52 tharaéfter iamér riament
II-21-38 thara ana (above, p. 109, note 180)
IV-35-37 tharafúri (above, p. 109, note 181)
II-4-4 er fasteta únnoto thar niuuan húnt zíto
séhszug ouh tharmíti (P tharmíti)

and even cases like:

III-6-29 ther drégit här in sinan nót finf girstinu
brot, ouh zuene físga tharmit

The last case is clearly prepositional in spite of the parallel possible compound in II-9-43 thaz kínd thaz druag
thaz uuiútu mit, because the físga is parallel to brot and
the tharmit serves only to indicate the connection: "along
with them," just as in I-22-60 er uuólta unsih léren, uuir
unsan fáter eren, ioh thia múter tharmit (P tharmit), where
no one would assume a verb *mit-eren.

Excluding such forms still leaves a fairly large number
of cases which are, at first glance anyway, doubtful. With
the above considerations in mind it is possible to eliminate
many where compounding with thara is certain or nearly certain.
A few will turn out to be, in line with the argument above
(p.107f.), probable compound verbs. Others will inevitably
remain ambiguous. The purpose of this whole section will
be served if we eliminate all those cases where verbal com-
pounding is impossible or improbable.
The cases are:

after  IV-4-38 héri ouh rédhafter so fólgata tharáfter
ana  I-23-29 thaz er thar ánagange (sio)
I-18-36 ther tharána gange
V-10-12 uuio iz tharána ist al gizált
I-11-9 tharána si er gizáltér (P tharána)
III-1-26 thara tharána húggé (P tharána)
II-9-23 tharanu maht thu irthénken (P tharána)
III-16-17 sēhe tharána (P tharana)
V-2-12 sē er tharana sóuuit
IV-1-46 fráuilí, thár uuir ana lágun
III-20-48 githuau ein hóró thar in uuár, inti kléipta
mir tharána sar

200 The consistent presence of thar or hiar with after and folgen makes verbal compounding unlikely. V. Monese Fragments XXXV-12 hear after folgendo; Tatian 116-4 dar after folgetun; Isidor XI-19 hear after folgendo; etc. Also v.2, p. 13 and 116.
201 Referring to uuega; almost certainly prepositional. (Erdmann emends to read tharána.)
202 Referring to situ; almost certainly prepositional.
203 " " forasagon; the presence of preposed anageit (V-10-5) and anazellent (IV-19-40 and II-6-42), etc. has little if any relevance here, as both are quite different in meaning.
204 " " brief;
205 Referring to a thaz clause; almost certainly prepositional
206 " " uuuntar; almost certainly prepositional.
207 " " lera. The anasahi of IV-29-49 means "look at". This means "perceive therefrom - or thereby - that..." Certainly prepositional.
208 Referring to gundfano. This approaches possible compounding with the verb, in form at least.
209 Note the relative use. In spite of IV-24-23 áanalag, not a likely compound.
210 Here is a very possible compound or isolated preposition. Note the transitive verb meaning "fix" or "stick". The tharana cannot mean "on it", because the reference would then be to hóro, which would give the reverse of the actual meaning. This is just like English "...and stuck it on"! V. Gothic atlagjands ana and galagidedun ana (p.79-80).
IV-5-58 then húgu uuir giuwézzen, thar báló
ánasezzen211
III-19-13 híar ist ana fúntan, thaz...212

fora (All cases disposed of above, p. 94. Compounding
possible only in foráságen.)

furi (v.2. p. 109, note 181)

in
IV-16-10 thaz er ófto tharaín giuuvon uuás gángan mit in213
III-4-11 engil gòtes guato fuar thar ín (P fuár)214
III-12-39 thish tharín ni soculun gán215
IV-11-14 nam áftor thiú ein békin, goz er uuázar
tharín216
V-5-7 ni giang er thiú halt thoh tharín (sim. V-6-25)217
V-7-12 luaget áuur do tharín218
I-17-59 ioch sar tharaín quamun219
II-11-5 er tho sár thara ingiang220
IV-15-5 uuárd uuólá then tharaingeit (P thar)

211 The stress marks are confused here; v. Erdmann, ad
loc. Here the ana has a preceding "object", namely uuérko,
etc. But the immediate sentence is just like III-20-48 and
may be an isolated preposition or a compound. It means,
literally, "what our wits and set them on".

212 A clear prepositional use. Similarly III-14-5. The
above case is included only to show the possibility of similar
constructions with híar.

213 Referring to garton. Certainly prepositional because
of the extra feature of virtually impossible word order of the
infinitive (that is, impossible for a compound verb); v.1. p. 184.

214 Referring to uuázar. Almost certainly prepositional.

215 See note 213.

216 Transitive verb, but with a clear "antecedent" for thar.

217 Referring to definite antecedents (grab in both cases)
and probably prepositional, but in an ambiguous position where
it might be or become a compound. Consider the possible parallel
in IV-23-30 giang... in thaz spráhhus ín. If the thar of V-5-7
be equated with in thaz spráhhus we should have an argument
for compounding. Naturally this is not a constant or absolute
equation, as is obvious if we try to put in thaz spráhhus in
the place of thar in III-12-39. tharín is a real compound, and
it may appear in V-5-7, too.

218 Parallel to line 7 luagata áuur in thaz gráb. The idea
of a verb *in-luagèn is next to impossible here. This is a good
case of tharín.

219 Refers to hus in the same line. Note the liaison con-
necting thara and ini! This is an extra argument for preposi-
tional tharain rather than compounding with the verb.

220 Given in Kelle III and Piper II under ingàn. Similarly
II-23-21 thie lázit man thar ñingan
V-6-28 tho er ñin-an sah thara ñingan
V-6-52 thara in zi gán-gan-ne

ingegin(1) III-16-27 thó sprah thara ingégini áuur thiu
selba ménigi221
V-16-43 ni mag ther diufal thara ingégin sin222

All the following cases. II-11-.5 refers to hus. It is
ambiguous, as are the rest of these forms with thara and in,
all of which have definite antecedents. in, therefore, shows
the three important types very clearly: the terminal points
represented by thie tharín ni souliun gán (definitely not a
compound verb) and I-4-19 ínglang er tho skíoro (as definitely
compound as in offers), between which lies the typical ambi-
guous case of er tho sár thara ínglang. The frequency of the
verb ingangán in ORG certainly makes one hesitate to deny
comounding in these ambiguous cases.

221 Similarly III-20-63 and IV-18-9. III-16-27 refers
to a preceding speech. It is almost certainly not a compound
verb, though its prepositional nature is not so obvious as,
e.g., III-14-116; v. Kelle III, p. 593 for other examples.

222 Other cases with sin: I-9-27, III-24-67, III-14-15,
IV-28-3. For some reason Kelle and Piper list only the last
three as compound verbs. Part of the decision rests on the
possibility of compounding with sin, which is rather unlikely.
(Piper also lists under ingegen-üesan IV-30-23 ingegen ímo
uuás.)

The other instances of thara with ingégín I have not
bothered to list above, as they are quite beyond the pale.
II-3-61 thih thára ingégín ristic, V-20-48 ther thára ingégín
ringe (P thára ingégín ríngë), and V-23-133 thara ingégín
rachon (P thára ingégín ráçhon) do not permit, on the basis
of meaning alone, any interpretation as compound verbs.
III-13-52 ...quámun thara ingégni (P thara) 223
IV-3-2 quám tho thara ingégni mhíhl uuórolmenigí
III-6-8 fúar ímo thara ingégni mhíhl uuórolmenigí 224
V-20-19 thara férít al ingégni éngilo ménigí
II-3-14 uulo éngilo ménigí fúar thar ál ingégni
IV-3-18 ...fúar thar ál ingégni (P ál ingégni). Fuar thar ál ingégni thes lántiutes ménigí
IV-4-17 thó fleiz thara ingégni thiu mhíhila ménigí (P tho. fléiz) 225
IV-5-41 thiu mhíhila ménigí thia uuát thar breitta
ingégni 226

mit(1) IV-8-28 ther láut tharmít ni uuari (P. tharmít) 227
IV-14-6 neme thia dásgun tharmít (P néme...tharmít) 228
IV-9-3 tho sant er pétrusaa sár iohánnem ouh tharmíti (P tharmít) 229

This and the next one are ambiguous. Kelle and Piper list both as compound verbs. In view of the total picture of ingégni one should be more than hesitant to call these compound verbs.

The next four (with faran) are all listed by Kelle and Piper as compound verbs, but they are all actually ambiguous. Indeed II-3-14 has such odd word order for a subordinate clause that interpretation as compound verb is highly unlikely. Only one case of ingégni plus faran (without thara) exists, viz. III-9-2. This apparently complete dependence of ingégni on thara argues against any interpretation as compound form.

Ambiguous; compounding unlikely.

Quite aside from the semantic considerations, the position of the ingégni after the verb, which is itself late in the main clause, makes compounding unlikely; v. i. p. 200. This opens the way to the interpretation of ingégni as belonging with thar - or as being an isolated preposition.

On compounds with sín, v. e. p. 119, note 222; p. 88.

Referring back to sekil. This is almost certainly prepositional, like III-6-29 above, for as far as I know mitnehmen as a compound meaning "take along" does not appear in OHG. Note that the Gothic mipniman means not "take along", but "accept (along with)". See G. Streitberg, Matthew 11, 14; v. Streitberg WB, p. 102.

This shows the equivalence of tharmít and tharmíti, which is characteristic of isolated prepositional ("adverbial") uses, but just the opposite of compounding usage. The sentence is like the preceding ones, and miti is surely prepositional. For an even more definitely adverbial parallel, v. e. p. 116 (III-6-29).
230 These two verses, one with thar(a)zua after, the other with it before the verb, are typical of zua uses with verbs of motion. (The only cases of zua alone with verbs are with gisprechan, sprechan, ruafan and sehah.) They all might, considered individually, seem like compounds. But the very unanimity of the use of thara makes this unlikely. Other examples: IV-29-9, IV-36-10, I-13-20 and with transitives (giliazan, rihten): III-12-40, III-18-8. Tatian 184-6 shows the real compound tho zuogiengun tunc accessurunt.

231 This verse, where F has zifuagi, shows how a thara compound, when it separates, immediately leaves the way open for the creation of a new compound (NHG zufügen). The other cases with fuagen are unseparated (I-1-71, V-24-17), and in view of the rest of the evidence III-14-71 is doubtless tharazua. Not all cases of separation indicate possibility of compounding; v. V-23-45 thara süftent sie züa, where even NHG would not say *zuseufzen.

232 In spite of NHG zuzählten, this is obviously no compound verb. Further, the past participle would, if it were such a verb, be separated, and both preverb and stem stressed, either of which would be enough to eliminate it as a compound; v. i. p. 189 and p. 204.

233 This form and II-6-15 with the same verb, in the meaning "go after something", have clear antecedents and, on a semantic basis alone, are definitely not compound verbs.

234 This is one of many uses with hugren (v. Kelle III, p. 596), and it demonstrates the impossibility of compounding. Note also, on the syntactical level, the word order in the subordinate clause (v. i. p. 200f.). IV-35-8 with a split infinitive (tharazua ouh húggén) also demonstrates syntactically the impossibility of a compound verb (v. i. p. 184). Similar uses with thenken, githingen, suorgèn, thingen, grunzen, none of them possible compounds.

235 This separated form shows the zua in the right position with the infinitive for a compound verb, but the weight of similar cases with tharazua plus the obvious reference to uuort makes compounding unlikely.
The above are all the forms with thara + preposition where compounding could enter into consideration.

Further compounds occur of course with non-prepositions. Of particular interest are the only ones which also enter into the compounding picture - ɗif and ɗiz.

IV-4-15 ... thaz fálın bráhtun. Namun sie tho iro uuát, legitun tharuf in gidát (P legitun)

IV-33-31 (referring to Christ's wounds) slıumo floz thar ūz gër blñat inti uuázar

Both have definite references and are doubtless real adverb combinations. But the possibility of their becoming (or falling in with) compound verbs is fairly clear.

The use of ɗif meaning "on" is late, and such uses as the above may well have contributed to the development of this meaning (via "up on"). The usual verb is analęgen (Gothic analagjan). The Tatian has 184-6 legitun iro hant in then heilant ana. Gothic, referring to the same in-cident, had Mark 11,7 jah brahtedun pana fulan at Iesua jah galagidedun ana wastjos seinos.

Otfri has the preposed form of the other combination in I-20-9 zahari ɗızfluzun. Whether this is a compound or not is another question. But there can be no doubt that the stage was completely set for compounding.

The use of ɗif and ɗiz as adverbs - which was presumably their condition before they were compounded with thara - is no surprise. Gothic iup, as was shown above (p. 731) was
an adverb, and ut, though still a compounding form in Gothic, may have had by its very separation a tendency to become confused with the ordinary adverbs in later development. It is one of the problems of the succeeding sections on syntax to discover how far this tendency went in OHG.

Quite contrary to the tendency of ëz to be an adverb is its ability to govern a case, even in OHG. Notker (Piper Notker II-50-5) has Unde der hohesto sprah in uz Et altissimus dedit uocem suam.\(^{236}\) More striking is the Tatian 145-12 thie dar uz themo lante sin with its clear prepositional function, though there seems to be a possibility of mistranslation or omission here. This may have nothing to do with the above thara use, but if it does, it could only mean that the union of thara and ëz is so much the more secure, for thara and preposition hold together better than thara and adverb; \(v.i.\)

Both widiri and widari, which were discarded as compounding forms, appear with thara:

\[\text{H-155 afur thåra uu} \text{uidiri (P uu} \text{uidari)}\] \(^{237}\)

\[\text{III-19-4 thaz uu} \text{ir thar sprechen uu} \text{idari}\]

The remaining cases (with forna, inne, nidare, oba, obana, ëfe and ëze) are not of much concern here.

\(^{236}\) \(v. \) wende, p. 280, with one more example.

\(^{237}\) \(Kelle \) III, p. 595: "hingegen, wiederum."
One special aspect of the thara problem deserves note, viz. the use of thara as a relative, with following ana, zua, ûfe. Obviously the thara, even in this extended use, has not lost its commom function as a relative. But all the cases in Otfrid are like the OE, where the preposition is separated from the relative,\textsuperscript{238} rather than like NHG, where the two are together.

Otfrid's examples:

IV-1-46 frêuilli, thâr uuîr ana lágum\textsuperscript{239}  
II-21-30 hînilrichi, thâr uuîr zuo io gingen \textsuperscript{ioh} ëmniizigen thingen  
V-8-24 thaz götnissi ruarta mit uuôrton \textsuperscript{filû} ëisfen, thâr uuîr zuo io ruafen

One factor which may have encouraged separation is the stress on thår(a).

Although this position might well encourage association of the prepositional form with the verb, it is to be noted that two of the three Otfridian examples have a word between these two. And with real verb compounds, not even io intervenes in Otfrid (\textsuperscript{v.i.}p.192). Thus only IV-1-46 is like the typical OE cases, where the preposition "steht so gut wie regelmaessig unmittelbar vor dem Verbum."\textsuperscript{240} Of course it is to be assumed that in many, perhaps most, instances there would

\textsuperscript{238}\textsuperscript{239}Y. wende, p. 46ff. \textsuperscript{240}An exact parallel in Tatian 54-8 nam thaz thar her analag. Y. wende, p. 46.
be no intervening member. Thus the way to compounding would be more open.⁴⁴¹

The others are like the exceptional cases in OE, e.g. Aelfric Homilies (Thorpe I, p. 258) his wisdom, be he mid sâlle gesceâafa geworhte.⁴⁴² In this case one would hardly assume a compound verb. 'There are many such instances in OHG, for example Piper Notker I-21-22 (festi) - Târa nehêin uuêg zû o nesf. Note the obvious difference between this case and one where a parallel situation could lead to compounding with the verb because the semantic relation demanded by the Germanic dialects is present, e.g. Otfrid's V-8-24.⁴⁴³

The one use with an adverb is even freer in word order and thus further removed from possibility of compounding with the verb:

II-1-22 thaz fûndamens zì hûfê, thaz thiu êrda lîgit ûfê (P ufe)

This is just like another OE exceptional case, Bede (Miller 428-19) pæm wege, þe ic aer com on, and also just like present-day English. In NHG this order is impossible.⁴⁴⁴

---

²⁴¹ Behaghel Syntax IV, p. 249 gives several examples and indicates a tendency of the "prepositional adverb" to move closer to the verb.

²⁴² 'V. wende, p. 47.

²⁴³ 'With the io gone, of course.

²⁴⁴ 'The tenacity of some syntactical patterns is well demonstrated, however, by the preservation in NHG of the OHG order, as in colloquial constructions like der Brunnen, wo die Leute von trinken; die Hand, da du mit geschlagen hast (v. Grimm IV, p. 1291); Exod. 20,21 da Gott innen war (ibid.), etc.
To sum up the results of the section on thara, we have:

(a) Adverbial or adverbial-type use for additional forms, viz.: ana, furi, in, ingegin(i), mit(i), af and zua. This adverbial type of use was indicated by the reference "prepositional" (vs. compounding) in some of the sections above. The parallel use of the two terms reflects the possibility of actual, prepositional adverbs in OHG. The relation of such use with thara to isolated prepositions like ana in Gothic du usfilhan ana gastim and Otfrid's man arme miti néri ti is problematical.

(b) A possible source for later verb compounds with forms which in OHG were still probably attached to thara.

(c) Several cases of possible compounds to carry on into the section on syntax.

(d) Several cases of indubitable thara compounds to omit from the actual analysis in that section.
I. Complete List of Otfrid's Forms

1. Introductory Note

The preceding discussion of the nature of the compounding forms and the more lexical, mechanical, or semantic considerations applicable to these forms has, I hope, prepared the way for the most important section — that on straight syntax.

The purpose of the foregoing section was, essentially twofold: a) to describe the compounding forms b) to boil the mass of cases down to those where the syntactical question of compounding or non-compounding is the only principal question. In the second process I think we successfully eliminated (or indicated the elimination of) such forms as zisamane, hera in uuorolt, and ubari-ubiri, as well as many individual instances of other forms. But the great majority of Otfrid's cases still remains. The following section gives all these instances from Otfrid, arranged alphabetically by compounding form. For completeness most of the forms eliminated or seriously questioned above have been included and set in parentheses. As further confirmation for their elimination appears it will be noted. The forms not in parentheses will be the principal material of the last section — the analysis of syntactical patterns.

Under each compounding form or adverb, the cases will be divided, for ease of reference and in line with the findings of the Gothic chapter, into transitives and intransitives, and within these into main clause, subordinate clause, and non-finite uses, further into the obvious groups of proposed
and separated forms.

The stress marks are given according to V, with any relevant variations by P, Kelle, Ardmann, and Piper have all been checked for the readings. No attempt has been made to mark the long vowels. These can be found in Piper. In general Ardmann is more meticulous than the others in his reading of the MSS, so his text is the basis of the form of the following verses. As far as word division goes I have given Ardmann’s version. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this is simply for convenience. All the editors and commentators divide rather freely according to their interpretation of the MSS and their stated or tacit principles of syntax. The Otfrid MSS are naturally better than the Gothic in the division of words, but not enough better to give a clear notion of most passages. It is obvious from many of Ardmann’s readings, incidentally, that he had a clearer idea of some of the syntactical facts behind points brought up in this study than did Kelle or Piper.
2. List
after

Non-Finite, Unseparated

III-11-24245 Sin uuňt ouh thes ni scâmeta, thaz er thaz réďinota;/ ni firliaz ouh in ther nôti, ni si imo fôlgetic;/ Ni si ūuur thaz iruuëliti, then nôt imo gizéliti,/ thia thârft imo giklágoti io after râafenti (P âfterrufentí)

, ana

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

V-11-9 ouh blias er sie âna (so thu uueist) then selbon hêsilegon géist (P geist)
(III-20-48 inti kléipta mir tharâna sar)246

Unseparated

H-67 réntor er iz ânafiang, tho iz zi nôti gîgiang
IV-5-58 then hûgu uuir giuueezzen, thar bâldo ânaseezzen
(V sézzzen, stress erased; P ânasizen)
I-15-34 ... er tod sie anauëntit (P ânauuentit)

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

V-12-59 tho er sie hîar thaz anablias
IV-37-3 thaz uuir iz ânafahen mit ânderen girâtin
V-7-24 uuar ih iz ânafafe
(V-10-5 uuanta âband unsih ânageit)
IV-29-37 so er sîh iz ânalegiti
I-17-29 so thîsu uuort tho gâhun then kûning anaquâmûn
(P anaquamun)

245Passage citation generally indicates the line of the compounding form (or adverb) or the verb, whichever is first.
246Note the dative case. All other ana verbs have accusatives in Ûtfrïd and practically in all of OnG. This is another argument for tharana. It counters the factor noted on p. 117, note 210.
I-12-5  so sinan ánasahun
IV-24-14 so sie inan ánasahun (P ánasáhun)
IV-29-49 súntar selb si in gáhi kristan ánasahi
V-10-26 iích intslúpta in gahun, then mithont se ánasahun
(V-2-12 so ër tharana scůuot (P erased an accent on tharana))
I-23-54 súntar siu man suénte inti fiur ánauuente
III-18-70 thaz sliumo sies gihúlfín ioh inan ánauuurfin
II-6-42 thaz ér... thaz uuib iz anazálta
IV-19-40 thu hóris, uwas sie němmont ioh thih ánazel lent

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
I-16-25 uuızzi thëh imo ana sär

Unseparated

IV-24-23 ther liút miıt thiṣu imo ánalaq
I-16-27 götes geist imo ánauuas (P ánauuas)

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated
(I-18-36 ther thar ánagange)247
(I-23-29 thaz er tharána gange)
(III-1-26 tház ih... tharana hágge)
(IV-1-46 fráuili, thár uuir ana láguın)
I-15-5 geist, ther mó ánauuas (P imo)

Non-Finite, Separated
(II-9-23 tharana maht thu irthénken (P tharána))
(I-11-9 thár ána si er gizaltér (P tharána... gizálter))
(V-10-12 uuio iz tharána ist al gizált)

Unseparated

V-20-96 beginnit sie ánafarton miıt... ioh ouh
án abrechon mit...
(III-14-5 thar mántu ana findan, uuio...)

247 Erdmann has emended this passage to read tharána gange.
II-22-13  beginnet ānascouon thio frōnisgon blōmon
(III-19-13  hiar ist ana fūntan, thaz...)

bifora

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Unseparated
I-1-52  thaz kristesk uooru uns sāgetun, ich drūta sine
uns zēlitun, bifora lázu ih iz ál (P bifōra lazu)
(IV-16-46  thaz sēlba... sie hiar bifōra zēlitun)

Intransitive Verb, Subordinate Clause, Unseparated
I-22-40  ni uuaš'er io so mari, ni thiz bifōra uuari

fora

Non-Finite, Unseparated
IV-35-44  so mān hiar fora sāgen scal

fram

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
IV-30-24  thaz scēltan līezun se allaz frām

Unseparated
IV-30-22  ... siez allaz frāmbrahtun, so uuās sies thō
githāhtun
V-25-83  thie guate es sar bigīnment, ich iz frāmbringent

Subordinate Clause, Separated
II-14-87  sēhet then mān, ther mir thaz allaz brahta
frām (P mir thaz allaz brāhta fram)

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
IV-24-11  giang pilātus zi īn tho frām
II-8-18  ni quam min zīt non so frām

Subordinate Clause, Separated
I-23-5  thaz er fūari thanan frām ūz untar uuōroltman
(P uz)
Non-Finite, Separated
IV-20-4  sie ni màsan gan so frám zi themo héidinen
         man 248

furi.

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
III-1-35  thia hánt duat si fúri sar

Unseparated
IV-2-10  mártha... thaz muas fúribrahta

Intransitive Verb, Subordinate Clause, Unseparated
IV-30-5  álle, thie thar uuárún ich ouh thar fúrifuarun

Non-Finite, Separated
III-20-79  sie híazun thiu gan fúri sar

Unseparated
I-4-51  uns sint kind zi béranne iu dága fúriuarane
(P fúriuarane)

heim249

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
I-18-44  gang thésan uueg, ih sagen thir éin, er gílítit
         thih héim (P héim)
H-130  bróaderscaf (ih sagen thir éin) – thi gílítit
         unsih héim
IV-5-23  tho sant er dřúta uns sine héim mit sînen
         gíbôten zuein

Subordinate Clause, Separated
III-3-25  ob unsih auur ladot héim man ármer thehéin

248 Of the fram forms, I-23-5 and IV-20-4 are not listed
    in Kelle III as compounds. II-8-18 is rarely if ever listed
    as a compound.
249 None in Kelle as compounds.
III-20-72 ther thir so muatfagota, thaz licht thir heim giholota (P heim)
(I-18-31) ob uns in muat gigange, thaz unsih heim lange)

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-11-16 sliumo fuar si sar heim
I-22-8 so iltun sie heim sar
I-27-28 ni bin ih thér... bi iaron quimit er iu heim
II-3-1 er quam uns súlih hera heim (P quam)
II-4-13 uuar imo súlih man thihein so quam uuísheiti
heim (P heim)
IV-26-41 súlih quement sie iu noh heim, thaz... (P quement)
H-72 sie quamun filu scánt heim
H-133 ni duen uuir só... sero quimit uns iz heim
IV-34-20 uuuntun heim tho spáto

Unseparated

III-2-5 bat er... mit imo heim fuari
I-22-55 siu so heim quamun

Subordinate Clause, Separated

IV-35-37 ér se fuarin heim
I-26-2 sid druhtin krist quam uns heim
III-16-59 thanne uns krist quimit heim, ni uueiz iz mánno
nihein (P heim)

Unseparated

I-22-19 so siu tho heim quamun

Non-Finite, Unseparated

I-18-24 ni uuollen heim uuison uuir uueneegon uuéison

250 This may be a subordinate clause.
Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-16-66  ioh er mih sánta hera ziu
II-14-48  so zilot iuer héra sar, ih zellu iu...

Unseparated

IV-17-18  himilige thégana... sih snéllo hérafuartin

Subordinate Clause, Separated

IV-6-25  thi ih héra nu bat so gérno
I-10-12  thaz er hér iz liaz

Unseparated

II-7-66  thaz er thih héra leitti
I-27-38  thie unsih héra santin
I-27-54  tház ih iu gizálti uuáz er hera uuolti (P héra uuolti)

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

II-12-54  húgi thoh nu héra méist
II-3-1  er quam uns súlih hera héim (P quám)
IV-12-61  er quam so risi hera in lánt (P quám)
V-4-38  ir quamut héra thuruh gát
IV-30-28  so stig nídar hera in uuár (V erased stress on stig and hera)

III-24-99  ioh er uuárbi... fon bêche hera uuídorort

Unseparated

IV-26-29  hera hóret, quad er, uuib
II-9-63  so uuer thiz firnéman uuolle: héra losen sie álle

Subordinate Clause, Separated

III-10-20  thaz... si héra sus ni lóufe (P loufe)

Unseparated

II-7-30  nih hera giílti zi thir
ther thanana hera quam in lant
ther er so hera quam

Non-Finite, Separated

sænet... hera nidargan
ther hera uuard gisentit (P gisentit)

hina

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

hina, hina nim inan

Unseparated

tho erstarp ther kuing herôd ich hina fharta
inan tod

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

thaz iin mihi iar irrefêke, inti hina nidarscrikke...
sulih ânthurf ist es mir

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

far thanne heimortsun hina ubar himila alle\textsuperscript{251}
(V erased an accent on hina)

far hina, uuidaruuerto

farames ūuur. thara zi in hina in iro lant in\textsuperscript{252}

hina in ėlílenti quam ibot imo in drūume

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

so er hina fuar nu thárasun\textsuperscript{253}
in

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

(IV-11-14 goz er uuázar tharin)
sie námun... kuingîlhih giwuâti... inti dátun
inan in (P nan in)

\textsuperscript{251}Not in Kelle III. (That is, not as a compound.)
\textsuperscript{252}Not in Kelle III.
\textsuperscript{253}Not in Kelle III – probably an oversight.
Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

IV-7-51  
so er érist thia árcha ingigliang (P archa ingigliang)

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

I-23-9  
fbar er tho in thia uuorlolt in

III-23-28  
farames áuur thara zi in hina in iro lànt in 254

IV-9-9  
fåret in thia burg in (P þur in)

I-22-33  
er giang sar in mit then brédigarin

IV-23-30  
giang mit kriste er tho fon in in thaz spráhhus
in (P in)

IV-34-6  
sie giangun ir then grébiron zen liutin in dia

IV-35-5  
giang er báldo tho fon in zi themo hérizohen in 256

(V-5-7)  
ni giang er thiul halt noh tharin

(V-6-25)  
ioh giang er sár io tharin

II-14-86  
fíta in thia þur in zen liutin

(V-7-12)  
lugat áuur tho tharin

III-24-41  
ni quàm noh tho drúhtin in thaz kástel in (P in)

IV-21-29  
zi thiu quàm ih hera in uuorlolt in 257

Unseparated

I-4-19  
ingiang er tho akioro

II-11-5  
er tho sár thara ingiang

V-12-26  
er ingiang ûngimerrit dáron so bisperrit (P ingiang)

(I-17-59)  
ioh sar tharin quàmun

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

IV-15-5  
uuard uuólta then thara ingeit

254 Not in Kelle III.
255 Not in Kelle III.
256 Not in Kelle III.
257 Not in Kelle III. If in is a compounding form, this sentence is another indication of the unity of hera in uuorlolt.
Non-Finite, Separated

(III-12-39) thie tharin ni sculun gán
(IV-16-10) thaz er ósto tharain giuuo on uuas gángan mit in
(III-10-23) ih ni bin, quad er tho zi in, gesétit hera in uuórolt in

Unseparated

II-23-21 thie lázit man thar ingan
V-6-28 tho er inan sah thara ingan
V-6-52 thara in zi, gánganne

ingegin

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

IV-4-56 thaz sélba ingégin ouh inquád thiá áftera
hériscart

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

I-3-49 ther ímo ingégin gárota

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

(III-2-3) ioh fúar ingégin ímo sar (P ímo)
(IV-16-17) ingégin ímo fuar in uuár ñññírsqálogan héri thar
(P erased an accent on ingégin)

II-3-24 sie giangun kuso ingégin úz thár zi thémo
gótes hus (P ingégin)

II-15-4 ther liut ingégin aller giang
IV-20-3 giang er séibo ingégin úz thár zi themo
pálinzhus (P giang)
(IV-16-35) krist giang fórna sos iz zám íoh ingégin in quam

Unseparated

III-9-2 ingégin fuarun fółkon zen séltsanen uuérkon

258 Not in Kelle III.
IV-24-13 ingēgin riaf tho lúto hériscæf thero líuto
IV-24-4 ingēgin skrei ginóto al ménigi thero líuto

Subordinate Clause, Separated

(V-16-6) thaz uuðla sie iz firmāmin, ingēgin imo quamin)

Non-Finite, Unseparated

(V-16-43) ni mag diufal thara ingēgin sin)

ingēgin

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

IV-5-41 thiú mihila ménigi, thiú uuát thar breitta

II-15-9 thie brántun imo ingēginí siechero manno ménigi

IV-5-53 slihtit uns ingēginí then uuēg thiú selba ménigi

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-6-8 fuar imo thar ingēginí mihil uuðroltménigi

IV-3-18 in mör gan tho ther liut al... fuar thara ál

ingēginí (P al ingēginí). Fuar thara ál in-

geginí thes làntliutes ménigi

V-20-19 thara férît al ingēginí èngilo ménigi

IV-4-17 tho fleiz thara ingēginí thiú mihila ménigi

(P tho fleiz)

III-24-6 ioh ilta krîste ingēginí (P ilta krîste)

III-13-52 móyeses giuvaro, helias ouh ther máro... quámun

thara ingēginí (P thara)

III-25-4 quâm mihil uuðroltménigi then hêreston ingēginí

(P ingēginí)

IV-3-2 quâm tho thara ingēginí mihil uuðroltménigi

IV-22-15 riaf imo ál ingēginí thes làntliutes ménigi

(P riaf)

(III-20-63 thanne ouh fon ther ménigi spráchun thara ingēginí)

Not in Kelle III.
(IV-18-9) tho spráh er... sliumo thara ingégni
III-24-67 uuás tho thar ingégni hárto mihil ménigi
IV-26-3 uuás tho thar ingégni thes lžtes mihil ménigi

Intransitive Verb, Subordinate Clause, Separated
II-3-14 uuio ēngilo ménigi frar thar al ingégni
II-14-15 thiu thár uuás tho ingégni

Non-Finite, Separated
II-15-13 so er thó gisah thia ménigi al quéman imo ingégni
mit

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
II-9-43 thaz kind, thaz drug thaz uuítu mit
(III-6-29 ther drégit hiar in sinan nót fīn gǐrstīnu brot
ouh zuene fíśga tharmīți)²⁶⁰
(IV-14-6 neme thie dāśgūn tharmīți (P nēme))
mit

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
(IV-9-3 tho sant er pētrusān sar, iohānnem ouh tharmīti
(P tharmītī))

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
I-22-16 thiu kind thiu fólgetun... liafun miti stillo

Unseparated
I-8-7 ēr sia ērlīchō zōh, in aegykūm mitīfīlōh
nāh

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated
V-5-10 ich giang themo ginōz nāh
V-6-27 thō giang nāh ther ānther
V-5-8 liaf er nāh in drati

²⁶⁰For comparison only; v.s. p. 116.
nidar

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

II-4-55   oba thu sis... gôtes sun, laz thih nîdar herasun
V-1-31    leg iz nîdar haldaz\textsuperscript{261}
IV-5-43   sie uurfun nîdar ana uuânk iro sêlono gifânk

Unseparated

III-17-41 er sîh sar nîdar nêigta (P nîdar nêigta)

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

II-5-21   bat thésan... er sîh ouh fon ther hôhi thes huses nîdar liazi (P liazi)

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

IV-30-17  stig nu nîdar herasun
IV-30-28  so stig nîdar hera in uuár (V erased accents on stig and hera)

Unseparated

IV-16-42  ... ioh alle nîdarfialum
II-24-7   ... fon themo bërge er nîdar giang (P nidargiang)
III-17-35 sêlbo druhtin nîdar sah, tho...

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

II-4-86   in thiu thu nîtharfalles
II-4-79   thaz ih mih hîar irrêke inti hina nîdarscrikke
III-17-44 unz er so nîdâr stareta (V erased an accent on stareta)

Non-Finite, Unseparated

II-7-72   himil sêhet ir indân, thie ëngila ouh hera nidargan

\textsuperscript{261}Kelle's reading. Piper and Erdmann give it as nidarnaldaz.
nu uuill ih thes geflízan, then segal nítharlazan
ih... mag hiar nídarstigan
ni mag... hera nídarstigan

nidare

Transitive Verb, Subordinate Clause, Separated

(III-17-43) unz er thar nidare tho scréib)

nidirí

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

II-11-18 ioch állaz thaz gisidili so dêt er fulu nidiri

Subordinate Clause, Separated

(II-14-83) thaz sìh liaz thiu sin diuri mit òtmuati so nidiri)

thana

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-26-3 nu duemes uuír thaz zuíual thana sár ubar ál
I-8-6 nam thes kuáres thana uuán (P thaná uuan)
III-24-37 sie namun thaná thuruh nót then selbon stéin, so
er gíbót
IV-24-31 nim thaná gáralicho thíh! sin bláat si ubar
tínsih (V erased an accent on thana)
IV-17-6 thoh slúag er imo in uuára thana thaz zésua ora
er uualzta thaná sar then stéin

Unseparated

II-15-11 thio súnta ouh thaná fluhta (P thanáfíulta)
III-4-30 ... er thaz bëtți sar irhúab, ioch sar iz thána
fuarta
III-9-11 so uuër so nan birharta, er fruma thaná fuarta
III-14-10 si gànz sìh thaná fuarta, so slíumo siu nan
róarta (P thana fuarta)

V-16-38 ... thie suhti thaná fuaret, so slíumo so ir se róaret
I-20-11  theie brusti sie in burtun, thaz fahs thana rouftun
V-25-42  thaz árga hiar ouh midit, ioh iz thána snidit
tIII-20-27  ioh thaz horo thána thuag (P thana thuag)
III-14-78  er blider thána uuanta, so uuér so zi imo nánda
          (P thana uuánta)

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

IV-35-25  oba sie nan thána fuartin
III-20-26  hiaz... mit uuásGU, so iz gízámi, thaz horo
           thána nami
III-20-60  so slúumo, so ih iz thána nam
IV-35-18  unz ér nan tho thána nam
IV-18-21  ... themo er thaz óra thana slúag (P thana sluag)
V-25-37  nub er iz thána snide ioh er iz thána scerre
V-25-49  uuant er... iz garo thána sneed
III-20-49  so ih thaz hóro thana thúag (P thánathuag)
I-27-65  tház ér... thiu spriu thána uuerre

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

II-4-99   fuar ther diufal thana sár (P thána sar)
V-7-6     thie drúta giangun thana sár

Unseparated

III-4-32  er sar zi thiu tho gifiang, mit themo bëtte thana giang

Non-Finite, Unseparated

V-20-113  biginnent sie thána keren

262 Possibly a subordinate clause, but see Erdmann on line 43 of this same section.
**thara**

**Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated**

II-18-23  
ni biut iz fárdir thara mér (P biut)

III-17-7  
sie thára tho in fárun, so sie ābiluwillig uuárun, eina hűarrun brahtun

IV-31-4  
ioh důa thar thina gáati

IV-33-40  
thaz deta dřáhtin thar do křist

V-23-164  
gilaz thir thára thinaz múat

III-20-59  
er kléipta mir ein bóro thar

V-23-4  
er thára ouh thie sine leitta (P thara)

**Unseparated**

I-14-20  
... thaz kind ouh thára brahtun

I-15-11  
múater thiu gáata thaz kind ouh thára fuarta

I-19-7  
thiia muater thára fuari (P tharafuari)

H-160  
thara gišite mih

II-8-8  
... ūuh man thara ládota thie iľŋoron

II-8-43  
then uuirt er thara ládota

IV-16-12  
... ioh sie thára leitta

H-10  
ioh mih io thára uuisi, thoh in es uuírdig ni si

**Subordinate Clause, Separated**

IV-2-3  
so er thára iz tho bíbráhta

V-4-61  
ni er sih fůage thara zí in

V-23-169  
thaz sie thára al thaz iár ládot mihil iámar

II-7-31  
thaz ih thih thes gibéitti, thara zí imo leitti

(P léitti)

---

263 This is the only form for which I have not attempted to give all the cases. In general I have given the forms listed by Kelle and Piper and others as compounds. Within this group there is more than sufficient evidence for purposes of analysis.

264 Listed in Kelle III !

265 Not in Kelle III - probably an oversight.
III-1-35  ob iaman rámet es thar
III-16-21  ther auur thára iz uuëntit (P thára iz uuëntit)
III-26-63  thaz... unsih thára io alle bi námen druhtin
            zélle (P thara)

Unseparated

III-11-10  thaz siu sia thára brahti
II-12-32   thaz er sih thára fuage (P thara fuage)
I-13-11    ther siu thára fuarta (P thara fuarta)
V-20-70    richi, thaz er gárota er ánageni uuórdoti, er
            iuih thara hóloti
III-20-60  nóh ir thes ni fáret, ir iuih thára keret
II-6-30    tház er es firléipti, iz auur thára kleipti in
            then boum
IV-6-20    uuánta sie in iz ságetun, zi góumon thara ládotun
V-5-12     thie nan thára legitun
II-9-35    thaz er nan thára léitti (P leitti)\(^{266}\)
V-22-12    thie sih io thára liezent
V-23-8     uuiio... sih hiar io thára liezent
IV-1-7     uuiio ér sih thara nháta (P thára nähta)
III-26-64  thaz... élle io bi mánne, er unsih thára nenne
III-21-24  thara inan krist tho uuánta ioh silbo thara sánta
V-1-25     thaz sih es thára uuentit

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-15-36  fuar thára mit then sïën zen stétin...
III-23-28  faranes àuaur thara zi in, hina in iro lánt in
IV-4-17    thó fleiz thara ingéini thiu mihiela mëni
            (P tho fleiz)
III-4-25    ih flu thara in dráti
II-4-13    so quam ein uuúb thara thó (P quam)

\(^{266}\) v. Piper ad loc. Erdmann has a misprint here.
blinte icht owh důube... owh thara zi imo quamun
quam tho drůhtin unser thara riazenten (P quam)
er quàm thar tho gimbato
quêmant thara owh thánne thia uuénégun állle
(P thara)
er sprah tho uuórton lúten thára zi themo dóten
(P spráh)

Subordinate Clause, Separated

thaz ih... icht fare in lúfte thara zi thír
thaz er fuari thára (P erased an accent on fuari)
thon gêner thara ni géroti sin selbes gëginuverti
ther thara in thiu gëliafi, thaz thara zi imo
riai (P thára in thiu gëliafi)

die thara zi imo quamun
thaz ih quàme thara zi thír
thaz sie quàmen thara zi in
thie thara mit imo quamun

uúio er selbo quàmi (thaz ist séltsani) bisparten
dórón thara zi in

thie thara zi imo quamun
thaz er... in thes tóthes sahi thara zi íru sahi

Unseparated

thaz sie thara fuarin (P thára fuarin)
thaz thá thara giangis mit mîr (P tharagiangis)
thaz er thára giangi
unz drúhtin selbo thára giang (P thara giang)
ní thaz er thara giílti
so sie tho thára quamun
so sie tho thára quamun

I-8-19
unz er thára thahta, ther ëngil imo náhta
Non-Finite, Separated

IV-33-4 ni uuolta si in then riuon thara zi in biscouon
III-3-10 er thara thoh faran uuolta (P thára)\textsuperscript{267}
V-23-48 beginnent thára io flízan (P begunnet thara)
V-23-49 beginnent thara io húggen
IV-7-39 so sénent se mit githuinge quéman thara zi thinge then... sun (P queman).

Unseparated

IV-3-20 thaz ēr thara quéman scoltta (P queman)
IV-35-7 thaz múasi er thara uuisen
IV-6-19 thie thara giládot uuarun
IV-3-1 thaz drúhtin krist thara quéman uuas
III-9-1 thaz drúhtin thara quéman uuas

\textbf{Úf}

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-18-59 er huab in ûf tho thaz múat... zi... (P huab)
III-24-89 huab thiů buγun uf zi hímile
IV-27-9 yrhúaben sie ûf in alauuár then kuning
(IV-4-15 legitun tharúf (P legitun))

Unseparated

IV-27-18 in thaz crúciman nan nágalta... ich thar nan úfirrihtun

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-4-31 yrstuant er ûf tho snello (P er sthant, accent erased)
IV-35-43 tho ŋiang uns ûf uuunna, thiu ŋuuinigu súnnna (P uf)
IV-15-61 ûf zi hímile er tho sáh (P uf)

\textsuperscript{267}v. Piper ad loc. Erdmann has a misprint here.
III-4-27  stant ûf, quad er
V-1-19  thaz zëigot uf in himila

Unseparated

IV-19-43  ûf yrserikta hárto ther furisto êuwarto
III-24-39  ûfirstuant si snêllo

Subordinate Clause, Separated

II-11-54  tho er ûf fon themo grâbe irstuant
III-13-58  unz thiu sin guati uf fon tôde irstuanti (P irstuanti)

Unseparated

III-24-43  thaz si so gahun ûfirstuant
III-24-24  thanne ëllu uuorolt ûfsteit
V-19-26  thaz uuorolt ûfrantæ

Non-Finite, Separated

V-4-47  er ist fon hêllu iruuântan ioch ûf fon dôde
irstuanton (P started an accent on irstuanton)

Unseparated

IV-3-14  thaz er ñan móhta ana uuân heizan ûfur ûfstan
(D ûf stân)

umbi

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-4-7  thên bifiangun ûmbi pôrzichä finfi
IV-29-12  mit thiu thékent sie nan ûmbi

Unseparated

IV-11-13  nân er einan sâban thar, umbigûrta sin in uuár
II-21-10  ûmbi kérît sin thaz múat, sélb so mo ther hâls
duat (P ûmbikerit)
II-11-51  er âl iz umbithânta
Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

I-22-19  so siu tho hēim quamun, sih ûmbibisähun
          (P ûmbibisähun)
I-1-104  thaz sie nan umbiriten (P umbiriten)
III-7-14 thaz sih io ûmbizerbît ioh ëmmizigen uuërbi
          (P umbizerbît)

Intransitive Verb, Subordinate Clause, Separated

II-1-17  er ther himil umbi sus ëmmizigen uuërbi (P uuurbi)
          Unseparated

IV-11-7  so uuit, so himil umbiuuârb
Non-Finite, Unseparated

II-14-105 ... mit then ëugon biginnet ûmbiscouuon
(P biginnet umbiscouuon)

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

IV-4-65  ... dreip se âl thanan ûz (P uz)
IV-7-58  ... dribi then thlob thanana ûz
III-17-46 sih thanana ûz tho fiartun
II-4-51  thänana er nan fiarta in eine bûrg gûata, fon then
          stêtin thanana ûz zi themo drûhtines hûs (P
          thanana)\textsuperscript{268}
III-16-28 liazun ûz in uuaron thes selben mûstes uuêuuon
          (P liazun uz)
IV-29-55  si liuzit iz al thanana uz zi... (P thananâ ûz;
          V erased an accent or ûz)
II-11-11  ioh uuarf se âlle thanana ûz
II-11-19  er uuurf iz âllaz thanana ûz
III-20-165 sie inan slîumo tho in uuâr uuârfun fon in ûz sar

\textsuperscript{268}Not in Kelle III.
IV-6-10  uurfun ûz, so er erist quám, then éinigon sinan  
(P uurfun ûz)

Unseparated

III-17-42  ioch iagilich sar ûzameiz
II-11-10  só thiui... kräft eine géislun thar gífláht,  
uzstiau er se iagilicho ioh filu kráfticho  
(P ûzatiaz)

Subordinate Clause, Separated

II-6-27  thaz er nan ûz thoh ni spe (P spé)
III-10-34  nist... fruma tház, thaz man zükke thaz maz then  
kíndon ir then hánton inti uuérfze ûz then  
hánton (P uuérfze)

Intransitive Verb, main Clause, Separated

I-14-19  siu fuarun fon theru bûrg ûz zi themo drúntines hûs  
II-11-4  so fuar er fon theru bûrg uz zi themo drúntines hus  
I-4-75  giang er uz tho spáto
II-3-24  sie giangun kûsgo ingégin ûz thár zi... (P ingégin)  
III-18-73  ... ioch giang ouh ûz tho sâre ûzar iro hánton, fon  
sinen fiánton
IV-6-3  giang io in mörgan thanan ûz thára zi...
IV-20-3  giang er sélbo ingégin ûz thár zi...  
IV-34-3  ... ioch giangun ûz thie dótun  
(V-20-25  thie sélbe irstantent álle fon thes lîchamen fällle,  
fon themo fûlen légere, iro uuérk zi irgebanne, ûz  
fon theru ásgu, fon...)  

Unseparated

I-20-9  thie múater thie rúzun, ioh zahari ûzfluzun  
IV-12-42  ûz giang sar tho líndo ther diufeles gisindo

269 This and IV-20-3 below are listed in Kelle III as  
ingégin compounds.
270 Not in Kelle III.
Subordinate Clause, Separated

I-23-5 thaz er fuari thanan frám úz untar uuðroltman (P uz)
I-28-17 thaz uuir ni faðen furdir úz
III-14-53 uuio fuarun thiul diufilir úz thar zi þétruses
hus (P fuarun)
III-12-34 thaz sie nirgângen thanan úz
V-9-1 tho thaz șuuiniga guat úz fon themo grábe irstuant
II-11-44 thaz uuir ni kértin thanana úz

Unseparated

IV-12-51 so slûumo sos er úżgiang... (P uzgiang)
IV-13-1 so iûdas thanan úżgiang
IV-20-9 so er úżgiang ingegin in

Non-Finite, Separated

V-21-8 ist férrro irdriban fon hîmile úz, ther...

widar

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

II-7-16 er kérta sih sar uuðidar zin

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

V-9-2 tho... thaz lib... fon bêche hera uuðidaruuarb

widari

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

IV-21-1 giang pilatus uuðidari mit ìmo tho in then
sòlari (P giang)

(III-8-10 mihil úngiuuitiri uuâs in harto uuðidari)
Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

III-7-54 in būah sie iz duent zisámane
IV-22-20 sie flúhtun in zi gámane thórna thar zisámane
III-7-8 mit minnon io ginfúagen zisámane unsih fůagen

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

III-26-48 starb afur thérer noti, er unsih sámanoti, ioh sines tóthes guati zisámane gifúagti
IV-29-42 ... sih ūntar in ruartin, zisámane gifúagtin

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

II-15-6 ... thie fůarun al zisámane
III-16-24 móyses gab iu uuízzod, thes ni uuírket ir drof, suntar get zisámane inti...
III-9-3 sie quamun ál zisamane (P zisámane)

Subordinate Clause, Separated

II-9-73 uuio iz químit al zisámane

Unseparated

II-8-5 thiu zisámane gihi tin

Non-Finite, Separated

V-5-13 zisámane al biuůántan
V-6-57 biuůántan thar zisámane

Unseparated

V-6-61 zisámane biuůántan
I-1-8 zisámane giůntan
H-137 simes... zisámane gifúagte

271 Elimination of most of these forms has been indicated above, but they are given here for a full picture.
zua

Transitive Verb, Main Clause, Unseparated

(III-14-71  thara ouh zua gifuagi blintero ginfagi)

Intransitive Verb, Main Clause, Separated

(V-20-20  quemment tharazua)
II-4-54  thar riaf er imo filu frua thrato rúmana zia
      (P riaf... zua)
I-19-3  ther engil spráh imo zia (P zua)

Unseparated

(IV-33-28  mit spéru er tharzua giiIta)
I-4-26  ther engil imo züasprah

Subordinate Clause, Unseparated

II-13-13  thes ér mo zuagisprichit
III-6-37  thar sie alle zásahun

Non-Finite, Separated

(V-16-40  tharzua sin ouh gizálte)

Unseparated

(I-24-13  thara hárto ouh zía drahton (P zua dráhton))
Within this large and, I think, obviously complex body of forms most scholars have drawn their distinctions with a very wide brush – if at all. To give a notion of the necessity of careful and detailed analysis I should like to note how one authority proceeded with the listing of compounds. Kelle, whose edition is easily the most useful for extensive work in Otfrid and whose opinions have been of great influence, gives as compounds the following proportions of possible verb combinations: all for after, bifora, furi, miti, nāh, nidar thana, umbi, zicamane, zua; all but one for fram, in, ingēgin, (nidiri), thara (this one an oversight, I assume), ūf, ūz, (uudar), (uudari); all but two for ana, hera, hina, ingēgin. He does not list forasagēn as a compound, nor mitdragon. And strangely enough he lists no compound whatever for heim.

J. Comparative Analysis – Inseparables and Adverbs

1. Introductory Note

In the analysis of this large number of possible compounding forms, it will be our purpose to discover any definite natural lines of syntactical demarcation, whether they be in matters of stress or of order. The procedure must be essentially the same as it was for Gothic, though the body of evidence is much larger and much more complicated. In Gothic an examination of word order patterns revealed one group of forms which behaved in an entirely different fashion from other forms used with verbs,

---

272 That is, excluding any occasional exceptions made for a particular instance of a given verb. He may, for example, deny compounding for one case of in-ēgn. This is ignored above.
This group consisted of inn and ut with already compounded verbs, and its behavior led us to call inn and ut separable compounding forms. Thus we ended up with the following Gothic groups:

1. Inseparable preverbs (bound forms plus all single compounds and almost all double compounds, except inn and ut).
2. Separable compounding forms (inn and ut).
3. Free adverbs.

Special cases like isolated prepositions, other separated preverbs (du, etc.) were sporadic and had not yet developed into definite patterns.

We must expect — or hope for— some such division in OgG. Up to now scholars have contented themselves with surprisingly hazy notions of OgG verb compounds, usually based on NHG with a few adaptations. Terms like 'composition' and 'semi-composition' have been used arbitrarily or in lieu of systematic classification. The only work I know of that approaches the problem at all is Leinen's, and his commences with the theoretical, is based on a limited number of forms, and does not attempt to carry the matter to a conclusion. Examining a whole, large document for all possible cases is the only "first step" to an understanding of the entire picture of compounding in the verb system. The ideal procedure would be to cover all of OgG, but this is patently impossible and has at least one minor though definite disadvantage, to wit, the intrusion of dialect and period differences. Ultimately the whole body of OgG sources
ought to be covered, but Otfrid — annotated and supplemented by the other major works — should be sufficient to give us the patterns we are looking for, if they exist. 273

The critical question is, to adapt a former statement: Does any group of these forms behave in some fashion systematically different from the others, in such a way that we can designate this group as separable compounding forms, the others as inseparables or adverbs? 274

Criteria for such judgement come from two sources. First are those from without the body of forms listed above, e.g., characteristics of inseparable compounding, characteristics of free adverbs (harto, guatlichu, etc.). Second are those within the above body of forms, particularly those indicated by the Gothic, e.g., order in the subordinate clause, order in the infinitive.

2. Comparison with Inseparables

The syntactical characterization of the inseparable forms, like their identification, is easy.

The preverb, as indicated above, is always before the verb. The stress pattern is equally simple. The bound forms are unstressed. The others had just enough stress so

---

273 In the general categories discussed below the forms parenthesized in the main list will be omitted from immediate consideration. (Any special or confirmatory evidence will be noted.) These forms, after all, have been eliminated or seriously questioned, and including them might give a distorted picture.

274 Any previously adduced evidence for compounding has been only a demonstration of a feeling that preverb and verb "belong together" or of the retention of an old pattern. Such factors were ni+verb, etc.
that if the meter required they could bear the accent. But there was no difference in stress in main or subordinate clause, no difference according to morphological form.

Actually only one of the inseparable patterns is significant for further investigation. This is the verb in normal (second) position, or later in the main clause. Initial position is treated separately, as befits its special nature. Exclusion of the subordinate clause rests partly on the Gothic evidence and partly on an anticipation of later results in the examination of Otfrid's clause structure.

The problem is to find the distribution of forms from the main list above in patterns parallel in word order to II-6-46 got giñádoti sin, V-12-10 uuir giïbuben thaz, or (with later verb) II-4-89 then sálidon sie intfâllent. Obviously this is no more than an external correspondency of order we are looking for. Syntactical identity can enter the picture only with possible inseparables like umbi. With adverbs this order is only Subject–Adverb–Verb (a type almost gone in NHG, to be sure) or Subject–Object–Adverb–Verb, etc. With possible compounding forms it would actually be most surprising, in view of the virtual absence of Gothic inn and ut in such order.

The evidence is quite negative, at least in showing any distinction among the forms. The unseparated preposed type of order appears with ana, fram, furi, heim, hera, hina, in, miti, nidar, thana, thara, ûf, umbi, ûz, zua! Otfrid thus serves
as a good example of the phenomenon noticed by Grimm \(^{275}\) — that in O\(\text{HG}\) these particles precede the verb much more frequently than they do in W\(\text{HG}\). This same fact caused Grimm, who had his doubts even about N\(\text{HG}\), to lean toward a theory of compounding for O\(\text{HG}\).

A more critical test appears when we take into consideration only those sentences running Subject-Verb-Object (Predicate), etc., like got ginádoti sin, excluding the type: then sálidon sie intfällent. Otfred has only:

\[
\begin{align*}
er \text{ ingiang } & \text{ ûngimerrit } \text{ dûron } \text{ so bisperrit (P } \text{ ingiang)}^{276} \\
(\text{sélbo druhtin } & \text{nidar sah, tho...})^{277} \\
(\text{ioh alle } & \text{nidarfiálan}) \\
(\text{er } & \text{ blíder thána uuanta}) \\
\text{thia muater } & \text{ thára fuari}^{278} \\
\ldots & \text{buh man thara ládota thie } \text{ iúngoron} \\
(\text{ioh } & \text{ zahari } \text{ úzfluzun}) \\[4pt]
\end{align*}
\]

This indicates that the great majority of the very numerous preverb positions in the main clause are with verbs late in the clause, e.g. IV-2-10 (martha) si sôno iz al bitháhta, thaz muas fáríbrahta, or muater thiu ġuata thaz kind ouh thara fuarta.\(^{279}\) Similar reservations concern

\(^{275}\)II, p. 872.
\(^{276}\)Verse numbers and stress (unless specially germane) will not be given iron now on if the form is taken directly from the main list.
\(^{277}\)This case and the one with thana do not really belong here; v.i. p. 202.
\(^{278}\)Object-Verb is the equivalent of Subject-Verb, still second position.
\(^{279}\)A fact which most writers ignore; v.i. p. 196.ff.
the frequent sentences with inti and ioh, which have something in common with subordinate clauses (e.g.). Such inti and ioh clauses are therefore not proper examples of this position.

For two of the particles in the examples above adverbial nature has been well substantiated. This position, therefore, is by no means surprising for thara and ãz, because neither free adverbs or adverbial phrases show any distaste whatever for this place between subject and verb. Witness I-5-33 thii thiarna filu sçono sprah, I-8 er állo stunta fréume şih, I-l-9 sie ouh in thii gisagetin. The remarkable fact actually is that the adverbs among the particles of the main list avoid this position much more than would be expected from the behavior of the ordinary adverbs. This type of order is consequently less distinctive than might be expected in showing any difference between compounding forms and adverbs. 280

Other OAg documents indicate simply that this type of order is rare. They do not give any indication that only a certain group of forms participates in such a sentence. Grimm cites Tatian 228-4 inti her abfuor fon iro ougon et ipse evanuit ex..., and Tatian 72-1 andera ratissa furisazta her in. 281 The rest of Grimm's cases actually are not this

280 For further discussion, on a broader syntactical plane, see the section on the main clause, below.
strict position but **inti** clauses (with subject in preceding clause), or **inti** + verb, or sentences like Otfried's er tho sar thara inslang, with a late verb, etc.

The Tatian also has 44-8 thanne ir inganget thaz hus, the imperative in 55-4 nidarstig (also 114-1) and 53-7 uzgang (also 92-6) and 95-5 uzlosi iz.

Diels considers such sentences in the Tatian and the Glosses to be influenced by the Latin. He gives glosses like con-
plodo ich cesameslahum, abigo in hintribe, congero in sampringe.
For the glosses certainly this assumption of Latin influence is correct. The Glosses have only preverbs. Their very unanimity excludes them from further consideration.

Such instances as the use after **ni**, on the other hand, prove that this pattern is possible. Diels cites the **ni** uz-
tribit from the Lionsee Fragments (v.s.p. 64) and gives further examples from "free prose," e.g. diu erda diu fure bringet ire uuocher; der uuise fure bringet sine reda. The other forms he cites are of dubious relevance, e.g. samo uber trifft bonitas patris omnem bonitatem, from williram. (Why shouldn't uber be before the verb?)

Behagel cites several of the above forms as well as later (MHG) ones like ich anabete Kristum Jesum and sie abtragen, stelen. He also indicates the persistence of this pattern

\[282^\text{v. Diels, p. 114.} \]
\[283^\text{v. Diels, p. 144 for references and other instances.}\]
into NHG by the sentence from His, Die anatomische Nomenkla-
tur: dieselbe auferlegt uns aber auch eine besondere Ver-
pflichtung.\textsuperscript{284} Consider also NHG ich anerkennen, etc.

There are two ways to explain these forms, which are cer-
tainly not regular for compounding forms, anyway, in OHG -
not even in the translation literature. One is to say that
they represent a reflex of the old word order of simple (in-
separable) compounds. This theory is supported by the fact
that mostly prepositional forms appear here (with a few ex-
ceptions like Otfrid's thara and perhaps nidar.

The other explanation is rather secondary, I think, but it
does explain the new forms. The subordinate clauses, the
late main clause positions (and the inti clauses) have so
many such preposed forms\textsuperscript{285} that these may have influenced
the retention or introduction of preposed forms into even
the strictest main clause position.

3. Comparison with Adverbs

The syntactical characteristics of free adverbs are very
important and must be understood fully. For they represent the
other pole (opposite from the inseparables), and if certain
forms in the lists above do not contrast distinctly with true
adverbs, then all the "possible compounding forms" we have

\textsuperscript{284} Y. Beha\textsuperscript{el} Syntax II, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{285} For a notion of the proportions, Y. Leinen, p. 49ff.
been talking about are only adverbs in a slightly specialized function. As I shall try to point out below, there are significant contrasts, and that is why I disagree completely with Schlachter, who says: "Rein theoretisch betrachtet konnten diese Adverbia (prepositional adverbs) dieselben Stellen im Satz einnehmen wie die bisher behandelten." 286

What then are the characteristics of the free adverb in Otfried? From a careful study of Ohly 287 and Sobel 288 it is possible to get a very detailed idea of the word order (and stress) patterns of Otfried's adverbs.

The very significant result of the application of these patterns to the cases in the main list is that some of the patterns occur in most or all of the possible compounding forms listed there, while others are definitely restricted to certain forms or groups of forms. Here, then, is the first large-scale indication of separation of the body of possible compounding forms into:

1. Forms which act just like and probably are adverbs
2. Forms whose behavior is not typically adverbial

Group 2 is our first convincing indication of a real pattern of separable compounding in Otfried, the theory being that if a common adverbial pattern is represented to an

286 v. Schlachter, p. 182. He excludes for the "prepositional adverbs" only initial position and position after initial verb, "was sich aus der Einteilung des Materials unmittelbar ergibt" — that is, even these differences are not basic. But both these positions appear in OmG with the forms Schlachter means by prepositional adverbs, and the latter is frequent.

287 Passim.

288 Principally pp. 96-122. Diels and Schlachter are also useful here.
abnormally small extent in the above list, the difference is caused by the presence of some other category (compounding forms) and the existing instances of the pattern show the true adverbs. After all, if all the above forms are adverbs they should share proportionately the characteristics of other adverbs with only the variation of chance. The reliability of the procedure will be apparent if a consistent group of forms shows up in the various exceptional categories.

The evidence can speak for itself and does so rather eloquently. The first column gives the pattern, the second has one or two examples from the free adverbs, the third gives examples from the list above, but only if the pattern is generally represented among all the forms of the main list.

**Absolute Position**

Sentence Initial\(^{289}\)

| V-23-91 hiar ist io | Only with bifora, hera, hina, in, uueuo |
| II-15-20 tharinne lag ingegin, úf, umbi, II-18-5 giuuisso, ih \(\text{ñz}^{290}\) sagen \(\text{iu}\) |

**Relative Positions**

Double Adverbs\(^{291}\)

| I-15-24 filu förahntlichio |
| er uualzta thana sar then stein |
| er kerta sih sar uuidar zin thia hant duat si |
| furi sar ioh thar furifuarun |

\(^{289}\) Only lists well over 500 of these instances where the adverb is followed by the verb! And this does not include sentences with ni. See Ohly, pp. 21-2. See also Diels, p. 20 and pp. 22-6 and 39-42, etc.

\(^{290}\) \(\text{ñz}\)

\(^{291}\) Numerous.
thar baldo anasezzen
uuizzi theh imo ana sar
liafun miti stillo
so man hiar fora sagen scal
er sinh sar nidar neigta
so stig nidar hera; etc.
er blider thana uuanta
thaz liight thir heim
ghirolota
ingiang er tho skioro; etc.

Only with hera, hina,
ingegin, thara, ñf, umbi,
ôz, zisamane²⁹⁴.

²⁹²Numerous.
²⁹³Numerous.
²⁹⁴V. i. Cases of separation by ni or gi of course do not count here.
²⁹⁵Fairly numerous.
²⁹⁶This is the category which, unless I am totally mis-interpreting him, Schlachter said (p. 133) doesn't exist, "da
After Verb but
Separated

I-1-27 yrfúrbent sie nu duemes uuir thaz zuıual
iz reino thana
druag thaz uuitu mit
I-4-84 giloubt er bliaes er sie ana
filu spáto liezun se allaz fram.
gileitit unsih heim
Ilta in thia burg in
laz thih nidar; etc.

Only with hera

Adverb-Verb—
Non-finite
Form

V-17-38 thaz báz sie
mohtin scbuon
I-4-21 thár gisah er
stántan
V-19-6 er uuérvin
még iingÁgan
II-3-53 nu ist
drúhtin krist
gidóufit
V-1-27 mit thiu ist
thar bizéinit
I-9-1 ér iu uuard
giuuahinit
V-5-18 er uuas fántan

dies (prepositional adverb) um als dem Verb gleichgeordneter
Bestandteil gelten zu können, etwaige noch vorhandene Satzglieder
zwischen sich und das Verb treten lassen müssete..."

Numerous.

Several — actually plenty in view of the very special
category involved. See Sobel, p. 109, who considers only the
infinitive, not the participle.

v. i.
Adverb-Non-finite Form-Verb

III-23-39 ther réhto gangan uuölle
V-12-25 ther iamer lében scolta

Verb-Adverb-Non-finite Form

I-22-25 bigan iz hárto anton

Non-finite Form-Verb-Adverb

V-20-1 gizéllen uuill ih sántar
IV-23-11 bissólta
ist er hárto

Verb-Non-finite Form-Adverb

IV-12-34 ni gidórsta sprechan lúto

Only with thara, fora

beginnent sie thana keren beginnet anascouwou
beginnit sie anafarton thar mahtu ana findan
mag hiar nidarstigan thaz muasi er thara uuisen
heizan afur ufstan
beginnet umbiscouwou uuollen heim uuison

None

Only with furi, fram, ingegini, ãz

300 Several.
301 The examples are given below. Actually the category is only rare, not distinctive.
302 Numerous.
303 A form like ni mag ther diufal thara ingegin sin also really belongs here in spite of rather wide separation of the
verb from the modal. (This would apply only if the sentence is not to be read ...tharaingegin...)
304 Quite numerous.
305 Several, actually quite sufficient to establish the
pattern.
306 V.1.
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Adverb-Verb-Adverb  
I-17-48 sliumo duet  
ouh thanne  
nu duemes uuir... thana  
bi iaron quimit er iu heim  
sero quimit uns iz heim  
hera nu bat so gerno  
ingiang er tho skioro  
ingegein fuarun folkon  
so stig nidar  
ufirstuant si snello  
umbigruta sih in uuar  
uzgiang sar tho lindo; etc.

Adverb-Adverb-Verb  
III-22-68 sie ther  
gisuaso uuarin  
II-4-107 noh uuergin  
ouh giffaren  
fon beche hera uuidaruuarb  
ioh ouh anabrechon  
baldo anasezzen  
hier fora sagen  
so siu tho heim quamun  
er sih sar nidar neigta  
iz garo thana sneid  
hier io thara liezent  
afur ufstan

Noun-Verb-Adverb  
I-19-9 ther kuning  
uuilit sliumo  
thie druta giangun thana  
thia hant duat si furi  
uuizzi theh imo ana  
thaz allaz brahta frem  
krist quimit heim  
er giang sar in  
than biiangun umbi; etc.

307 Quite numerous.
308 Numerous.
309 In all of these the possible compounding form is the one directly before the verb. For the contrary order, see "Before Verb but Separated" above.
310 Numerous. Pronouns and phrases with nouns are included.
thar sie alle zuasahun guati zisamane gifuagtzi
zahari uzfluzun iz umbithahta
uuorolt ufateit sih thara nahta
thaz horo thana thuag; etc.
duemes... thaz zuual thana
druag thaz uuitu mit
bias er sie ana
liezun se allaz fram
gileitit unsih heim
zilot iuuer hera
datun inan in
ilta krieste ingegini; etc.
ladot heim man armer thehein
ferit al ingegini engilo
menigi
giang nah ther anther
uurfun nidar... gifank
uualzta thana sar then stein
namun thana... stein
dua thar thina guati
then bifiangun umbi porzicha
finfi
uurfun uz... sinan
liazun uz... uueuuon

311 Numerous.
312 Numerous.
313 Numerous.
314 Such instances as uurfun nidar... gifank (transitive verb followed by compounding form or possible compounding form, followed in turn by the direct object) are an especial contradiction of Schlachter's denial of such word order (e.g. p. 163, note 296).
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Out of the total list of common patterns involving adverbs and their verbs there are, thus, a surprisingly large number of patterns which are not common to all or most of the possible

315 quite numerous. This group is only a specialization of "Before Verb but Separated" above.

316 Only with hera, hina, ingegin, uf, ûz, zisamane.

317 Quite numerous. A specialization of the group "Directly before the Verb" above.
compounding forms. These may be called the distinctively adverbial patterns. If the forms from the main list which do enter into these distinctively adverbial patterns are a consistent group, we have the first indication, on a syntactical level, that they are adverbs and not compounding forms. If, in turn, these same forms have previously shown adverbial uses we have further substantiation of their non-compounding nature. Finally, the remaining group — those forms which don't appear in the distinctively adverbial patterns — must behave thus for some definite reason, and the only reason that is applicable is their very close relation to the verb. Thus we have here, if the evidence is consistent, the first indication of special behavior of a special group, true compounding forms.

Examination of the distinctively adverbial patterns does indeed show consistency in their participating forms, though this consistency is not so total as to make further evidence unnecessary. These patterns are:

Sentence Initial
(bifora, here, hina, in, in-
gegin, ãf, um-
bi, ãz)\textsuperscript{318}

bifora laz\textsuperscript{i} h iz al
here horet, quad er, uuib
here lesen sie alle
hina, hina nim inan
(ioh hina fuarta inan tod)

\textsuperscript{318} Such position in Otfried is much more significant, of course, than the invariable preverb position of the Glosses (\textit{v.g.} p. 70). For further discussion, \textit{v.i.} Theoretically any unstressed preverb in this position might be inseparable. Since \textit{P} stresses bifora and ãz where \textit{V} doesn't, they are beyond the pale, however, and here koret as well as hina... quam cannot very well be special inseparable compounds. Only for umbi\textit{gurta} does this remain a possibility, for \textit{umbi} is so frequently unstressed (\textit{v.g.} p. 59) that inseparability in certain verbs is to be considered a likelihood.
ingiang er tho skioro
ingegin skrei ginoto al menigi...
ingegin riaf tho luto heriscaf...
ingegin fueun folkon
ufirstuaut si snello
uf yrorsikta harto ther furisto euuarto
umbigurta sih in uuar
umbi kerit sih thaz muat
uzgianç sar tho lindo ther diufeles gisindo
... uztiaz er se (after a so clause)

Before Verb but
Separated 319
(hera, hina,
ingegin, thara,
åf, umbi, åz,
zișamane)

319 By something other than a bound form of course.

320 As well as all the other double adverbs of this sort, viz. hera nidarstigan, hera nidargan, hera uuidaruuarb. Note that these involve no new adverb for the above list.

321 The prepositional cases of ingegin, like ingegin in quam (see main list), have their non-compounding nature confirmed by this same category.

322 A glance at this fine long sentence makes Kelle's and Piper's listing of tharabringan for this verse look a trifle optimistic.
tho er uf fon themo grabe irstuant
guati uf fon tode irstuantin{323}
uf fon dode irstantan{324}
er ther himil umbi sus emmizigen uuurbi
thaz er nan uz thoh ni spe
... guat uz fon themo grabe irstuant{324}
zisamane unsih fuagen

er hera uuard gisentit

so mán hier fora ságen skal{325}
thaz ér thara quèman scolta (P queman)
thaz drúhtin krist thara quèman uuas
thaz drúhtin thara quèman uuas
thie thara giádot uuarun

sie ni muasen gan so fram
sie hiazun thiu gan furi sar
so er thoGISAH thia menigi al queman
imo ingegini
ist ferro irdriban fon himile uz,
ther...{326}

---

323 All the òf cases are ones where the notion of adverb +
prepositional phrase was previously discussed (v.g. p. 101),
but the separation is valid and germane in any case.

324 See note 323.

325 As indicated above, and as shown by the stress, there
is a strong possibility of inseparable compounding here. This
does not apply to the following example. In spite of un-
stressed thara here we have, in view of the numerous separated
instances with the same verb, no cause to suppose inseparability.
Further, the case of er thara thoh fárán uuoalta (P thára) shows
the normal lax order of thara, even in this same construction.
Finally, a double inseparable (thara-ci-) is more than unlikely.

326 lag gisuntorot thar, biuuntan thar zisamane is actually
the equivalent of this word order, but the construction is not
so closely knit.
A specialization of the second category in this same list. Examples, with type of separating member:

thaz er her iz liaz (pronoun)
hina in elilent quam imbot (preposition plus noun)
ther liut ingegin aller gian (adjective or pronoun modifying preceding noun)
thaz... unsih thara io alle bi namen druhtin zelle (object pronoun, prepositional phrase, subject noun!)
uf zi himile er tho sah (prepositional phrase, pronoun)
uz fon themo grabe irstuant (prepositional phrase)
zisamane unsih fuagen (pronoun)

The following comments and reservations need to be made.

1. Sentence initial position is the least satisfactory of these categories to deal with. Obviously, if separable verbs come to some extent from original inseparables, initial position must have been one of their earlier possible word order patterns. Persistence of such proposed order we have seen in cases like ni uztribit. Yet Otfred has only two forms in this category which do not appear in other distinctively adverbial patterns, and those are in (ingiang er tho skioro) and bifora (bifora lazu ih iz al). The stress marks of both principal manuscripts for in and of P for bifora show that these are not inseparable. We can therefore say that, surprisingly enough, separable compounding forms have almost entirely abandoned this word order pattern, leaving it to the adverbs.327

327 This agrees with the statement by Diels (p. 26): "Ganz einstimmig bezeugt die freie Prosä, dass die trennbaren Präpositionaladverbien den Satz nicht einleiten können." Unfor-
This fact is especially obvious in the case of imperatives, where we find such adverbial elements as hina (nim inan) and hera (horet) before the verb, but no compounding forms.

The regularity of this development is further supported by the separable compounding forms of Gothic, inn and ut, which in spite of the common initial position of simple, inseparable inn and ut (e.g. Matthew 7, 13 innaggaip pairh aggwu daur) always avoid position before the verb initially. An exception such as Luke 14, 35 utuswairpand imma, like Otfrid's ingiang er, may be a remnant of older usage, but the pauciety of such cases only emphasizes the general rule.

That separable compounding forms can, in exceptional cases, start the sentence even in NHG is demonstrated by sentences like und herein drängte ... ein kleiner Kerl (from Sudermann's Katzensteg) or Auf steigt das Gebet, etc. Speaking of such examples, Leinen pointed out that this is not the equivalent of ordinary preposed order, say, in the subordinate clause. In these initial positions, pause is possible after the particle.

Unfortunately most of the meaning is drained from his statement when we see his list of these "prepositional adverbs": aba, suo, ãz, fram, fora, oifora, furi, in, widar, nidar, ubar, thuruh. ãz, fram and furi are pretty obviously adverbs; widar, ubar and thuruh are almost entirely inseparable; and cases of initial position do occur with several of these forms. 328 p. 7.
and forms which have lost their concrete meaning do not participate in this type of order. One cannot say: "An fängt das Schauspiel."

Other OHG cases of initial in may be influenced by their Latin originals, e.g. the instances like Tatian 186-3 inti inleittā Petrusan et introduxit Petrum.329

bifora is too rare to allow any definite conclusions.

2. The fact that Otfrid has no forms whatever in the category "Non-finite Form – Verb – Adverb" (biscoltan ist er harto) is presumably accidental. In view of the obvious tendency of separable compounding forms to stick to their infinitives and participles (see further discussion below), the absence of such cases is no surprise. But one might expect them with the adverbs, e.g. heim, hera, thara, etc.

3. Other factors indicating the absence of compounding may confirm the verdict of these word order patterns which are, by themselves, indicative but not conclusive. sie hiazun thiu gan furi sar, for example, is not only a typical free adverb pattern, but it is also quite opposed to the order of the compound infinitive, as both Gothic and OHG (v.i) show.

4. The absence, among the compounding forms, of cases like so man hiar fora sagen scal is surely accidental. After all, this position would be natural not only for adverbs but also for any compounding form, separable or inseparable, e.g. IV-15-43 leīrt... uuo thaz firdrāgan scoltun. Other OHG sources

in any case, vouch for this type of word order, though it is still surprisingly rare. Tatian 32-3 has fater... ther thie sunnun ufgangen tuot oriri facit and the participle in 143-1 thaz her fon theru samanungu uzforuuorfan ni vvurdi ut de synagoga noneicerentur.

The scarcity of this pattern is especially surprising since it is the one which becomes the normal order in the NHG subordinate clause (as in the Tatian examples in the preceding paragraph). In any case, it is of no help in making distinctions between adverbs and compounding forms and may be discarded.

5. The last category cannot exactly be counted separately, because it rather duplicates the second, as noted. But it certainly is a refinement or extreme case of such word order.

With the above reservations, the evidence is still very impressive. A table will help to visualize the consistency of the "membership" in these patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hera</td>
<td>hera</td>
<td>hera</td>
<td>hera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hina</td>
<td>hina</td>
<td></td>
<td>hina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>ingegin</td>
<td></td>
<td>ingegini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thara</td>
<td></td>
<td>ingegini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âf</td>
<td>âf</td>
<td></td>
<td>thara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbi</td>
<td>umbi</td>
<td></td>
<td>âf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âz</td>
<td>âz</td>
<td></td>
<td>âz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zisamane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zisamane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consistency and number of examples of hera, hina, ingegin(1), thara, âf, and âz is almost enough by itself to prove they are adverbs. And this same fact is very strong
argument for the same conclusion even with the least frequent cases, fram and furi.

The two appearances of zisamane are enough to finish this form, since its regular double stress in preposed position has already been cited against compounding.

umbi still provides something of a puzzle. No doubt some of the cases among the adverbial patterns show adverbial nature, but we must not make the mistake of assuming that all umbi's are ipso facto adverbs and not compounding forms. Evidence has already been quoted on the subject of umbi as an inseparable preverb (p. 55–9). Judgment must therefore be reserved on the above case of umbigurta as well as some of the other instances in the main list. The two other umbi forms immediately above may safely be considered adverbs.

In this connection it would not be amiss to remark that there is always the possibility of a single form being an inseparable with some verbs and separable with others. But the status of such forms in NHG, as well as the general word order and stress situation in Otfrid cautions against too wide an application of this principle. It would be very unwise to go beyond Lachmann's group of umbi, widar, ingegin, hintar, furi, and some of these are, I think, not properly classified. (hintar, of course, is never separated in Otfrid and is practically never separated in NHG; Lachmann's cases

330 v. Lachmann, pp. 369–73.
of ingegin are dubious). Further, it should be remembered that such dual function in Oâ€™G is not necessarily (a) inseparable or (b) separable, but may be (a) inseparable preverb, (b) adverb. Thus, for example, the adverbial nature of umbi is still quite intact, if only from the case of umbi sus emmizigen uuurbi, and the burden of proof would rest on finding sure instances where pre-verb umbi is inseparable.

Stress in the various patterns is not a good indicator of adverbs among the possible compounding forms in the main list, as an examination of the pertinent passages in Sobel will show. Both these adverbs and the compounding forms tend to be more strongly stressed than ordinary adverbs, and Otfried makes no further distinction among them. In general, Sobel's observation that in double adverb situations the "more important" adverb is stressed\textsuperscript{331} applies to these forms we are considering. They are the ones which we felt most strongly to belong with the verb, and all of them, adverb or compounding form, receive a relatively strong stress and are marked by Otfried.

One minor indication by stress of a distinction between compounding forms and adverbs appears with the infinitives and is discussed below.

4. Results

Review of the whole evidence gives us the following results.

1. Adverbial nature (and not separable compounding) is

\textsuperscript{331}Y. Sobel, pp. 111–2.
now certain for zisamane, virtually so for hera, hina, ingegin, ingegini, thara, ãf, ãz; indicated for furi, fram, umbi.

2. Real separable compounding may still be sought among the remainder.

3. Inseparable compounds may appear with furi, fora, (ingegin), umbi.

5. Possible Prepositional Uses

The only forms in the first group (adverbs) which are also prepositions in Olfrid's OnG are furi, ingegin and umbi. All these adverbial cases must therefore be re-examined to see if they are not isolated prepositions.

For ingegini in so er tho gisah thia menigi al queman imo ingegini (one of the distinctively adverbial patterns) we have already discussed the possibility of postpositional use with the object imo (v.g.p. 90). Similarly, for three of the forms in the category "Before Verb but Separated" prepositional use has been indicated. These are ingegin imo fuar; ioh ingegin in quam; ingegin imo quamun. The otherwise definitely adverbial position of the above, added to the likelihood of their being prepositions certainly ends the possibility of compounding. It also lends credence to the assumption of prepositional and postpositional use, as well as use with thara, as indicated in the respective sections preceding.

Five forms still remain from the adverbial patterns, viz.
ingegin aller giang; ingegin ouh inquad and the three initials
ingegin skrei, ingegin riaf, ingegin fuarun. No prepositional
use has previously been assumed for these.

Compounding is out as far as ingegin aller giang is con-
cerned. The full passage (II-15-1 to 4) gives some support to
the notion of prepositional use:

Fúar tho druhtin thánana sid tho thérera redina
sid tho thëmo thinge zi thëmo héiminge.
Es máru uuort tho quàmun, so uuit so syri uuár
so uuit so galiléa bifiang; ther liut ingégin aller giang

What precisely the "antecedent object" might be it is hard to say.
Perhaps it is druhtin. This sentence might then be considered a
parallel to the Gothic sentence in Luke 8, 44 which has the re-
move reference to Jesus renewed by the following is: atgaggandei
du aftaro attaitok skauta wastjos is. In any event prepositional
nature remains very dubious. The same goes for IV-4-55 to 56:

thaz súngun io zi nóti thie fórderun liuti,
thaz sélba ingégin ouh inquád thiu áftera hériscáf

Here the "object" could be liuti, but the case is doubtful.

For the initial forms prepositional nature is impossible
to prove.

The one case of furi is in III-20-79 sieve (referring to the
priests) híazun thiu (father and mother) gan fúri sar, thaz
siu, gizáltin thaz uuár. Here again prepositional use is con-
ceivable - the reference being "them, the priests."

Finally, for umbi, the passage in question (II-1-17 ff.)
gives no indication of a possible object for a prepositional use.

In summary, then, these isolated uses, except for the ones
indicated with ingegin(i) should remain as adverbs. Calling
them all prepositions would be forcing them into a classi-
fication arbitrarily and on insufficient evidence, simply
to serve the desire for uniformity. Prepositional or post-
positional use may, on the other hand, be assumed for in-
gegin(i) wherever the object or thara is present.

K. Patterns in Morphological
Classes and Clauses

1. Introductory Note

Positive evidence for identification has up to now been
restricted to the adverbial forms. Evidence serving to identify
compounding forms has been purely negative. But the most interes-
ting material lies precisely in the field of positive identi-
fication of compounding forms. Just as in Gothic, this identi-
ification can be made through the discovery of certain morpho-
logical arrangements and syntactical patterns which character-
ize a group of forms as intimately associated with the verb -
in which group the adverbs do not participate.

The correspondence with the Gothic is actually fairly
surprising. The Gothic patterns which established inn and ut
as separable compounding forms were primarily: the infinitive,
the main clause, the subordinate clause. The regularity of
certain patterns observed in these categories did not suf-
fice to demonstrate separable compounding for inn and ut.
Nor does it for OHG forms. Final assurance of the validity
of the classification is at hand only when positive non-
participation of the adverbial forms in these same exclusive patterns is proven — as for Gothic, so for OHG.

2. Infinitive and Nominal Forms

The infinitive was entirely regular for Gothic, but the number of instances was distressingly small. Otfrid provides many more, and the results are that much more interesting and conclusive. The Gothic inn and ut occurred before the infinitive, not after it and not separated in pre-verb position. The cases of infinitive use in Otfrid show the following in direct pre-verb positions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{beginnet ánascouuon thio frónisgon bláomon} \\
\text{beginnit sie ánafarton mit... ioh ouh śnabrechon mit...} \\
\text{thie lázit man thar ingan} \\
\text{tho er inan sah thara ingan}^{332} \\
\text{himil séhet er indán, thie ēngila ouh hera nídargan} \\
\text{nu uuīl ih thes geflízan, then segal nítharílan} \\
\text{ih... mag hiar nídarstigan} \\
\text{ni mag... hera nídarstigan} \\
\text{beginnent sie thána keren}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ni uuollen héim uuison uuir uueneron uuēison} \\
\text{(ni mag diufal thara ingégin sin)}^{333} \\
\text{thaz núasi er thara uuīsen} \\
\text{thaz ēr thara quēmon scolta (P queman)} \\
\text{thaz er nan móhta ana uuśn heizan ūfur ūfstan (D ūf stán)} \\
\text{... mit then ūgōn biginnet ūmbiscouuon (P biginnet ūmbiscouuon)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{332}\) If these two cases are not thar(a)in.  
\(^{333}\) Probably tharain-gégin.
The group above the line consists of forms which did not participate in the distinctively adverbial patterns. Note that both MSS show invariable stress — always on the preverb. This pattern of compounding form before the verb is equally a characteristic of the inseparable compounding forms, but the latter show invariably unstressed preverb.

Here then is our first definite indication of a class of real compounding forms.

The validity of this category as an indicator of compounding is apparent when the cases of adverbs in this position are examined. After all, the position directly before the infinitive is a common adverb location (v.g.p. 165, etc.), so one would expect duplication, just as in Gothic for example dala* attiuhan in Rom. 10, 6 parallels innatgagan in Luke 14, 23 (v.g.p. 721) in spite of its demonstrably different character. But here half the similar word order patterns in O.G are disturbed by other and differing factors! The point of stress was mentioned before. Note that thara uuisen, thara queman and even, for R, umbiscoon have exactly the opposite stress pattern from those forms which are beginning to characterize themselves as compounding forms. While the case of umbiscoon is very doubtful, there is no doubt whatever about thara. It is certainly an adverb, and it is rather likely that it shows a stress pattern characteristic of ordinary adverbs vs. compounding forms. Sobel states the situation for adverbs between verbs thus: "Das Präpositional- adverb; nidar, thara und hie und da das Nominaladverb tragen
allein den Accent im Verse. He then cites the above cases with ãnafarton, ãnascouuon, hiar nidarstigan and thâna keren. But of the 51 cases Sobel cites with ordinary adverbs, 47 have the same stress patterns as mîasi er thara uuisen.

This is one of the few cases where compounding forms differ in stress from the adverbs, but the nearly complete antithesis is convincing.

On the basis of infinitive patterns we apparently have therefore as true compounding forms: ana, in, nidar and thana.

The remaining forms among the adverbs viz. hîim uuison, ingégin sin, ûfstan and V's ûmbiscouuon are exactly parallel to the compounding forms in order and stress, but the ingégin form is probably to be read tharaingégin, and the umbi verbs require considerable further analysis as possible inseparables. So actually only the heim and ûf forms duplicate the pattern of the compounding forms at all.

Complete confirmation of the distinction appears when we examine those instances where the adverb forms show different, not similar, word order. In the following cases they emphasize both their difference from the compounding forms

---

335 He includes this form in the list. I deduced it from the figures. He also included hîim uuison in the other set. This I likewise deduced, the purpose in both cases being to have the figures for ordinary adverbs like harto, gun, etc.
336 D's stress marks don't mean much against V and P.
and the validity of the infinitive as one of the criteria for differentiating between compounding forms and adverbs.

sie ni múasen gan so frám
sie híazun thiu gan fűri sar
so er thó gisah thia ménigi al quëman imo ingëgini
so sënen se mit githuinge quëman thara zi thinge then...

sun (P queman)
beginnent thara io hággen
beginnent thára io flízan (P beginnent thara)
er thara thoh fáran uuolta (P thára)
ni uuolta si in then řiuun thara zi in biscouon

Here the adverb, just as in Gothic with the subordinate clause order, shows its great freedom in contrast to the "bound" pattern of the compounding form. It occurs after the infinitive. It occurs after the infinitive and separated. It occurs before the infinitive but separated by one or even two words! Any of these situations is enough to prove absence of compounding.

Some sentences which seemingly belong in this section have been omitted. The characteristics of the infinitive word order and stress now established help to clarify their omission, though it is justified on other grounds as well.

III-14-5 thar mántu ana findan, uuiio..., which Kelle writes ana findan in the text and which Sobel assumes to be a compound, is clearly out of line with the proper stress

---

337 This form, plus the previous evidence, makes the exclusion of the above thara ingëgini sin from any consideration as a compound all the more likely.
338 Y. Kelle I ad loc. But in the Glossary he does not list it as a verb.
339 Y. Sobel, p. 63.
for a separable compound. The explanation of thar...ana, already likely for this form, is now virtually proven. 340

fora in so mán hier fora ságen scal has already been discussed at some length. Its stress pattern seems now to be such that it cannot be considered a separable compounding form (unless an irregularity be assumed). Similarly for reasons of stress as well as for other reasons it cannot be considered a denominative. The only likely class, if it is a compound as I assume it to be, is the inseparable compounds.

uudarstántan in II-11-27 is of course inseparable, and its stress is as expected.

A very important point must be noted in this connection: any form which has a preverb may appear to be an inseparable compound, and this fact may encourage an inaccurate and misleading assumption - namely that the forms with the preverbs are inseparable and that the forms with the particle after the verb are some other verb. With a few verbs - or rather with a few particles - this is doubtless true, but the danger of carrying the idea too far has already been noted in connection with Lachmann's hypothesis and elsewhere in this chapter. Fortunately most of Othfrid's stress evidence is clear enough to preclude this error. That is, no one is likely to say

340 The same consideration also confirms the previous diagnosis of thara compounds for thie thrain ni sculun gan and tharain giuunon uusas ĝangan mit in.
that ánasçcouun is inseparable and cite the absence of any
scounota ana as proof.

Equally fortunate is the plethora of meaning parallels
just like those cited for Gothic. They are obvious from the
main list. One need list only a couple of examples:

nidarstigen - stig nidar
ingen - er giang sar in ...
unz er nan tho thána nam - sie namun thana ... then selbon
stein

This sort of list may be duplicated proportionately in
Tatian, Isidor, etc.

A final note concerns the nominal forms. In Gothic we
cited bi innatgahtai as one aspect of the unseparated separable
compounding form. While Utfrid's evidence in this line is not
distinctive, it is still interesting. For Utfrid's OdG shows
compounding even with the adverbial forms (though infrequently),
and this new type of compounding actually indicates the first
definite step toward real composition with such forms. With
verbs they are still adverbs.

OdG has numerous examples of nominal composition with the
separable particles, e.g. anadsht,341 anassit, anaranufti (Utfrid),
ingang (Utfrid), niderfal, dananuwt, thanatrib, etc., etc.
Of the adverbial type Utfrid has the noun herafart and the
adjective ufhaldez; the Tatian has hinafart, ufgang, uziart
and uzingang; Isidor has framchumat; etc.

Exactly what influences operated here, or for that matter what influence these nouns had on verb compounding, is rather uncertain. That the noun formations are independent of any previous verbal compounding is shown not only by their origin in a period when definite absence of compounding can be demonstrated for hera, etc., but also by such differences as Rück- with nouns and zurück with verbs. Paul says: "Nach Analogie der präpositionellen (Zusammensetzungen) sind dann auch andere von Haus aus lokale Adverbia mit Nomina actionis verschmolzen, nämlich her, hin, fort, weg, vorweg, zusammen, heran, herauf, etc., hinan, hinauf etc., dar (nur in Darleihen), rück, dem zurück in verbalen Zuss. entsprechend. Schon im und. Ludwigeslied erscheinen hierwist (das niertzae) und hinafert. The problem deserves further special study.

Lest it be thought that all of the above discussion is superfluous, because perhaps "everyone" recognizes the adverbial nature of hera, etc., I should like to refer again to the check list of Kelle's glossary entries (p.153) and note further that, of the forms in the preceding two sections (on adverbs and on infinitives), Kelle lists specifically as compounds all but one fora, one fram, two hina's, one her, two ingedin's and one ûf. Piper is even more generous in his listings of compounds. Some other scholars are as liberal. Some are less liberal, but they are almost invariably arbitrary or inconsistent in designating compounding forms or adverbs.

\[342\] Paul V, p. 23.

\[343\] Excepting the ones with heim, which for some reason neither Kelle nor Piper considered a compounding form.

\[344\] But he says eats compounding here; Piper lists ûf-sehan.
3. Participles

Participles would presumably show exactly the same relationship as the infinitives, but there are no cases of participles with ana, in, nidar, or thana. Within the adverbs, however, the same non-compounding patterns appear as did in the infinitives.

One form must be omitted from further discussion. Ótfrod's furuarane in uns sint kind zi béranne iu dága furuarane (P furifárane) shows not only by P's stress, but by the absence of gi in the participle that it is inseparable. Here, as with umbi (v.i.p.216), even the small number of instances cannot hide the confusion that exists. Ótfrod also has the form állo, thie thar uuérun ioh oun thar furifuarun.\(^{345}\)

Like umbi, furu shows double nature; inseparable compounding form or adverb (presumably not separable compounding form).

The remaining (adverbial) cases\(^{346}\) are:

ther héra uuward giséntit (P gisentit)
ih ni bin... giséntit héra in uuőroltin\(^{347}\)
er ist fon héllu iruuántan ioh ūf ūon dōde irstantan
ist férrro irdriban ūon himile úz, ther...
zişámane al biuuántan
biuuántan thar zisámane\(^{348}\)

---

\(^{345}\) On the probable distinction in meaning, v.s.p. 68 f. and Lachmann, pp. 371-2. Lachmann also cites inseparables like the glosses furizimprit obstructum (Arabianus), furistoppot obturatum (Junius), furipundan recondita (Lerou).

\(^{346}\) Hier ist ana funtan, thaz... is like thar mahu ana findan, uuio...; v.s.p.184f. It is hier...ana, not anaftan. Hence it is not listed here.

\(^{347}\) This proves adverbial nature not only for hera but also for at least this case of in.

\(^{348}\) If any further proof of the adverbial nature of fora = "before" and of its connection with hier were needed, forms
thie thara giládot uuuarun
thaz drúntin thara quéman uuas
thaz drúntin krist thara quéman uuas
simes... zisamáne gifůa酯e
zisamáne biuñántan
zisamáne gísántan

Only the last six even look like compounds, and the consistent double stress of the zisamáne forms has already been mentioned as precluding any idea of compounding. The two participial forms in strictly adverbial order are a further confirmation. The stress of the thara forms also pretty well precludes considering them as compounds – assuming that the stress pattern of separable infinitives would apply in the participle too. The other evidence against thara is more than sufficient anyway.

In the first group separation is clear indication of adverbial nature, though there are no separable compounds to compare them with – in Útiríd anyway.349

The one declined infinitive (thara in zi ꚃananne) is regular enough but obviously ambiguous.

like IV-7-92 hier föra uuard giuůñht, falling into this same group, would surely suffice. The form is mentioned only to indicate the type of evidence available now to confirm previous rejection of such forms as föra from further consideration as compounding forms.

349 ther ana si er gizalter has already been indicated as a tharaná compound, and its order is clearly impossible for a compound verb. The same applies to uuio iz tharana is al gizalt, and tharzuas sin oon gizulte. All these confirmed cases of thara compounds cast further doubt on the remainder, which may only accidentally show regular order.
4. Results in the Non-Finite Categories

The sum of the instances in the infinitive and the participle shows adverbial nature for:

fram, furu, hera, ingegini, thara, ûf, ûz, zisimane.

True compounding is probable for:

ana, (in), nidar, thana.

There is no evidence on the rest.

The list of adverbs above is substantially the same as the list derived from simple word sequence patterns, with relatively few duplications. It should be unnecessary by this time to say that this is not accidental.

One caution is necessary, though. It still cannot be said, for example, that since ûf appears in both lists of adverbs it cannot be a compounding form under any circumstances. While it is unlikely, it is still possible that ûf could be an adverb in some cases and a compounding form in others. That is, uf fon dode iristuanti proves by its word order that this ûf is not a compounding form but it does not necessarily prove that thaz si so gahun ufirstuant is no compound — any more than wenn wir hinüber zu Schmidts gehen proves there is no compound hinüber—gehen in NähG. Such reservations stem mainly from the ûf fon... sort of phrases already marked as likely adverbial uses. They are not, by the way, to be entirely ignored in considering forms like ufirstuant, though they certainly are not full and sufficient evidence.

The attempt to find an answer to this problem requires full examination of all the evidence and even this may, in the case of the rarer forms, leave undecided cases.
For the time being, I should like to remark that the problem concerns primarily Α and ΑΖ and refer to the final discussion, below, of these two forms.

5. Subordinate and Main Clauses

Even more striking and better documented evidence for the different behavior of the compounding forms and the adverbs is to be found in the word order of the various types of clauses.

There is some difficulty, to be sure, in identifying all subordinate clauses in OœG, as some of them seem to share subordinate nature and main clause characteristics (i.e. no conjunction). It depends of course on one's definition—that is whether the criterion be "subordinate meaning" or presence of certain conjunctions. Yet almost all the cases will work out very smoothly, in spite of this possible ambiguity. And anyone desirous of checking further may always refer to the appropriate sections of Erdmann's Syntax der Sprache Otfrids.

The evidence has, in a sense, already been supplied in the division of the main list into clauses. For clarity it must however be repeated in separate and analytical form.

The general rule for the subordinate clause is exactly the same as it was for Gothic. It turns out that such clauses show two distinctly different types of word order—one group of forms being invariably before the verb, Leinen, who denied any regularity of word order for Gothic, does indicate patterns of order—or incipient patterns—for the Tatian, though he treats only ΑΖ, in, Υ, and nider, thus missing a complete picture of the compounding situation. But, just as in Gothic, not necessarily at the end of
the other, while sometimes preposed, being extremely free in taking other positions.

Invariably preposed:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ana} & \quad \text{tho er sie hiar thaz anablias} \\
\text{thaz uuir iz anafahan mit anderen giratin} \\
\text{uuar ih iz anafabe} \\
\text{so er sih iz analegiti} \\
\text{so thisu uuort tho gahun then kuning anaquamun} \\
\text{so sinan anasahun} \\
\text{so sie inan apasahun} \\
\text{suntar selb si in sehi kristan anasahi} \\
\text{then mitont se anasahun} \\
\text{suntar siu nan suente inti fiur anauuente} \\
\text{thaz sliumo sies gihulfin ioh inan anauuurfin} \\
\text{thaz er... thaz uuib iz anazalta} \\
\text{tho horis, uuas sie nennent ioh thih anazellent} \\
\text{ther mo anauuas}^3^5^2 \\
\text{in} & \quad \text{so er erist thia archa ingiglang} \\
\text{uuard uuola then thara ingeit}^3^5^3
\end{align*}
\]

the clause. Ruhfus, \textit{Stellung des Verbs} (Dortmund, 1897), pp. 75-6, indicates a general tendency in the Tatian for verbs to go to the end of subordinate clauses but notes that certain types of clauses, notably relative and daß clauses, do not represent this tendency so strongly. Fücker's work on the rhyme documents (see Bibliography) shows end and middle position about equal.

\(^3^5^2\)Other forms parenthesized in the main list but showing "regular" order are: uuanta aband unsih anageit, ther tharana gange, thaz er tharana gange, taaaz ih... tharana hugga, thar uuir ana laqun, so er tharana scouot. For the last five, tharana still is the leading possibility, and the omission of the forms is quite justified.

\(^3^5^3\)If it isn't tharain.
bat thesan... er sih ouh fon ther hohi thes huses

in thi thu nitharfalles
thaz ih nih hier irreke inti hina nidarscrikke
unz er so nider stareta

oba sie nan thana fuartin
hiaz... mit uuasgu, so iz gzami, thaz horo thana nami
so sliumo, so ih iz thana nam
unz er nan tho thana nam
... themo er thaz ora thana sluag
nub er iz thana snide ioh er iz thana scerre
uuant er... iz garo thana sneid
so ih thaz horo thana thuag
thaz er... thiu spriu thana uuerre

The free order of the other group - and proof that they are true adverbs and not compounding forms - appears with the following:

sehet then man, ther mir thaz allaz brahta fram
thaz er fuari thanan fram uz unter uuoroltman

ob unsih auur ladot heim man armer thehein
er se fuarin heim
sid druhitin krist quam uns heim
thanne uns krist quimit heim, ni uueiz iz manno
nihein

(All cases of hera in uuorolt in subordinate clauses)

thi ih hera nu bat so erno
thaz er her iz liaz
thaz... si hera sus ni loufe

354 Possible main clause, but see Erdmann's comment (p. 391).
355 No preposed form in subordinate clause. For other uses with bringen see main list.
356 Preposed order in ther... heim giholota, so siu tho heim quamun.
357 Preposed order in thaz er thi hera leitti, thie unsih hera santin, uuaz er hera uuolti, nin hera giilti, ther er so hera quami, ther thanana hera quam.
hina thaz ih hina nidarscrikke)

ingegini uuio engilo menigi fuar thar al ingegini
thiu thar uuas tho ingegini

thara (19 instances with all kinds of separation in
subordinate clauses, every one with a form commonly
listed as a compound verb; see main list)

ôf tho er uf fon themo grabe irstuant
unz thiu sin guati uf fon tode irstuanti

umbi er ther himil umbi sus emmizigen uuurbi

âz thaz er nan'uz thoh ni spe

358 nina here is a free adverb, of course, the verb being
nidarscrikkeren. There are no forms in which hina goes as
directly with the verb as do the other adverbs in the list,
except for the preposed form so er hina fuar.

359 None preposed.

360 Preposed in 22 instances; see main list.

361 Preposed order in thaz si so gahun ufirstuant, thanne
ellu uuorolt ufstet, thaz uuorolt ufstante.

362 Preposed order in so siu sih umbibisahun, thaz sie nan
umbiriten, thaz sin io umbizerbit, so uuit so himil umbiuuarb.

363 Leinen (p. 49) regards âz as incipiently regular in
UHG, especially so in the Tatian, but less so in Utirid.

364 Separation by ni alone or even by tho alone might
not preclude the listing of regular order for uz-spe. ni
even in Gothic (saei inn ni ategoi) could function as a
sort of tmetric particle. For other examples, v.g. p.32-31.
Tho in the Tatian separates nidar, which is otherwise entirely
regular as a compounding form (v. Leinen, p. 74) from a part-
iciple in 99-2 and 99-3 nidar tho uallanti procidens autem.
This leads directly to the assumption of tmetric tho or tho
and normal order rather than adverb and, for the compounding
form, irregular order. But the whole situation in Utirid
argues against a double tmetric particle. Double stress in
P is, though not a clinching argument, a source of doubt
about compounding in âz... spe. Further discussion on âz
below.
nīst... frumā thaz, thaz man zukke thaz maz then
kindon ir then hanton inti uuerpef uz then
hunton
thaz er fuari thanan fram uz unter uuoroltman
uuio fuarun thiу diuulfir uz thar zi petruses hūs
thaz sie nirgengen thanan uz
tho thaz euuiniga guat uz fon themo grabe irstant
thaz uuir ni kertin thanana uz
thaz uuir ni faren furdir uz
365
zisamane uuio iz quimit al zisamane 366

Insufficient evidence appears for word order analysis of
bifora, 367 furi, 368 ingēgin, 369 widar, 370 zua. 371

No evidence is available in Ōtfrid on after, mit(i),
nāh, widari.

365 There are a few remarks to be made on the ûz forms.
In the last two, one wonders what would happen in such order
where two rules of word sequence conflict— for compounding
forms anyway. ni would require the verb after it, but sub-
ordinate order would require the particle before the verb.
Since ûz is apparently an adverb, this order is simple to
explain. Another matter concerns the case of fuari... fram
uz. This sentence was also mentioned under iram. The double
listing is not accidental. The least this form proves is that
neither fram nor ûz is compounded with faran here. Finally,
proposed order occurs with ûz in so sliumo sos er uzgian, so
iuðas thanan uzgian, so er uzgian ingēgin in.
366 Proposed in ... zisamane gifuaqtin, ... zisamane

367 One case, preposed.
gifuaqt, thiу zisamane glihitin.
368 One case, preposed.
369 One case, preposed.
370 One case, preposed.
371 Two cases, preposed.
For the sake of ready comparison, the main clause evidence follows directly. After that comes the discussion of individual forms on the basis of instances in both subordinate and main clause.

An immediate and somewhat surprising difference appears when the OHG main clause forms are compared with the Gothic inn and ut. Even the compounding forms of Otfried's main clauses show no such regularity or unanimity of contrast with their analogues in the subordinate clauses as did Wulfilas inn and ut. Remember that in 18 instances the Gothic had main clause inn and ut separated from the verb, nine of them independent of or contrary to the Greek, while there were only three preposed, two of which may be regular. For a translation piece this is rather overwhelming. Yet Otfried, who is far more independent linguistically, shows numerous—in some cases preponderant—preposed order in the main clause.

This sort of order has been noticed before, of course. Grimm's use of such forms as evidence for OHG compounding has already been quoted. But the rather striking explanation for most of these preposed forms seems to have been overlooked in the general absence of interest in the subject of compound verbs and their word order. The explanation is found in a type of main clause sequence already noted by many scholars. This is the order which Behaghel calls Nicht-zweitstellung
(to avoid the term "end position," which is too restrictive), he notes that the verb, which normally came second in the Germanic main clause or simple sentence — this because of its weak stress — often was displaced by unstressed particles. These unstressed particles had "einen noch geringeren Ton... als das Verbum" and hence preempted second place. Thus arose a pattern typified by Behaghel's examples from the Anglo-Saxon chronicles, e.g. se Valentinianus eft gesamnode werod. He cites numerous OnG examples and notes that this order tended to disappear entirely at the end of the OnG period.

Uffrid has this pattern of word order in full force and it is exactly here that the proposed compounding form is at home!

Reis also noted this order, which he called "Endstellung" and noted further the frequency with which some adverbs appear before the verb, e.g. Isidor II-20 so dhar auh ist chiscri-ban. But neither he nor Diels, who also noted the type of

---

373 Behaghel also notes here the fact that a second sentence, "der einen ersten konjunktionell angeschlossen ist,... nicht selten die Nichteitstellung des Verbums zeigt." See this section (ibid., p. 13) for further discussion.
374 ibid., pp. 14-5.
375 ZefdPh 33, pp. 219-24.
376 ibid., p. 220.
words which give rise to "Schlußstellung des Verbs","377 noticed
the extraordinary regularity with which this late position
of the verb is associated with preposed word order in the
compounding forms. In part this is the result of the feeling
of both Reis and Diels that this order is the equivalent of
final position. Naturally if one regards late position as
final, everything has to precede and there is no need to in-
vestigate further.

This is not true final position in any sense, as Behagel
shows. Otfrid and many other documents have such word order
as Isidor XXXIV-1 umbi dhen samun dhurah dhen selbun esaian
qunad druhtines stimna. Thus, position after the late verb
was definitely open. And Otfrid's cases of late verb followed
by adverb are good examples of such position.

This is the situation in Otfrid:

a) With verb in middle position,378 compounding form and
adverb regularly follow. On initial compounding form
and adverb, v.g.p. 172.
b) With verb in late position,379 compounding form directly
precedes and so do most adverbs. Exceptions are proof of
adverbial nature.380

378 Preceded by the subject or by one predicate element
(object or prepositional phrase, etc.).
379 Preceded by two full sentence elements, usually subject
and predicate (object, etc.) and followed by any other sentence
element or by none.
380 This is a reversal of the practice in the preceding
sections of citing the evidence and then drawing the conclu-
sions from it. But I think we have now reached the point
where compounding forms and adverbs have, in principle at least,
fairly well identified themselves.
The body of forms, which follows, does two very positive things. First, it establishes the fact that the frequent preposed position of the compounding form in the main clause is not accidental or haphazard, but perfectly regular. Second, it provides, through the exceptions mentioned in (b) above, further clear identification of adverbs.

The cases with ana, in, nidar and thana: (The relatively few inti and ioh sentences have been omitted from the table because of their ambiguity and because of their infrequent appearance in Otfrid.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle and Initial</th>
<th>Late Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ana ouh bias er sie ana... then... geist; etc.</td>
<td>rehtor er iz anafiang then hugu uuir giuuezzzen, thar baldo anasezzzen er tod sih anauuentit ther liut mit thisu imo analag gotes geist imo anauuas er tho sar thara ingiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in er giong sar in; etc. faret in thia burg in; etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nidar so stig nidar; etc. stig nu nidar; etc.</td>
<td>er sih sar nidar neigta fon themo berge er nidar giang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thana sie namun thana...; etc. nim thana garalicho thih; etc.</td>
<td>... thio sunta ouh thana flunta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

381 These cases, which seem to offer no further points of interest, are: inti datun inan in, ioh alle nidarfialun, ioh iz thana snidit, ioh thaz horo thana thua_5. In the Germanic languages in general, as Kuhn points out (pp. 50–51), the secondary main clauses are largely equivalent to subordinate clauses.
er fruma thana fuarta
... thie suhti thana fuarta\textsuperscript{382}
si ganz sih thana fuarta
thie brusti sie in ougtun,
that fahs thana roufunt
er sar zi thiu tho gifiang,
mit themo bette thana giang

The regularity of the late main clause pattern is striking.
There are no exceptions to the preposed order of the compounding forms. All the exceptions are, as mentioned above, with the forms already characterized as adverbs. The irregularity takes two forms:

a) Adverb before the late verb but separated: thaz selba
ingegin ouh inquad thiu aftera heriscaf; ther liut ingegin
aller giang;\textsuperscript{383} sie thara tho in farun, so sie ubiluuillig
uuarun, eina huarrun brehtun; er thara ouh thie sine leitta;
blinte ioh ouh doub... ouh thara zi imo quamun; uf zi himile
er tho sah; sih thanana uz tho fiartun;\textsuperscript{384} mit minnon io
giuagem zisamane unsih fuagen.

b) Adverb after the late verb: ioh er mih santa hera ziu;
thiu mihila menigi thia uuat thar breitta ingegini; in morgen
tho ther liut al... fuar thara al ingegini; moyses giuaro,

\textsuperscript{382}Subject considerably previous. This is the only case which even looks like a middle position - that is, among these preposed compounding forms.

\textsuperscript{383}May be middle position, depending on what aller is.

\textsuperscript{384}If tho can be tmetic (v. nidar tho uallanti in Tatian), this would be "regular."
helas ooh ther maro... quamun thara ingegini; thanana er nan fuarta... thanana uz; sie inan sliumo tho in uuar uuurfun fon in uz sar; in buah sie iz duent zisamane.

In sum: ana, in, nidar, and thara are still quite regular as compounding forms. There is no exception. There is, on the other hand, further proof of the adverbial nature of hera, ingegini, ingegini, thara, (ûf), ûz, zisamane.

This piling up of evidence for forms like ingegini, thara and zisamane, which were very early suspected of being adverbs and not compounding forms, is gratifying. There is no contradiction as we proceed from one criterion to another. This speaks well for the validity of our criteria and helps to seal the case of such adverbial forms.

This word order with the late verb may also explain two of Wulfila's three "exceptional cases" of inn in the main clause (v.s. p. 65).

The construction with middle (and initial) verb is more consistent but for that very reason less indicative of any distinction between compounding forms and adverbs. The only exception among the compounding forms in middle position is er ingiang. in has already shown the rare sentence initial order discussed above (ingiang er). It is, as a matter of fact, the only one of the apparent compounding forms which shows any irregularity at all, and this may indicate some caution in classifying it.
Two forms which seem at first glance to be exceptional have been omitted from the table. They are sélbo druhtin nídar sah and er blíder thána uuanta. These forms would, if the verb were considered in middle position, be the equivalent of er ingiang and definitely exceptional. While this may conceivably be the case, I am inclined to think that they are actually late verbs, and that Otfrid felt that he had two sentence elements in er blíder (subject and a sort of predicate adjective\(^3\)) and sélbo druhtin (pronominal form and noun\(^4\)).

Behaghel gives a large number of constructions with other sentence elements before the presumably middle verb and notes the difficulty of interpreting them.\(^5\) Certainly in the later language "adverbial" elements could, in close connection with the subject, precede a middle verb. Behaghel cites an extreme example in Luther, II Lacc. 3, 18 die Leute aber hin und wider in deusern liefen zusammen.\(^6\) But these cases cannot be adduced as evidence for the OHG situation. Certainly Otfrid's numerous cases of regular (separated) compound verb in the middle position show only simple subjects, nothing as extensive even as selbo druhtin.

\(^3\) Y. I-9-19 sie spráchun uilu blíde.
\(^4\) The independence of selbo-selb is considerable. It often goes to the predicate, e.g. V-19-62 er duat iz sélbo and V-20-17 thar sizzent drúta sine, tai er zöh hier sélbo in libe.
\(^5\) Y. Behaghel Syntax IV, pp. 15-6.
\(^6\) ibid., p. 22.
6. Results in Clause Patterns

The results of the analysis of Otfrid's word order in clauses and non-finite forms reveal the following as separable compounding forms:

- ana, in, 389 nidar, thana,
- and the following as adverbs: 390
  - fram, furry, 391 heim, hera, ingegin, ingegini, thara,
  - if, umbi, 392 az, zisemane.

This is in entire accord with the evidence from other criteria.

The other documents confirm regularity for the compounding forms indicated for Otfrid. Suffice it to say that all of the Tatian's in and nidar forms are in regular order. 393 The same is true of ana. thana, of course, does not appear in many OHG MSS, its place being taken by abo.

L. Stress

Stress offers rather little help in distinguishing compounding forms and adverbs, as I discovered after analyzing all the patterns I could think of.

---

389 v. s. p. 172; p. 188, n. 347.
390 In addition to any previously identified as adverbs and not further considered above, like fora.
391 Also an inseparable compounding form.
392 See note 391.
393 v. Leinen, p. 62 and p. 74.
One set of statistics shows a considerable difference, however. Interestingly enough it is the separated parallel to the preposed pattern of adverb-verb (zisåmame gífñagtî), which was used to demonstrate absence of compounding for zisamane, etc. This stress situation would naturally be very clear in preposed order. (That is, adverbs would show frequent stress on the verb as well as the adverb; compounding forms will not show stress on both the verb and the compounding form.) That it continues to be significant in separation is so much the more striking. The relation of the stresses is approximately consistent with the preposed situation. In separation the true compounding forms very rarely show double stress, while the adverbs frequently do. The evidence of double stress, with the total figures:

Compounding forms:

- ana: oui bîias er sie åna (1 out of 2)
- in: inti dâtun inan in (P nan in)
  - fâret in this burg in (P burg in)
  - ni quàm noh tho druntin in thaz kástel in (P in)
- (V - 3 out of 10; P - none out of 10)

---

394 In addition to the infinitive pattern above (p. 183).
395 The only exceptions: P's nîdar liazì, P's thánaflâñta. V avoided a double stress by erasing an accent on the verb in nîdar stareta. The unanimity is much more remarkable than the two exceptions.
396 These are taken from the main clause only.
397 There is no telling whether this high proportion for ana is actually significant or accidental - or whether the stress of a presumably original postposition operated here.
Adverbs (figures only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thara</th>
<th>1 out of 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tha</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heim</td>
<td>V - 7 out of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P - 6 out of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bera</td>
<td>V - 2 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P - 3 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingegin</td>
<td>2 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingegini</td>
<td>V - 7 out of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P - 11 out of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means for the compounding forms only four double stresses in V — in P just one — out of the 25 separated verbs in the main clause. For the adverbs the relation is quite substantially different. Excluding thara, in the total of 72 main clause instances V has 31 double stresses and P has 36.

These figures by themselves would be anything but conclusive. The contrast is the revealing feature. And the proportions are clearly different for the two types. This difference can scarcely be accidental, and in view of the sentence pattern involved it is rather extraordinary.

---

398 In the three prepositional cases, of course, Ingegin is not stressed; e.g. Tug Ingegin imo.

399 Even including a couple of sure prepositional cases! See note 398.

400 Thara is odd in having only one double stress in P, none in V. P: er spráth tho uuorton láten thára ri thëmu dótien (V spráth). But it has 7 cases in V and 4 in P with neither thara nor verb stressed — out of a total of 18 instances. Thus, though it has no double stress pattern, it still does not show the typical contrasting pattern of compound verbs.
The fact that there are a few cases of stressed verb in the separated compounds (v.s.; also main list) is less surprising when we realize that the verb, even with preposed compounding form was presumably not unstressed in OHG, but only less stressed. This is particularly likely when we recall that the original Germanic prepositional compounds presumably had heavier stress on the verb. Leinen calls the OHG verb stress a lighter "Hochton," not a "tieftonig" stress - or absence of stress. Indeed it is rather surprising that there is this difference between adverbs and compounding forms at all.

Another aspect of the stress situation is the difference in word order with noun and pronoun objects. It results, I assume, from the fact that compounding forms are less stressed than adverbs. The contrast (poorly represented as it was) appeared in Gothic, where a similar stress relationship was assumed. The situation there was (v.s. pp. 67-73):

a) Compounding form with pronoun: uswarpun imma ut
b) Compounding form with noun: attauh inn Paitru
c) Adverbial form with pronoun: atwandida sik aftra
d) Adverbial form with noun: uzuhhof auona iup

The weakly stressed pronoun precedes both compounding form and adverb. But the more strongly stressed noun resists this process of being sandwiched in between verb and compounding.

401 V. Leinen, p. 15.
form, because, for example, the inn did not have enough stress to follow the Paitru. The adverb, however, had heavier stress than the compounding form and could follow the noun.

In the light of the later development of the German compounding form, which sends the particle to the end (or after the object) whatever the nature of the object or particle, we might expect UHG not to show any differentiation here. The fact that it does is actually a bit surprising and is support for the validity of the stress pattern and confirmation of the hypothesis for Gothic.

The situation, in summary, is as follows.

With pronoun object in the main clause, both compounding form and adverb follow the object. With noun object, compounding form precedes and adverb either precedes or follows. In other words exactly like Gothic (except that extant Gothic has, in the adverb group treated, no case of adverb before noun object).

The cases of noun object with compounding form are:
sie uuurfun Nidar ana uuánk iro selono gifánk (P gífánk)
er uualzta thana sar then stéin
sie namun thana thuruh nót then selbon stéin
nam thes háares thana uuán (P thana uuán)

The one exception points toward the NaG order:
duemes uuir thaz zuial thana

402 Examples: laz thih nidar and giléitit thih héim (P heim). There is only one exception and that with a stressed pronoun: him thana gárílino thíh. These stressed pronouns are fairly frequent and not mistakes (v. Sobel, pp. 50–52). Similarly, NodE: You caved away that ?1 or Pick up him (not her). Emphatic stress on the object may also cause non-final position in the NaG compounding form.

403 The reason for this somewhat odd order is not clear.
The cases with adverbs:
tho sant er drúta uns sine héim
er kléipta mir ein hóro thar
huab thiù ñugun uf zi himile
... dribi then thlob thanana úz
sie flúhtun in zi gámame thórma thar zisámame

ioh ñùa thar thina gáati
gilaz thir thára thinaz múat
er háab in úf tho thaz múat
liazun úz... theš selben múates uueuuon
ueurfun úz... òeninon sinan (P uárfun úz)

A final note on stress I append merely as a suggestion.
There must be some reason for the fact that compounding forms
so regularly precede the verb of the subordinate clause, and
that adverbs follow it as well as precede it. It seems more
than likely that the greater stress of subordinate clause
verbs noted for so many IE languages, Sanskrit for example,
(compared to the weakly stressed or virtually enclitic
nature of ordinary main clause verbs) is a leading factor in
keeping the relatively stressed compounding form in pre-verb
position. But adverbs, having stronger stress than com-
pounding forms, can follow. This corresponds not only to

I have never taken recourse to "poetic license" as an explana-
tion for any particular bothersome case, because I think it
is a sort of constant factor, affecting all statistics a bit,
and better left as such. But it does seem a possibility in
this sentence.

404 Kuhn (pp. 50–68) gives the best — indeed almost the
only — full discussion of the difference between the verbs of
the two types of clauses in Germanic. He uses the terms
"selbständig" and "gewunden" rather than "main" and "subordinate,"
for the reason already noted above: the "subordinate" nature of
inti, ioch, and other clauses. I have used the terms "main"
and "subordinate" because the issue actually can be decided on
that basis in Útirid, there being no few secondary main clauses.
the noun object patterns above, but also to the infinitive patterns, the infinitive, too, being a strongly stressed sentence element.

With weaker stressed verbs - main clause verbs in middle position - the compounding form "breaks loose." Or perhaps it would be better to say: the second position in the sentence is a weakly stressed position, and the separable compounding forms cannot occupy it, while inseparables can.

Naturally in OHG these relationships are in general already an established pattern, and the Otfrid forms do not show this older stress relation by the accent marks, as a glance at the main list will show.

M. Special Problems

Several remarks must be made on individual forms in order to document sufficiently the results of this general survey.

A slight breath of suspicion hovers over ana. In many cases the ana could, as I pointed out some time ago, be interpreted as a postposition rather than as a compounding form. In the original discussion I dealt with the most obvious of these uses and pointed out even there some reasons for not assuming wholesale postpositional use.

405 See the subordinate and main clause listings for ana in the main list and compare the discussion on pp. 73-86.
Certainly postposition is a real phenomenon in OHG and OE. It is equally certain that it is a mistake to call all OE prepositions in the same position compounding forms. Harrison\(^{406}\) did so, much to the detriment of his study, and was contradicted by Gottweiss\(^{407}\) and others. In OE there seems to be no sufficiently clear pattern of separable compounding forms to sustain Harrison's diagnosis. But in OHG there is. And further, the justification for considering ana a compounding form lies precisely in the absolute regularity of its word order in Otfrid (and elsewhere). If it were a postposition it should show freer word order, just as the OE forms do. This does not mean than many of the ana forms weren't originally postpositions. This is after all one of the points of origin we have assumed for compound verbs. But in Otfrid the ana has pretty surely made the transition to a compounding form. There is excellent reason in the syntactical field for this statement. It would otherwise be very difficult, indeed impossible, to explain why there are no sentences in Otfrid like:

\(^{406}\)The Separable Prefixes in Anglo-Saxon (Baltimore, 1892), passim.

\(^{407}\)V. R. Gottweiss, Die Syntax der Präpositionen at, be, ymb (Halle, 1905), p. 86.
a) imo ana uuas gotes geist
b) gotes geist imo uuas ana
c) imo got ana then geist blias
d) geist, ther imo ana io uuas
e) geist, ther imo uuas ana; etc. 408

to parallel the OE:

a) Genesis 1041 hine on cymeâ... wracu
b) Psalma 87,6 hi me asetton on sead hinder
c) Deor 5 sippan hine Niêhad on nede lege

d) Beowulf 1935 Þat hire an dâges eagum starede
e) Bede (Millier 428-19) wege, þe ic ær com on; etc.

A further point which is apt to get lost in the subtleties
of the situation is that calling ana a postposition in Otfried
means that here the short form is the postposition and the
long one (anan) is the preposition, whereas in all the other
Otfried forms (widari, ubari, etc.) and in the Germanic forms

408 The absence of such sentences in any OHG work (with
a few exceptions) is proof of how far ana had gone toward
compounding. It is also the best argument against Wende's
listing of Otfried's and Notker's examples as postpositions.
(Wende does admit the growth of compounding.) There is, to
be sure, one apparent holdover of postpositional use and that
is the accusative with some of these verbs, e.g. Piper Notker
II-28-7 der sezzet sin ana, daz er got si vs. Tatian 101-1 anasazta
in sino henti. See Wende, p. 275, and Grimm IV, p. 1045 (on
line 5 of the hildebrandslied). Notker also shows a couple
of cases with definitely non-compounding order, like Piper
Notker II-550-7 so dih ana beginne gan temptatio and Piper
Notker I-36-18 tih ana uuanont sie solchero sculde. There
are doubtless some others I have not located, but the very
paucity of such postpositional word order emphasizes the
strength of the compounding pattern.
in general the long (stressed) form is the postposition.

In view of the above evidence we may safely say that ana is a compounding form in Otfrid and probably in most of OHG, while we bear in mind the possible postpositional origin of many of its instances and the likely postpositional nature of a few cases.

in is not too strongly represented, and there are more dubious cases than one might care for, namely the one initial ingiang and the one odd case with in before the verb in middle position: er ingiang... duron. Some of the sentences show a rather suspicious degree of removal from the verb, too. Since the other compounding forms are so regular, these points are rather more important than their small number would indicate.

More specific is the case of III-10-23 ih ni bin... gisentit here in uuorolt in. This obviously cannot be a verb əingisenten. The in in this sentence, in the light of the known word order pattern of participles is definitely an adverb.

409* Sievers, PBB V, 480-81.
410 A good example: farames auur thara zi in hina in irolant in.
411 Leinen (pp. 62-3) thinks that the boundary between in as "prepositional-adverb" and in as compounding form is often indefinite in Otfrid.
412 Nor, certainly, is it heragisentu as Kelle lists it in his Glossary.
If we can assume separate existence of adverb and compounding form, then this would take care of III-10-23 as an isolated adverbial form, without further damage to the consistency of the compounding pattern for in. Naturally this implies the same procedure with ûf and ûz, for example. But in these forms the majority of the evidence is against, not for, compounding.

Even with the above reservations I think it fair to say that in may have been an adverb in some cases (and still is in III-10-23) but that it nevertheless, in Otfrid's usage, associates itself so closely with the verb that it may be listed under the compounding forms.

Leinen's figures for the Tatian give considerable support to the notion of compounding. In 9 cases entirely independent of or contrary to the Latin, the translator has the in after the verb in the main clause, while in none of the 20 subordinate clauses does he have other than preposed order. The order for the non-finite forms is similarly regular.

---

413 Y. Leinen, p. 55 and pp. 62-3; also above, p. 190.
414 ibid., p. 62.
415 All cases where the in precedes the verb in the main clause are in agreement with the Latin (Leinen, pp. 60-62). Furthermore, some are with late verbs, where this position is regular - a factor which Leinen did not recognize. The latter in 87-8 (inti ir in iro arbeit ingiengunt). With inti: 18-1, 83-1, 117-2, 133-10, 186-2, 186-3, 220-4, 228-2.
416 Y. Leinen, p. 62.
The Monsee Fragments show entirely regular order with in compounds: XV-25 kenc in der chuninc duo daz kasahi intrauit, XX-16 kengun in mit imo za... intrauerunt, and XV-28 mueo quam du hera in intrasti, as well as the participles in VII-17 and XIV-8 ingangante intrantes. Here in the separated forms the in stays close to the verb, unlike many of Otfrid’s cases.

The general considerations mentioned above (p. 190 and p. 213) on the possibility of dual nature – adverb and compounding form – for certain particles, as well as the combination of ūf with preposition + object into a phrase (uf fon dode), requires a brief re-examination of the ūf forms. 417

The word order of these phrases is a positive indication that ūf is an adverb. But these phrases may have to be deducted from the picture of ūf with verbs, and the remaining forms have a slight tendency to look like compounds.

The regular instances would be:

Main clause: er huab in ūf tho thaz máat (in V; on P, v.i.)
   ioh thar nan ūfirrihtun
   yrstuant er ūf tho snello (P er stuant, accent then erased)
   tho giang uns ūf uuunna, thi uúuinguí súunna
   (in P; on V, v.i.)
   stant ūf

Subordinate clause: thaz si so gahun ūfirstuant

417Leinen is rather non-committal about ūf in Otfrid.
He definitely calls it a sentence adverb in V-4-57, II-11-54, III-13-58, but considers compounding likely in most other cases; v. Leinen, p. 69.
thanne éllu uuorolt úfsteit
thaz uuorolt úfstante

Non-finite: thaz er nan möhta ana uuán heizan áfur úfstan
(on D, v.i.)

Such a situation - a form sometimes adverbial entering into genuine compounding - is certainly not impossible, as the further development of German áf-auf shows.

The facts which indicate that this is probably not the case with áf, that even simple áf with verbs is an adverb and not a compounding form, are:

1. Initial word order in úfirstuant si snéllo and áf yrscrikta hártó ther furisto ñuarto.

2. Parallelism of:
er huab in uf tho thaz muat and huab thiú ougun uf zi himile
yrstuant er uf tho snello and uf fon dode irstantan
thaz si so gahun ufistuant and tho er uf fon themo grabe
irstuant

This indicates that the (left-hand) simple forms, which might look like compounding forms, were actually regarded as quite equivalent to the (right-hand) adverbial forms.

3. Double stress in yrhúaben sie áf, P's húab in áf.
V's giang uns áf, D's úfstán (corresponding to V's áf zi himile er tho sáh. As indicated in the chapter on stress, even separated compounding forms seldom have both parts stressed.

None of these factors, of course, precludes absolutely the idea of compounding. But when so many doubtful features appear the whole picture inevitably looks less and less like
compounding.

It must be conceded, none the less, that if seems to be on the way to separable composition. Later development confirms this tendency, and even in OHG other documents seem to indicate it.

The situation in the Tatian, for example, is substantially "regular." Of the 18 forms entirely independent of the Latin, the 10 main clause cases are all after the verb (e.g. 18-1 inti arstuant uf), the one subordinate clause form is preposed (69-6 nibi her ... iz ufheue), and the 6 non-finite forms are similarly regular (e.g. 32-3 ufgangen). This raises the definite possibility of differences among OHG texts, indicating the presence of more advanced stages in the development toward a broader compounding system.

umbi is among the most difficult forms to analyze. Its non-compounding nature has been demonstrated by the clause pattern er ther himil umbi sus emmizigen uuurbi. There is unfortunately no antecedent object to put this umbi with - at least none that I can see in the passage (II-1-17). Were this possible we should have another case of real isolated preposition like IV-2-23 man arme miti neriti. But the only thing to do is to call it an adverb.

The initial form umbi kērit sin thaz måut, sēlb so mo ther håls duat (P ûmbikerit) is probably adverbial. Erdmann writes two words ûmbi kērit, while Kelle and Piper write one.

418 v. Leinen, p. 68.
If V's stress is correct, then Erdmann's version and adverbial nature for the umbi are definitely assured. The double stress alone would be enough to show it is no compound (y. zisamane). If P's stress is correct, the situation is less positive, though even then adverbial use would be far more likely than compounding.

These two are the only forms which are, at first glance, out of the compounding picture.

The frequent stress pattern in pre-verb position umbi-verb, which occurs only with umbi (y.s.p. 59), has already been interpreted as a likely indication of the existence of inseparable umbi compounds. Lachmann, who carries this idea as far as—and perhaps considerably farther than—the evidence allows, bases his distinction on meaning, confirmed then by stress. He says: "Vor einfachen Verbis stehn sie tieftonig, wenn der ausgedrückte oder gedachte Accusativus bei umbi und hintar, Accusativus oder Dativus bei wider und gegin, nicht durch das Verbum an sich bedingt ist, sondern nur durch die Präposition: im entgegengesetzten Falle stehn umbi wider ingegin hintar adverbial, oder wenn man lieber so sagen will, sie werden mit dem Verbo trennbar zusammengesetzt, sind also betont."\(^{419}\) He then gives thaz sie nan umbiriten (P's stress; V. has none); er ál íz umbithánta; so uuit, so himil umbiuárb; and umbígárta sìh in uuár, all as inseparables. V's (rad) thaz sìh io ûmbízerbit

\(^{419}\) y. Lachmann, p. 369.
he thinks is "more correct" than P's umbizérbit.

Lachmann's idea of the "prepositional" form being un-stressed would imply compounding with the verb, because if the umbi in, say, V thaz sie nan umbiriten were a postposed preposition with nan it would probably be stressed.

It seems certain that there are inseparables among the umbi forms, but the situation is very confused. The extraordinary variations in stress are symptoms of this confusion of the preposed forms, only umbigárti, umbitháhta and umbi-uuárb are stressed alike in V and P. All the remaining five have conflicting stresses. This is a startling contrast to the other inseparables and to the separable compounding forms, where stress is very uniform in V and P.

Another disturbing factor is that two of Lachmann's four inseparables have separated parallels:

umbitháhta vs. mit thiu thékent sie nan ŭmbi,
umbiuuárb vs. er ther himil umbi sus êmmizigen uuárb

Lachmann takes this in his stride,420 but with the very small number of umbi forms all told, these parallels are striking. They certainly show the same general meaning, while NàG pairs like übersetzten / übersetzen always have a clear differentiation of meaning.421

---

420 V. Lachmann, pp. 369-70.
421 This raises the possibility that such a form as umbiuuárb may actually be umbi uuárb. There is not sufficient evidence to do anything with this idea, however.
It seems to me far better to say that Otfrid's forms represent the early, rather ill-defined stage of the development of new inseparable compounds with umbi. These compounds will perhaps soon show regular characteristics of stress and meaning, but they scarcely do so yet.

The final question, of course, is whether the existing or incipient dichotomy in Otfrid is (a) inseparable umbi / compounding form, or (b) inseparable umbi / adverb umbi. I am fairly sure that it is the latter, and for the following reasons:

1. The word order of umbi in er ther himil umbi sus ēmmizigen uuárbi (P uuurbi) is impossible for a compounding form.

2. The double stress in umbi kērit and umbibilisāhun in V and the similar stress in both ḫSS for thēkont sie nan umbi (as well as the complete lack of stress in V umbiriten) are likewise not the pattern of compounding forms.

Other ḫSS give little help. The Tatian, for example, shows typical inseparable order in 22-1 inti umbigiens ther heilant alla Galileam and 134-2 umbibigubun inan thie Iudæi, probably also in 200-1 inti rot lāhan umbibigubun inax, though the inti pattern may be at work here.

\[422\] Lachmann, as the previous quotation shows, regards such a decision as immaterial. But the whole evidence of the present study makes it imperative.

\[423\] Other proposed forms in Tatian 141-13, 102-2 (not a circum- verb in the original), 155-25, 188-1, all in subordinate clauses.
The only separated form is δυ-7 into scouuota tho umbi
thia zi gesehanne et circumspiciebat videre eam. Obviously
the translator did not want to use *umbiscouuota, which
would give a parallel to all his other direct translations
of circum- verbs. This does not, however, prove the exist-
ence of a separable compound.

zą appears in groupings much like the ạf fon phrases,
but the characteristics of these instances with zą give
less credence to the assumption of adverb + prepositional
phrase (v.s. pp. 100-102). zą, therefore, must stand
largely on its own, and very few cases are to be deducted
on the basis of independent adverbial use.424

There is thus little to alter the validity of the
fairly numerous factors speaking against compounding for
zą: adverbial word order (p. 169 ff.), the participle with
postposed zą (p. 188), the numerous adverbial sequences in
the subordinate clause (pp. 194-5), separated preposed as
well as postposed order in the late main clause (pp. 200-
201), in addition double stress in one preposed form
(zągiiyang) - in a word virtually the whole battery of
possible non-compounding patterns.

424 These cases are: uz fon themo ạrabe and uz untar
uuoroltman, possibly one or two others.
The only reason for bringing the question up is that òz is so generally regarded as a compounding form and that the evidence in Tatian seems to confirm this.\textsuperscript{425}

But apart from the Tatian there are several convincing parallels to the adverb type of order in Otfrid, indicating clearly that òz is not a compounding form like its Gothic relative. The Monsee Fragments show I-4 òaz er aufuori (for arfuori) uz fona iro marchom in a subordinate clause, though there is the possibility of a phrase uz fona here. In the same document there is a passage which is virtually impeccable as a denial of compounding. This is XVII-20 sihante uz maccun excolantes, with a participle and opposed to Latin order at that! A similar participial instance occurs even in Tatian (139-8): nu ther herosto... uuirdit eruorpfan uz eicietur foras, suggesting that 82-7 ni aruuirphu ih uz and 60-14 alen uzaruuarphi en are only coincidentally in compounding positions and casting a bit of doubt on òaz in general.\textsuperscript{426}

\textsuperscript{425}V. Leinen, pp. 54-5.

\textsuperscript{426}Tatian 72-5 uuil thu that uuir faren inti arlesemes iz uz colligimus looks like a fine sample of adverbial order in the subordinate clause, but it might just as well be a parallel to Gothic... stubbangggand inn... V.S. pp. 65-67. The same may apply to Otfrid's thaz man zukke thaz maz then kindon ir then hanton inti uuerpfex uz then hunton.
N. Residue

There is an inevitable residue of forms in Otfrid which remain doubtful because of insufficient evidence. By the nature of the criteria used, the identification of an adverb is much easier than the identification of a compounding form, so that one or two instances of adverbial word order are sufficient to mark some of the rarer forms. Thus one has little hesitation in classing from as an adverb if only from the infinitive gan so fram. The other instances are so like this that there is no fear of dual nature (as there is, say, with umbi). But some of the rarer forms show no characteristics which are distinctively adverbial. Yet at the same time they are not numerous enough to provide the consistent patterns of compounding. Their characteristics are ambiguous.

after. The preposition appears in III-10-20 ich after uns ni ruafe; Tatian 85-3 siu ruofit after uns.

Tatian 60-4 has quam in thero menigi after venit in turba retro. Also 116-4 thio menigi thio dar forafuorun inti thio dar after folgetun turbae autem quae praecedebant et quae sequabantur. The latter may possibly be dari after. Similarly Monsee Fragments XXIV-12 hear after folgento in sequentibus, especially in view of Isidor XV-13 hear after in consequentibus and Isidor's numerous instances of dhar after, together or separated, with and without verbs (e.g., VII-16 so dhar auh after ist chiquhedan sic enim subiunguitur and XXIV-10 dhar ist after chiscriban sequitur. All are written in fairly distinct separation from the verb.) Some
doubt is cast on the possible _after_ verbs by Isidor XI-3 folget hear auh after sequitur. The almost invariable presence of hear and _dhar_ indicates that there was probably no verb *afterfolgen* or *afterquedan*, else we should have a few cases of sequitur translated folget after, and the like. Tatian's _quam..._ after can be adverbial as well as compounded.

Morphology and stress of Otfred's _after rúafenti_ (P _afterruafenti_) are noncommittal.

The weight of the evidence is on the adverbial side, but it is inconclusive.

_bifora_. The two examples could be either compounding form or adverb. Kelle and Piper give both as compounds. The pure adverbial use in IV-16-46 híar bifóra might be slightly on the side of adverbial nature here. It must be conceded, though, that the meanings are different. The adverb is temporal, as is Tatian 145-17 sénu ih sagetaz iu bifora, which Sievers naturally gives as an adverb. _bifora lázu_ (P _bifóra luzu_) means "prefer, give first place to" and _ni thiz bifóra uuari means _"( no one was so illustrious) but what he – the child Jesus – excelled him."

Both of these are from spatial meanings which is natural to compounding. Non-temporal meanings appear also in Konsee Fragments I-7 see saar butun imo bifora laman offerebant
 Numerous temporal uses appear in the Isidor. The ambiguity possible with even a fair number of examples is obvious here, because all of the cases of this sure adverb bifora are in quite proper word order for a compounding form.

There is one factor which is rather strong circumstantial evidence for adverbial nature. This is the frequent equivalence of fora and bifora in the Glosses, etc., as well as Notker's forelaizen excipere paralleling Otfrid's bifora lazu. Fora, of course, is either an adverb or (presumably) an inseparable compounding form, as indicated before.

Finally, there is one definite point against compounding to be found in the matter of order. The middle verb or initial verb in ...bifora lázu ih iz al (P bifôra lazu) has a virtually impossible word order for a compounding form. Its solitary companions would be er ingiang or ingiang er.

mit. Thaz kind, thaz drug thaz uuitu mit has the word uuitu in the relation of Objektvertauschung with the form mit, just as in the hypothetical Gothic sentence insandida mîp brobar discussed on p. 91. Whether this Otfridian form comes from any verb *mitdragan is doubtful.

---

427 In Otfrid the see saar would involve late position for the verb, and if it were a compound it would read biforabutun. There is no telling whether the Lonsée fragments followed this rule, but it is very probable.


The sentence parallels exactly the adverbial use in
ther drégit... finf girstimu brot ouh zuene flaga tharmit. This does not prove adverbial nature for the mit above.

A slight piece of evidence against compounding lies in the order of the noun object. The regular sequence for a compounding form (p. 207) would seem to be #druag mit thaz uuitu. Naturally this evidence is not con-
clusive.

The possibility of isolated preposition, which is obvious for IV-2-23 man arme miti neriti, is not to be overlooked. Since the mit is in a rhyme pattern it may be shortened from miti.

miti. The two forms\textsuperscript{430} are in regular enough word order for compounds, but the possibility of miti as an ad-
verb is further supported by the numerous -i extensions of prepositions, none of which enters into compounding.

nañh. Its adverbial and adjectival nature has already been noted (p. 19). The order is non-committal. It would certainly admit of compounding.\textsuperscript{431}

One of Otfried's forms seems as if it could be inter-
reted as a postposition. This is ioh giang themo ginóz nah. But Otfried has no preposition nañh, and Tatian's preposition means "near, by".\textsuperscript{432} Since the meaning of the nañh forms with gangen and loufan is "after" it seems

\textsuperscript{430}Both listed by Kelle and Piper as compounds.
\textsuperscript{431}All three listed by Kelle and Piper as compounds.
\textsuperscript{432}nach apparently does not get its Nág meaning until Notker and "illiram. The Gonsee Glosses do show a nah uns post nos. Y. Graff, \textit{Die althochdeutschen Prápositionen}, p. 97.
that we have no preposition here.

The strictly adverbial quality of Gothic nehv and nehva, indeed the apparent absence of any clear compound in the older Germanic dialects, rather argues against compounding in Otfrid's nāh. Yet this is anything but definitive.

nidiri. This form is non-committal. With the probable absence of compounds formed with any of the -i extensions, the cases with nidiri look more unlikely.

widar. It appears in two sentences which might seem compounding forms with the verb: er kėrta sih sar uuidar zin and tho... thaz līb... fon bēche hera uuidaruuarb.
The order in both is ambiguous.

While the semantic situation would permit the assigning of the spatial meaning "back" rather than the temporal "again" (the latter being the meaning of Otfrid's adverbs) and thus give some credence to compounding, the chances are still that we have here the simple adverb. The form would demand separate treatment, and compounding would be much more likely if it were not for the clear adverb use of widar (in addition to the usual widari-widiri) in IV-17-24 er sāztaz uuidar hēilaz (v.s. p. 28). It also seems natural that the adverb form widar would have the meaning "back" as well as "again" and this is entirely confirmed by the Tatian 221-3 mittiu siu thisiu quad,
Adverbial nature, as already mentioned, is pretty definite. It is further supported by P's giang pilatus uuidari, with its double stress.

zua. Aside from its numerous connections with thara, which vouch for its adverbial nature, zua appears alone five times with verbs of speaking and seeing.

No word order feature classifies this zua in any way. Yet several facts speak rather strongly against compounding:

1. Possibility of postpositional use (pp. 102-3).

2. Double stress in V riaf... zaa (P stresses neither) and V sprah imo zaa.

3. The direct parallel with thara in V-8-24 gtnissi... thara uuir zua io rufen.

A final paragraph must be devoted to the instances of possible double compounding.

Further support, in turn, for thara compounding wherever possible lies in the word order of tharzua sin ouh gizalte - quite contrary to compounding patterns.

All of which Kelle and Piper list as compounds.

But Leinen (pp. 42-5) regards zuo + sprehan forms as likely compounds. His arguments are a bit abstract, ignoring entirely such matters as stress and possibility of postpositional use.

The correspondence between thara forms and postpositions (thara insegini = imo insegini) is no accident. Further treatment would be interesting but is beyond the field of this study.
The effect of the various syntactical considerations on the group of forms in the section on "Double Compounding" is fairly extensive. Adverbial nature and irregular order take their toll and leave only the following as double forms in which one is surely a compounding form: hina nidarscrikke, hera nidarstigan, hera nidaragan, so stig nidar hera, farames auur thara... hina... in, and the combinations with the inseparable compounds of heim, hera, thara, ûf, umbi, ûz, zisamane, and zuu (v.g. pp. 64-7). In all of these latter, of course, the one element is distinctly adverbial, but most of them are in the proper order for assimilation into the compounding pattern. Such a group is typified by NôG aufbewahren. Thus the same possibility of association with compounds is open for them as for forms like ûf and ûz with simple verbs. There is very little evidence for a group of compounds in ÔôG paralleling aufbewahren, however.

Remarkably enough, this leaves for Otfried only one form both of whose particles are compounding forms. This is ingiogan. It is the sole instance corresponding to the main scene of compounding — that is, separable compounding — in Gothic, the inn and ut double compounds! In this fact lies the most extreme contrast between Gothic and ÔôG.

A direct parallel in Tatian 128-7 inti anagiefel in thiobra et incidit in latrones.
0. Summary of Results and Comparison with Gothic

We have now heard all of the evidence which bears on the principle question: Is there in OHG a separable compounding system distinct from the free adverbial pattern? The answer, in which lies the main import of this study for OHG syntax, is "yes" and has been throughout the paper.

The principal group of forms, of which I think only one is at all doubtful, is small but significant. Among its number – ana, in, nidar, thana – in is the only one for which strict adverbial use can be demonstrated in Otfrid. This general absence of real adverbial forms in the compounding system certainly does not last long, but it shows that Otfrid's language was on much the same plane as Wulfilas', where true adverbs like dalap and iup maintained their freedom of order, resisting incorporation into a pattern regulated by the verb.

For Otfrid, at any rate, these forms show another surprising characteristic. None of them is an indubitable preposition. ana is for F, of course, and in may be identical with the preposition in, though stress and length are such likely concomitants that almost all scholars write in where the form has no object of its own.
Certainly the lexical nature of these forms did facilitate their grouping as a separate syntactical class.

Even Otfred's all-or-nothing accentuation cannot hide the fact that these forms had one further characteristic—beyond the lexical and syntactical ones already discussed. This characteristic is a degree of stress presumably less than the adverbs, but greater than the inseparable prefixes hintar, thuruh, untar, ubar, and widar.

This stress situation is actually the best support for the similar hypothesis made for the Gothic, where the stress of iup, etc. was presumed to be greater than that of inn and ut.438 The tenacity of certain syntactical and stress patterns is one of the most striking observations that a comparative study provides.

In the field of Otfred's syntax per se I hope this study has brought to light a few new or at least generally neglected points. The main ones involve:

1. The establishing of a pattern of separable compounding, centering around ana, in, midar, and thana.

2. Description of some special features of main and subordinate clause word order.

438 Much of the Gothic argument, which suffered from a slight paucity of material, was based on the treatment of noun and pronoun objects. The same study in OHG showed the remarkable parallel between the two languages.
3. Clear differentiation between compounding forms and free adverbs.

4. Further evidence on the probable multiple origins of compounding forms.

5. Consideration of late main clause position as an important variant in Oâ©G (and perhaps Gothic) word order.

6. Fuller discussion of the thara compounds.

The points of comparison with the Gothic have, I trust, been made clear in the body of the study. A few main particulars may be summarized and recapitulated. In every one of them the way is open for further work in OS, ON, OE, above all in Notker's OHG and in MHG.

1. OHG no longer depends on double compounding to "free" its first members for a separable compounding system. Indeed, the possibility of having a true compounding form with an already compounded verb has, it seems, nearly disappeared. Only ingiâ©iang appears in Otfriâ©, and it is a good thing that it is in preposed order, for one would be tempted to regard giâ©iang... in as circumstantial evidence for adverbial in.

2. The fate of Wulfilâ©a's numerous compounding forms is interesting - taking the liberty of speaking as if Gothic were the ancestor of OHG. The force of the inseparability I have assumed for Gothic simple compounds seems to be reflected in the large number of forms that
are inseparables in Otfrid, to wit the analogues of and, bi, du (in part), faur and faura (in part), hindar, pairb, ufar, us, wipra. The idea of a separate group of Gothic compounding forms consisting of first members of doublets is supported by the fact that, of the etymological correspondencies of that group, ana is a compounding form, du in part (zuo) an adverb, faur in part (fora) an adverb, and mib an adverb. The two new words occupying the semantic field of Gothic forms appear as compounding forms: thana (= af) and nidar (= uf). uf has another semantic equivalent in the inseparable untar. The separable inn and ut of Gothic are divided, in being a compounding form (but the one with the only adverbial instances in Otfrid) and ëz being an adverb.

Thus, in general, the Gothic divisions, whatever their relation to the Proto-Germanic divisions, are significant comparatively and historically as well as synchronically.

4. The order of the compounding form in the OHG is freer than that of Gothic. More remote separation from the verb is possible. This brings the compounding form into contact but not identity with the adverbs. This in turn facilitates the growth of the compounding system through the assimilation of some of the adverbs.
5. The pattern of compounding form before the late main clause verb is, on the other hand, an instance of close connection with the verb which is true of OHG and at least likely though not so common in Gothic.

6. The continuing possibility of multiple origin for compounding forms is one of the most important similarities between OHG and Gothic. The OHG situation is the best verification for the paths of origin which were indicated by Gothic. OHG suggests as old and new sources:

a) Originally inseparable preverbs
b) Prepositions in isolation (various types)
c) Forms associated with thara (including ãf and ãz)
d) Adverbs

In the last field – the adverbs – Otfrid is especially rich in those coincidences of word order which later become significant. The adverb before the verb in, say, subordinate clauses or infinitives grows into a compounding pattern, where it was only incidentally associated with the verb before. Cases like thanne ëllu uuorolt ãfsteit show the sort of pattern that encourages the formation of ãf compounds.

7. Stress patterns (noun and pronoun objects, infinitives, subordinate clauses) show remarkable similarity, though Gothic stress must be assumed. OHG accent marking aids in an interpretation of Gothic.
8. OHG apparently has adverbial uses for prepositions, thus giving some justification to the term which seemed largely out of place in Gothic - "prepositional adverbs."

9. The most remarkable or perhaps the most natural correspondence between the two languages is within the group of word order patterns. They are in effect absolutely the same for OHG as they were for Gothic. It is now apparent that the large categories of infinitive, main clause, and subordinate clause would actually be enough to establish in both languages the class of true compounding forms as opposed to free adverbs or insep-

ables.
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