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The aim of this paper is to reconsider and revise the classification of prefixes and particles added to OE verbs, proposed in Niwa (1991, 1995), comparing it with Hiltunen’s classification and referring to an approach within generative grammar. We argue that (i) prefixes and particles with a prepositional function play as important a role as ones with an adverbial function and that (ii) prefixes added to OE verbs can be subdivided into nonfixed ones and fixed ones. We found that for (i), while Hiltunen disregards it, generative grammar supports it. In the case of (ii), while Hiltunen agrees with it, though using different terms, generative grammar does not allow it on the basis of the principle of economy.*
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1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to revise and extend the classification of prefixes and particles added to OE verbs, proposed in Niwa (1991, 1995), so that it can support the explanation of their structural and semantic development, particularly referring to Hiltunen’s classification and a derivational analysis of generative grammar.

Prefixes and particles in OE verbs are structurally various and semantically ambiguous.1 See the following examples:2

* I have benefited from discussion with Kazuhisa Ishikawa (Aichi Gakuin University), Tomohiro Yanagi (Chubu University), and Hiroyuki Nawata (Shimane University).

1 Morphological and semantic notes about verbal prefixes and particles are given here. As a morphological note, the word “particle” does not include prefixes. Furthermore, it excludes pure adverbs and prepositions. We have set up two types of prefixes: fixed and nonfixed prefixes. The former is different from the latter in that it does not have a free form. It includes ge-, a-, be-, and so on. The other prefixes are all nonfixed prefixes. As a semantic note, here are two meanings: spatial meaning and negative
AN ATTEMPT AT CLASSIFYING PREFIXES AND PARTICLES ADDED TO OE VERBS

(1) a. *S.Chr. 871 70 15* Æþered cyning ond Ælfred his broþur þær micle fierd to Readingum ge læddon ‘King Æthelred and Alfred his brother led great levies there to Reading’ (*ge*- intensive)

b. *S.Chr. 755 48 6* þa on þæs wifes gebaerum *on* fundon þæs cyninges þegnas þa unstilnesse ‘then from the woman’s cries the king’s thanes became aware of the disturbance’ (*on*- intensive) (Niwa (1995: 239))

c. *S.Chr. 871 70 28* ond *on* feohtende wæron óp niht ‘and they were fighting till night’ (*on* ‘against’) (Niwa (1995: 226))

d. *S.Chr. 894 86 20* ond wæs þa *u*tafaren *on* hergaþ ‘and he was then gone out on a plundering raid’ (Niwa (1995: 157))

e. *S.Chr. 918 98 12* ond hergodon *on* Norþ Wealas æghwær be þam see ‘and harried against North Wales everywhere along the sea’ (Niwa (1995: 244))

f. *S.Chr. 911 96 3* Her bræc se here *on* Norðhymbrum þone frið ‘in this year the host in Northumbria broke the truce’ (Niwa (1995: 249))

First, compare (1a–d). The prefixes *ge-* in (1a) and *on-* in (1b) are different from the prefix *on-* in (1c) with regard to separability and kind of meaning. The former are bound forms while the latter has its free form. The former have an intensive meaning while the latter has a literal meaning. Only the former is dealt with in this paper. Furthermore, when we use the traditional terms, adverbs or prepositions, we point to both particles and prefixes.

Examples used in Niwa (1991, 1995) are taken from *VP, S.Chr.* and *P.Chr.* *VP* = *The Vespasian Psalter* (Sweet (1885)), *S.Chr.* = *The Saxon Chronicle Parker MS* before 1001 (Plummer and Earle (1952)), and *P.Chr.* = *The Saxon Chronicle Peterborough MS* after 1122 (Plummer and Earle (1952)). Why were these examples used? As written in Niwa (1991: 34), *VP* was written mainly in Mercian or Kentish in the first half of the ninth century. It was written not in ordinary prose but in a unique prose based on an interlinear gloss with the Latin original. The uses of prefixes are abundant, probably reflecting formal usage, even if influenced by the prefixes in the Latin original. *S.Chr.* was written in ordinary early West-Saxon. *P.Chr.* was written mainly in East Midland dialect during the period 1122–1155. These three texts alone did not provide enough data, but roughly represent two different types of OE—religious English and secular English—and three diachronic periods—earliest OE, standard OE and a transitional stage between OE and ME—. In this paper, however, we have decided not to use *VP*, an interlinear gloss, except for special cases, in order to avoid complications resulting from the Latin influence.
meaning. Look at the two on-’s in (1b, c). They appear to be the same prefix but their meanings are different. One is intensive, while the other is literal. We will call this difference in meaning a problem of literal or figurative meanings. (1d) indicates another problem. The prefixes and particle used here all have similar spatial meanings. Thus, it appears that there is an accumulation of prefixes and a particle with a similar meaning. Why are ut- and on necessary in addition to a-? This issue will be treated later as a problem of Cumulative Tendency (CT). Furthermore, ut- in (1d) might not be a prefix but a particle placed immediately before the verb. We will consider this later as a problem of fixed or nonfixed prefixes.

In (1e) and (1f) both examples of on are prepositions, but there is a difference between them in combination. We will consider this later as a problem of pure adverbs and prepositions.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we will introduce Hiltunen’s (1983) classification as a representative previous study. In Section 3 we will show a revised version of Niwa’s classification, and in Section 4 we will try to structurally explain prefixes and particles dealt with here through the format of generative grammar. Section 5 provides conclusions.

2. Previous Studies

In previous works dealing with OE grammar, prefixes and particles added to verbs were treated to a greater or lesser extent, but heated discussion arose in Mitchell (1985: 440–448) about difficulties of their classification. He tried to show, for instance, the distinction between prefixes with a prepositional function and ones with an adverbial function, by the criterion of function, that is, (a) when a compound verb consisting of a prefix and intransitive verb remains intransitive, the prefix has an adverbial function [...] ; (b) when a compound verb consisting of a prefix and intransitive verb becomes transitive, the prefix has a prepositional function [...] ; and (c) when a compound verb consisting of a prefix and transitive verb remains transitive, the prefix has an adverbial function [...] (Mitchell (1985: 443)). He concluded that, “[w]e have reached the boundaries where the kingdoms of the preposition, the adverb, the separable prefix, and the inseparable prefix meet

---

3 Prefixes for-, to-, in- and on- have both a bound form and a free form. We distinguish them, such as by using for1- and for2- when it is necessary. See note 12.
and melt into one another.”

Following him, a very convincing and comprehensive classification appeared. We find it in Hiltunen’s description of his research (1983: 23). See (2) below.

(2) The classification of phrasal verbs provided in Hiltunen’s book (1983: 23)

\[
\text{phrasal verbs} \\
\text{involving phrasal adverbs} \quad \text{involving prepositional adverbs} \\
\text{with an adverbial function} \quad \text{with a prepositional function} \\
\text{detached from the head, or as verbal} \quad \text{as post-}
\text{prefixes}^4 \quad \text{positions as verbal prefixes}^5 \quad \text{preceding the head}
\text{the head not expressed as verbal, as the}
\text{inseparable, as the}
\text{case may be ...}
\]

Hiltunen (1983: 20) states that, “OE phrasal verbs are collocations of a verb and a phrasal or prepositional adverb.” A phrasal adverb here corresponds to what this paper describes as an adverbial prefix and particle, and a prepositional adverb corresponds to the prepositional prefix and particle of this paper. He, following the terminology in Campbell (1974) and Mitchell (1985), emphasizes an adverbial function.

Furthermore, prepositional adverbs are divided into those having two functions, an adverbial function and a prepositional function. It seems to us that this division is not clear. Concretely, this adverbial function refers to examples of a preposition without a head (e.g. *feng C to ‘C succeeded to’) and fixed and nonfixed prefixes (see notes 4 and 5). Their adverbial function is stronger, but they are still prepositions. Inseparable prefixes such as *a-, *be-, and *ge- are classified in two places. It is not ideal for the same prefixes to appear in two places. We will discuss this more in Section 3.2.1.

Now, let us discuss phrasal adverbs in (2). Hiltunen indicates that phrasal adverbs involving phrasal adverbs have an adverbial function and those involving prepositional adverbs have a prepositional function.

---

4 *ge-, *a-, *be, *for- (in *forgiefan) and *under- (in *understan) are classified here.
5 *ge-, *a-, *be, *for- (in *forgiefan) and *under- (in *understan) are classified here too.
al adverbs include examples like *adun*, *aweg*, *forð*, *niðer*, *up*, and *ut* and differentiates them from prepositional adverbs. This appears to be a good treatment because these words are separable and in many points are different from prepositional adverbs. But it is not always clear whether phrasal adverbs should include verbal prefixes such as *up*- and *ut*- . It seems that he notices prefixed form but is reluctant to call them so.6 This is one point we criticize in Hiltunen’s classification: the strength of combination is not fully accounted for. We will discuss this later as a problem of fixed and nonfixed prefixes.

As a whole, however, his classification is plausible because it includes almost every type of prefix and particle, and particularly, the classification of prepositions is both innovative and largely exhaustive. Traditionally, little attention has been paid to the prepositional function in prefixes. For instance, Sweet (1925: 36–37) said nothing concerning prepositions. In contrast, Hiltunen’s focus on prepositional adverbs in (2) includes almost every type with a prepositional function such as prefixes, particles, postpositions, and non-head prepositions. This is the point which distinguishes his classification and makes it convincing.

Another point to characterize Hiltunen’s classification is that he uses the term ‘adverbs’ to cover all adverbial and prepositional prefixes and adverbs. It may be good to use a single term for all verbal prefixes and particles, if they share enough common properties to use the term. However, while we think that they have something in common, the difference between prepositions and adverbs is so great in relation to verbal prefixes and particles, that we propose to put an equal value on both as seen in our classification. We will discuss this as a problem of adverbs or prepositions.

---

6 Hiltunen does not add any explanation about phrasal adverbs here in (2), but Hiltunen (1983: 25) states that, “many phrasal and prepositional adverbs can appear both separated from the verb and joined with it.” This means that he appears to be thinking of prefixes in phrasal adverbs.

3.1. Assumptions, Classification, and Examples

First we make some basic assumptions for our classification.

(3) a. Prefixes and particles are divided into either prepositional ones or adverbial ones.
   b. They can be classified as fixed prefixes, nonfixed prefixes, or particles, based on the strength of combination.
   c. Figurative and literal meanings are distinguished.

Making the assumption in (3a) is the result of giving an equal value to both adverbs and prepositions, while (3b) is the central part of our classification. As our classification is not intended to be a mathematically based classification, but a semantically and structurally based one, the distinction referred to in (3c) is also included.

Given these assumptions, several problems mentioned above can be solved. Hiltunen, as seen in (2), classifies prefixes into separable vs. inseparable. These terms are appropriate ones in that they express the distinction between fixed and nonfixed prefixes, but also have some problems. (3c) has not been treated so far, because most particles added to verbs have a literal meaning, but it is necessary to point it out when we think that the important feature of phrasal and prepositional constructions of present-day English is a semantic one and it has already begun as we see below in the odd-numbered examples with figurative meanings in (5).

The reasons for the assumptions in (3) are discussed in Section 3.2. The table in (4) and the sentences in (5) show the revised classification and typical examples, respectively.

---

7 Niwa’s classification is based on a descriptive analysis of the three texts shown above in note 2. The revised version not only removes the VP data, but also theoretical considerations are made and it is partly revised. In particular, the classification A1 was revised.

8 For all examples, see Niwa (1991, 1995).

9 There are at least two problems. (i) The word ‘separable’ must be used in two ways for adverbial prefixes and prepositional prefixes. The latter are far from being called separable. (ii) This reminds us of German separable prefixes which are separated from verbs by grammatical rules.
(4) A revised classification of prefixes and particles added to verbs based on Niwa (1991: x, xi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>function</th>
<th>prefix</th>
<th>particle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>B1 (nonfixed)</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2 (nonfixed)</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositional</td>
<td>A1 (fixed)</td>
<td>D1 D2 (front-positional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3 (nonfixed)</td>
<td>D3 D4 (post-positional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4 (nonfixed)</td>
<td>D5 D6 (non-head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1 D2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3 D4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 D6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cf. In the classification, capital letters show each type of verbal prefix and particle, an even number shows a literal meaning, and an odd number indicates a figurative meaning. The following are the details. A1 = prepositional figurative fixed prefix(es);10 B1 = adverbial figurative nonfixed prefix(es); B2 = adverbial literal nonfixed prefix(es); B3 = prepositional figurative nonfixed prefix(es); B4 = prepositional literal nonfixed prefix(es); C1 = adverbial figurative particle(s); C2 = adverbial literal particle(s); D1 = prepositional front-positional figurative particle(s); D2 = prepositional front-positional literal particle(s); D3 = prepositional post-positional figurative particle(s); D4 = prepositional post-positional literal particle(s); D5 = prepositional non-head word figurative particle(s); and D6 = prepositional non-head word literal particle(s)

According to (3b), verbal prefixes and particles can be divided into two forms: prefixes and particles. Prefixes are further divided into fixed ones and nonfixed ones. Particles do not include pure adverbs and prepositions as shown in note 1. On the other hand, according to (3a), all verbal prefixes and particles belong to one of two functions: adverbial or prepositional. Typical examples to support this classification are shown in (5).11 Some examples given earlier in (1) are repeated here.

(5) A112ge-(=1a) S.Chr. 871 70 15 Æþered cyning ond Ælfred his broþur ber micle fierd to Readingum geæddon ‘King Æthelred and Alfred his brother led great levies there to Reading’ (ge- intensive)

---

10 The problem as to whether A1 is prepositional or adverbial has been long discussed. In Hiltunen it is classified into both adverbial and prepositional functions. I propose here that it is prepositional, for the reason discussed in (9), though Niwa (1991) did not conclusively solve this problem.

11 The examples are shown in the form (1A1 for) instead of the usual (1a) hereafter.

12 Prefixes for-, in -, to-, and on- have both a bound form and a free form. The number 1 expresses a bound form, and 2, a free form. See note 1.
**on-** S.Chr. 755 48 6 ṭa on ṭæs wifes gebærum on-
fundon ṭæs cyinges ṭegnas ṭa unstilnesse ‘then from the woman’s cries the king’s thanes became aware of the disturbance’ (*on* intensive)  
(Niwa (1995: 239))

B1 *forð-* S.Chr. 1053 182 1 Goduwine eorl *forðferde* ‘earl Godwine passed away’  
(Niwa (1991: 118))

B2 *ut-* S.Chr. 896 89 16 ṭa onget se here ṭæt hie ne mehton ṭa scypu *utbrengan* ‘then the host saw that they could not bring out ships’  
(Niwa (1995: 156))

B3 *ofer-* S.Chr. 937 110 6 Weealles *ofercoman*13 ‘(they) overcame the Welsh’  
(Niwa (1991: 192))

B4 *of-* S.Chr. 792 54 11 Offa Miercna cyning het Æþelbryhte rex ṭæt heafod *ofáslean* ‘Offa, king of the Mercians ordered them to strike off King Æthelberht’s head’  
(Niwa (1991: 169))

C1 *up* P.Chr. 1132 262 29 Ond dide him gyuen *up* ṭ ab-
brace of Burch ‘and made him give up the abbacy of Burch’  
(Niwa (1995: 138))  
cf. This example belongs to the earliest ME.

C2 *up* S.Chr. 865 68 11 se here hiene on niht *up* bestæl ‘the host went secretly inland by night’  
(Niwa (1995: 130))

D1 *on* P.Chr. 1137 265 15 Heold mycel carited in the hus and ṭop wethere wrohte *on*14 ṭe circe ‘held many commemoration feasts in the house and nevertheless extended the church’  
(Niwa (1995: 261))

D2 *on* (=1e) S.Chr. 918 98 12 ond hergodon *on* Norþ Wealas æghwaer be ṭam sæ, ‘and harried against North Wales everywhere along the sea’  
(Niwa (1995: 244))

---

13 The meaning ‘overcome’ seems to be a kind of figurative meaning.
14 Garmonsway (1955: 265) shows this figurative meaning of ‘to extend’ for *wyrcean* ‘to work’ + *on*. 
D3\textsuperscript{15} No examples

D4 to S.Chr. 616 24 4 ond þar to gehalgode Romanum to biscope ‘and he consecrated Romanus (as) bishop there-to.’ (Niwa (1995: 58))

D5 to S.Chr. 2 16 ond þa feng Cenwalh to\textsuperscript{16} ‘and then Cenwalh succeeded to (the kingdom)’ (Niwa (1995: 59))

D6 to S.Chr. 887 80 22 forþæm hira nan næs on fædren healfe to\textsuperscript{17} geboren buton … ‘for not one of them was born thereto on the paternal side but …’ (Niwa (1995: 58))

All examples of verbal prefixes and particles treated in Niwa (1991, 1995) are given in (6), though newly-developed adverbs such as away, off, down, and so on, are not included.\textsuperscript{18}

(6) a. adverbial: up(-), ut(-), forð(-)
   b. prepositional: ge-, a-, be-, for1-, in1-, to1- on1-, for2(-), efer(-), geond(-), in2(-), of(-), ofer(-), to2(-), ðurh(-), wið(-), ymb(-), on2(-), ot(-)

The prefixes ge-, a-, be-, for1-, in1-, to1-, and on1- are bound forms. The others are not bound forms but have their prefix forms and free forms.

3.2. Discussion

3.2.1. A Problem of Prepositions or Adverbs

In Hiltunen’s classification all verbal prefixes and particles are regarded as adverbs. We agree with him in so far as prefixes are more or less adverbial and prepositions without a head and postpositions such as those indicated above in D4, D5 and D6 are also adverbial. But an alternative classification which treats prepositions and adverbs as equal in status seems to us better for the reasons below. The reasons are shown from a descriptive, an etymological, a structural,\textsuperscript{19} and probably a semantic point of view.

\textsuperscript{15} No examples of D3 are found in Niwa (1991, 1995). This is probably because in order to get a figurative meaning, a close connection with a verb is necessary, which seems to be structurally difficult.

\textsuperscript{16} To belongs to D5 because the word ‘kingdom’ is omitted, and the meaning of ‘succeed to’ is figurative because fon means only ‘take.’

\textsuperscript{17} Thereto is omitted.

\textsuperscript{18} We have not necessarily given all possibilities in (6), because of a scarcity of examples.

\textsuperscript{19} As for the structural point of view, see Section 4.
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First, there is no problem about D1 and D2 being classified as prepositional and C1 and C2 being classified as adverbial because in D1 and D2 particles are added to nouns while in C1 and C2 particles are added to verbs. In Hiltunen’s classification of (2), D1 and D2 are regarded as a kind of adverb which is called a prepositional adverb with a prepositional function.

Secondly, D4–D6 are partly prepositional and partly adverbial. Why are they classified as prepositional? We argue that they are not prepositional adverbs, but are adverbial prepositions. See (7b, c).

(7) a. V … Adv, (original adverb, e.g. code *ut*)
    b. V … PN ((adverbial) prepositional phrase) > P … V … N,
       (D6 type; e.g. feng to kingdom > to feng kingdom)
    c. V … PN (prepositional phrase) > P-V … N, (prefix; e.g.
       feng to kingdom > to-feng kingdom)

The adverb in (7b) is different from the original adverb in (7a) because the former comes from a prepositional phrase (PN), which is adverbial. The preposition in the PN still preserves a prepositional nature and has a relationship with the noun, although it is separated from that noun (N). The particle to in (5D5) with a noun omitted has an adverbial function, but it is still a preposition. We can observe even a semantic difference between (7a) and (7b). The adverb in (7a) has an independent meaning such as ‘out,’ while that of (7b) has a dependent or connective meaning such as ‘to.’

Thirdly, there is a problem about (5B3/4): why are they prepositional? See again (7c). The preposition (P) in the prepositional phrase (PN) is separated from its noun (N) and added to V as a prefix. It still preserves a prepositional nature and has a relationship with the noun. Remember Mitchell’s (1985: 443) words cited at the beginning of Section 2.

Therefore, we can safely conclude that adverbial prefixes (5B1/2) have separated adverbs, while prepositional prefixes (5B3/4) also have free prepositions but they are separated from prepositional phrases. In concrete terms, see the difference in the examples below (8).

(8) a. 5B2 *ut-
    S.Chr. 896 89 16 þa onget se here þæt hie ne mehton þa
    scypu *utbregan ‘then the host saw that they could not bring
    out ships’ (Niwa (1995: 156))
    b. C2 *ut
    S.Chr. 944 110 32 ond aflymde *ut twegen cyningas ‘and
    drove out two kings’ (Niwa (1991: 115))
c. 5B4 of-

*S.Chr.* 792 54 11 Offa Miercna cyning het Æþelbryhte rex þæt heafod ofaslean ‘Offa, king of the Mercians ordered them to strike off King Æthelberht’s head’

(Niwa (1991: 169))

d. the pure preposition of

*P.Chr.* 1154 268 31 cusen oþer of heom sælf ‘they chose the other from themselves’

(Niwa (1991: 177))

In (8a, b), 5B2 ut- has a separated form (= a free form) of C2 ut and in (8c, d), 5B4 of- also has a free preposition of, but it is not a separated form of the prefix of- but of a prepositional phrase such as of heom sælf ‘from themselves.’

Finally, there is a traditionally unsolved problem: whether ge-, a- and be-, as shown earlier in A1, should be considered adverbial or prepositional. Hiltunen classified them in both categories, as pointed out in note 10. There is no descriptive criterion for this classification, but it seems that an etymological point of view will offer great support for those in A1 being prepositional. See (9).

(9) a. ga- (OE. ge-, OS gi-, OHG. ga-, gi-), originally a preposition meaning together, which already in prim. Germanic was no longer used as an independent word. (Wright (1949: 172))

b. bi- prep. c. acc. and dat. by … OE. bi, be, OHG. bi.

(Wright (1949: 310))

c. us-20 prep. c. dat. out, out of, from. (Wright (1949: 352))

The prefixes ga-, bi- and us- are all prepositions in Gothic, frequently preserving their case government. They weakened their concrete locative meaning in OE, but still belonged to a prepositional group.

Now the above discussion seems to be enough to conclude that two functions, adverbial and prepositional, should be treated equally, rather than only favoring an adverbial function.

### 3.2.2. A Further Problem concerning Prepositional Prefixes

There is one further problem with prepositional prefixes. That is, some prepositional prefixes have both an intensive use and a literal use. So, they have a bound form and a free form. We have already seen this phenomenon in on- in (5). Let us now see it in prefixes in-, to-, on- and for- in

20 Us- is the Gothic form of OE a-.
(10a–h). Please note here that we have used _VP_ for _in_- and _for_- because there are no examples of the prefix _in_- and _for2_- in the _Chronicle_ data.

(10)  a. _in1_- _VP_ 76 19 _inlihton bliccetunge_ ðine eorðan _Inluxerunt coruscations tuae orbi_ ‘the lightings enlightened your world’ (_in_- intensive) (Niwa (1991: 135))

b. _in2_- _VP_ 67 19 _soðlice ða ne gelefað ineardian dryhten god enim qui non credunt inhabitare Dominus Deus_ ‘truly, on those who do not believe, the Lord God might dwell’ (_in2_- has a free form ‘in’)

       (Niwa (1991: 136))

c. _to1_- _S.Chr._ 896 89 20 _ond ða ealle ðe hie alædan ne mehton tobræcon_ ‘and all that they could not take away they broke up’ (_to_- intensive) (Niwa (1995: 54))

d. _to2_- _S.Chr._ 894 84 31 _hæfde … his fierd on tu tonumen had divided his levies into two’ (_to2_- has a free form _to_ ‘to’) (Niwa (1995: 55))

e. _on1_- _S.Chr._ 755 48 6 _ða on ðæs wifes gebærum onfunden ðæs cyninges þegnas ða unstillnesse_ ‘then from the woman’s cries the king’s thanes became aware of the disturbance’ (_on_- intensive) (Niwa (1995: 239))

f. _on2_- _S.Chr._ 871 70 28 _ond onfeohtende wæron ðe niht_ ‘and they were fighting against till night’ (a free form _on_ means ‘against’) (Niwa (1995: 242))

g. _for1_- _S.Chr._ 816 60 2 Þy ilcan geare forborn Ongol cynnea scolu ‘in the same year the school of the English was burned down’ (Niwa (1991: 88))

h. _for2_- _VP_ 67 32 _sigelhearwan forcymeð hond his gode. Aethiopia praevent manus ejus Deo_ ‘Ethiopians stretch out their hand to God’ (_for_ = ‘before’)

       (Niwa (1991: 77))

As shown in parentheses, _in_-, _to_-, _on_- and _for_- in (10a–h) have both a bound form and a free form. This significant phenomenon seems never to have been pointed out previously.

### 3.2.3. The Problem of Fixed and Nonfixed Prefixes

Traditional treatments of nonfixed prefixes are ambiguous. Mitchell (1985) does not touch them at all. Quirk and Wrenn (1955: 109–119) treat them in combination with fixed prefixes. The _OED_ (Murray et al. (1933)) has an entry, for instance, for _up_- as a prefix. Hiltunen notices them in
that he differentiates them from fixed prefixes, using the term “separable” vs. “inseparable.”

We move on here to argue that there are types of prefixes in OE other than fixed prefixes, which we have called nonfixed prefixes. The reasons were discussed in Niwa (2003). They are as follows: first, there are many examples such as (1c) on-, (5B2) ut-, and so on, which are written exactly as a morphological form of prefix. We have even found an example below where ut is used as a prefix as well as a particle in the same sentence as in (11), though this is an example from $VP$. The prefix ut- exactly corresponds to the prefix e- in Latin.

(11) $VP$ 40 7 ond uteodon ut Et egrediebatur foras ‘and they went out’

Furthermore, in (12) we have found an example where forð- (B1) is used after ge- (A1).

(12) S.Chr. 571 18 29 þy ilcan geare he geforþferde ‘in this year he passed away’

This example alone provides ample evidence that forð- is a prefix, though this is an exceptional example.\(^{21}\)

Secondly, nonfixed prefixes are used more freely in ME as prefixes, such as uphold and outbear (Niwa (2003: 243)) and even in present-day English.

Thirdly, the separable verb system in German as illustrated in (13) indirectly supports the existence of nonfixed prefixes.

(13) a. Ich gehe aus.

b. … wenn ich ausgehe …

The prefix aus- in (13b), which corresponds to an OE nonfixed prefix, is shown as separated into aus in (13a).

Next, there is no problem about regarding the prefixes shown earlier in B3/4 (prepositional) as nonfixed prefixes. They have free forms as was shown in (8). They (B3/4) are used as prefixes morphologically with more stability (with clear distinction from a particle form) than B1/2. For example, æfterfylgian (Niwa (1991: 58)), oferhergian (Niwa (1991: 192)), and so on.

Finally, we would like to say that there was a strong drift of making prefixes, ‘prefixation,’ in OE, or more correctly in West Germanic, and nonfixed prefixes are a product of this drift. However, many scholars and particularly generative grammarians neglect this view.

3.2.4. The Problem of Pure Adverbs and Prepositions

We are now in a position to distinguish adverbial particles and prepositional particles from pure adverbs and pure prepositions. Niwa (1991: 25) pointed out the morphological distinction, saying that “[u]sually free [= pure] adverbs can be morphologically identified because they have rather longer forms [...].” Examples are *binnan, butan, upwards, ham, norð*, and so on. Hiltunen (1983: 21) says that pure adverbs lack a completive connotation as illustrated in (14).

(14) a. He pulled the rope *up*.
   b. He pulled the rope *upwards*.
*Up* in (14a) is an adverbial particle because it means ‘to pull to a final position’ and expresses a completive connotation, while in (14b) *upwards* lacks such a connotation.

As for distinguishing prepositional particles from pure prepositions, Hiltunen says nothing, but there is a difference as seen at the beginning of this paper in (1e, f). The boundary is sometimes ambiguous, but Niwa (1991: 26) says that, “[t]he identification of pure prepositions is not conclusive now, but a static local meaning, a temporal meaning, a meaning of manner and a causative meaning are among the signs of pure prepositions.”

3.2.5. The Problem of Figurative Meaning

As shown in (3c), Niwa’s classification identifies figurative meaning, because it is important in understanding the beginnings of the phrasal and prepositional verbs of present-day English. For example, *guuen up* in (5C1 *up*) is the earliest example of the phrasal verb. However, an approach concerning figurative meaning is traditionally ignored, because examples with figurative meaning are few and their figurativeness is slight. Thus, our indication of this kind of meaning is supposed to be contributive.

Examples with figurative meaning were indicated in (5) by adding odd numbers: A1, B1, B3, C1, D1 and D5 (as for D3, see note 15). Generally speaking, such meaning is so complex that it is hard to classify. Therefore, we have roughly divided the meaning of verbal prefixes and particles into a literal meaning and a figurative meaning. To supplement this potentially oversimplified approach, the following explanation is added.

There is a difference between adverbial and prepositional, and between prefixes and particles concerning figurativeness. As for the former, *forð-* in (5B1), adverbial, is idiomatic (‘passed away’) while *ge-* and *on-* in (5A1), prepositional, are intensive, but *offer-* in (5B3) is idiomatic (‘overcome’). As for the latter, prefixes, *ge-* and *on-* in (5A1), are intensive
while particles, *up* in (5C1), *on* in (5D1) and *to* in (5D5), are idiomatic (‘give up,’ ‘extended’ and ‘succeeded,’ respectively). We can summarize this semantic situation in (15).

(15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>form function</th>
<th>prefix</th>
<th>particle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>B1 idiomatic</td>
<td>C1 idiomatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositional</td>
<td>A1 intensive</td>
<td>B3 intensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can basically say that B1 and C1 in an adverbial function are idiomatic, while A1 in a prepositional function is intensive. B3 in a prepositional function is transitional from idiomatic to intensive. We can safely say that an intensive meaning occurs only in a prepositional type and not in an adverbial type.

We can summarize the meaning of verbal prefixes and particles, assuming that the spatial meaning progressed as in (16).

(16) a. The meaning of verbal prefixes and particles is a spatial one as noted in our introduction.
    b. It is divided into literal and figurative meanings.
    c. The figurative meaning is divided into an idiomatic one and an intensive one.
    d. It seems that meanings developed from a literal meaning, through an idiomatic one to an intensive one.
    e. The intensive meaning does not occur in an adverbial type.

The tendency described in (16d) is problematic, because the gap between an idiomatic meaning and an intensive meaning is too great. We leave it for future study.

3.2.6. The Problem of CT

When we meet with cumulative prefixes and particles as in the case of (1d), we have to assume CT (Cumulative Tendency), which is a main theme in Niwa (1991, 1995). This was early suggested by Jespersen (1917: 9) for the construction of negation as in (17).

(17) a. ic *ne* sece (nawiht/naht). (OE)
    b. I *ne* seye *not*. (ME)

In (17a), the particle *ne* was weakened, so *not* appeared to strengthen it in
(17b). Niwa (1991) found this tendency to be of wide occurrence and providing one important motivation for historical change of language, defining it as here in (18a) and extending examples as in (18b–f).

(18) a. When a certain linguistic unit weakens in sense, another linguistic unit with a similar meaning appears and strengthens it. We call it a Cumulative Tendency (CT).

(Niwa (1991: 39); revised)

b. S.Chr. 792 54 11 Offa Miercna cyning het Æþelbryhte rex þæt heafod ofaslean ‘Offa, king of the Mercians ordered them to strike off King Æthelberht’s head’

(Niwa (1991: 169))

c. S.Chr. 894 86 20 ond wæs þa utafaren on hergaþ ‘and he was then gone out on a plundering raid’ (Niwa (1995: 157))

d. S.Chr. 897 91 17 ond hie forðy utodreowan ‘and hence they rowed out (to sea).’ (oð is a preposition now lost)

(Niwa (1995: 157))

e. S.Chr. 890 82 15 ond hie bedrifon ut on ane ea ‘and drove them out into a river’

(Niwa (1995: 158))

f. VP 71 16 … ofer bið upahefen ofer Libanan munt westem his … super extollitur super Libanum fructus ejus ‘the fruits shall be above raised over Mount Lebanon’

(Niwa (1991: 187))

In (18b) of- (prep. B) and a- (A) have a similar meaning and make a CT. In (18c) ut- (adv. B) and a- (A) have a similar meaning and make a CT. In (18d) ut- (adv. B) and oð- (prep. B) have a similar meaning and make a CT. In (18e) be- (A), ut (C) and on (D) have a similar meaning and make a CT. These indicate multiple CT in the Chronicle data. Surprisingly the VP data shows a multiple four-part example in (18f): ofer (D), up- (adv. B), a- (A) and ofer (D). We discuss this further in relation to (22) below.

The idea of CT for verbal prefixes and particles was pointed out by Ishikawa (2000: 261, 269) and Denison (1985: 47), though neither used the term CT. We would like to propose the relevance of the CT approach and connect it with functional features in generative grammar.


While in Niwa (1991, 1995), reasons for classification were not discussed so comprehensively, in this paper, we could reveal why the distinction of
adverbial function and prepositional function is necessary and why nonfixed prefixes can not be disregarded. Furthermore, we explained more about CT, using the *VP* data.

4. Derivations in the Format of Generative Grammar

4.1. Ishikawa’s Assumptions

Our classification of verbal prefixes and particles can be supported by a structural analysis in the format of generative grammar. Ishikawa (1999, 2000) makes a basic assumption as shown in (19). (19) is set up to avoid the prohibition stated by the Principle of Lexical Integrity in (20).

(19) $V^0$ has internal structures, $V^{02}$ and $V^{01}$, that is:
$$V^0 = [V^{02} \ldots [V^{01} \ldots V^{00} (stem) \ldots ] \ldots ]$$

(20) Principle of Lexical Integrity

No syntactic rule can refer to elements of morphological structure. (Lapointe (1980: 8))

Syntactic operations can be applied to elements in the upper domain (above $V^{01}$), whereas they cannot in the lower domain (below $V^{01}$). This distinction can make it possible to explain the difference between the prefixes in A1, which are in the lower domain and cannot be extracted, and the prefixes and particles in examples in B and C, which are in the upper domain and can be extracted when necessary.

Then the idea of CT is integrated in the SC Criterion with $[\text{PRF e}]$ as in (21).

(21) SC Criterion and $[\text{PRF e}]$

a. A W-prefix $[+\text{SC}]$ must be within the same $V^{02}$ as a particle $[+\text{SC}]$.

b. A particle $[+\text{SC}]$ must be within the same $V^{02}$ as a W-prefix $[+\text{SC}]$.

c. The abstract null prefix $[\text{PRF e}]$ with $[+\text{SC}]$ must be assumed in the absence of a W-prefix.

(Ishikawa (2000: 261, 256, 257))

A W-prefix means a weak prefix as in A1, and $[+\text{SC}]$ means having a spatial and/or completive meaning. Ishikawa assumes the spatial meaning must include both of the two meanings “motion-through-location” and “terminus or result” (p. 254). $[\text{SC}]$ is an abstract semantic feature. A $[\text{PRF e}]$ is available when a W-prefix $[+\text{SC}]$ is absent.
4.2. Our Assumptions

The first problem is that the SC Criterion does not cover all our verbal prefixes and particles. That is, it does not include nonfixed prefixes (B) or some prepositional examples (D). We argue to extend the SC Criterion by CT, as mentioned in Section 3.2.6. In order to adopt this CT, an order of cumulation must be set up. Each prefix and particle must be ranked and lined up according to this order of cumulation. We prepared the following order related to examples (18b–e).

(22) a. The order of cumulation
   particle (prep.) with a noun (D) > particle (adv.) (C) > nonfixed prefix (adv.) (B) > nonfixed prefix (prep.) (B) > fixed prefix (A)
   b. the multiple CT

   The VP data in (18f) seems to show more multiple CT than the Chronicle data.

A particle (prep.) with a noun is semantically the strongest, because it modifies a verb with a noun as shown in on ane ea (18e) and in ofer Libanan munt (18f), and a fixed prefix is semantically the weakest, because it is only an intensive one. The adverbial prefixes (B), such as up-, ut-, and forþ-, are productive in OE and seem to be stronger than the prepositional prefixes (B), such as ofer- and of-.

In relation to (22b) we must think about why there is such a difference between the Chronicle data and VP data. One reason will be the influence of Latin in an interlinear gloss. In the VP data adverbial prefixes (B), up-, ut-, and forþ-, unique OE prefixes, seem to have been used effectively. For instance, in (18f) a- corresponds to Latin ex-. So, the introduction of up- here seems not for translation but for strengthening the CT effect, using an OE favorite.

How can the SC Criterion be extended by CT? I assume (23) as an extended SC Criterion.

(23) a. The SC Criterion is extended for all prefixes and particles as far as they have [+ SC] features.
   b. The SC Criterion is applicable to multiple prefixes and particles. Prefixes and particles without [+ SC] features are excluded.

Now we adopt Ishikawa’s internal V structure in (19) and insert the order of cumulation in (22) to make the tree diagram shown in (24). We have found no examples which have all categories in one single verb, as seen in (18).
The next problem to consider is about where all the verbal prefixes and particles are generated. Our answer is that A (fixed prefix) is generated in V01, while D and C are generated in PP and AdvP in VP and are incorporated into an appropriate position in the tree (24). This movement is motivated by the SC Criterion in (22) and the extended SC Criterion in (23). That is, SC features attract each other toward cumulation. Our basic assumptions are now given in (25).

(25)  
   a. Prepositional particles (D) are generated in PP within VP.  
   b. Adverbial particles (C) are generated in AdvP within VP.  
   c. Fixed prefixes are generated in V01 but nonfixed prefixes (B) are at one stage literal particles as C and D outside V02 and then are incorporated into V02 and are finally reanalyzed as nonfixed prefixes there.  
   d. The semantic difference mentioned in (3) has not been fully treated in this paper. All we can say is that prefixes in

---

(22) The semantic difference can be generated by a semantic rule in each domain, but here we will be satisfied by pointing out the difference of domain.
AN ATTEMPT AT CLASSIFYING PREFIXES AND PARTICLES ADDED TO OE VERBS

V⁰¹ always have an intensive meaning and adverbial particles in V⁰² do not have an intensive meaning.

(25a, b) explain the difference between prepositional and adverbial particles.²³

4.3. Illustrations

Following the assumptions in (25), most of the examples included previously in (5) can have the derivations illustrated in (27) below. We had better now confirm two points shown in (26):

(26) a. Verbs are generated in V⁰⁰ and have to get an A prefix or a null prefix [PRF e].

b. Landing sites of particles in V⁰² are overtly decided before or after the verbs according to the verb initial/final parameter. Our data contains examples exhibiting both values because the data are taken from the transitional period from verb-final to verb-initial.

In (27), the (b) examples show structures before the derivation, and the (c) examples show structures after the derivation.

(27) A1 ex. ge-

a. S.Chr. 871 70 15 Æbered cyning ond Ælfred his broþur þær micle fierd to Readingum gelæddon ‘King Æthelred and Alfred his brother led great levies there to Reading’ (ge- intensive)

b. [v' [v⁰² [v⁰¹ ge- læddon]]]

B1 ex. forð-

a. S.Chr. 1053 182 1 Goduuine eorl forðferde ‘Earl Godwine passed away’


c. [v' [v⁰² [Adv forð] [v⁰¹ [PRF e]-ferde]] [AdvP [Adv' tAdv]]]

> [v' [v⁰² [Adv forð-] [v⁰¹ [PRF e]-ferde]]]

cf. By reanalysis forð in V⁰² becomes a nonfixed prefix. For the term ‘reanalysis,’ see Roberts and Roussou (2003: 3).

²³ As we showed in (7), there is a clear difference between a preposition and an adverb. A preposition maintains a relation with a noun, while an adverb (such as ut and up) functions without a noun, sometimes slightly modified in form, as in the case of forð (fore + ð).
B3 ex. ofer-

a. *S.Chr. 937 110 6 Weealles ofercoman ‘(they) overcame the Welsh’
b. \[v' \text{coman} [\text{PP} [p' [p ofer]]]\]
c. \[v' [v'^02 [p ofer] [v'^01 [PRF e]-coman]] [\text{PP} [p' t_p]]\]
\[> [v' [v'^02 [p ofer-] [v'^01 [PRF e]-coman]]]\]
cf. By reanalysis ofer in \(v'^02\) becomes a nonfixed prefix.

C1 ex. up

a. *PChr. 1132 262 29 Ond dide him gyuen up ð abbrice of Burch ‘and made him give up the abbacy of Burch’
b. \[v' \text{gyuen} [\text{AdvP} [\text{Adv} [\text{Adv up}]]]\]
c. \[v' [v'^02 [v'^01 [PRF e]-gyuen]] [\text{Adv up}] [\text{AdvP} [\text{Adv} t_{Adv}]]\]

D1 ex. on

a. *PChr. 1137 265 15 Heold mycel carited in the hus and þe wethere worhte on be circe ‘held many commemoration feasts in the house and nevertheless extended the church’
b. \[v' \text{worhte} [\text{PP} [p' [p on] [NP be circe]]]\]
c. \[v' [v'^02 [v'^01 [PRF e]-worhte] [p on]] [\text{PP} [p' t_p [NP be circe]]]\]

D4 ex. to, ge-

a. *S.Chr. 616 24 4 ond þar to gehalgode Romanum to biscope ‘and he consecrated Romanus (as) bishop there-to’
b. \[v' \text{gehalgode} [\text{PP} [p' [p to] [NP þar]]]\]
c. \[v' [v'^02 [v'^01 ge- halgode]] [\text{PP} [p' t_p [NP þar]]]\]

D5 ex. to

a. *S.Chr. 2 16 ond þa feng Cenwalh to ‘and then Cenwalh succeeded to the kingdom’
b. \[v' \text{feng} [\text{PP} [p' [p to] (NP)]]\]
c. \[v' [v'^02 [v'^01 ge- feng]] [\text{PP} [p' t_p (NP)]]\]

Two examples of multiple prefixes and particles are added in (28) and (29).

(28) a. *S.Chr. 890 82 15 ond hie bedrifon ut on ane ea ‘and drove them out into a river’
(Niwa (1995: 158))
b. \[v' [v' \text{bedrifon}] [\text{AdvP} [\text{Adv} [\text{Adv ut}]]] [\text{PP} [p' [p on] [NP ane ea]]]\]
c. \[v' [v'^02 [v'^01 be- drifon] [\text{Adv ut} [p on]] [\text{AdvP} [\text{Adv} t_{Adv}]] [\text{PP} [p' t_p [NP ane ea]]]\]

(29) a. *VP 71 16 … ofer bið upahefen ofer Libanan munt westem his … super extollitetur super Libanum fructus ejus ‘the fruits shall be above raised over Mount Lebanon’
(Niwa (1991: 187))
b. \([V' \, [V \, \text{ahefen}]] \, [PP \, [P' \, [P \, \text{ofe}r_1]]] \, [\text{AdvP} \, [\text{Adv} \, [\text{Adv} \, \text{up}]]] \, [PP \, [P' \, [P \, \text{ofe}r_1]]] \, [NP \, \text{Liban}an \, \text{munt}]]]

c. \([V' \, [V_{02} \, [P \, \text{ofe}r_1]] \, [\text{AdvP} \, [\text{Adv} \, \text{up}]] \, [V_{01} \, \text{a}- \, \text{hefen}]] \, [P \, \text{ofe}r_1]]] \, [PP \, [P' \, tPJ]] \, [\text{AdvP} \, [\text{Adv} \, tAdv]] \, [PP \, [P' \, tPJ] \, [NP \, \text{Liban}an \, \text{munt}]]]

\text{cf. By reanalysis } up \text{ in } V_{02} \text{ becomes a nonfixed prefix.}

5. Conclusions

Concerning the problem of fixed and nonfixed prefixes, we agree with Hiltunen in accepting prefixes other than fixed prefixes, though he uses the terms “separable” vs. “inseparable.” Generative grammar refuses to have other prefixes for the reason of the principle of economy, though by re-analysis we tried to generate them as seen in (27B1 forð- and B3 ofer-) and (29c up-). We would like to have nonfixed prefixes in order to confirm the current of prefixation, which was still active in OE.

Regarding the problem of prepositions or adverbs, generative grammar supports our setting up of PP and AdvP. Hiltunen, on the other hand, refuses to use the term ‘preposition,’ and he instead uses the term ‘prepositional adverb.’ We would like to treat both prepositions and adverbs equally, because of the syntactic difference mentioned in (7).

Niwa (1991, 1995) used the VP data and the Chronicle data. In this paper, we used only the Chronicle data to avoid distracting complications caused by the influence of Latin. We reached almost the same conclusions except for a few examples, but with the effect of CT, a great difference occurred as was seen in (18).

Then, the introduction of generative grammar has provided not only a structural explanation for prefixes and particles dealt with here, but also an answer as to why a complex system of particles and prefixes arose and how strongly the feature agreement works. The traditional idea of Cumulative Tendency, a wider semantic entity, is not only harmonious with SC Criterion but also extendable to it.

Furthermore our classification includes the difference between literal meanings and figurative meanings as seen in (4) and (15). Traditional approaches have rarely taken that issue up.

Thus, we can hopefully say that our classification is simple but has structural beauty and meets the diachronic drift of prefixes and particles.

There, however, remain a number of problems, in particular concern-
ing the application of Cumulative Tendency and the mechanism of derivations. We are happy to continue to pursue efforts towards their solutions.
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