

# THE PREVERB *GE-* ADDED TO *NIMAN* IN THE OE GLOSS TO THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS<sup>1</sup>

---

YOSHINOBU NIWA\*

---

## INTRODUCTION

The function of *ge-* as a meaningless prefix in L<sup>2</sup> was touched on by P. Fijn van Draat in 1902<sup>3</sup>, and was examined in detail by F. Weick in 1911<sup>4</sup>, and the conclusion reached was that there was no consistent usage of *ge-* there. But as recently as 1949 M. L. Samuels made another exhaustive study of its function, with constant reference to the Latin words glossed, and the results proved that the use of *ge-* in L was strongly influenced by Latin and was not entirely random.<sup>5</sup> But still this is not conclusive and admits of exceptions. Above all, in the case of *NIMAN*<sup>6</sup>, one of the commonest verbs in OE, we can hardly find any trace of Latin influence on the usage of *ge-*, as illustrated in detail in §1. This means that his theory, which is mainly based on Latin influence, does not clarify the usage of *ge-* with this verb and another theory is needed.

It is my purpose in this paper to re-examine the examples of *NIMAN* and to discover any distinctive feature which marks off *geniman* from *niman* and to complement Samuels' conclusions.

---

\* Associate Professor at Tokyo University.

<sup>1</sup> This is an interim report on the function of *ge-* added to *niman* in various OE dialects.

<sup>2</sup> Lindisfarne Gospels, ed. W. W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*.

<sup>3</sup> 'The Loss of the Prefix *ge-* in the Modern English Verb and some of its Consequences,' *E. St.* 31, 360 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Das Aussterben des Präfixes ge- im Englischen*, Diss. Heidelberg, (1911).

<sup>5</sup> 'The *Ge-* Prefix in the Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels,' *Trans. of the Phil. Society* (1949), 62-116.

<sup>6</sup> The capital *NIMAN* stands for both simplex and *ge-*compound hereafter.

Another reason to take up NIMAN here is that though it has traditionally been classified among Perfective Simplicia<sup>1</sup> and regarded as incapable of taking *ge-* because of its inherent perfective meaning, it takes the preverb so frequently in L as to raise the question over simplex and *ge-* compound.

THE SCOPE OF OUR INQUIRY INTO NIMAN. Items necessary for confirming or complementing Samuels' conclusions<sup>2</sup> will be as follows.

- (1) The extent of Latin influence.
- (2) The possibility that the usage is regulated by verbal meanings, tense and mood, and other syntactic relations.
- (3) The possibility that the usage is regulated by the preceding words or sounds.

The possibility that it is regulated by the preceding sounds is an item suggested by Pilch's theory as to the loss of ME *I-*.<sup>3</sup>

#### EXAMINATION OF THE USAGG OF *GE-* ADDED TO NIMAN IN L<sup>4</sup>

Our approach to the subject will be made based upon the data furnished by the following tables.

##### §1. Latin influence.

(1) Tables 1 and 2 show that Samuels' conclusions based on the length of the Latin word glossed cannot be applied to NIMAN throughout. When the Lat. ind. present is glossed by the present in L, *ge-comp.* is used for RAPIUNT (XI 12), TOLLIT (IX 16), and

<sup>1</sup> Verbs having the perfective meaning in themselves. e.g. *findan*, *weorðan*. According to Streitberg, they did not take *ga-* in Gothic ("Perfective und imperfective Aktionsart im Germanischen," *PBB* (1891), 70-178).

<sup>2</sup> Those of our concern are that (1) *ge-* is used for glossing long Latin words, specially in the present and future, and for glossing compound verbs in the present participle, etc. (2) *ge-* is meaningless but its use is slightly regulated by tense and mood, (3) *ge-* is often omitted when the verb is preceded by closely connected monosyllables.

<sup>3</sup> See Pilch, 'Der Untergang des Präverbs *ge-* im Englischen' (1955): He says that ME *I-* was omitted by contraction of some vowel when the final sound of a preceding word was a front vowel. The similar omission of *ge-* is conceivably possible in L because the dialect of L is as far advanced as ME dialects in its disregard for the meaning of *ge-*.

<sup>4</sup> The past participle is not treated in this paper except when specially needed.

TABLE 1. Frequency of occurrences of NIMAN in L (Matthew) in terms of Latin verbal forms (The numerals show the number of occurrences of the verbs in L)

Latin Conjugation→		Indicative					Imperative Subjunctive			Infinitive	Participle		Total	
Latin ↓ Verbs	Verbs in L ↓	Pres.	Fut.	Imperf.	Perf.	(Passive) Plu-perf.	Pres.	Pres.	Imperf.		Pres.	Past		
accipio	<i>n</i> /*	1			1 (pr)								2	23
	<i>ge-n</i>										1	1(pr) 3(pr)	5	
	<i>ge-n</i> /*				2		1				1(p)	1 1(p)	6	
	*	1		1(p)	5		1			1	1(p)		10	
adhibeo	*						1						1	1
assumo	<i>ge-n</i>	1 (+to) (p)			2							1(ppl)	4	5
	<i>ge-n</i> /*				1								1	
adsumo	<i>ge-n</i>				1 (+to)						1 (+to) (p)		2	2
apprehendo	*											1(p)	1	1
capiō	<i>n</i>	1										1(p)	1	4
	<i>ge-n</i>							1(pr)		1			2	
	<i>ge-n</i> /*								1(p)				1	
comprehendo	<i>n</i>									1			1	1
diripio	<i>ge-n</i>									1 (+to/from)			1	2
	<i>ge-n</i> /*							1(pr)					1	
duco	*					1 (pr)		1(inf)					2	2
fero	<i>ge-n</i>				4								4	4
rapio	<i>ge-n</i>	1											1	1
racipio	*					1 (sub p)							1	1
sumo	<i>ge-n</i>				1								1	4
	*				1					1	1(pr)		3	
suscipio	<i>n</i>										1		1	1
teneo	<i>n</i>				1						1		2	10
	<i>ge-n</i> /*				1								1	
	*		1(inf)		4		1			1			7	
tollo	<i>n</i>						3			2			5	10
	<i>ge-n</i>	1	1(pr)				1			1			4	
	*						1						1	
vello	<i>ge-n</i>									1			1	1
Total	<i>n</i>	1			1		3				2		7	73
	<i>n</i> /*	1			1			1	1				4	
	<i>ge-n</i>	3	1		8		1	1		4	2	5	25	
	<i>ge-n</i> /*				4		1			2	1	2	10	
	*	1	1	1	10	2	4	1		4	2	1	27	
		6	2	1	24	2	9	3	1	10	7	8		

Note: Symbols and Abbreviations.

1. *ge-n*=*geniman* *n*=*niman* \*=a verb synonymous with NIMAN

2. + indicates the occurrence of a particle after NIMAN.

3. / indicates an alternative gloss. e.g. \*/*n*.

4. Conjugation in L is put in parentheses only when different from that of Latin.

p=indicative past

pr=indicative present

sub p=subjunctive past

inf=infinitive

ppl=present participle

TABLE 2. Distribution of *niman* and *geniman* in L (Matthew)

Conjugation	Chapters & lines	Verbal forms	Preceding words	Latin verbal forms	Meanings (contexts)
PRESENT	IV 6	genimmæs	hondum	tollent	'will take (you) up (by their hand)'
	IX 16	genimes	ald t foruered	tollit	'take away (fullness)'
	XI 12	geniomes	hia	rapiunt	'take (it=kingdom) (by force)'
	XII 29	genimeð	ðas	diripiat	'will spoil (his house)'
	XIX 12	geniomas	genioma	capiat	'(let him) receive (it=kingdom)'
	X 38	nimeð	ne	accipit	'takes (not his cross)'
	XIX 11	nimaþ	ne ealle	capiunt	'(not) receive (this saying)'
	XXVI 52	niomað	þe ofslæð t	acciperunt	'will take (the sword)'
PAST	IV 5	genom	ða gefeng t	assumpsit	'took (him into the city)'
	IV 8	genom	eft	assumpsit	'seized (him)'
	XII 45	genom	and	assumit	'took (with himself...spirits)'
	XIII 31	genom	þæt onfeing t	accipiens	'took (which=a grain of mustard seed)'
	XIII 33	genom	þæt onfeng t	acceptum	'took (which=leaven)'
	XIV 12	genomon	his	tulerunt	'took up (the body)'
	XIV 20	genomon	and	tulerunt	'took up (of the fragment)'
	XV 37	genomon	screadungum	tulerunt	'took up (of the broken meat)'
	XVI 22	to-genom	and	adsumens	'took (him aside)'
	XVII 1	to-genom	sex	adsumsit	'took (Peter, James and John)'
	XIX 25	genom	and geheald t	tenuit	'took (his hand)'
	XX 17	genom	hælend	assumit	'took (the twelve disciples apart)'
	XXII 15	genomo	hia	caperent	'should entangle (Christ in his speech)'
	XXIV 39	genom	and	tulit	'took away (them)'
	XXV 3	genomun	ne	sumserunt	'took (no oil)'
	XXV 3	genomun	idlo gefengon t	acceptis	'took (their lamps)'
	XXVI 26	genom	onfeng ðe	acepit	'took (bread)'
	XXVII 24	genom	miððy	accepta	'took (water)'
	XXVII 48	genom	of hiora	acceptam	'took (sponge)'
	XXVII 30	genomon	him onfengon t	acceperunt	'took (the reed)'
	XXVI 55	nomo	ne	tenuistis	'seized (me)'
IMPERATIVE	II 13	genim	and	accipe	'(arise and) take (the young child)'
	IX 6	genim	aris	tolle	'take up (the bed)'
	XVII 27	nim	gestige	tolle	'take up (the fish)'
	XX 14	nim		tolle	'take (what is thine)'
	XXV 28	niomas		tollite	'take (the talent from him)'
PRESENT PARTICIPLE	XXVII 6	geniomende	sacerda	acceptis	'taking (the silver pieces)'
	XXVI 37	genomende	ða	assumto	'taking (Peter with him)'
	XXVI 27	genimmende	et	accipiens	'taking (the cup)'
	XXVII 27	nomende	undercyniges	suscipientes	'taking (Jesus into...)'
	XXVI 57	niomonde	hia	tenentes	'seizing (Jesus)'
INFINITIVE	XII 1	genioma	ongunnun	uellere	'(began) to pluck (the ears of corn)'
	XII 29	of-genimma t fram-genimma	his	diripere	'(can) spoil (his goods)'
	XIX 12	genioma	mæge	capere	'(can) receive (it)'
	XXIV 17	genioma	ne ofstiges	tollere	'to take (anything out of...)'
	V 40	niomanne	to	tollere	'(will) take away (thy coat)'
	XXIV 18	niomanne	to	tollere	'to fetch (his clothes)'

simplex for CAPIUNT (XIX 11), ACCIPIT (X 38); when the Lat. perfect is glossed by the preterit in L, simplex is used only once; when the Lat. imperative is glossed by the imperative in L, *ge*-comp. is used for ACCIPE (II 13), TOLLE (IX 6), and simplex for TOLLE (XVII 27, XX 14), TOLLITE (XXV 28). Thus it cannot be said that ACCIPE and TOLLE in the imperative are longer than TOLLITE, or that TOLLIT in the present is longer than CAPIUNT or ACCIPIT.

(2) According to Samuels' conclusions, *ge*- is used for glossing Lat. compounds in the imperative and present participle. He even quotes a few examples of NIMAN in the imperative. The instances furnished by Table 2 are as follows.

#### IMPERATIVE

Simplex: TOLLE (XVII 27, XX 14), TOLLITE (XXV 28)

*Ge*-Comp.: ACCIPE (II 13), TOLLE (IX 6)

#### PRESENT PARTICIPLE

Simplex: SUSCIPIENTES (XXVII 27), TENENTES (XXVI 57)

*Ge*-Comp.: ACCIPIENS (XXVI 27)

It is doubtful whether his conclusion on Lat. compounds is true or not, because TOLLE (IX 6) is a simple verb, but is glossed by *ge*-comp., and SUSCIPIENTES (XXVII 27) is a compound verb but is glossed by simplex. In addition, Table 1 shows that some Latin prefixes are glossed by *to*, a preposition of destination rather than by *ge*-. Compare ADSUMO and ASSUMO with SUMO.

There is another possibility of solution. The simplicia in XX 14 and XXV 28 will be explained from the fact that they take an initial position in the sentence, where *ge*-comp. hardly occurs, as we see in the next section.

(3) The three Latin verbs in the subjunctive (CAPIAT XIX 12, DIRIPIAT XII 29, CAPERENT XXII 15) are glossed by *ge*-comp. in the indicative. These examples are not referred to by Samuels but will have some relation to his statement, "L 6.31 ut faciant, *hia doað* altered to *gedoe*. Here *ge*- is clearly a sign of Mood . . . *ge*- may be said to reinforce the functions of the subjunctive itself".<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Samuels, *op. cit.* 79.

(4) Attention may be called to the fact that about half of the simplicia gloss TOLLO (5 cases for 11), but such occurrences may be accidental, because 2 of them were explained in (2) and the other 2 cases will be simplicia characteristic of the uninflected infinitive.<sup>1</sup>

§2. Analysis of the preceding words (sounds), verbal meanings, tense and mood of NIMAN as distinctive features.

(1) In some texts in West Saxon (e.g. the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle A), *geniman* means taking forcibly and the simplex, the mere taking. This will be the most probable difference of meaning that exists between them, because *ge-* functions as an intensifier extensively in OE. But Table 2 shows that even this difference does not exist here:

INFINITIVE	V 40	simplex	'take away = deprive'
	XIX 12	<i>ge-comp.</i>	'receive'
PRESENT	XXVI 57	simplex	'seizing'
PARTICIPLE	XXVI 27	<i>ge-comp.</i>	'taking (the cup)'
IMPERATIVE	II 13	<i>ge-comp.</i>	'take (the young child)'
PAST	XII 45	<i>ge-comp.</i>	'took (with himself . . . spirits)'
	XXVI 55	simplex	'seized'
PRESENT	XIX 12	<i>ge-comp.</i>	'receive'

So we can say that the simplex and *ge-comp.* are not distinctive of the verbal meanings.

(2) The occurrence of *ge-* is regulated by the preceding monosyllables.

First, after *ne*, a negative particle, simplex occurs regularly except in one case (XXV 3). This will be the only explanation for XXVI 55, where simplex occurs quite exceptionally in the past tense.

XXVI 55: *ic sætt lærde in tempel 7 ne mec gehealdige † ne nomo.*  
*sedebam docens in templo et non me tenuistis*  
 (I sat teaching in the temple and you did not seize me.)

As mentioned above (p. 68, n. 3), H. Pilch insists that the loss of *i-* in ME is due to the contraction of the front vowel with the initial sound of the preverb. A cursory glance at Table 2 shows that his theory is

<sup>1</sup> See §2. (2).

to some extent applicable to our examples. Simplex occurs after *-e* (XXVI 55, XVII 27, X 38, XIX 11, V 40, XXIV 18), and *ge*-comp. occurs after consonants and a back vowel (*-a*) with a few exceptions (XIX 12, XXV 3). But further examination shows that simplex occurs not after the mere *-e*, but after *ne* and it also occurs after a back vowel in the case of *to*. This means that the loss of *ge*- is not simply due to phonological reasons, but to lexical or even semantic reasons. Even in ME it is probably false to attribute the loss of *i*- to phonetic reasons alone as Pilch did, because the loss of *i*- happens after *ne* almost perfectly but not so after other front vowels.<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, after *to*, a sign of the inflected infinitive, simplex occurs regularly, while *ge*- is used for the uninflected infinitive.

<i>to niomanne</i>	V 40, XXIV 18
<i>geniman</i>	XIX 12, XXIV 17, XII 1, XII 29

Samuels says that the tendency to simplex after *ne* and *to* is very strong in L and is due to "the separable nature of the preverb and the presence of monosyllables closely connected to the verb."<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that the meanings of these particles are not lightly to be disregarded, either.<sup>3</sup>

(3) All examples in the past are compounded with *ge*- except one (XXVI 55). *Ge*- acts as a sign of the past tense, as Samuels suggests.<sup>4</sup>

(4) *Ge*- in the present tense can be explained neither from the length of the Latin words glossed nor from the preceding monosyllables with satisfaction. In XXVI 52, simplex occurs though it neither follows *ne*, nor glosses a short Latin word. It means that an explanation must be sought in a different direction.

<sup>1</sup> Pilch, *op. cit.* p. 40. To quote his statistics in part: Lay. B. after *hii*, *i ich* 22:10, after *ne* 21:1, after *to* 6:9, after one syllable pronoun ended with *-e*, 18:91 (The first gives the number of simplex, and the second, that of *i*-comp).

<sup>2</sup> Samuels, *op. cit.* p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> In the case of *ne*, negativity is one reason, I think. The same supposition is made by R. H. Lawson for OHG *hiuuent*. (The prefix *GI-* as a perfectivizing Future significant in OHG TATIAN, *JEGP* 64.94). In the case of *to*, it may fairly be presumed that *ge*- and *to* were felt to perform the same function.

<sup>4</sup> Samuels, *op. cit.* p. 81.

§3. More examination of . . . examples<sup>1</sup> in the present tense. . .

In order to give full explanation to *ge-* mentioned above (§2 (4)), examples concerned from the four Gospels<sup>2</sup> were examined, and we have found that the use of *ge-* in them is regulated by the type of clause and its position<sup>3</sup> besides the preceding monosyllable suggested by Samuels.

(1) *Ge-* occurs in a co-ordinate clause connected by *and* (probably also *but* and *for*), when the clause is final.

J XI 48: gif ne forlettes hine suæ † ðus alle gelefes on hine 7  
                   si dimittimus eum sic omnes credent in eum et  
       cymmeð romane † romuaro 7 *genimeð* usa 7 userne 7 stoue 7 † eac  
       uenient romani et tollent nostrum et locum et  
       cynn<sup>4</sup>  
       gentem

Mk IV 15: ðas uutedlice aron seðe ymb woeg ðer bið gesauen word  
                   hi autem sunt qui circa uiam ubi seminatur uerbum  
       7 miððy geherdon sona cuom † cymeð ðe wiðerworda 7  
       et cum audirent confestim uenit satanas et  
       *geniomað* word þte gesawen wæs in hearta hiora<sup>5</sup>  
       aufert uerbum quod seminatum est in corda eorum.

Mt XII 29: † huu mæge ænig inngeonge or in hus  
                   aut quomodo potest quisquam intrare in. in domum  
       strong 7 fato † maðmas his of-genimma † from-genimma buta ærest  
       fortis et uasa eius diripere nisi prius  
       gebínde ðone stronga 7 ðonne hus ðæs *genimeð* † gehrypes<sup>6</sup>  
       alligauerit fortem et tunc domum illius diripiat

Mt IV 6: 7 cuoeð him gif sunu godes arð ðu send ðeh ufa hidune  
                   et dixit ei si filius dei és mitte té deorsum

<sup>1</sup> The literal translation into Modern English is put in the footnote in case of necessity.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew (Mt), Mark (Mk), Luke (L), and John (J).

<sup>3</sup> There is a case when both the criterion of type of clause and that of position can be applied to it. In such a case, it depends upon the context which one is to be employed.

<sup>4</sup> 'if we leave him thus, all will believe in him and the Romans will come and *take* our place and flock.'

<sup>5</sup> 'these truly are those who are about the way, where the word is sown and when they have heard (it), soon comes Satan and *takes away* the word that was sown in their hearts.'

<sup>6</sup> 'or how may any man enter into the house of a strong man and take away his vessels except when he first binds the strong and then he *will spoil* his house.'



awritten is forðon forðon englum his behead of ðe 7 in  
 scribtum est enim quia angelis suis mandauit de té et in  
 hondum *genimmæs* ðec ðy læs 7 eaðe mæg ðu wið-spurne to 7 wið  
 manibus tollent té ne forte offendas ad  
 stane fot ðinne<sub>1</sub>  
 lapidem pedem tuum

Mt XI 12: from dagum uutedlice wið nu ric  
 Á diebus autem iohannis baptistae usque nunc regnum  
 heofna mægen 7 un-eaðe geðolas 7 ðæm ðreatende 7 nedunga  
 caelorum uim patitur et uiolenti  
 hia *geniomes* þ<sub>2</sub>  
 rapiunt illud

Mt IX 16: ænig monn soðlice insendes ald clað fihles 7 fotclað  
 nemo autem inmittit commissuram panni  
 reades in wede ald 7 foruered *genimes* forðon fyllnisse  
 rudi in uestimentum uetus tollit enim plenitudinem  
 his from wede<sub>3</sub>  
 eius á uestimento

Simplex occurs when the clause is non-final.

L IV 10, 11: englum his behead from ðec þte efne-gehereð ðe. 11.  
 angelis suis mandabit de te ut conseruent té.  
 7 forðon In hondum lædeð 7 *niomað* ðec eaðæ mæge þte ðu  
 et quia in manibus tollent té ne forte offendas  
 wiðspurna to stane fot ðinne<sub>4</sub>  
 ad lapidem pedem tuum

J XV 2: all þ palmung 7 in mec ne brengende uæstem *nimeð*  
 omnem palmitem in me non ferentem fructum tollet  
 hine 7 ðene 7 all seðe brenged þ uæstm he clænsias ðene þte  
 eum et omnem qui fert fructum purgabit eum ut

<sup>1</sup> 'he said to them if you are God's son, send (you) down; it is written, for to his angels he commanded of you and they *will take* you in their hands lest you should hurt your foot against a stone.'

<sup>2</sup> 'truly from the days of John the Baptist till now the kingdom of heavens suffers strength and violent men *ravish* it.'

<sup>3</sup> 'no man truly puts a piece of new cloth into an old garment, for it *takes off* its fullness from the cloth.'

<sup>4</sup> 'he commanded of you to his angels that they should keep you all the way. 11. And for they *will take* you in their hands lest you should hurt your foot against a stone.'

Comparison of this example with Mt IV 6 above will support our theory of position because these contexts are almost the same and the only difference between them is the position of the clause.

þ uæstem forðor brenge<sub>1</sub>  
fructum plus adferat

Mk XVI 18: nedró hia *niomas* 7 gif deadic huæt gedrincas  
serpentes tollent et si mortiferum quid biberint  
ne hia † him sceððað<sub>2</sub>  
non eos nocebit

J X 12: ðe celmertmonn † 7 seðe ne is hiorde ðæs † his ne sint  
mercennairius et qui non est pastor cuius non sunt  
scíp ða agno † syndrigo gesiið þone (*sic*) uulf cymmende 7 forlettas  
oues propriæ uidet lupum uenientem et dimittet  
ða scipo 7 fliið 7 ðe ulf *nimeð* † 7 to-straigdes † todrifeð ða scíp<sub>3</sub>  
oues et fugit et lupus rapit et dispertgit oues

J X 18: nænigmonn *nimeð* hia † from me ah ic setto hia from me  
nemo tollit eam a me sed ego pono eam a me  
seolfum mæht ic hafo to settanne † hia † ðailca<sub>4</sub>  
ipso potestatem habeo ponendi eam

(2) *Ge-* occurs in a principal clause.<sup>5</sup>

L XI 22: gif ðonne bið strongra him se ofercymmend gebindeð † fore-  
si autem fortior illo superueniens uicerit  
cymeð hine alla woepeno his *genimeð* on ðæm gelefde 7  
eum uniuerſa arma eius auferet in quibus confidebat et  
reafo his todld<sub>6</sub>  
spolia eius distribuit

Mt XIX 12: aron forðon cuoen-hiordo ða ðe of modres hrif sua  
sunt enim eunuchi qui de matris utero sic  
boren weron 7 aron geworden<sub>o</sub> sint from monnum  
nati sunt et sunt eunuchi [qui] facti sunt ab hominibus  
7 sint unawoemdo ða ðe hia seolfa hygdiglige beheoldon fore  
et sunt eunuchi qui se-ipsos castrauerunt propter

<sup>1</sup> 'every branch in me that bears no fruit he *takes away* and every branch that bears fruit, he clears it, that it may bring forth more fruit.'

<sup>2</sup> 'they *take up* serpents and if they should drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them.'

<sup>3</sup> 'he who is a hireling and not a shepherd, whose sheep are not his own, sees the wolf coming and he leaves the sheep and flees, and the wolf *ravishes* and scatters the sheep.'

<sup>4</sup> 'No man *takes* it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down.' This is a negative sentence, so can be explained as simplex mentioned in (3), too.

<sup>5</sup> There may be some difference of the occurrence of *ge-*, according to the subordinate conjunction.

<sup>6</sup> 'if then a stronger than he come upon him and overcome him, he *will take away* all his weapons, in which he trusted, and divide his good.'

ric heafna seðe mæge genioma *geniomas*<sub>1</sub>  
 regnum caelorum qui potest capere capiat

Simplex occurs in a subordinate clause and a simple sentence.<sup>2</sup>

Simple sentence

J X 24: ymb-saldon † forðon hine iudeas 7 cuoedon him huu long  
 circum-dederunt ergo eum iudaei et dicebant ei quous-  
 † gehuelc sauel usra † ðu *nimes* gif ðu arð críst cuæð ús euunge †<sub>3</sub>  
 que animam nostram tollis si tú és christus dic nobis palam

*seðe* clause

L VI 30: eghuelcum uutedlice giugiende ðec sel J seðe *nimmeð* ðaðe  
 omni autem petenti té tribue et qui auferet que  
 ðin stin ne eft-bidde ðu  
 tua sunt ne repetas

J I 29: oðer doeg gesæh iohannes ðone hælend cummende to him 7  
 altera die uidet iohannes iesum uenientem ad sé et  
 cuæð heono lomb godes seðe *nimeð* r lædeð synne middangeardes  
 ait ecce agnus dei qui tollit peccatum mundi

Mt XXVI 52: ða cueð to him ðe hælend gehuerf † gecerr suord  
 Tunc ait illi iesus conuerte gladium  
 ðin in stowe † styd his alle forðon ða ðe ofslæð † *niomað*  
 tuum in locum suum omnes enim qui acciperunt  
 sword of sword † mið suord hia losas † forð-aworðað  
 gladium gladio peribunt

*pæt* clause

L XIX 22: cuoed him of muðe ðinum ðec ic doeomo la esne wohfull  
 dicit ei de ore tuo té iudico serue nequam  
 ðu wistes þ ic gearnfull † gearuutol monn am *nimmes* þ  
 sciebas quod ego austerus homo sum tollens quod  
 ic ne gesett 7 hrippes þte ðu(*sic*) ne gesaudes  
 non possui et metens quod non seminaui

*ðara* clause

J XX 23: ðara gie eft-forgefes † synna biðon eft-forgefen him † ðæm  
 Quorum remiseretis peccata remittuntur eis misa

<sup>1</sup> 'truly there are eunuchs, which were so born out of mother's belly and eunuchs, which were made of men, and are eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. Whoever can take it, let him *take* it.'

<sup>2</sup> Its function is regarded as identical with that of a subordinate clause.

<sup>3</sup> 'therefore the Jews came round about him, and said to him, how long do you *take* away our soul? If you are Christ, say to us openly.'

forgefen sint	7	ðara	gē <i>nimað</i> †	gē gihabbað	genumeno †	gehaldeno
sunt		et quorum	retinueritis		retenta	
sint						
sunt						

But *ge-* is used on one occasion in a subordinate clause introduced by *seðe*.

L VI 29: 7 seðe ðec slaeð on cece agef æc ða oðero 7  
 Et qui té percutit in maxillam praebe et alteram et  
 of ðæm † from him seðe *genimeð* ðe woedo æc þ cyrtil  
 ab eo qui auferet tibi uestimentum etiam tunica [m]  
 mælle ðu forstonda † forbæda  
 noli prohibere

Just in the next line the simplex mentioned above (L VI 30) occurs in a clause introduced by *seðe*. So the only possible reason for this *ge-* will be that the glossator wanted to give a stylistic effect.

(3) After *ne* (probably also in a sentence including *ne*) and after *ic*<sup>1</sup>, *ge-* is not used. This absence of *ge-* occurs even in the clauses mentioned in (1) and (2).

After *ne*

Mt X 38: 7 seðe ne onfoeð † ne *nimeð* ðrouung his 7 fylges † soecæs  
 et qui non accipit crucem suam et sequitur  
 meh ne is meh wyrðe  
 me non est me dignus

L XIII 33: soð hueðre gehriseð † gedæfneð me to-dæg 7 tomerne 7  
 uerum-tamen oportet me hodie et cras et  
 ðæm æfterfylgende geonga forðon ne *nimeð* witge losia  
 sequenti ambulare quia non capit prophetam perire  
 buta hierusalem  
 extra hierusalem

J VIII 37: ic uat þte suno abrahames gie aron † ah gie soecas mec  
 scio quia filii abrahæ estis sed quaeritis me  
 geccarfa † to accuellanne þt † forðon wuord min ne *nimeð* in  
 interficere quia sermo meus non capit in  
 Iuh ic þ ic gesæh æt ðæm fæder. ic spreco 7 gie ðaðe  
 uobis 38 ego quod uidi apud patrem loquor et uos quæ

<sup>1</sup> Because of the lack of examples it is not certain whether *ge-* is omitted after *ic*, though Samuels' examples illustrate this. Samuels, *op. cit.* pp. 100, 101.

gie gesegon æt feder Iurum gie wyrcas  
uidistis apud patrem uestrum facitis

J X 28: 7 ic lif éce ic silo him 7 ne losað in ecnise  
et ego uitam aeternam dó eis et non peribunt in aeternum  
7 ne *nimeð* hia ænig monn of minum hondum † of hond min  
et non rapiet eas quisquam de manu mea

J XVI 22: 7 gie forðon nú æc † unrotnise gie habað † eftersona  
et uos igitur nunc quidem tristitiam habebitis iterum  
uutudlice ic gesium † gesie iuih 7 gefeað † hearta iuer 7  
autem uidebo uos et gaudebit cór uestrum et  
gefea iuer † ne *nimeð* ænigmonn from iuh  
gaudium uestrum nemo tollit à uobis

J X 18: cf. (1)

Mt XIX 11: seðe cuoeð ne alle *niomað* þ word † ðis ah ðæm  
qui dixit non omnes capiunt uerbum istud sed quibus  
gesald wæs  
datum est

After *ic*

J XII 32: 7 ic gif ahefen † biom from eorðo alle ic *nimo* † heartlice  
et ego si exaltatus fuero á terra omnia traham  
to me seolfum  
ad me ipsum

§4. It is clearly seen from the following examples from Matthew that the usage of *ge-* is regulated by the type of clause or its position in several other verbs in the present tense, too.

DOA The usage of *ge-* is entirely due to the type of clause.

*Ge-comp.*

Mt IV 19: and cuoeð him cumas æfter mec 7 ic *gedo* Iuih sie † wosa  
fisceras monna.<sup>1</sup> (Co-ordinate clause, final)

Mt XVII 4: gif ðu wilt ic *gedo* her ðrea huso<sup>2</sup> (Principal clause)

Mt XIX 16: 7 heonu an geneolecde cueð him larua la god huæt godes  
ic *gedoom* þ ic hæbbe lif ece.<sup>3</sup> (Principal clause)

<sup>1</sup> 'and he says to them, Follow me, and I *will make* you fishers of men'

<sup>2</sup> 'if you will, I *will make* here three tabernacles . . .'

<sup>3</sup> 'and, behold, one came and said unto him, Good God, what good thing shall I *do*, that I may have eternal life?'

Mt V 32: forðon eghuelc seðe forletes wif his buta unclænes lustas Inting  
*gedoeð* † wircas ða ilca gesyngege.<sup>1</sup> (Principal Clause)

Mt XVIII 35: sua 7 fæder min heofonlic *gedoas* iuh gif ne gie . . .<sup>2</sup>  
 (principal clause)

Mt XXVIII 14: 7 gif ðis gehered bið from ðen groefa we ge-trewað him  
 sac-leaso iwih we *gedoeð*.<sup>3</sup> (Principal clause)

### Simplex

Mt XX 13: cueð la freond † la meg ne *dom* ic ðe laæðo † baeligniso.<sup>4</sup>  
 (Simple sentence. After *ne*)

Mt XXVII 22: cuoeð him hwæt ðonne *dom* ic of ðæm hælende seðe  
 acueden is crist.<sup>5</sup> (Principal clause)

Mt VI 2: mið ðy ðonne ðu *doas* ælmessa nelle ðu bema † stocc singa . . .<sup>6</sup>  
 (Subordinate clause)

Mt XXI 23: cueðende in ðæm mæht ðas *do*.<sup>7</sup> (Subordinate clause)

Mt XXI 24: ic iuh sægo in ðæm mæht † in huelc mæht ðas ic *doa*.<sup>8</sup>  
 (Subordinate clause)

Mt V 19: seðe uutedlice *doeð* læreð ðes micil bið geceigð in ric heafna.<sup>9</sup>  
 (Subordinate clause)

Thus, in principle we can say that *ge-* comp. occurs with DOA in a final coordinate clause and a principal clause while simplex occurs in a subordinate clause (and probably in a non-final co-ordinate clause). This is what we have found with NIMAN.

<sup>1</sup> 'whoever shall put away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, *causes* her to commit adultery.'

<sup>2</sup> 'so my heavenly Father *shall do* you, if you do not . . .'

<sup>3</sup> 'and if this is heard by the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and *make* you safe.'

<sup>4</sup> 'said to the friend, I *do* you no wrong.'

<sup>5</sup> 'said to him, what *shall I do* then with Jesus who is called Christ?'

*Ge-* will not occur here even in a principal clause because the nature of a principal clause is weak and it comes near to a simple sentence.

<sup>6</sup> 'therefore when you *do* your alms, do not sound a trumpet . . .'

<sup>7</sup> 'saying by what authority you *do*.'

<sup>8</sup> 'I tell you by what authority I *do* these things.'

<sup>9</sup> 'whoever shall *do* and teach them truly, will be called great in the kingdom of heaven.'

Other examples in Matthew, which are all simplex, are almost subject to this rule.<sup>1</sup>

## DRIFA

### *Ge-comp.*

Mt XII 27: gif ic in belzebub fordrifo dioules suno iuera in huæm hia *gedrifes*.<sup>2</sup> (Principal clause)

### Simplex

Mt XII 28: gif uutedlice ic in gast godes ic *drifo* diowles cuðlice † forðon ðerh-cuom in iuih ric godes.<sup>3</sup> (Subordinate clause)

Mt XII 26: gif ðæ wiðer-braca ðone wiðerbracao *drifes* wið † betiuih him to-dæled wæs † tosliten is.<sup>4</sup> (Subordinate clause)

## FYLGA

### *Ge-comp.*

Mt XVI 24: gif hua wil æfter meh ge-cyme . . . *gefylgeð* me.<sup>5</sup> (Principal clause)

---

<sup>1</sup> The rest of the examples (all simplex) occur:

(The subordinate conjunctions are illustrated in parentheses)

in a subordinate clause

VII 19 (Relative pronoun), VII 21 (*seðe*), VII 24 (*seðe*), XII 50 (*swa*), XI 7 (*swa*), VI 3 (*hwæt*).

in a non-final co-ordinate clause

VII 17 (*but*), XXIII 5 (*but*), XXIII 23 (*and*).

in a final co-ordinate clause

XXVI 73 (*for*)

in a simple sentence

XII 17

in a principal clause

XII 2 (*pæt*), XXIII 15 (*miððy*), V 47 (*hwæt*), XX 46 (*hwæt*), XXIV 48 (*gif*).

after *ne*

VII 26, V 46, V 47, XXIII 3.

In the case of a principal clause, the absence of *ge-* may be due to the type of subordinate clause.

<sup>2</sup> 'if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children *cast* them *out*?'

<sup>3</sup> 'if I truly *cast out* devils by the Spirit of God, then the kindgom of God will come to you.'

<sup>4</sup> 'if Satan *cast out* Satan, he is divided against himself.'

<sup>5</sup> 'if any man will come after me, . . . *follow* me.'

## Simplex

Mt X 38: seðe . . . 7 *fylges* † soecæs meh ne is meh wyrðe.<sup>1</sup> (Subordinate clause)

## RYP A

*Ge*-comp.

Mt XII 29: cf. §3 (1) (Final co-ordinate clause)

## Simplex

Mt VI 19: nællas gie gestrionaige iuh gestriono in eorðo . . . ðer ðeafas ofelfes † *brypes* forstealas.<sup>2</sup> (Subordinate clause)

## SWING A

*Ge*-comp.

Mt X 17: hia gesellas forðon Iuih in gemotum 7 in somnungum hiora hia *geswingas* iuih.<sup>3</sup> (Final co-ordinate clause)

## Simplex

Mt XXIII 34: and of him ge *suingas* in gesomnungum iurum ge biðon gewoehtat † geohtas iuih of burug in burig.<sup>4</sup> (Non-final co-ordinate clause)

## CONCLUSIONS

My observations on the preverb *ge*- added to *niman* are summarized as follows:

1. The length of the Latin word glossed cannot determine the occurrence of *ge*- throughout.
2. The influence of Latin compound words is not obvious.
3. Samuels' views that *ge*- is a sign of the past tense and is omitted after *to*, *ne*, and probably *ic* are confirmed.
4. Absence of *ge*- after *ne* is due not to the mere phonetic reasons,

---

<sup>1</sup> 'he that . . . *follow* after me, is not worthy of me.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, . . . where thieves *break through* and steal.'

<sup>3</sup> 'for they will deliver you up to the councils and they *will scourge* you in their synagogues.'

<sup>4</sup> 'and some of them you shall *scourge* in your synagogues and persecute them from city to city.'



as pilch insists, but to the word *ne* itself. It even seems due to its meaning.

5. The usage of *ge-* in the present can be explained by (1) positional relationship (final: non-final)<sup>1</sup>, (2) the type of clause (principal: subordinate), except when the verb is preceded by some monosyllable. This explanation is applicable to *niman* and a few other verbs and will complement Samuels' conclusions which are largely based on the Latin words glossed and monosyllabic words.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Sherer reports that a similar distinction exists in the Gothic *ga-*. 'The Theory of the Function of the Gothic Preverb *ga-*' *Word*, 20.222-245 (1964).