The Indo-European Background of Old English ge-neah `is sufficient ': Application of a Non-Brugmannian Method

田中, 俊也
九州大学大学院言語文化研究院

The Indo-European Background
of Old English *ge-neah* 'is sufficient':
Application of a Non-Brugmannian Method

Toshiya Tanaka

1. Introduction

Grounded upon the hypothesis that the PIE verbal system was of an active-inactive type, propounded by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1984/1995), Lehmann (1992, 1993), Kurzová (1993), among others, Tanaka (2001b: 53ff.) proposes a method for extrapolating the original PIE morpho-semantic category of a given IE verb. It is comprised of the following four criteria:

(1)

I. a. If the meaning reconstructible for a given IE verb is agentive, it is likely to suggest that the verb at issue descended from an original active verb.

   b. If a non-agentive meaning is reconstructible for a given IE verb, it is likely to suggest that the verb at issue derived from an original inactive verb.

   N.B. Since agentivity, as well as Aktionsart, of a reconstructed meaning is often ambiguous, this criterion should not be used exclusively.

II. a. If a given IE verb has an etymological counterpart which suggests itself as a (direct) reflex of the *CeC-$m(i)/s(i)/t(i)$ configuration, it may point to an original active verb.

   b. If the pertinent verb lacks it (but shows a reflex of the *Ce/oC-$h_2e/th_2e/e$ configuration), it may point to an original inactive verb.

   N.B. An ostensibly archaic verbal morphology can be an analogical creation, especially when the morphology at issue is productive in the pertinent IE dialect, and therefore, this criterion alone is not to be heavily relied upon.

III. a. If a given IE verb has a very archaic agent noun *CeC-$tĕ/ŏr$, it can hint at an original active verb.

   b. If the relevant verb lacks it, on the other hand, it can hint at an original inactive verb.

   N.B. A seemingly archaic agent noun can be a secondary creation, especially when the nominal formation at issue is productive in the pertinent IE dialect, and therefore, this criterion alone is not to produce conclusive evidence for the original category.

IV. a. If a Hittite verb corresponding to a given IE verb shows a *mi*-conjugation (save for nasal-infixing, *yo-suffixing, *sk-suffixing, etc., *mi*-conjugations), it might perhaps be suggestive of an original active verb.

　　b. If a Hittite verb corresponding to a given IE verb shows a *ḫi*-conjugation, it might
　　　　perhaps be suggestive of an inactive verb.
　　N.B. Because many Hittite verbs seem to have undergone replacement of the original
　　　　conjugation class by the other one, this criterion must be regarded as a weaker one.

This paper attempts to give a new account of the pre-history of the OE Class V preterite-present *ge-neah* 'is sufficient' and its Germanic counterparts by applying this method to analysis of related IE lexemes.[1]　The problem of what PIE verbal class OE *ge-neah* may reflect is approached below.[2]

2.　PIE Schwebeablaut

The PIE base underlying OE *ge-neah* or Gmc. **nah-* 'be sufficient' may be considered to be **Hnek̂-*.　Since Benveniste's (1935: 152) proposal, the Schwebeablaut between **Hen-k̂-* (Type I) and **Hn-ek̂-* (Type II) has normally been accepted by scholars (pace Anttila 1969: 124ff.).[3]

　　First, a variety of morphologies of IE verbs related to OE *ge-neah* 'is sufficient' must be observed.　The following chart collects together pertinent materials from major IE dialects (cf. Walde and Pokorny 1930-32: I. 128f.; Pokorny 1994: I. 316ff.; Seebold 1970: 355f.; Lehmann 1986: 70f.; Kronasser 1966-87: I. 269, 437; Puhvel 1991: 289-292; Whitney 1885: 1, 4, 87, 89; Macdonell 1916: 369, 394, 395; among others):

(2)　Verbs from PIE **Hen-k̂-* or **Hn-ek̂-*
　　a. OInd.
　　　　i) √ aś, aṃś
　　　　pres. (V, Ved.) *aś-no-ti* 'he attains' (< **Hṇk̂-neu-ti*)
　　　　perf. (Ved.) *ānáṃśa, ānā́śa* 'he has attained'
　　　　aor. (only in the Ātmanepada or middle) *āṣṭa* 'he attained himself'

---

1) Here I omit an exposition of the reconstructed PIE active-inactive verbal system upon which I am basing my analysis below.　For this, see Tanaka (2001b: §2.2; forthcoming: §3.2; etc.).
2) Tanaka (2000: 299f.) has already briefly discussed this problem only in the light of the third criterion in (1) above, leaving aside a detailed morphological analysis of related IE lexemes.　This paper aims at a more comprehensive historical and comparative examination of the OE preterite-present verb concerned.
3) The value of the initial laryngeal seems to be controversial.　Benveniste (1935: 152), Beekes (1969: 236), Puhvel (1991: 292), Sihler (1995: 485), etc. postulate it as **h₁*, and Mayrhofer (1986: 134), etc. as **h₂*.　See Lindeman (1987: 77f.) and the references cited there for this issue.　Despite this difficulty, however, it seems that the description adopted here, based on Benveniste's root theory, better captures the nature of the base alternation than the traditional description where the bases **enek̂-, *nek̂-, *enk̂-* are merely enumerated (cf. Pokorny 1994: 316ff.; Lehmann 1986: 71; etc.).　Thus, this paper espouses the representation based on Schwebeablaut.　Stronger evidence for the existence of the initial laryngeal is obtained not only by Hittite *ḫenk-zi* 'he lifts' (reflecting the PIE Type I base **Henk-*) but also by Old Indic *ínak-ṣ-a-ti* 'endeavours to reach' (reflecting the PIE Type II base **Henk̂-*; cf. Beekes 1969: 236).　See also Cowgill (1965: 151), where other materials suggesting the existence of the initial laryngeal are raised.

N.B. No agent noun such as **$*a(m)\acute{s}$-tr* 'one who attains' is attested (see Whitney 1885: 4; Monier-Williams 1899: 114).

ii) √akṣ

pres. (I, RigVeda) *ak-ṣ-a-t* 'he attains' ($<$ *$H\eta\hat{k}$-s-e-t*)

perf. undocumented (except for the perf. mid. ppl. *ākṣ-āṇá* 'having attained oneself' in RigVeda; see Whitney 1885: 1; Monier-Williams 1899: 3; etc.)

aor. 3 pl. *ákṣ-iṣ-ur* 'they attained' in RigVeda (see Whitney 1885: 1; cf. Macdonell 1910: p. 384, Note 7 and the references cited there).

N.B. No agent noun such as **$*akṣ$-tr* 'one who attains' is attested (see Whitney 1885: 1; Monier-Williams 1899: 4; etc.).

iii) √naś, naṃś

pres. (I, Ved.) *náś-a-ti* 'he attains' ($<$ *$Hne\hat{k}$-e-ti*)

perf. undocumented

aor. (Ved.) *ā-naṭ* 'you/he attained'

(Ved.) *naṭ* 'he attained'

N.B. No agent noun such as **$*naś$-tr* 'one who attains' is attested (see Whitney 1885: 89; Monier-Williams 1899: 532).

iv) √nakṣ

pres. (I, Ved.) *nák-ṣ-a-ti* 'he attains' ($<$ *$Hne\hat{k}$-s-e-ti*)

perf. (Ved.) 3 pl. *na-nakṣ-úr* 'they have attained',

(Ved.) 3 sg. middle *na-nakṣ-é* 'he has attained himself'

aor. undocumented

N.B. No agent noun such as **$*nákṣ$-tr* 'one who attains' is attested (see Whitney 1885: 87; Monier-Williams 1899: 524).

b. Av.

i)

pres. *aš-naoi-ti* 'he attains' ($<$ *$H\eta\hat{k}$-neu-ti*) (see Reichelt 1909: 104 and 403 *s.v.* ǫs-; Kellens 1984: 170; among others)

perf. undocumented

aor. undocumented

N.B. No agent noun such as ** *aš-tar-* 'one who attains' is attested.

ii)

pres. *nas-ai-ti* 'he attains' ($<$ *$Hne\hat{k}$-e-ti*)

perf. undocumented

aor. *ənāxštā* 'he attained', *s*-aor. (see Reichelt 1909: 121; among others)

N.B. No agent noun such as **$*nas$-tar-* 'one who attains' is attested.

c. Gk.

 pres. undocumented (suppletion by φέρω 'I carry')

 perf. ἐνήνοκα 'I have carried'

 aor. ἤνεγκον 'I carried'

 inf. ἐνεγκεῖν 'to carry' (so far supposed to reflect either *en-enk- or *ne-nk-)

d. Lat.

 pres. *nanciscor* (OLat. *nanciō*) I attain

 perf. *na(n)ctus* sum 'I (have) attained'

e. Hittite

 pres. *ni-ni-kzi* 'he lifts' (-*nin*- being an infix in the stem *ninink-*),

 pret. *ni-ni-kta* 'he lifted'

 pres. *ḫenkzi* 'he allocates'

 pret. *ḫenkta* 'he allocated'

f. Lith.

 pres. *nešù* 'I carry'

 aor. *nešiaû* 'I carried'

 inf. *nèšti* 'to carry'

g. OCS (cf. Schmalstieg 1976: 109ff.; among others)

 pres. *nes-ǫ* 'I arrive, reach'

 aor. *nes-ox-ъ* 'I carried'

 inf. *nes-ti* 'to arrive, reach'

h. OIr.

 pres. *ro-icc* 'he reaches' (cf. *icc-* < *inc-* < *$\bar{\imath}$nk-* < *$\bar{e}$nk-*)

 pret./perf. *ro-ānaic* (< *$\bar{o}$n-on$\hat{k}$-e*)

i. Arm.

 pres. *hasanem* 'I arrive, reach'

 pret. *hasi* 'I arrive, reached'

j. Toch.

 A *eṃts-* 'carry, hold, seize'

 B *eṅk-* 'carry, hold, seize'

k. Gmc.

		pres.sg.	pres.pl.	pret.	p.p.	
Go.	*ga-nah*	—	—	—		'be sufficient'
	bi-nah	—	—	*bi-naúhts*		'be permitted, allowed'
OE	*ge-neah*	*ge-nugon*	*ge-nohte*	—		'be sufficient'
OHG	*gi-nah*	—	—	—		'be sufficient'

(3) below, on the other hand, simply distinguishes verbs reflecting the Type I base **Henk̂-* from those reflecting the Type II **Hnek̂-*:

(3)   Type II   Type I
                *Hnek̂-   **Henk̂-*
                                      Gk. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$-$\epsilon\gamma\kappa$-$\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ (= inf. of $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$)
    cf. Att. aor. 1 sg. $\H{\eta}\nu$-$\epsilon\gamma\kappa$-α
    (< perf. with Att. redupl.)
    OIr. *ro-icc*
    (< the lengthened grade **ēnk-*)

      Ved. *nā́śati*
      Av. *nasaiti*
      Hit. *ni-nin-k-*   Hit. *ḥenk-*
      Lith. *nešù* (< **nešō*)
      OCS. *nešù* (< **nešō*)
      Arm. *hasi* (aor.)
              hasanem (pres.)
                      Toch. A *eṃts-*, B *eṅk-*
      Gmc. **nah-*
nasal infix.   Ved. *aśnóti*
      Av. *ašnaoiti*
      (< **Hn̥k̂-neu-*)
      Latin *nancīscor* (deponent)
      (perf. *na(n)ctus sum*)

Since Gmc. **nah-* 'be sufficient' is interpretable as reflective of the (Type II) base **Hnek̂-*, the primary concern of this paper converges on analysing those IE verbal forms stemming from this base.

3. Application of the Method Concerned

Among the verbs reflecting the Type II **Hnek̂-* in (3) above, there are ones which show obviously innovative or non-archaic forms (cf. the second term in (1) above). OInd.(Ved.)

náśati, Av. *nasaiti* 'he gains, attains', Lith. *nešù*, OCS *nesǫ* 'I carry', Arm. *hasanem* 'I come to, arrive' show thematic present forms; OInd.(Ved.) *áśnóti* and Av. *ašnaoiti* (< *$\eta\hat{k}$-neu-ti*) 'he gains, attains' point to nasal infixation; Latin *nancīscor* 'I get, obtain' (cf. perf. *na(n)ctus sum*), a deponent, is enlarged by the *-sk-* element.[4] A couple of Old Indic (Vedic) materials, on the other hand, suggest archaisms.[5] The 2 sg. present *nak-ṣi* 'you gain, attain' appears to reflect an athematic present *$ne\hat{k}$-si*, from which Pokorny (1994: 316) infers that the verb *náśati* originally took an athematic conjugation for the present. Moreover, the aorist *ā́naṭ* 'he gained, attained' is frequently assumed to be a root aorist, reflecting PIE *e-$Hne\hat{k}$-t*. See Cowgill (1965: 151), Lindeman (1987: 78), Sihler (1995: 485), among others.

If *nakṣi* or *ā́naṭ* is not an Old Indic innovation and truly reflects an archaic PIE verbal form, it will suggest that the relevant base produced an active verb *$Hne\hat{k}$-m(i)/s(i)/t(i)*. But the Germanic *nah-*, unless it is ascribed to an innovation in Germanic, at the same time points to an archaic PIE verbal form, *$Hno\hat{k}$-$h_2e/th_2e/e$*, the meaning of which should be reconstructed as 'be in the state of reaching or attaining (the goal, norm, standard, etc.)' (> 'be sufficient, enough').[6] In my own theoretical framework (cf. Tanaka 2001b: §2.2; forthcoming §3.2), it seems natural to decide that a PIE base produces *either* an active *or* an inactive verb, but *not both*. In other words, the theory concerned would require that either the Old Indic or the Germanic materials should be an innovation, though neither Old Indic nor Germanic seems to provide very crucial, direct evidence for this.

By means of the method spelt out in 1 above, I should attempt to pass my judgement upon this dilemma. Despite the first term in (1) above, neither '(agentively) gain, attain'

---

4) Inside the verbal stem of Latin *nanc-i-sc-or* a nasal element is observable. To posit *Hne-n-k-*, a Type II base with a "Position 2a" nasal infix (cf. Karstien 1971; Tanaka 2001a: §3.2), may be independently motivated by the Ved. 1 sg. middle aorist *nám̐ṣi*, the 3 sg./pl. perfect *ānám̐śa, ānaśúr*, the OIr. suffixless preterite stem *-ānec-*, etc. (cf. Lindeman 1987: 77f.). But the *a*-vocalism in Latin *nanc-* still remains problematic, as Seebold (1970: 355) among others acknowledges.

5) Hittite *(ni)nikzi* takes the *mi*-conjugation and has the meaning 'lifts', which may be understood as of durative/imperfective Aktionsart. Despite the fourth term in (1) above, this material itself does not provide reliable morphological or semantic evidence in judging the original status of the verb. The Hittite *mi*-conjugation, regularly accompanied by preterites without a thematic vowel and with endings from IE *-m, *-s, *-t,* etc., is considerably productive, and we can conjecture that a considerable number of Hittite verbs showing this conjugation come from the original *ḫi*-conjugation class (cf. Tanaka 2001b: §3.3). The meaning 'lift' seems ascribable to a secondary development in Hittite from the reconstructed meaning which should be somehow related to the notion 'gain', 'attain' or 'reach'.

6) If this option is taken (below we will actually do so), it will follow that the Germanic preterite-present reflects the original state-denoting inactive verb from the relevant base. There is little or no reason to hold that the preterite-present *nah-* was analogically created inside Germanic. Since the category of 'preterite-present' must have been in the process of being lost (the history of English actually show this tendency; cf. Visser 1963-73: III. §§1343, 1369ff. & 1711ff.; Warner 1993: 141; Denison 1993: 296f. & 315f.; etc.), there should have been no motivation for the relevant verb to change the original morphology *$Hne\hat{k}$-m/s/t* to *$Hno\hat{k}$-$he_2e/th_2e/e$*. Moreover, the meaning 'suffice, be sufficient, enough' is readily derivable from the supposed original meaning 'be in the state of reaching, attaining (the goal, norm, standard, etc.)'.

nor 'be in the state of attaining/reaching' seems unsuitable for a reconstructed meaning of PIE *$H nek$-,[7] for what we can say at this stage of the argument is that the reconstructed meaning should have something to do with the notion 'gain, attain' and the agentivity or stativeness of the meaning is not to be directly known.   As regards the mophological properties, both Old Indic and Germanic materials appear to show archaic characters, and the second criterion in (1) alone does not seem capable of clearing up the current problem. Thus, the third criterion is expected to play its role.   As spelt out in the third clause in (1) above, it is worth while testing the case by means of the criterion of the existence or absence of an archaic agent noun deriving from the relevant base.

Materials from IE dialects do not provide any instance of an agent noun inheriting the form **$H nek$-*te/or* 'one who gains, attains, reaches' (see (2) above again). This provides a theoretical basis for the appraisal that an inactive verb rather than an active derived from PIE *$H nek$-.   This will, in turn, suggest that the relevant Old Indic verbal forms are innovations which took place at some dialectal period.

Given this interpretation, a mystery of Old Indic verbs reflecting *$H nek$- will also, it seems to me, be illuminated in a new fashion within our theoretical framework. This is related with the question of why there are more verbs than one for 'attain, reach, arrive at' in Old Indic, such as those reproduced below:

(4) Vedic Verbs for 'attain, reach, arrive at' from *$Henk$- or *$H nek$-
a. nasal-infixing *aś-nó-ti* ($<$ *$H n k$-*neu-ti*), see (2a) i) above.
b. s-enlarged *ák-ṣ-at* ($<$ *$H n k$-*s-e-t*), see (2a) ii) above.
c. thematic *náś-a-ti* ($<$ *$H nek$-*e-ti*), see (2a) iii) above.
d. s-enlarged *nák-ṣ-ati* ($<$ *$H nek$-*s-e-ti*), see (2a) iv) above.

It is my opinion that this plurality of related verbs points to their innovative character. If PIE had had an active verb **$H nek$-*m/s/t* '(voluntarily) gain, attain, reach', why is it *not* the case that Old Indic shows only one verb directly reflective of this form, i.e., pres. *náś-a-ti* vs. aor. *$\bar{a}$-naṣ-ṭ* $>$ *ánaṭ*; and why did Old Indic have to create new verbs by means of nasal infixation and stem-enlargement with *-s-? It must be recalled here that typical PIE active verbs, such as *$bher$-*mi/si/ti* 'bear, carry', *$ghwen$-*mi/si/ti* 'smite', *deh_3-*m/s/t* 'give', *$dheh_1$-*m/s/t* 'put, set' (see Tanaka 2000: §2 (1); 2001b: §3.2 (5)), show up in Old Indic, simply showing a pair of a present and an aorist, without being accompanied by plurality of present and aorist forms:

---

7) It seems natural to regard the meaning 'gain, attain' as having the momentary/perfective, rather than durative/imperfective, Aktionsart.   From this, it may be supposed that at least OInd. 2 sg. *nak-ṣi* 'you gain, attain' should be an intra-OInd. innovation; that is, the present at issue should have originally been thematic, as exemplified by Vedic 1 sg. *náśāmi* and 3 sg. *náśati*.   It can, then, be inferred that at least there was no active-durative verb **$Henk$-*mi/si/ti* in the proto-language.

(5) Quondam Active Verbs in Old Indic

　a. PIE *bher-mi/si/ti* 'bear, carry', active-durative

　　OInd. pres. *bi-bhár-ti* (Rigveda) vs. aor. *bhar-tám/bhṛtám* (Brāhmaṇas)

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　cf. pass. aor. *a-bhār-i* (Ved.)

　b. PIE *gʷhen-mi/si/ti* 'smite', active-durative

　　OInd. pres. *hán-ti* (Ved.) vs. aor. *a-ji-ghan-at* (Epic)

　c. PIE *deh₃-m/s/t* 'give', active-momentary

　　OInd. pres. *dá-dā-ti* (Ved.) vs. aor. *á-dā-t* (Ved.)

　d. PIE *dheh₁-m/s/t* 'put, set', active-momentary

　　OInd. pres. *dá-dhā-ti* (Ved.) vs. aor. *á-dhā-t* (Ved.)

　　　　　　　　　　Cf. Whitney (1885: 114, 202f., 71f., 82, respectively)

This being the case, a particular explanation is required for the genesis of different shapes of a present and an aorist from PIE *Hneк̂-* or *Henк̂-* in Old Indic.

　Our theoretical appraisal that PIE had a state-denoting inactive verb *Hnoк̂-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be in the state of attaining, reaching' but not an active-momentary verb **Hneк̂-m/s/t* 'attain, reach' seems to be capable of giving a natural account of the Old Indic situation now in question. At some period between PIE and Old Indic (perhaps at Pre- or Proto-Indo-Iranian period), when the original verbal category of inactive was in the process of being lost,[8] the relevant verb must have ceased to be a verb describing a non-agentive state and have been reinterpreted into a verb for '(agentively) attain, reach, arrive at'. At this period, a present (especially, a thematic present with an *e*-grade stem) must have started to be established as the basis of the verbal conjugation (cf. Kurzová 1993: 112f.). Several strategies must have been available to pre-literate Aryans to arrive at the reinterpretation at issue.

　The enlargement of the stem by *-s-* is especially noteworthy in tracing this process. The enlarged stem *Hnek̂-s-* is attested only in the Indo-Iranian branch (cf. Av. *é-nakš-*; see Mann 1984-87: 834) and is obviously an Indo-Iranian innovation. This *-s-* is interpretable as a perfectivising or punctualising element,[9] and OInd. *nák-ṣ-a-ti* (Ved.) (< *Hnek̂-s-e-ti*) and *ák-ṣ-a-t* (Rigveda) (< *Hṇk̂-s-e-t*) are supposed to have been created from the original stative *Hnok̂-h₂e/th₂e/e* by modifying the *o*-grade stem into the *e*- or zero-grade, adding the *-s-* element, and replacing the original endings with the thematic endings (i.e., *-o-m(i), -e-s(i), -e-t(i)*).[10] The change in vowel grade of the stem and the replacement

8) This is because of the structural change from the active-inactive to the nominative-accusative type, which must have started in the Late PIE period (cf. Tanaka forthcoming: Note 8).

9) For other instances where *-s-*, an IE perfectivising or punctualising element, is used to enlarged the verbal stem, see Lehrman (1997: 154), Hewson & Bubenik (1997: 34), etc. For related discussion of this element, see Shields (1992: 35ff.), Lehmann (1993: 169 and 179f.), Kurzová (1993: 181ff.), etc.

10) It might perhaps be inferred that at a primitive stage of PIE there was a nominal verb *Henk-e* '(there is

of the endings were obviously due to the reason that these were more suitable for a present in the new, present-based verbal system than the original *o*-grade stem and the original peculiar endings. What is important here is that the motivation for adding the perfectivising *-s- to the stem becomes clear by the estimation that the original verb was inactive-stative. The original Aktionsart of the relevant verb was by no means momentary or perfective, but by adding the perfectivising *-s-, modification of the Aktionsart into momentary or perfective (hence, the meaning '(agentively) attain, reach') was enabled. In other words, if we postulate that the original verb was active-perfective, there does not seem to be any motivation for adding the perfectivising element *-s- to the relevant stem.

Further evidence for the reinterpretation process posited above seems to be obtained if we observe the distributional pattern of a Gmc. preterite-present and cognate verbs in Old Indic. Examples of *dars- (< *dhors-) and *parf- (< *torp-), which are reasonably ascribable to previous inactve-statives,[11] are relevant here. (6) and (7) below demonstrate that it is occasionally the case that a Gmc. preterite-present corresponds to some innovative presents other than a simple thematic present in Old Indic:

(6)

   a. Gmc. *dars-(a)/t(a)/e 'dare' (< *dhors-h₂e/th₂e/e 'be bold')

   b. OInd. *dhárṣ-a-ti* (Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, Rāmāyaṇa) 'dares' (them.pres. < *dhers-e-ti)

        dhr̥ṣ-ṇó-ti (from Vedas onwards) 'dares' (nasal infix. < *dhr̥s-neu-ti)

                                       Cf. Whitney (1885: 85)

(7)

   a. Gmc. *parf-(a)/t(a)/(e) 'need' (< *torp-h₂e/th₂e/e 'be in the state of enjoying, be satisfied')

   b. OInd. 'enjoy, satisfy oneself, be pleased'

        tr̥mpáti (Vedas, Brahmaṇas, Sutras), a thematic present with nasal infixation

                (< *tr̥-m-p-e-ti)

        tr̥pyati (from Atharva-Veda onwards), a thematic present enlarged by *-y-

                (< *tr̥p-y-e-ti)

        tr̥pṇóti (Vedas, Brahmaṇas), a nasal infixing present (< *tr̥p-neu-ti)

                                   Cf. Whitney (1885: 65f.)

---

a state/process of) attaining', which later differentiated into *Hnek̂-h₂e/th₂e/e 'be in the process of attaining' and *Hnok̂-h₂e/th₂e/e 'be in the state of attaining'. No verb directly reflecting these survived into Old Indic. It is possible to hold that the reinterpretation now under discussion may have taken place on the basis of the erstwhile inactive-processive verb (i.e., a medium tanatum, which would have shown up as *naś-e, *nak-ṣe, *naṣ-ṭe, if it had survived into Old Indic). In this case, the reinterpretation process in creating *nak-ṣ-a-t* is more simply described, for it is involved only with attachment of *-s- and modification of the endings, without modification of the vowel grade of the stem (of course, assuming that this reinterpretation occured before the vowel change *a, *e, *o > a took place).

11) I will offer elsewhere a detailed explanation that these preterite-presents reflect PIE inactve-stative verbs, besides the concise suggestion advanced in Tanaka (2000: §3.3.1 and §3.3.2).

The pattern described in (6) and (7) above indicates that these original inactive-stative verbs were replaced in Old Indic with some innovative presents enlarged by a nasal or other elements (as well as a simple thematic present, in the case of √*dhṛṣ-*, give in (6)), so that they might take a number of present forms which were appropriate or normal in the new verbal system. There is no reason to deny that similarly to these cases, Old Indic developed the thematic present *náś-a-ti* (Vedic; < **Hneḱ-e-ti*) and the nasal-infixing *aś-nó-ti* (Vedic; < **Hn̥ḱ-neu-ti*), instead of directly inheriting from the proto-language **Hnoḱ-h₂e/th₂e/e*, which no longer assumed the shape that would fit in with the productive morphologies for the category of present at the relevant dialectal period.

Although intra-Old-Indic materials provide little or no direct, conclusive evidence (phonological or morphological) for the idea that Old Indic *nak-ṣi* and *ā́naṭ* do not point to an original athematic root present or aorist, evidence from the corresponding, archaic agent noun as well as from the distributional pattern of Old Indic present forms makes it highly probable that this is the case. It thus seems appropriate to conclude that as far as the PIE Type II base **Hneḱ-* is concerned, the inactive **Hnoḱ-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be in the state of gaining, attaining, reaching (the goal, norm, standard, etc.)' was derived from it[12] but not an active ***Hneḱ-m(i)/s(i)/t(i)* '(agentively) gain, attain, reach'.

4.　Excursus: The Type I Base

Before closing this paper, several comments may be called for on the verbal forms which are assumed in (3) above to have derived from the Type I base **Henḱ-*.

4.1.　Greek ἐνεγκ- 'bear, carry'[13]

Greek ἐνεγκ- 'bear, carry' is mainly used as the aorist couterpart of φερ- in a suppletive paradigm, cf. Liddell and Scott (1968: 1922). If, as Buck (1933: 284) elucidates, the Attic 1 sg. aorist ἤνεγκα comes from a perfect with Attic reduplication (i.e., ἤν-εγκ-α), the Type I stem **Henḱ-* is recognisable in the stem -εγκ-. Cowgill (1965: 151), on the other side, proposes that ἤνεγκα should descend from the base **Hnenḱ-* and be interpreted as a root aorist (i.e., *e-Hnenḱ-m*). The base **Hnenḱ-* can be anatomised as **Hne-n-ḱ-*, a Type II base with a nasal infix at Position 2. Since this infixing base is also attested elsewhere, in the Old Indic perfect *ānáṁśa* (3 sg. < **He-Hnonḱ-e*; cf. Note 4 above) and in the Latin deponent *nanc-iscor* (cf. (3) above), the supposition of this base may be tenable. However, I am sceptical of the idea that ἤνεγκα points to a root aorist. Although the relevant Attic form

---

12) It does not seem that perfect forms directly reflecting **Hneḱ-* (without enlargement by **-s-*, etc.) are recorded in Vedic (neither Whitney 1885: p.89, s.v. *naś, naṁś* 'attain' nor Pokorny 1994: I. 316 raises a relevant form). Perfects from the (Indic) roots, *aś-, aṁś-*, (i.e., pres. *aśnóti* vs. perf. *ānáṁśa*, cf. Whitney 1885: 4f.) and *nakṣ-* (i.e., pres. *nákṣati* vs. perf. *nanakṣús, -kṣe*, cf. Whitney 1885: 87), on the other hand, are attested in Vedic. After the perfect or original inactive shape was lost at a pre-Vedic period, it had not been revived as *a paradigmatised perfect* in the Vedic peirod.

13) I acknowledge that my opinion expressed in this subsection is broadly different from Sihler's (1995: p.563, 507 Note a).

is interpretable as reflecting either a perfect (with Attic reduplication) or a root aorist, no instance of a root aorist from this nasal-infixing base is attested outside Greek but a perfect is attested in Old Indic. Furthermore, Attic attests a set of thematic aorist forms for the other persons as well as 1 sg. (e.g., 1 sg. ἤνεγκον, 2 sg. ἤνεγκας, 3 sg. ἤνεγκε, pl. ἠνέγκ-αμεν, -ατε, -αν; cf. Liddell and Scott 1968: 1922), and an apparent root aorist is only attested for 1 sg. The relevant phenomenon seems to be better interpreted as a case where a perfect merged into an aorist paradigm.

What kind of interpretation is obtainable in attempting to explain the genesis of the relevant suppletion in Greek? As far as Old Indic is concerned, no aorist counterpart of *bhṛ-* (i.e., a verbal form for 'bore, carried') is attested in Vedic, and such was created as late as the Brāhmaṇas period (i.e., *bhartám/bhṛtám*; cf. Whitney 1885: 114). Given that the era of the composition and compilation of the Rigveda is estimated to be about 1200-1000 B.C. and the date of the Brahmanas literature approximates 800-500 B.C. (cf. Burrow 1955: 35 and 43; etc.), we may say that in the Old Indic history it took a relatively long time for the original active-durative verb *bher-* to accomplish its paradigmatisation. A similar situation could be conceived for paradigmatisation of Greek φέρ-. Homer does not attest an aorist for this verb, and it is by no means impossible to consider that the relevant paradigmatisation was finally attained after the Homeric period. Presumably, in some time in the (pre-)history of the Greek language, when the original category of inactive was no longer productive or was being lost, the original stative *Hnonk̂-* 'be in the state of attaining' was somehow reinterpreted as a verb denoting an agentive action 'gain', 'attain', 'reach', which denoted a perfective action and which was potentially the perfective counterpart of a verb denoting a durative action, 'carry'. Attic 1 sg. ἤνεγκα, originally a perfect, may somehow reflect the archaic state-denoting inactive verb, though it underwent some morphological remodelling after the style of Attic reduplication. All the other Attic aorists show thematic forms (i.e., ἤνεγκον, ἤνεγκας, ἤνεγκε, ἠνέγκ-αμεν, -ατε, -αν, etc.) and are interpretable as relatively new formations. They were created to develop the aorist paradigm to φέρ-, probably by modifying the endings of the original ἤνεγκ-α, *-θα, -ε, etc., at some period in the Greek language. This must have taken place after the archaic root aorist forms started to be lost or became no longer productive, but before the sigmatic aorist became predominantly productive. As far as the modification of the singular paradigm is concerned, the process may be virtually reduced to the innovation in 1 sg. from ἤνεγκ-α to ἤνεγκ-ον, probably on the analogy of the other 1 sg. aorists with the -ον ending, productive at that period (e.g., ελιπ-ον, εφυγ-ον, ετεκ-ον, ετεμ-ον, etc.; cf. Buck 1933: 283; Sihler 1995: 561). Since the 2 sg. perfect ending, originally -θα (cf. οἶσ-θα), was in Greek normally reshaped into -ας (cf. Szemerényi 1990: 312; Sihler 1995: 571; etc.), the 2 sg. ἤνεγκ-ας may be understood as having emerged by going through this widespread change. Needless to say, the 3 sg. ending -ε in ἤνεγκ-ε is interpretable as inheriting the original perfect ending.

4.2. Hittite ḫenk-

Hittite ḫenk- is an example unambiguously attributable to the Type I base *Henk̂-. This verb means 'bestow, consign, commit, secure, assign, allot, provide, present, offer' and takes the *mi*-conjugation (cf. Puhvel 1991: 289). Puhvel (1991: 292) assumes that this verb has gone through a semantic shift from 'carry' to 'bestow' on the strength of the verbal noun ḫenku(wa)r 'carrying' > 'offering, gift' (cf. Gk. φόρος 'tribute', Skt. áṁśa- 'portion').

As stated in Note 5 above, the Hittite *mi*-conjugation does not seem to offer crucial evidence for determining the original Aktionsart of a verb.

4.3. Old Irish -icc-

In respect of Old Irish *ro-icc* 'reach', *do-icc* 'come', *air-icc-* 'find', *con-icc-* 'can', Pokorny (1994: 317) surmises that the lengthened-grade *ēnk̂-ti (> *īnk- > *inc > icc) transferred to a thematic conjugation. Even if this is true, the origin of the lengthened-grade stem remains unexplained. Lindeman (1987: 58) criticises Pokorny's surmise by claiming that pre-Celt. *ēnk̂-ti, athematic, would have yielded unattested **inchti and adding that even the supposition of pre-Celt. *ēnk̂-e-t, thematic, ends up *ad hoc* since no other vestige of this form is observable in any other IE dialects. He suggests that the relevant OIr. verb reflects the nasal-infixing base *Hnenk̂- (e.g., OIr. -ánaic < *h₂e-h₂nonk̂-e, cf. OInd. perf. ánaṁśa; OIr. suffixless pret. -ánaic, -áncammar, áncatar > Prim. Ir. *āneg- > Insular Celt. *ānank- > h₂e-h₂nṇk̂-, cf. OInd. perf. 3 pl. ānaśúr). Cf. *op.cit.,* pp.58 and 78. (Lindeman considers that the initial laryngeal of the relevant radix should be postulated as h_2 but not as h_1, cf. Note 3 above.)

4.4. Summary: The Status of the Type I Base

No example of the agent noun reflecting the Type I base, **Henk̂-te/or 'one who (agentively) attains', is found in IE dialects. We do not obtain any crucial evidence to suggest that an active verb was derivable from the Type I base *Henk̂-.

5. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to apply the Non-Brugmannian method spelt out in (1) above to the case of the OE preterite-present *ge-neah* 'is sufficient' and its cognate IE verbs in order to reason out their PIE status. As a result of the morpho-semantic analysis of the pertinent data, we have claimed that the PIE verb was most probably an inactive rather than an active verb. We have added, furthermore, that there is no evidence that the Type I base *Henk̂- produced a PIE active verb.

References

Anttila, Raimo 1969. *Proto-Indo-European Schwebeablaut*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1969. *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague: Mouton.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Benveniste, Émile 1935. "Esquisse d'une Théorie de la Racine". In Benveniste, 147-173.

Benveniste, Émile 1935. *Origine de la Formation des Noms en Indo-Européen*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Buck, Carl Darling 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burrow, Thomas 1955. *The Sanskrit Language*. London: Faber and Faber.

Cowgill, Warren 1965. "Evidence in Greek." In Winter, 142-180.

Denison, David 1993. *English Historical Syntax*. London: Longman.

Karstien, Hans 1971. *Infixe im Indogermanischen* (Gekürzte Fassung). Heidelberg: Winter.

Kellens, Jean 1984. *Le Verbe Avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Kronasser, Heinz 1966-87. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kurzová, Helena 1993. *From Indo-European to Latin: The Evolution of a Morphosyntactic Type*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lehmann, Winfred P. (comp.) 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1993. *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Lehrman, Alxander 1997. "Hitt. *ga-ne-eš* and the Laryngeal Theory", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 102, 151-155.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott (coš.) 1968. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, with a supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lindeman, Frederik Otto 1987. *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Macdonell, Arthur A. 1910. *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Trbner.

Macdonell, Arthur A. 1916. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Mann, Stuart E. (comp.) 1984-87. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary* (in one volume). Hamburg: Buske.

Mayrhofer, Manfred 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. I, 2nd half-vol.: *Lautlehre [Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen]*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Monier-Williams, Monier (comp.) 1899. A *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, New Edition. Oxford: Clarendon.

Pokorny, Julius (comp.) 1994. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd edition, 2 vols. Bern: Francke.

Puhvel, Jaan (comp.) 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol 3: *Words beginning with H*. Berlin: Mouton.

Reichelt, Hans 1909. *Awestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Schmalstieg, William R. 1976. *An Introduction to Old Church Slavic.* Cambridge Mass.: Slavica.

Seebold, Elmar (comp.) 1970. *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben.* The Hague: Mouton.

Shields, Kenneth 1992. *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sihler, Andrew L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Szemerényi, Oswald 1990. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 4th edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlische Buchgesellschaft.

Tanaka, Toshiya 2000. "Gmc. Preterite-Presents and IE Nouns of Agency: A Test for the Original Stativity." *Linguistics and Philology* 19, 291-305.

Tanaka, Toshiya 2001a. "Where Does Gmc. *ōg- 'fear' Come From?: The Problem of the Original Base Structure." *Studies in Languages and Cultures* 13, 139-148.

Tanaka, Toshiya 2001b. "Towards Tracing the Quondam Morpho-Semantic Category of a Given Indo-European Verb: A Method Grounded upon the Hypothesis of Proto-Indo-European as an Active Language." *Linguistics Science* 36, 29-59.

Tanaka, Toshiya forthcoming. "The Origin and Development of the *es- vs. *wes- Suppletion in the Germanic Copula: From a Non-Brugmannian Standpoint." *NOWELE* 40 (March 2002).

Visser, F. Th. 1963-73. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language,* 3 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Walde, Alois and Julius Pokorny (comp.) 1930-32. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 3 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Warner, Anthony R. 1993. *English Auxiliaries: Structure and History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitney, William Dwight 1885. *The Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language.* Leipzig: Breitkopf and Hrtel.

Winter, Werner (ed.) 1965. *Evidence for Laryngeals.* The Hague: Mouton.

古英語動詞 *ge-neah*「十分である」の印欧語の背景について：
非ブルークマン的方法を適用して

　　Tanaka（2001b)は，印欧祖語に関する最近の「非ブルークマン的」再建モデルに基づいて，印欧諸語における任意の動詞に関して，祖語における動詞の（形態，意味に関する）クラスを推量する一般的方法を提案している。本稿の目的は，この方法に基づいて，古英語第 V 類過去現在動詞 *ge-neah*「十分である」の歴史的由来について，もっとも蓋然性の高いと思われる新しい推論を与えることである。

　　当該の過去現在動詞は，印欧祖語のタイプ II 語基 **Hn-ek̂-*（語根 **Hen-* のゼロ階梯形態 +e- 階梯の語尾 **-ek̂-*）に由来する動詞である。印欧諸語における同じタイプ II 語基に遡る動詞すべての意味特性，形態特性を，上記の方法に照らして分析した結果，当該の動詞は印欧祖語において，***Hnek̂-m/s/t* '(agentively/ voluntarily) gain, attain, reach' という active-momentary 動詞であった可能性は低く，**Hnok̂-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be in the state of gaining, attaining, reaching (the goal, norm, standard, etc.)' という，inactive-stative 動詞であった可能性が高いということを明らかにした。

　　また，タイプ I 語基 **Hen-k̂-*（語根 **Hen-* の e- 階梯形態 + ゼロ階梯の語尾 **-k̂-*）から派生した動詞群に関しても同様の分析をした結果，それらの動詞群からも，当該の語基から active 動詞が印欧祖語の時代に派生していたという証拠は得られないということを主張した。