

Remarks on Two Morphophonological Differences Between Strong and Preterite-Present Verbs in Germanic

Tanaka, Toshiya
Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University

<https://doi.org/10.15017/1786407>

出版情報：英語英文学論叢. 65, pp.17-29, 2015-03-20. The English Language and Literature Society
バージョン：
権利関係：



Remarks on Two Morphophonological Differences Between Strong and Preterite-Present Verbs in Germanic*

Toshiya TANAKA

1. Introduction

The verb system of all the Old Germanic languages consists of the four types listed in (1):

(1) Germanic Verb System

- a. **Strong verbs:** those which are inflected according to ablaut or vowel gradation such as PDE *take, took, taken* (productive)
- b. **Weak verbs:** those which are characterised by dental preterites such as PDE *love, loved, loved* (highly productive)
- c. **Preterite-present verbs:** those which use preterite tense formations as the present tense such as PDE *I can* and *(s)he can* (***(s)he cans*; cf. *I ran* and *(s)he ran/**rans*) (limited in number; only 14 tokens reconstructable for Proto-Germanic)
- d. **Anomalous verbs:** those which are inflected anomalously such as PDE *be (am, are, is, was, were, been), do (does, did, done), and go (goes, went, gone)* (restricted sharply in number)

This paper deals with two of these verb types, namely, strong and preterite-present verbs, and leaves aside weak and anomalous verbs. The preterite formations of strong verbs and the present formations of preterite-present verbs are traditionally thought to have inherited the perfect formation from Proto-Indo-European (PIE); see Brugmann (1904: pp.546-547, §710.5), Matzel (1970: 173), Jasanoff (1994: 272 and 277), and others. There are also a number of other

* This is a revised version of the paper read at the Language Variation and Change (LVC) research forum that took place at Kyushu University's Ito Campus on 24th May 2014. Thanks are due to all those who gave helpful comments on my talk. Among others, I am especially grateful to Stephen Laker for kindly providing me with information on Gothic *Bononiensia*. Needless to say, however, any errors or shortcomings remaining in this paper are my responsibility alone.

theories. For example, one theory assumes that strong preterite formations result from a mixing of the perfect and the root aorist, but this view is not widely accepted; see Tanaka (2013a: §2), where it is argued that this thesis does not suffice to explain some important morphological properties of the forms at issue.

This paper focuses on the fact that, when we carefully compare specific morphophonological features of the Germanic strong preterite and preterite-present present tense formations, we find two remarkable differences between them. Recognition of this fact leads to the conclusion that those differences cannot be sufficiently explained by simply assuming that both of them come from the PIE perfect alone;¹ hence some new explanatory theory is needed. (Yet no specific proposal will be provided in this article. Part of one, however, is spelled out in my previous papers, and remaining issues will be postponed for future studies.)

2. Conspicuous Morphophonological Differences between the Two Categories

Strong verbs are morphologically classified into seven types, whereas preterite-presents are usually divided into six classes. See (2) - (7) below (excerpted from Tanaka 2011: 15-16), where Old English verb forms are employed to illustrate the characteristics of each class. The strong class VII is not directly relevant to the present discussion, so I omit that category in this section. It should be noted that the classes of strong and preterite-present verbs are determined according to the verb's stem shape. If the verbal stem goes back to PGmc. **CīC-* (< pre-PGmc. **CeīC-*), as illustrated in (2), the verb in question belongs to Class I. As described in (3) - (7), the verbal stem shapes pertinent to Classes II-VI are PGmc. **CeuC-*, **CeRC-*, **CeR-*, **CeT-*, and **CaC-*, respectively. In sum, the class to which a strong or preterite-present verb belongs is determined morphologically in Germanic.

1 The PIE perfect is formed by reduplication, followed by the *o-/zero-grade* root and the perfect ending; e.g. 3 sg. **dʰe-dʰórs-e* '(s)he dares' and 3 pl. **dʰe-dʰṛs-ǵs* 'they dare' (cf. Ringe 2006: 153; Tanaka 2011: 137).

(2) Class I: *CīC- < *CeīC-

strv:	inf.	pret.sg.	pret.pl.	---	p.p.	---
ppv:	---	pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	inf.
PIE:	*ei	*oi	*i		*i	
‘ride’	<i>rīdan</i>	<i>rād</i>	<i>ridon</i>		<i>riden</i>	
‘know’		<i>wāt</i>	<i>witon</i>	<i>wiste,</i> <i>wisse</i>	<i>witen</i>	<i>witan</i>
‘thrive’	<i>þēon</i>	<i>þāh</i>	<i>þigon</i>		<i>þigen</i>	
(cf. Go. <i>þeihān</i>)						
[exceptional:		<i>āh,</i>	<i>āgon</i>	<i>āhte</i>	<i>āgen,</i>	<i>āgan</i>]
‘own, possess’		<i>āg</i>			<i>āgen</i>	

(3) Class II: *CeuC-

strv:	inf.	pret.sg.	pret.pl.	---	p.p.	---
ppv:	---	pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	inf.
PIE:	*eu	*ou	*u		*u	
‘choose’	<i>cēosan</i>	<i>cēas</i>	<i>curon</i>		<i>coren</i>	
‘pull’	<i>tēon</i> (< *tēohan)	<i>tēah</i>	<i>tugon</i>		<i>togen</i>	
‘avail’		<i>dēag, dēah</i>	<i>dugon</i>	<i>dohte</i>	...	<i>dugan</i>

(4) Class III: *CeRC-

strv:	inf.	pret.sg.	pret.pl.	---	p.p.	---
ppv:	---	pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	inf.
PIE:	*eR	*oR	*ŕ		*ŕ	
‘bind’	<i>bindan</i>	<i>band</i>	<i>bundon</i>		<i>bunden</i>	
‘know’		<i>can(n)</i>	<i>cunnon</i>	<i>cūþe</i>	<i>cūþ,</i> <i>-cunnen</i>	<i>cunnan</i>
‘grant’		<i>an(n)</i>	<i>unnon</i>	<i>ūþe</i>	<i>ge-unnen unnan</i>	
‘become’	<i>weorþan</i>	<i>wearþ</i>	<i>wurdon</i>		<i>worden</i>	
‘need’		<i>þearf</i>	<i>þurfon</i>	<i>þorfte</i>	...	<i>þurfan</i>
‘dare’		<i>dearr</i>	<i>durron</i>	<i>dorste</i>	...	* <i>durran</i>

(5) Class IV: *CeR-

strv:	inf.	pret.sg.	pret.pl.	---	p.p.	---
ppv:	---	pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	inf.
PIE:	*eR	*oR	*ēR/*Ṛ		*Ṛ	
‘bear’	<i>beran</i>	<i>bær</i>	<i>bæron</i>		<i>boren</i>	
‘steal’	<i>stelan</i>	<i>stæł</i>	<i>stælon</i>		<i>stolen</i>	
‘owe, should’		<i>sceal</i>	<i>sculon,</i> <i>scylon</i>	<i>sc(e)olde</i>	...	* <i>sculan</i>
‘take’	<i>niman</i>	<i>nam</i>	<i>nō/āmon</i>		<i>numen</i>	
‘remember’		<i>ge-man</i>	<i>ge-munon</i>	<i>ge-munde</i>	<i>ge-munen</i>	<i>ge-munan</i>

(6) Class V: *CeT-

strv:	inf.	pret.sg.	pret.pl.	---	p.p.	---
ppv:	---	pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	inf.
PIE:	*e	*o	*ē/* _e		* _e	
‘see’	<i>sēon</i> (< * <i>seohan</i>)	<i>seah</i>	<i>sāwon,</i> <i>sægon</i>		<i>sewen,</i> <i>ge-segen</i>	
‘be enough’		<i>ge-neah</i>	<i>ge-nugon</i>	<i>ge-nohte</i> cf. Go. <i>bi-naūhts</i>	...	*- <i>nugan</i>
‘measure’	<i>metan</i>	<i>mæt</i>	<i>mæton</i>		<i>meten</i>	
‘say’	<i>cweþan</i>	<i>cwæþ</i>	<i>cwædon</i>		<i>cweden</i>	
‘be’	<i>wesan</i>	<i>wæs</i>	<i>wæron</i>		...	
[exceptional: ‘be able’]		<i>mæg</i>	<i>magon</i>	<i>meahte,</i> <i>mihte</i>	...	<i>magan</i>]

(7) Class VI: *CaC-

strv:	inf.	pret.sg.	pret.pl.	---	p.p.	---
ppv:	---	pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	inf.
PIE:	*a/o/a	*ō/ā	*ō/ā		*a/o/a	
‘go’	<i>faran</i>	<i>fōr</i>	<i>fōron</i>		<i>faren</i>	
‘be allowed’	<i>mōt</i>	<i>mōton</i>	<i>mōste</i>	...	* <i>mōtan</i>	

2-1. Class IV and V Plural Formations

Now, observe (5) and (6) above. Class IV and V plural formations of the Germanic verbs at issue show a conspicuous morphological difference, as represented in (8):

(8)	strong preterite plural	preterite-present present plural
Class IV	* <i>bǣr-un</i> ‘they bore, carried’ < pre-PGmc. * <i>b^hēr-nt</i>	* <i>skul-un</i> ‘they owe, shall, should’ < pre-PGmc. * <i>skl-nt</i>
Class V	* <i>māit-un</i> ‘they measured’ < pre-PGmc. * <i>mēd-nt</i>	* <i>nug-un</i> ‘they are enough, suffice’ < pre-PGmc. * <i>n_eg^h-nt</i>

A strong class IV preterite plural formation on the one hand shows a long vowel in its verbal stem (e.g. PGmc. **bǣr-un* ‘they bore, carried’ < pre-PGmc. **b^hēr-nt*). On the other hand, a preterite-present class IV present plural formation exhibits a vowel reflecting the original zero-grade (e.g. PGmc. **skul-un* ‘they owe, shall, should’ < pre-PGmc. **skl-nt*). Likewise, the stem vocalism of a strong class V preterite plural form indicates a long vowel (e.g. PGmc. **māit-un* ‘they measured’ < pre-PGmc. **mēd-nt*), though the stem vowel of a preterite-present present plural suggests an original reduced grade vowel (e.g. PGmc. **nug-un* ‘they are enough, suffice’ < pre-PGmc. **n_eg^h-nt*).

Schumacher (2005) has recently offered an explanation of the origin of the strong IV and V long stem vowels by means of his ‘*bi-getun* rule’ (i.e. **T₁eT₁.T₂-* → **T₁ēT₂-* during the PIE period). However, Tanaka (2012) demonstrates that there are serious flaws in Schumacher’s account of the different stem shapes between the preterite plural of the strong IV and V classes on the one hand and the present plural of the preterite-present IV and V classes on the other. Instead of Schumacher’s (2005) explanation based on his proposed ‘*bi-getun* rule’, Tanaka (2012) attempts to account for the difference in vowel length on the basis of his own ‘morphological conflation theory’, which claims that the long vowel in the preterite plural forms of the strong IV and V verbs reflects a long vowel of the strong form of the acrostatic I (or Narten) type though the two types of the imperfect (the acrostatic I and amphikinetic types) and the reduplicating perfect were conflated to generate the PGmc. strong preterite tense formation system, whereas the athematic present middle (or reduplicating perfect middle) and the reduplicating perfect active were amalgamated to create the PGmc. preterite-present present tense formation system.²

2 Regarding the ‘morphological conflation approach’ to the genesis of the PGmc. strong preterite formations, see also Tanaka (2009 and 2010).

2-2. Verner's Law Effects in Gothic

Let us move on to the second salient morphophonological difference between strong and preterite-present verbs.

As for Gothic strong class I-VI verbs, no effects of Verner's law³ can be observed with any preterite plural formations (cf. Verner 1877: 103f.;⁴ Meillet 1970: 27;⁵ Bernhardsson 2001: 26F and 17ff.;⁶ Liberman 2010: 381;⁷ and others).⁸ (9) charts the case of PGmc. **wesan* 'stay, dwell, be' and its reflexes in Gothic and other Germanic languages (cf. Prokosch 1939: 172; Seebold 1970: 561; Tanaka 2013a: 106; 2013b: 16):

(9) **wesan* 'stay, dwell, be'

	Inf.	pret. sg.	pret. pl.	p.p. (pret. part.)
Go.	wisan	was	wesun	undocumented
ON	vesa, vera	vas, var	vōrom	verenn, vesenn
OE	wesan	wæs	wæron	(-weran, -woran)
OFris.	we(i)sa	was	wēron	wesen
OS	wesan	was	wārun	undocumented
OHG	wesan	was	wārun	-weran

Regarding the strong class VII verb, however, there is one token where the out-

-
- 3 Verner's law is defined by Ringe (2006: 102) as follows: "After the PIE voiceless stops had become voiceless fricatives by Grimm's Law, they became voiced by Verner's Law if they were not word-initial *and* not adjacent to a voiceless sound *and* the last preceding syllable nucleus was unaccented." This article takes the following relative chronology as read: Grimm's law → Verner's law → Germanic accent shift (cf. Schaffner 2001: 57-68).
 - 4 Verner (1877: 103f.) states that "Gothic, from which comparison is normally started, is not acquainted with this differentiation in the conjugation [i.e. the differentiation between the strong preterite singular with a root-final voiceless fricative and the strong preterite plural with a root-final voiced fricative: T.T.] at all [my translation: T.T.]" = "das gotische, von dem man gewöhnlich beim vergleichen ausgeht, diese differenzi[e]rung in der conjugation gar nicht kennt."
 - 5 Meillet (1970: 27) offers the following remarks: "Gothic has in general lost these grammatical alternations. However, it has preserved a trace of them in its preterite-presents; for example, it opposes *aih*, 'he possesses', to *aigun*, 'they possess' ..."
 - 6 Bernhardsson (2001: 2) makes the following statement: "In the Gothic verb, however, "grammatischer Wechsel" was practically non-existent ..."
 - 7 Liberman (2010: 381) points out "the immunity of Gothic strong verbs to voicing."
 - 8 This article handles the data from Wulfila's Gothic alone and leaves the newly discovered *Gothica Bononiensia* out of consideration. (Regarding the latter documents, see Finazzi and Tornaghi 2013, Falluomini 2014, and others.)

come of Verner's law is observable. The preterite formations of *slepan* 'sleep' manifest both the root-initial *s-* and *z-*: compare the *s-* in *sai-slep* 'he slept' (Mat 8. 24), *ana-sai-slep* 'he fell asleep' (Luke 8. 23), *ana-sai-slepun* 'they fell asleep' (I Thess. 4. 14) and *z-* in *ga-sai-zlep* 'he slept, died' (John 11. 11), *ga-sai-zlepun* 'they slept, died' (I Cor. 15. 6) (see Sturtevant 1957: 561; cf. Snædal 2005: 479).⁹

With the preterite-present verbs, the situation is quite different from the strong verbs. Of the 13 preterite-present verbs attested in Gothic, four have a stem which ends in a voiceless fricative, and two of them clearly show the effects of Verner's law:

(10) Gothic Preterite-Present Verbs (Snædal 2005: 15 and 533; cf. Braune & Heidermanns 2004: 167-170; Tanaka 2011: 20)

- a. 1 and 3 sg. *aiḥ* (3 and 4 times, respectively) 'I possess, (s)he possesses' vs. 1 pl. *aiḡum* (2 times) and *aihum* (3 times) 'we possess', 2 pl. *aihuþ* (1 time) 'you possess', 3 pl. *aiḡun* (2 times) 'they possess'¹⁰
- b. 1 sg. *þarf* (3 times) 'I need' vs. 1 pl. *þairbum* (6 times) 'we need', 2 pl. *þairbuþ* (2 times) 'you need', 3 pl. *þairbun* (4 times) 'they need'¹¹

1 sg. *lais* 'I know' is attested only once (Phil. 4, 12),¹² and no plural form is documented. The class III *dars* shows no effects of Verner's law in its present plural formations such as *ga-daúrsum* 'we dare, are courageous'.¹³

The data on Go. *slepan** and two preterite-present verbs in question seem

-
- 9 Bernhardtsson (2001: 158f.) observes that Go. strong class VII *skaidan* 'separate' (pret. 3 sg. *skai-skaid*, 3 pl. *skai-skaid-un*; cf. OS inf. *skēdan* (-th-), pret. sg. *skēth*, pret. pl. undocumented, p.p. *skēthan*) and Go. strong class III *hvaírban** 'live, walk' (cf. OHG (h)werfan/werban) might be exceptions to the case of levelling in favour of the voiceless variants. Respecting *skaidan*, LIV (2001: p.248 note 2) suggests that it should be a PIE root **skejt-*, apart from **skejd-* 'spalten, abrennen, zerreißen', that underlies the PGmc. **skaipa-* 'separate'. As far as *hvaírban** is concerned, Mailhammer (2007: p.125 fn. 140) determines, following in the footsteps of Seebold (1970: 282), that PGmc. had two distinct verb forms **hwerba-* and **hwerfa-* 'turn to'. Gothic would have inherited the former variant from the PGmc. lexicon.
 - 10 With reference to the subjunctive formations, all the three attested forms show -*g-* but not -*h-*: 3 sg. *aigi*, 2 pl. *aigeip*, 3 pl. *aigeina*. Concerning the present participle, both forms with -*g-* and -*h-* are documented: sg. nom. m. *aigands* (4 examples), sg. gen. f. *aigandeins* (1 example), and pl. nom. m. *aihandans* (2 examples). No infinitive is documented. See Snædal (2005: 15).

to indicate that the paradigmatic levelling (i.e. the original voiced fricative in the preterite plural form became voiceless under the influence of the preterite singular) was ongoing and not yet completed during the period of Wulfila's Biblical Gothic. Nevertheless, no strong I-VI verb shows any evidence of grammatical change in its preterite plural formation, to which there is no exception.¹⁴ This would seem to pose a mystery: Why does it appear that the paradigmatic levelling has been altogether completed in the preterite plural form of those strong I-VI verbs with a root-final voiceless fricative, though a strong VII verb and two preterite-present verbs at least partially show traces of the original grammatical change in their preterite or present plural formations?

In the NWGmc. languages, the effects of Verner's law are observable in the preterite plural formation of strong verbs (especially strong I-III verbs), and the

-
- 11 With respect to the subjunctive and present participle forms, all exhibit the *-b-* shape: subj. 1 pl. *þairbeima* (1 example), 2 pl. *þairbeip* (1 example), pres. ptc. sg. dat. m. *þairbandin* (2 examples). No infinitive is attested. See Snædal (2005: 533).
 - 12 Philippians 4, 12: *οἶδα καὶ ταπεινοῦσθαι, οἶδα καὶ περισσεύειν, lais jah haunjan mik, lais jah ufarassu haban* (Streitberg 2000: 378f.) 'I know both how to abase myself and how to have abundance.'
 - 13 The 1 pl. *ga-daúrsum* is attested only once in Biblical Gothic (2 Corinthians 10, 12): *οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρίναι ... ἐαυτούς ... unte ni gadaursum domjan unsis silbans ...* (Streitberg 2000: 316f.) 'for we dare not judge ourselves' The infinitive *ga-daúrsan* is documented twice and the present subjunctive 1 sg. *ga-daúrsjau* once. (See Snædal 2005: 90). Note that the word-internal sequence *-rz-* is permissible in Gothic (e.g. *marzjan* 'offend', a weak 1 verb, and *fairzna* 'heel', a feminine *ō*-stem noun; cf. Lehmann 1986: 246 and 107; Bernhardsson 2001: 285f.). Given this fact, it seems possible to think that a 1 pl. **ga-daúrsum* happened to be unrecorded in Wulfila's Biblical Gothic and that the 1 pl. *ga-daúrsum*, a verb form which had gone through analogical levelling, happened to be employed in 2 Corinthians 10, 12.
 - 14 Although it is observed that the preterite plural formations of the NWGmc. strong I-III verbs well-nigh regularly show the effects of Verner's law (cf. Prokosch 1939: 163), there are also exceptions such as strong I 'rise' (ON *risa*, *reis*, *risu*, *risinn*, OE *risan*, *rās*, *rison*, *risen*; cf. OHG *risan*, *reis*, *rirun*, *giriran*) and strong II 'flee' (OHG *fliohan*, *floh*, *fuhun*, *giflohan*; cf. OE *flēon*, *fleah*, *flugon*, *flogen*); see Tanaka (2013b: p.15 fn.20) and the references cited there. It does not seem feasible to interpret the lack of VL effect in the OE pret. pl. *rison* 'they rose' as a consequence of dissimilation (**riron* > *rison*), given that OE *drēosan* 'rush, fall, perish' testifies VL effect (Strong II, pret. sg. *drēas*, pl. *druron*, p.p. *droren*; cf. Bernhardsson 2001: 158). Given this fact, it looks all the more enigmatic that Biblical Gothic provides no exception to the 'analogical levelling' of the preterite plural formations of the strong I-VI verbs.

same outcome can also be seen in the present plural of preterite-present verbs. In Wulfila's Biblical Gothic, however, strong I-VI verbs stand in stark contrast to preterite-present verbs (and the strong VII *slepan** 'sleep'), when it comes to the effects of Verner's law. No scholar has so far presented any explicit, systematic historical explanation of this contrast which has met with wide acceptance among other investigators.¹⁵

3. Discussion

Section 2 confirmed that, whilst strong and preterite-present verbs share many similar morphological characteristics, there are two prominent morphophonological differences between these two distinct categories of verbs. One difference is that the strong IV and V preterite plural formations exhibit a long radical vowel reflecting PGmc. **-ǣ-* or **-ē^l-*, whereas the preterite-present IV and V present plural formations do not show any long vowel but a vowel developing from some reduced-grade vocalism in Proto-Germanic in their roots. The other is the peculiarity found in Wulfila's Gothic, where no outcome of Verner's law can be traced in any preterite plural forms of strong I-VI verbs, though a strong VII verb *slepan** 'sleep' and two preterite-present verbs *aigan** 'possess' and *þaúrban** 'need' retain the effects of Verner's law in their preterite or present plural formations.

In my view, the morphophonological resemblances between strong I-VI verbs and preterite-present (I-VI) verbs¹⁶ can be safely attributed to the fact that both categories of verbs under current discussion can be traced back to the PIE perfect (active) in some way or other, as has long been claimed by researchers. Nonetheless, the two divergences demonstrated in the preceding section (i.e. the difference in vocalism between the strong IV/V preterite plural and the preterite-present IV/V present plural forms on the one hand, and the difference in Verner's law effect between strong I-VI verbs and preterite-present verbs in Gothic on the other) could not be furnished with a principled explanation, in view of the traditional assumption that both categories of verbs evolved solely

15 For the research history about the absence of any VL effects in Gothic strong I-VI verbs, see Collinge (1985: 209-211) and Bernhardsson (2001: pp.17-43, §1.4).

from the PIE perfect (active).

In Tanaka (2012) I proposed and developed a ‘morphological conflation theory’ as a way of approaching the issue of why the strong IV/V preterite plural and the preterite-present IV/V present plural formations disagree with each other in radical vocalism. Consequently, it remains a challenge to examine whether or not the same ‘morphological conflation theory’ can sufficiently account for why the Gothic strong I-VI preterite plural morphology is systematically immune from the effects of Verner’s law. The proposed morphological conflation theory distinguishes Gmc. strong verbs from preterite-present verbs, to the extent that the former verbs developed from the mixture of the PIE (or pre-PGmc.) imperfect (acrostatic 1 or amphikinetic) and the reduplicating perfect active, whilst the latter stemmed from the amalgamation of the PIE (or pre-PGmc.) present (or reduplicating perfect) middle and the reduplicating perfect active. This theory or hypothesis would imply that strong preterite plural formations once (i.e. in pre-Proto-Germanic) had both radical-accented and ending-accented forms (the former coming from the acrostatic 1 imperfect and the latter from the amphikinetic imperfect and/or the reduplicating perfect active morphology; cf. Tanaka 2013b: 4-9). In contrast, preterite-present present plural formations in the pre-PGmc. period possessed only ending-accented forms because the accent was placed on the inflectional ending in the case of either the present middle (or reduplicating perfect middle) or the reduplicating perfect active plural (cf. Tanaka 2011: 105-244). It remains yet to be verified whether or not this line of thought will help construct any convincing explanation of the fact that the strong I-VI preterite plural morphology in Wulfila’s Gothic always appears to evade the application of Verner’s law, though some partial discussion on this point is conducted in

16 As stated in §2 above, Gmc. preterite-present verbs are normally classified into six (i.e. I-VI) classes; see Prokosch (1939: pp.187-193, §65) and other standard handbooks. This article follows this traditional, descriptive classification of preterite-present verbs, though Tanaka (2011: 242 et passim) would regard PGmc. **aig-* ‘possess’ and **ōg-* ‘fear’ as class VII verbs, for the original reduplicating syllable of the perfect active and middle had not been lost, albeit contracted with the verbal radix after the loss of the laryngeal phonemes, in these verbs. Wright and Sayce (1954: 163) also considers **aig-* ‘possess’ to be a class VII verb.

Tanaka (2013b: 11-15).

4. Conclusion

By introducing the present author's current interest in research and referring to his previous works, this paper has illustrated how two morphophonological aspects of those basic verbs which are inflected according to ablaut or vowel gradation (i.e. strong and preterite-present verbs) in Germanic remain unexplained even in the long research history since Bopp or Grimm in the 19th century. It might be stated that comparative Indo-European and comparative Germanic linguistics has yet to advance to the point of giving a consistent, systematic account of the morphophonological differences between strong and preterite-present verbs in Germanic.

References

- Bernhardsson, Haraldur 2001. *Verner's Law in Gothic*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Braune, Wilhelm & Frank Heidermanns 2004. *Gotische Grammatik*, 20th edition. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brugmann, Karl 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner. [Reprinted, 1970. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.]
- Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The Laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Falluomini, Carla 2013. "Zum gotischen Fragment aus Bologna." *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 143, 281-305.
- Finazzi, Rosa Bianca and Paola Tornaghi 2013. "Gothica Bononiensia: Analisi Linguistica e Filologica di un Nuovo Documento." *Aevum* 87, 113-155.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1994b. "Germanic." In Bader, Françoise (ed.) *Langues indo-européennes*. 251-280. Paris: CNRS editions.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. (comp.) 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lieberman, Anatoly 2010. "Verner's Law." *NOWELE* 58/59, 381-425.
- Mailhammer, Robert 2007. *The Germanic Strong Verbs: Foundations and Development of a New System*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matzel, Klaus 1970. "Zum System der starken Verben des Germanischen." In Tilakasiri, J. (ed.) *Añjali, Papers on Indology and Buddhism: A Felicitation Volume Presented to Oliver Hector de Alwis Wijesekera on his Sixtieth Birthday*. 173-181. Peradeniya: The Felicitation Volume Editorial Committee, University of Ceylon.
- Meillet, Antoine 1970. *General Characteristics of the Germanic Languages*, tr. by William P. Dismukes. Florida: University of Miami Press.
- Prokosch, Eduard 1939. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of

America.

- Ringe, Don 2006. *A Linguistic History of English*, Vol. 1: *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schaffner, Stefan 2001. *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Schumacher, Stefan 2005. " 'Langvokalisches Perfekta' in indogermanischen Einzelsprachen und ihr grundsprachlicher Hintergrund." In Meiser, Gerhard and Hacksten, Olav (eds.) *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, 17. – 23. September, Halle an der Saale. 591-626. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Seebold, Elmar (comp.) 1970. *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Snædal, Magnús (comp.) 2005. *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic*, 2nd edition. Reykjavík: University of Iceland Press.
- Streiberg, Wilhelm (ed.) 2000. *Die gotische Bibel*, Vol. 1: *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage*, 7th edition. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sturtevant, Albert Morey 1957. "Verner's Law in the Preterit Tense of the Gothic Reduplicating Verb *Slepan*." *Modern Language Notes* 72, 561-563.
- Tanaka, Toshiya 2009. "The Proto-Germanic Third Person Plural Strong Preterite and the Proto-Indo-European 'Type I' Thematic Present Formations: With Special Reference to the Strong IV and V Classes." *Gengo Kagaku (Linguistic Science, Kyushu University)* 44, 1-23.
- Tanaka, Toshiya 2010. "Osthoff's Law and the Rise of the Strong I-III Preterite Formations in Proto-Germanic." *Gengo Bunka Ronkyu (Studies in Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University)* 25, 7-21.
- Tanaka, Toshiya 2011. *A Morphological Conflation Approach to the Historical Development of Preterite-Present Verbs: Old English, Proto-Germanic, and Proto-Indo-European* (The Faculty of Languages and Cultures Library 2). Fukuoka: Hana Shoin.
- Tanaka, Toshiya 2012. 「ゲルマン語強変化動詞および過去現在動詞 IV, V 類に見られる形態的差異について：Schumacher (2005) 論考の批判的考察と形態的混交説からの提案」(Why do the Germanic Strong IV and V Preterite Plural Formations Morphologically Differ from the Preterite-Present IV and V Present Plural? A Critical Examination of Schumacher's (2005) Treatise and a New Proposal in View of a Morphological Conflation Theory), a paper read at the 145th meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan, 24 November 2012, Hakozaki Campus, Kyushu University.
- Tanaka, Toshiya 2013a. 「ゲルマン語強変化動詞 IV, V 類の過去複数形をめぐる考察」(Some Thoughts on the Origin and Development of the Germanic Strong IV and V Preterite Plural Formations), *Studies in English Language and Literature (Kyushu University)* No. 63, 67-112.
- Tanaka, Toshiya 2013b. 「ゲルマン語強変化動詞 V 類過去複数形に散発的に見られる語根末摩擦音の有声化について：*wes- 'be, stay dwell' の例を中心に」(On the Sporadic

Voicing of the Root-Final Fricative in the Germanic Strong Class V Preterite Plural Formations: with Special Reference to the Case of *wes- 'be, stay, dwell'), *Historical Linguistics in Japan* Vol. 2, 3-20.

Verner, Karl 1877. "Eine Ausnahme der ersten Lautverschiebung." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 23, 97-130.

Wright, Joseph and O. L. Sayce 1954. *Grammar of the Gothic Language*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.