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<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>C Mng</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIIN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmc</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goth</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Compound idiomatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Preverb idiomatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Verb idiomatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Idiomatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I*</td>
<td>Idiomatic compound excluded from consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Metaphorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Non-idiomatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Polysemeous</td>
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<td>P*</td>
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<tr>
<td>IE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIN</td>
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</tr>
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<td>IITSC</td>
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<tr>
<td>Insep Ptc</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS</td>
<td>Late Common Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>Old High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGmc</td>
<td>Proto-Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS (tags)</td>
<td>Part of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEI</td>
<td>Text Encoding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(format)</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITUS</td>
<td>Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text und Sprachmaterialien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb class</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(1–7)</td>
<td>Class I–VII strong verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W(1–4)</td>
<td>Class I–IV weak verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb type</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDN</td>
<td>Secondary denominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDV</td>
<td>Secondary deverbative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

In many Indo-European languages there is a class of invariant forms (as opposed to inflected forms) that may have several functions. Preverbs derive from this class of forms, which are often viewed as including three types (Pinault, 35):

1. Adverbs
2. Preverbs (along with prepositions and postpositions)
3. Particles

Another way of expressing these distinctions is that these forms may have adverbial function when used independently, prepositional (or, more properly, adpositional) function with nouns and a verb-specifying function with verbs (P. Ramat, 408). When used in the verb-specifying function they are generally referred to as preverbs.

The use of preverbs in Gothic is extensive. Over half of the verbs in Gothic, in fact, show prefixation (West 1983: 138). Many of these forms exhibit some alteration of the meaning of the original verb and some do not.

The purpose of this study is to examine the use of preverbs in Gothic, specifically with regard to their meaning-changing function. The specific focus is on significant meaning changes or idiomatization, in which the resultant form does not mean simply the sum of its parts but takes on a new meaning that may or may not be clearly related to the meanings of the original forms.

Some questions addressed are:

- What preverb idiomatization categories can be defined for Gothic?
- Under what circumstances does idiomatization occur and not occur?
- Is it possible to define a model of idiomatization of preverbs in Gothic?
- Can such a model not only classify idiomatization types but give us some predictive power as to when idiomatization is likely to occur, and if so, what direction it might take?

This book is based on my doctoral dissertation research at the University of Georgia in 2007–2008. It begins with a summary of the literature regarding two primary elements of the idiomatization issue. The first is a review of current thinking on the nature and processes of semantic change. This is important in that in any discussion of idiomatization it quickly becomes apparent that it is
not possible to begin without a model or at least frame of reference in which to put such a discussion in context.

The other primary element of idiomatization is preverbation itself. This includes the genesis of preverbs in Proto-Indo-European (PIE): the characteristics of the inherited process, common preverbs and other forms that later developed into preverbs, and resultant forms that show characteristics of idiomatization.

To that end, following a survey of related research, in Chapter 3 I provide a brief discussion of the approach and methodology employed in this study. Given that little work has been done on idiomatization of preverb and verb complexes in the Indo-European languages, it is important to draw on any similar or related work that can provide some guidance in the undertaking. Some of the methodology of necessity had to be developed as the project progressed. It is up to the reader to decide whether and how the findings attest to the effectiveness of the approach.

Chapter 4 is a discussion of semantic change. The first focus is on the processes of semantic change, with an eye to determining what (if anything) the research in that field can contribute to the study of idiomatization via preverbation. This is followed by a discussion of objective measurement (as opposed to theoretical constructs) of semantic change, whose retrospective approach to data analysis, as it turns out, is rather more valuable to the focus of this study, which in large part has at its foundation a need to determine both whether and to what degree verbal compounds are idiomatic. The chapter concludes with a description of the process, conclusions, and methods for determining idiomatization that I developed as a result of the insights gained from a study of semantic change.

Chapter 5 deals with the issue of preverbs in a general way. This includes the use of preverbs in descendant IE languages in order both to demonstrate the widespread nature of preverbation in IE in general, and to shed light on Gothic regarding the similarities and differences in its use of preverbs, particularly in an idiomatic setting.

After the general discussion of preverbs, Chapter 6 examines preverbs in Gothic specifically. There are three main sections in this chapter. The first is a detailed discussion of “The Semantics of Preverbs in Gothic” (West 1983), the closest and most pertinent research to that of this study that I have been able to find. West’s analysis and insights, while not specifically about idiomatization, were very useful in my own analysis. This is followed by a presentation of the specifics of Gothic preverb categories. The chapter concludes with observations regarding preverbs and aspect in IE languages and a preliminary discussion of the issue with regard to Gothic.
In Chapter 7, I present the data on which this study is based. I created a Microsoft Excel® database that includes an exhaustive list of all Gothic compound verbs that have preverbs affixed to them, and various data views of preverbs and verbs and their types of idiomatization. The Appendices include tables drawn from that Excel file.

Chapter 8, “Idiomatization of Gothic Compound Verbs”, presents the main discussion and findings of this study. It details the kind and degree of idiomatization of all Gothic preverbs and verb stems, along with the compounds that they form. This chapter presents each of the 97 Gothic idiomatic and polysemous verb compounds individually, with examples of those verbs in context and descriptions of their characteristics. This is followed by a detailed discussion of which preverbs and verb stems are idiomatic and to what degree. It also includes a discussion of verb compounds with a low degree of semantic change that, while not counted as idiomatic for the purposes of this study, evince a metaphorical meaning that makes them important to examine in this context.

In Chapter 9 I return to a discussion of preverbs and aspect, specifically with regard to this phenomenon in Gothic. It is important to treat this issue in that while for most (but not all) scholars there is a clear presence of aspect-marking via preverbation in Gothic, there is less agreement on the specific nature and extent of that presence.

Chapter 10 is a separate treatment of ga-, by far the most common preverb in Gothic. It is so significant that it merits its own chapter to discuss its unique presence and functions in the language.

The final chapter summarizes the conclusions drawn from the analysis and findings of this study. I also discuss some directions for future research suggested by this work that are beyond the scope of my initial research and analysis.

Notes

1 Microsoft Excel® is a registered trademark of Microsoft Corporation. All uses of “Excel” in this book refer to that trademarked product.
2. Related Research

There is an extensive literature of Gothic scholarship. While not all of it is pertinent to or useful for the study of idiomatization, much of it is invaluable in providing a basis for any serious research on the Gothic language. This chapter begins with a review of that literature, and is followed by a discussion of the specific sources on Gothic that I used for collecting the data that underly this analysis.

The same may be said of the literature on semantic change, especially in the past twenty years: it is extensive but much of its focus is on the mechanisms and processes of semantic change rather than on the analysis of its results. Still, the field provides valuable insights into phenomena that help to illuminate issues of both the genesis and the determination of degree of semantic change. The section on semantic change provides a survey of sources that were particularly useful in the study of the idiomatization of preverbs in Gothic.

The following section is a survey of literature on the study of preverbs themselves. They have been examined from many points of view, but rarely with regard to their effect on or role in semantic change.

The chapter concludes with a review of electronic, online sources on the Gothic language. As with most fields of study, there are several such resources that provide a wealth of information and search technologies that are invaluable to a study of this kind.

2.1. Gothic

There are several traditional sources for research on the Gothic language. Among them the most used, and arguably the most important, is Streitberg’s *Die Gotische Bibel*. For this study I used the 2001 edition. This book is a bilingual Greek-Gothic publication, with identical texts on facing pages. It includes the text of Wulfilä’s New Testament as well as portions of Chapters 5–7 of the Old Testament Book of Nehemiah and the *Skeireins*, a commentary on the Gospel of John.

*A Gothic Etymological Dictionary* (Lehmann: 1986) proved to be a very useful tool for looking up the derivation of words and identifying the New Testament Greek equivalents of Gothic verbs. The derivation of roots and affixes in this book includes comparisons of related forms in other Germanic and other Indo-European languages. Lehmann is particularly helpful in pointing out calques or loan translations, i.e. words that are (often) morphemic translations, usually from Greek to Gothic.
Lehmann’s book, actually a reworking of an earlier work, the *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache* by Sigmund Feist, has some drawbacks. It is often difficult to find verbs in the book because once they are treated in any form, it is the only time they appear, with no cross-referencing. In addition, verb forms may be treated with or without a prefix. In any case, an entry for a given verb stem (with or without a prefix) includes a list of forms with other prefixes. It is difficult to determine the first (and only) such reference; there is little consistency in the approach. For example, the verb *aigan* ‘have’ is listed in its root form and other related forms included in that listing (and nowhere else) are *fair-athan* ‘partake of’ and *ga-aiginon* ‘get better of’ (A63, 14). But *af-taurnan* ‘tear off’ (a passive form) is listed with the prefix (preverb), as well as *dis-taurnan* ‘tear apart’ (intransitive) and *ga-taurnan* ‘vanish, cease’ without other commentary on related forms (A35, 8), while the related active form is treated under *dis-taurn* ‘tear apart’ (transitive), along with *ga-taurn* ‘tear down, remove’ but the secondary forms are also listed under this entry (D22, 91). Yet the verb *qistjan* ‘destroy’ is listed in its base form along with the active-passive pair *fra-qistjan* ‘destroy’—*fra-qistnan* ‘be destroyed’ (Q8, 277). It can be quite confusing and not a little frustrating, given that no guidance is given to the reader as to how to determine where to find any particular form; it is often necessary to consult the Gothic index at the end of the book since the organization is not immediately apparent.

### 2.2. Data Sources

In addition to Streitberg (2001) and Lehmann (1986), other source texts that I used extensively include Lambdin’s *An Introduction to the Gothic Language* and Bennett’s *An Introduction to the Gothic Language*. There are a number of good online Gothic databases that include the entire Gothic corpus as well as statistical data and tools for analysis. Notable among these are the TITUS Texts and Gothic Online, from the University of Texas Linguistics Research Center. These and other electronic resources are described in more detail in Section 2.5.

### 2.3. Semantic Change

There are four primary texts that I found useful and pertinent for the examination of semantic change. *From Etymology to Pragmatics* (Sweetser 1990) is a seminal text that is often referred to in the literature on the subject. Sweetser’s primary focus is on the analysis of patterns in semantic change over time, in this book specifically it is on showing how a general framework entailing “a
pervasive metaphorical structuring of our internal mental world in terms of our physical world” (Sweetser 1990: 145) accounts for both diachronic semantic change and synchronic polysemy. The underlying idea for Sweetser is that the metaphorical structuring is the result of experientially structuring one domain (i.e. our internal mental world) in terms of another (the physical world).

Sweetser shows that diachronic semantic change and synchronic polysemy alike are inadequately described as changes in semantic features alone. She allows that while there are some relevant parameters of semantic contrast that help determine which words can change their meanings, since much of meaning is based on speakers’ understanding of the world, “such parameters are more complex and less objective than feature analysts have thought them.” (ibid.: 25)

She says that rather than try to describe metaphorical relationships in particular in terms of changes in one or more semantic features, it is necessary instead to describe the mapping of one domain into another.

The focus in *The Evolution of Grammar* (Bybee et al. 1994) is on grammatical morphemes associated with verbs, what they refer to as ‘grams’, and specifically on those grams that have a fixed position with respect to the verb (Bybee et al. 1994: 2). Although they deal mainly with separate morphemes as opposed to affixes or preverbs specifically, this focus would seem to apply directly to the study of preverbs.

While it is true that their approach is applicable to the examination of preverbs, it is mainly so in the analysis of their development from earlier forms. Since their work is concerned primarily with processes of semantic change, the focus of this idiomatization study necessarily focuses on a later part of their development, i.e. on how those preverbs pattern with regard to semantic change after their role as preverbs is already established. There are other parts of their analysis regarding the role of metaphor and inference in semantic change, however, that may be more pertinent for this study and that are discussed in more detailed below in the chapter on semantic change.

*Grammaticalization* (Hopper and Traugott 1993, revised 2003) is another foundational work, one whose focus is on those changes (in the first edition referred to by the authors as processes) undergone by lexical items that come to have grammatical functions. Specifically, they define the term as “the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions.” (Hopper and Traugott 2003: xv) They point out that the term “grammaticalization” refers to both the research framework to account for linguistic phenomena and to the phenomena themselves (ibid.: 1).

The authors give many examples of such changes and discuss general cross-linguistic tendencies through examining similar changes in various related and
unrelated languages. They note that grammaticalized forms may be clitics, affixes, independent words or even periphrastic forms and that the important common element that brings them under the grammaticalization umbrella is the type of change they undergo in replacing earlier forms to fulfill some grammatical function.

Another observation is that grammaticalization excludes “pure” semantic change (e.g. a change in meaning in an individual lexical item like Old English sterf: ‘die’ to modern ‘starve’) and straightforward word-order change, and most importantly that it “involves morphosyntactic change initiated by and correlated with pragmatic and semantic changes.” (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 231–232) While the specific genesis of preverbation as an Indo-European phenomenon is not precisely knowable, it is unlikely to conflict with this assertion.

Finally, the authors point out that grammaticalization is both unidirectional and gradual. While an individual change may be abrupt for an individual, its spread in a linguistic community is necessarily gradual both over time and in terms of its frequency of use (ibid.: 232).

Regularity in Semantic Change (Traugott and Dasher 2002), as the title indicates, is concerned with determining and defining patterns and mechanisms of change in meaning, both within and among languages. Like Sweetser (1990), this work examines the role of pragmatics in semantic change. With a particular focus on subjectification, Traugott and Dasher hold that the direction of semantic change from the external and concrete to the internally-motivated and abstract is the result of the pragmatic uses of the language. Regarding subjectification, the authors explicitly say that they consider it to be the major type of semantic change (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 97). In addition, the authors argue that polysemy is central to any theory of semantics and semantic change. This holds for synchronic and diachronic studies alike, and it arises from processes of what they call invited inferencing (IIN), a type of pragmatic inferencing (ibid.: 16).

Invited inferencing is the inclusion of another in the subjectification process, i.e. the hearer/reader is included in the new meaning or use of a term that is innovated by the speaker/writer. When the new meaning becomes a preferred meaning and is a convention of use in a community, it is a generalized invited inference (GIIN).

The process of pragmatic inferencing in semantic change as a mechanism in the development of polysemy is at the heart of their invited inferencing theory of semantic change (IITSC). Metaphorization and metonymization (including subjectification and intersubjectification) are pragmatic processes by which semantic change comes about (ibid.: 39–40).
An article that is particularly helpful in understanding the process (and measurement of) subjectification is “Towards an Operational Notion of Subjectification” (Torres Cacoullos and Schwenter 2005). This article is useful in its approach to a general analysis of semantic change, and specifically regarding whether the approach would be useful in determining and defining degree of semantic change.

Subjectification refers to “…the tendency for meanings to change away from objective description of the external situation and towards the expression of the speaker’s internal perspective or attitude.” (Torres Cacoullos and Schwenter: 347) As such, it is a pragmatic phenomenon, in that the speaker intends to convey extra-semantic information. This notion is the cornerstone of Traugott’s theory of diachronic semantic change (Traugott and Dasher 2002). She also points out that the phenomenon is considered to be gradient in nature (Traugott 1995: 32), but that most if not all research on the topic has relied on the analyst’s intuition as to the nature and degree of subjectification of a given form at various points in time. Regarding this gradient nature, it should be pointed out that while the spread of a change throughout a speech community may be gradual, the initial change itself is abrupt (i.e. on the part of an individual innovator).

Torres Cacoullos and Schwenter’s goal in this paper is to demonstrate the need for and a method of objectively measuring the development of subjectification over time. They use quantitative measures of several linguistic features associated, they claim, with subjectivity on the speaker’s part, in order to make a start in the development of an operational notion of subjectification, i.e. a quantifiable and measurable method of determining the presence and degree of subjectivity as expressed in subjectification. They say that the problem of determining the degree of subjectivity in polysemies can be avoided by looking at the expansion of the functional range of a form that indicates subjectification.

The authors identify three features that indicate such an expansion of functional range in the use of Spanish a pesar de (originally ‘to the sorrow or regret of’, now ‘in spite of’) in 12th-through 20th-century writing. The three features that they claim are associated with increased subjectivity on the part of the speaker and therefore with increased functional range of the phrase are coreferrentiality, subjunctive forms and preposing.

They show that over time the usage of these three features has increased and with it, they claim, the degree of subjectification expressed by the phrase has also increased. They conclude that identifying such features and objectively measuring them is the first step towards the creation of a set of general features that may be applied to such studies.
2.4. Preverbs

Much has been written about preverbs in IE languages from a developmental, phonological and, to a lesser extent, syntactic point of view. Somewhat less has been done by scholars on the semantic effects of preverbs on the verbs to which they are attached (or otherwise syntactically associated).

Of particular note is the insistence on drawing parallels between the use of preverbs (particularly with regard to marking aspect) in Slavic and other languages or language families. This is discussed in more detail in Section 5.2.

While less has been done on this topic for Gothic specifically, two important articles on preverbs are Georges-Jean Pinault’s “Le Problème des Préverbes en Indo-Européen” (1995) and Jonathan West’s “The Semantics of Preverbs in Gothic” (1982). Each presents key insights into the workings of preverbs in general and in Gothic specifically.

2.4.1. Pinault

Pinault discusses the tripartite nature of the invariable forms mentioned above but he divides them somewhat differently, as adverbs, preverbs along with pre- and postpositions, and particles (Pinault 1995: 35). Regarding preverbs, he points out an important distinction in considering the Germanic family in general, i.e. that semantic modification of a verb by a preverb does not depend on immediate proximity of the two elements.

It is important to distinguish preverbation and univerbation because the preverb takes on semantic predominance over the verb in many languages regardless of its specific position (ibid.: 47). It is interesting to pursue his arguments in the context of idiomatization of preverbs in Gothic, although his conclusions regarding semantic predominance are not necessarily shared by all scholars, and they specifically conflict with those of West (1983).

2.4.2. West

West’s greatest contribution to this study is his analysis of Gothic preverbs by semantic categories (West 1983). While he was not specifically looking at idiomatization via preverbation, his classification, including statistical data on frequency of occurrence of preverbs based on his own work and the earlier doctoral research of A.L. Rice (Rice 1932), proves invaluable as a model and starting point for this effort.

West’s nine semantic categories include one that he refers to as lexicalization; that category that most closely matches the idiomatization focus of this study. His analysis and its implications for the study of idiomatization of verbal compounds via preverbation is treated in detail in Section 6.1. One of his
conclusions that conflicts with Pinault as noted above is that “…the semantic load on the preverbs, as segments, in…Gothic is relatively small” (West 1983: 164).

2.5. Electronic Resources

There are many electronic sources available to researchers of Gothic. Some, in the vein of the Wikipedia phenomenon, are simply sites where individuals claiming some expertise in Gothic offer contributions of various levels of validity. These range from informal (e.g. newsslists, chat rooms, blogs and the like) to rigorous academic efforts and in making use of them, as is the case with so much available on the internet, a policy of *caveat lector* is best. A particularly frustrating experience is finding a sprinkling of Gothic scholarship that has been inserted into text having to do with the other, so-called “Goth” (sometimes extended to “Gothic”) culture of black clothes, nail polish and make-up. This is occasionally true of sites for those interested in pre-Christian European religion(s), and even Gothic literature and architecture!

There are several valuable resources, however, that are true repositories of serious Gothic scholarship. Some of them are described below.

- *Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien* (TITUS): Arguably the best electronic research tool available for Gothic, the TITUS server is a joint project of the Institute of Comparative Linguistics of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main (where it is housed) and several other European universities. It provides free online availability (with various textual search and statistical tools) to the New Testament books, Old Testament fragments, *Skeireins*, Busbecq’s Crimean Gothic materials and, via a link to Uppsala University, a facsimile copy of the *Codex Argenteus*. Notably, TITUS provides verse-level lookup capabilities as well as word-level search. A search returns verses in four separate versions: Wulfila’s original Gothic text, the text in Roman script, and the text in both Latin and Greek.
- *Gothic Online*. A glossary of Gothic designed to accompany online lessons, hosted by the Linguistics Research Center (founded and directed by Winfred Lehmann until his death in August 2007) of the University of Texas at Austin. This is a good source for rapid search at the lexical level. All entries are indexed and hot-linked to the lessons in which they appear.
- *The Wulfila Project*. A database of Gothic for online search for the technically proficient. It is hosted by the University of Antwerp in Belgium.
According to the website itself, “Project Wulfila is a small digital library dedicated to the study of the Gothic language and Old Germanic languages in general. Our primary goal is to provide linguistically annotated editions that can be downloaded in TEI format or browsed online, linked to a digital glossary, POS-tags and interlinear translations. The focus is currently on the Gothic Bible and minor fragments.” This is not a user-friendly site for those without technical expertise but for those familiar with database access it can be very useful.

- **Gothic Etymological Database**: Another database of Gothic for online search for the technically proficient. It represents the *Gotisches Wörterbuch, 2. Aufl.* by Gerhard Köbler of Innsbruck University, published on the internet by the author, hosted in the Netherlands. It is very useful for fast searches and will return a vast amount of information on any string entered, including etymology, German and English translations along with the Latin and Greek sources, and all attestations cited by form, chapter and verse.

- **The Bible Gateway**: This is not a resource for Gothic text, but it is an invaluable source for Bible translations in many languages, ranging from Arabic to Vietnamese. There are 21 English versions of the Bible, including several varieties of the King James Version, the Wycliffe Bible, American and English Standard Versions, the Darby Translation and Young’s Literal Translation. This is particularly useful for comparing ways the Greek New Testament has been translated across time and in a variety of contemporary English editions.

**Notes**

1. In keeping with the practice of other scholars, all references to Lehmann (1986) will have this form, indicating the item number and page number for ease of reference.

2. Traugott and Dasher use the terms speaker/writer (SP/W) and addressee/reader (AD/R) for these roles.
3. Approach

This study includes an exhaustive analysis of all Gothic preverbs along with the verbs to which they are attached, with regard to the meaning of the verbs without preverbs, the various degrees of idiomatization the preverbs create and the meanings of the preverbs alone and in conjunction with the verbs with which they are used. It also examines preverbs in related languages (and as reconstructed from PIE) in an effort to determine commonality of usage and trends in idiomatization. The study examines the forms in isolation and in context, comparing where appropriate the Greek usage for which they are translations.

3.1. Methodology

In performing this analysis I have attempted to the greatest extent possible to use multiple sources for all data. In case of differences or outright discrepancies in definitions or usage I have usually relied on the most recent sources. Generally, I have consulted Lambdin (2006), Lehmann (1986), Snædal (1998) and Streitberg (2001) in that order for word lists and definitions, occurrences and locations, and verses in context, respectively. I also made extensive use of online resources, primary among which is the TITUS database of Gothic noted in the previous chapter.

I performed an exhaustive analysis of all prepositions, adverbs and other particles in order to determine which could be used as preverbs and in what form. First I compiled an Excel database of all compound verbs in Gothic that contain preverbs. For each such compound, I made an entry in fields containing its preverb and the preverb’s meaning(s) and derivation, the verb stem and its meaning(s), the compound itself and its meaning(s), whether or not it is idiomatic and any pertinent notes, e.g. derivations, cognates, discrepant opinions and their sources, etc.

Besides this general overall database, which I refer to as the Master Table, as the analysis proceeded I created a number of additional worksheets corresponding to various views of the data (all preverbs, preverbs sorted by idiomatization category, all verbs, verbs sorted by idiomatization category, and the like). Most of these views are included in this document in the various appendices and are also described in more detail, with examples, in Chapter 7.

I examined all compound verbs that include preverbs, looking both at their definitions and their usage in trying to find idiomatic influences of the preverbs.
in question. I have included a number of tables in this book that detail all of these elements.

In determining which compound verbs have been fully or partially idiomatized (i.e. a given verb may be polysemic, i.e. idiomatic in some usages/contexts and not in others, or it may be only somewhat semantically—metaphorically—changed), I used the guidelines outlined in Section 4.3.2, which I developed and refined through a process of trial-and-error during the analysis. In analyzing the degree and type of idiomatization I also found helpful the models of semantic development described in Section 4.1.1, particularly Hopper and Traugott 2003, and the approach described in Section 4.3 based on the ideas in Torres Cacoullos and Schwenter 2005. These helped me to classify the verbs and preverbs as to type and degree of idiomatization.

If it is important to make decisions about type and degree of semantic change, it is equally important that making such decisions be dependent on the existence of a good descriptive model of semantic change. Such a model needs to be adequate in describing both the semantic change process itself and the criteria by which degree of change is determined.

The following chapter describes recent work in semantic change (particularly of the process of semantic change), and the model I used to determine degree of change. Even a cursory overview of recent work in this field makes it quickly apparent that there is no lack of material for determining and describing the process of change. Degree of change, however, is another story altogether. It seems that most research into and analysis of semantic change is primarily focused on how the change comes about and not on its results.
4. Semantic Change

The study of idiomatization of preverbs is impossible without considering the nature of semantic change. It becomes clear quite quickly with even a cursory analysis of Gothic preverbs that an attempt to discuss them is not possible without positioning them in the context of a theory of semantic change. At the very least, a set of semantic terms with clear definitions is necessary.

This chapter examines current thinking on semantic change. Of particular interest is research into the processes of semantic change. While the process is not the primary focus of this study, insights and terminology from this evolving field is useful for the analysis of preverbalization with respect to idiomatization. If nothing else, it provides a set of terms to use for classifying types of compound verbs regarding the presence or lack of semantic effects of preverbalization.

4.1. Processes of Semantic Change

Most of the research and literature on semantic change is concerned with the processes by which it comes about. The literature review in Section 2.3 illustrates this focus via its emphasis on phenomena like grammaticalization (or grammatization for Bybee et al.), subjectification, invited inferencing and other pragmatic approaches. While these approaches are valuable in helping us to understand the nature of semantic change, I find them somewhat less useful in the focus of this study, at least with regard to determining the nature and degree of idiomatization, and specifically with regard to the semantic distance of a particular compound verb from the root meanings of its component parts.

4.1.1. Grammaticalization, Subjectification, Lexicalization

The three terms grammaticalization, subjectification and lexicalization, as is true of so many linguistic terms, are used in different ways by different scholars. The lines separating them are not always clear either—one may at times, but not always, be considered to be a subgroup of another, or they may be seen as three separate processes that may overlap.

Lexicalization

The term ‘lexicalization’ has a variety of interpretations. Some scholars give it a precise meaning while others use the term somewhat more loosely. One definition is that lexicalization is:
either (i) a change in the syntactic category status of a lexeme given certain argument structure constraints, e.g. use of the nouns calendar or window as verbs… or (ii) the formation of a new member of a major category by the combination of more than one meaningful element, e.g. by derivational morphology or compounding. (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 283)

If we consider argument structure constraints as being (or as having been) applicable to verb compounds (since in Germanic there is evidence of the gradual syntactic association of preverbal elements with various verbs that eventually resulted in compounds), the first condition can be seen to hold for some if not all preverbation. Certainly a lexeme changing from free adverb or preposition to inseparable preverb is a change in its syntactic category status. The second condition may be met by a verb joining the ranks of aspect-marked compounds by the addition of an preverb like go.

Other views can be more structural than functional. Bybee et al. seem to take the view that compounding in and of itself is lexicalization. In discussing research on the evolution of inflectional and derivational affixes (Heine and Reh 1984), they make statements that indicate a liberal and general view of lexicalization. For example, of affixation of inflectional grams (grammatical morphemes), they say that, “…the gram and its lexical host are taken to be a single unit, that is, they are lexicalized together.” In discussing derivational affixes, they point out that “lexicalization occurs before extensive generalization and, moreover, may occur at different times for different lexical verbs.” (Bybee et al. 1994: 163) Their discussion implies that lexicalization in this context signifies the creation of a single lexical item, i.e. the verb with its affix(es).

Similarly, Hopper and Traugott discuss lexicalization specifically in terms of univerbation. They cite Lipka’s definition of lexicalization as “the phenomenon that a complex lexeme once coined tends to become a single complete lexical unit, a simple lexeme” (Lipka 1990: 95), pointing out that this process is often called ‘univerbation’. A compositional form like ‘arise’, derived from ‘on’ + ‘rise’, has become monomorphemic and non-compositional. They argue that since it belongs to the major class Verb, it is considered to be lexical. In addition, a construction like ‘hafta’ (‘have to’) belongs to the minor class Modal and is therefore considered to be grammatical. They go on to say that these and other examples show that since both have undergone a univerbation process, there is a point where grammaticalization and lexicalization intersect (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 134–135).

Finally, oddly enough in one of the few sources to deal directly with semantics and Gothic preverbs, West defines lexicalization as almost exactly what is meant by idiomatization in this book (West 1983: 150). This issue is covered in more detail in Section 6.1.2.