九州大学学術情報リポジトリ
Kyushu University Institutional Repository

Two Hidden Preterite-Present Verbs in germanic : An Argument for Their Inactive Lineage

Tanaka, Toshiya
Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Kyushu University

https://doi.org/10.15017/5422

出版情報：言語文化論究. 15, pp.21-31, 2002-02-15. 九州大学大学院言語文化研究院
バージョン：
権利関係：

KYUSHU UNIVERSITY

Two Hidden Preterite-Present Verbs in Germanic: An Argument for Their Inactive Lineage

Toshiya Tanaka

1. Introduction

Traditional Gmc. linguistics usually grants fourteen members the status of a preterite-present (cf. Prokosch 1939: 187-193; Birkmann 1987: 66-85; etc.).[1)] However, a number of scholars have pointed out that there are verbs in Germanic which suggest their previous status as a preterite-present. This type of verbs may be, if they are correctly ascribed to previous preterite-presents, labeled hidden preterite-presents in Germanic. In terms of the theoretical framework proposed in Tanaka (2001a, forthcoming), it is expected that a hidden preterite-present, if any, reflects a previous inactive verb. This paper takes up a couple of representative examples which scholars have so far proposed to interpret as hidden preterite-presents, and reexamines them by means of my own theoretical devices, in order to show whether or not they are ascribable to PIE inactive verbs.

2. Theoretical Framework

The present section very briefly recapitulates essential hypotheses advanced in Tanaka (2001a, forthcoming).

Tanaka (2001a: §2.2; forthcoming: §3.2) claims that PIE was an active-inactive language and proposes a simpler verbal system for the relevant language, which may be diagrammed as follows:

(1) The PIE Verbal System

	the active class	the inactive class
semantics:	agentive	non-agentive
morphology:	**CeC-m(i)/s(i)/t(i)*	**Ce/oC-h_2e/th_2e/e*

subclasses:	durative	momentary	stative	processive
morphology:	**CeC-mi/si/ti*	**CeC-m/s/t*	**CoC-h_2e/th_2e/e*	**CeC-h_2e/th_2e/e*

PIE verbs are classifiable into two types, active and inactive. An active verb denotes an

1) If ON *mon* 'I/he become(s)' and *knā* 'I/he know(s)' are included, there are sixteen members (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969: II. 136-139; etc.). It is plausible to consider that these 'preterite-presents' are independently ON creations (cf. Birkmann 1987: 243-251; etc.), though.

agentive action and an inactive verb a non-agentive situation. Active verbs are subclassifiable into the durative and the momentary type. An active-durative verb possesses a **CeC-mi/si/ti* morphology (i.e., with the hic et nunc particle **-i-* suffixed), and an active-momentary verb a **CeC-m/s/t* (i.e., with no suffix). Each inactive verb must have possessed a pair of variant forms: the stative **CoC-h_2e/th_2e/e* 'be in the state of something' and the processive **CeC-h_2e/th_2e/e* 'be in the process of something'.

As a general method of identifying the original morpho-semantic (sub)class of a given documented IE verb, Tanaka (2001a: §5) proposes the following four criteria:[2)]

(2) Criteria for Tracing the Original Subclass of a Given Verb

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 *hi*-conjugation, it might perhaps be suggestive of an inactive verb.

N.B. Because many Hittite verbs seem to have undergone replacement of the

2) The same criteria are reproduced in Tanaka (2001b: 1) as well.

original conjugation class by the other one, this criterion must be regarded as a weaker one.

3. Analysis

I assume that all or at least the majority of the fourteen Gmc. preterite-present verbs are direct reflexes of a PIE inactive-stative verb (cf. Tanaka 2000). Below I attempt to elucidate the quondam morpho-semantic status of two of the Gmc. verbs which several scholars have so far interpreted as hidden preterite-present verbs. If it can be demonstrated that they descend from PIE inactive verbs, they may be paralleled with preterite-present verbs within the present theoretical framework.

3.1. OHG bibēn, etc.

Meid (1971: 22) observes that OHG *bibēn* (> Modern German *beben*) 'tremble, be frightened' goes back to a reduplicated perfect form and that originally it was a member of the preterite-presents. According to his opinion, this OHG verb is compared with Old Indic *bi-bhé-ti* (reduplicated present; < older 'perfect' *bi-bā́ya* 'be frightened'; see also Cardona 1992: 1) and thus, it must have changed its status into a stative *ē*-class verb in the pre-literate OHG period (see also Brugmann 1895: p.97 §537).

Verbs which are considered to be cognate with OHG *bibēn* are attested in Indo-Iranian, Germanic and Slavonic. They are collected together in (3) below (cf. Pokorny 1994: 161f.):

(3)

a. Old Indic *bhyáte* he 'fears'
b. Avestan *bayente, byente* 'they frighten'
   MPers. *bēsānd* 'they are fritened'
c. OHG *bibēn*, OS *biƀoñ*, OE *beofian*, ON *bifa* (wk. verbs) 'quake'
d. OCS *bojǫ, bojati sę* 'fear'

The underlying PIE base may be posited as **bhei-*. The original meaning of this base is interpretable as being related to the notion 'tremble, quake, quiver' or else 'fear, be afraid'.

As far as the semantic characteristic is concerned (cf. the first clause in (2) above), it seems to suggest the inactive origin of this verb, since the notion 'fear' or 'tremble' is involved normally with a non-agentive phenomenon. One can voluntarily quiver one's body, but more normally, one involuntarily trembles with fear, for coldness, at a shocking sight, etc.

What, then, do the morphological properties point to concerning the original status of the relevant verbs (cf. the second clause in (2) above)? Let us first examine the Old Indic verb. Present, perfect and aorist forms of this verb attested in Vedic, the oldest layer of Old Indic, are presented below (cf. Whitney 1885: 111f.; Macdonell 1916: 402; etc.):

(4) √ *bhī̆, bhīs*, 'fear'
pres. 3 sg. bibhéti, 3 pl. bíbhyati
middle 3 sg. bháyate
perf. bibhāya
aor. root, 1 pl. bhema, ppl. bhiyāná
thematic, 3 sg. bī̆bhayat, middle 3 pl. ábī̆bhayanta
sigmatic, 3 sg. ábhāiṣī̆t

Concerning the aorists, no genuinely athematic form reflecting a skeleton like **CeC-m/s/t* is to be recognised (i.e., there is no cogent evidence for the original ***bhei-m/s/t*). It is true that the Vedic 1 pl. augmentless *bhema* 'we feared' is describable as a root aorist (cf. Macdonell 1916: 402; etc.), but this 1 pl. form, with the gunṇa-vowel, is interpretable as a newly created form by analogy with an imperfect of the root class (cf. Whitney 1896: pp.299f., §831a) in the (pre-)Vedic period (i.e., a PIE inheritance would have shown the form ***bhi-ma*). Vedic also attests sigmatic aorists, 1 pl. *ábhāiṣma*, 3 pl. *abhāiṣur* (cf. *mā́ bhāis* 'do not be afraid' in Brāhmaṇas); see Monier-Williams (1899: 758), Sihler (1995: 560), etc.[3] *Bhiyāná* is described as a root-aorist participle (cf. Whitney 1896: p.303, §840b), but this does not provide evidence whereby it is judged that the original verbal form followed the above skeleton. 3 sg. *bī̆bhayat* shows a thematic vowel. A strengthened form with *-ī̆-*, middle 3 pl. *ábī̆bhayanta* (cf. *op. cit.*, p.311, §866), also suggests an Old Indic innovation.

With regard to the presents, on the other hand, the middle 3 sg. *bháyate* and the active (i.e., Parasmaipada) 3 pl. *bíbhyati* (Class I: cf. Macdonell 1916: 402; Burrow 1955: 301; etc.) show thematic vowels, which suggests their relatively new creation. Problematic is the 3 sg. active *bibhéti* (Class III, cf. *ibid.*), in which no thematic vowel is recognised. From the phonological viewpoint, this is interpretable as reflecting either **bi-bhei-ti* or **bi-bhoi-ti*. If the former option is taken, it may suggest that previously this verb took the athematic conjugation for the present. If the latter option is adopted, it will suggest that this form goes back to the perfect origin, having suffered the modification of the ending from **-e* to **-ti*, as is claimed by Wackernagel (1907), Pokorny (1994: 161), Meid (1971: 22), Cardona (1992), etc. Both interpretations are possible and inside Old Indic materials there seems to be no cogent, direct evidence to choose one over the other. Let us leave this problem for a while.

As far as perfects are concerned, the form *bibhāya* is interpretable as reflecting the old, canonical perfect, **bi-bhoi-h_2e*, with the proviso that the stem vowel was lengthened by Brugmann's Law (cf. Burrow 1955: 342: etc.).

Let us move to a morphological analysis of the verbs given in (3b-d) above. The Avestan example is evidently a causative and of secondary formation. The Middle Persian verb reflects the **-sk-* enlarged stem (i.e., Proto-Iranian **bai-sk̂-*; cf. Pokorny 1994: 161). The

3) The vṛddhi-strengthening in these sigmatic aorists should be ascribed to an Old Indic innovation.

OCS form does not seem to give an important key to our concern, since the present *bojǫ* obviously shows a thematic conjugation and this dialect has almost completely lost archaic root aorists and archaic *o*-grade perfects for the verbal conjugation (cf. Tanaka 2001a: §5.5 and §5.11). Germanic examples are all weak verbs, which are considered to be secondary verbs, and hence, these do not appear to supply crucial morphological evidence for the original status of the relevant verb, in so far as the hypotheses presented in §2 above alone are taken into consideration.[4)]

Now the problem is the interpretation of the Old Indic verb. We can say that if 3. sg. pres. *bibhéti* reflects **bhi-bhei-ti* and if this type of athematic conjugation was previously available to other persons, numbers as well, this suggests that the original verbal form must have been an active, **(bhi-)bhei-mi/si/ti* (though the meaning '(agentively) quiver (repeatedly)', attributable to this, seems at best highly improbable). And it can also be said that if the same form is, as several scholars have so far figured, ascribable to **bi-bhoi-ti*, the ending replaced with the original perfect ending **-e*, this may be a reflex of the PIE inactive **(bhi-)bhoi-h_2e/th_2e/e*. I am of the opinion that the latter option should be chosen over the former. Along with the semantic evidence referred to before moving to this morphological analysis, there is another type of morphological evidence which suggests that this is the case (cf. the third clause in (2) above). No agent noun reflecting ***(bhi-)bhei-tĕ̄/ŏr* 'one who (agentively) quivers (repeatedly) (?)' is attested in any IE dialects (cf. Pokorny 1994: 161f.) even including Old Indic (cf. Whitney 1885: 111f.), where this type of agent nouns are very productive.

In the process of paradigmatisation (cf. Kurzová 1993: passim), it can be decided that Old Indic innovated such new presents as *bibhéti* by modifying the inherited **bhi-bhoi-e*.[5)] In

---

4) I believe that Gmc. weak verbs were primarily descendants from PIE inactive verbs, though weak verbs of the PIE active pedigree were analogically created after weak verbs constituted a very productive category in the language. If this is true, the situation now at issue will give some hint as to the original status of the verb now in question. It will suggest or at least not deny that the relevant verb goes back to a PIE inactive verb. I shall spell out elsewhere a detailed discussion on the genesis of weak verbs in PGmc.

5) In this connection, the following observation by Burrow (1955: 296f.) is noteworthy:

> The fundamental meaning of the perfect, as it emerges from a comparison of Sanskrit and Greek, and is confirmed by the evidence of the other IE languages, is that of state as opposed to process which is expressed by the present: e.g. *bibhāya* 'he is afraid' as opposed to *bhayate* 'he becomes afraid'; *ciketa* 'he is aware of': *cetati* 'he becomes aware of, notices'; *tasthau* 'stands (permanently)': *tiṣṭhati* 'takes his stand', etc.
>
> We may understand that the Vedic perfect *bibhāya* retained the original stative meaning and that the innovated present acquired the meaning 'become afraid' by adding the process nuance to the original meaning (this nuance of meaning was characteristic of the system of Vedic presents). See also Sihler (1995: 568), where it is stated that *bibhāya* retained a stative meaning 'fear' later in the Brāhmaṇas period as well (but lost it in the Epic period). In the passage cited above Burrow rightly claims that the original meaning of a PIE 'perfect' must be understood as that of state. For the relevant OInd. (i.e., Ved. and Bra.) examples, see also Macdonell (1916: 342f. & 344).

Germanic, on the other hand, the relevant inactive verb was remodelled into a weak verb, or else, was lost but replaced with a weak verb. A similar process is also conceivable for other dialects (i.e., OCS, etc.; see (3) above again), wherein the relevant inactive verb was lost but replaced with a new, productive type of a present.

This subsection may be concluded with the claim that PIE had an inactive verb **bhi-bhoi-h_2e/th_2e/e* 'be in the state of trembling (repeatedly)' but not an active verb ***bhi-bhoi-mi/si/ti* 'agentively quiver (repeatedly) (?)'. The relevant **Ci*-reduplication may be understood as a formant which adds the nuance of repetition to the meaning denoted by the stem (cf. Lehmann 1974: 188; Cowgill 1979: 34; etc.). It can be inferred that since the meaning 'be in the state of trembling', denoting an involuntary state, implies a repeated action, it must have enticed the **Ci*-formant (i.e., **bhi-*) to be (even optionally) attached to the stem (i.e., **-bhoi-*), and this survived into Old Indic and Germanic.

3.2. OE eart

Prokosch (1939: 221) expounds Anglian *earþ, arþ* (and West Saxon *eart*), a 2 sg. pres. copula, as coming from an original preterite-present, suggesting that the meaning 'thou art' can be related to 'thou hast arisen' and that the ending *-þ* is interpretable as reflecting the original **-t* (< **tha*).[6] The idea of ascribing this verbal form to an original preterite-present has been accepted by a number of scholars (cf. Cowgill 1960: 488; etc.). This subsection takes up this OE verbal form and undertakes a historical and comparative analysis in order to see whether or not this 2 sg. present is ascribable to an archaic inactive verb, **or-tha* (> Gmc. **ar-þa* > OE *ear-þ*).

Verbs interpretable as cognate with OE *ear-t/þ* are given below (cf. Whitney 1885: p.10 √*ṝr*, p.14 √*ṛ̥*, *ṛ̥ch*; Pokorny 1994: 326ff., s.v. 3. *er-:or-:r̥-*; Watkins 1985: 17; etc.):

---

6) Several scholars have attempted to return this verb to the root **es-* 'be'. But this idea requires a number of unnatural, unnecessary assumptions. Pokorney (1994: 340), for example, interprets OE *eart/earþ* as deriving from IE **es-* as well as the other copulative forms (e.g., 3 sg *is*, 3 pl *sind*, etc.). He assumes that the ending *-t/þ* was obtained due to the influence from preterite-presents. It does not seem that one can find any natural motivation for the supposition that an original athematic root present took up a preterite-present ending only for the 2nd sg. Furthermore, ascription of the stem final *-r* in *ear-t/þ* to the original *-s* in **es-(si)* is doubtful, for a rhotacism between a vowel and a sibilant/stop/fricative (i.e., in the environment *V___s/t/þ*) is highly unlikely. Even leaving aside whether or not accepting the preterite-present origin of OE *ear-t/þ*, many scholars today seem to hold the view that this verb comes from IE **er-*, distinct from **es-* (see Onions 1966: 81; Watkins 1985: 17; Hogg 1992a: 163; etc.), though there was once a hot disputation upon this issue between Flasdieck (1936/37, 1937/38) and Mezger (1937). Concernig the *-t* in West Saxon, on the other hand, Prokosch's observation that "this was as analogical *-t* as in the preterit presents (*wāst, þearft* etc.) or in Go. ON *gaft*." (1939: 221) sounds problematic. For the final consonant clusters in these verbs should be understood as directly reflecting the original clusters **-st-* and **-pt-* (cf. Krahe and Meid 1969: I. 85), having nothing to do with analogy. But anyway, the West Saxon 2 sg. personal ending *-t* seems to be a secondary development.

(5)

a. Vedic

i) √*ĭr*, 'set in motion'; see also Macdonell (1916: 372)

pres. *ī́r-te* (2nd Class)

perf. *ĭri-ré* (3 pl.)

ii) √*r̥*, *r̥ch* 'go, send'; see also Macdonell (1916: 373f.)

pres. *íy-ar-ti* (redupl. pres., 3rd Class)

r̥chấti (*sk*-pres., 6th Class)

r̥ṇóti (nasal-infixing pres., 5th Class)

perf. *ā́r-a, ā́ri-tha* 'have/has come'

aor. *ā́r-ta* (middle, 3 sg.)

ā́r-a-t (3 sg.)

b. Armenian pres. *y-arn̆em* I arise (*ne/o*-pres.; cf. Godel 1975: 123; etc.)

aor. *y-areay* (*a*-aorist; cf. Godel 1975: 121f.; etc.)

c. Hittite *ar-ḫi/ti/i* 'arrive at'

ar-nu-zi 'sets in motion' (causative)

ar-sk-i-zi 'comes' (*sk*-pres.; cf. Sihler 1995: 505f.)

See also Puhvel (1984: 108ff.).

d. Greek pres. *ὄρ-νῡ-μι* 'urge on (vt.)', *ὄρ-νυ-μαι* (middle)

aor. *ὦρσα*, *ὤρορα*, *-ον*

perf. *ὄρωρα* 'I stir myself' (Attic reduplication, cf. Sihler 1995: 488; etc.)

e. Latin *orior* 'I arise' < **or-yo-*

As far as the PIE radix is concerned, **h₃er-* rather than **er-* may be postulated (cf. Lehmann 1974: 224; Sihler 1995: 489; etc.) since many forms, including even those expected to be reflective of the original *e*-grade, show the *o* vocalism in the stem. Furthermore, a (Type I) base with a laryngeal suffix, **h₃er-H-*, may be posited in analysing these forms, evidence for which is obtainable by analysing OInd. *ī́r-te* (< **r̥̄-tai*, cf. Brugmann 1895: §509, p.75; etc.) as inheriting the zero-grade variant of that base, i,e, **(h₃)r̥H-*.[7]

Materials gathered up in (5) above do not show any relics of such an archaic root present as ***h₃erH-mi* (cf. the second clause in (2) above). Innovative presents are observable, such as reduplicative (e.g., Ved. *íyarti*), *sk*-enlarged (e.g., Ved. *r̥chấti*, Hit. *arskizi*), nasal-infixing (e.g., Ved. *r̥ṇóti*, Hit. *arnuzi*, Arm. *yarn̆em*, Gk. *ὄρνῡμι*), which suggests that these presents were created in dialects in the process of paradigmatisation. On the other hand, presents reminiscent of archaic PIE forms are also detected. Hittite *ar-ḫi/ti/i*[8] suggests

7) The base at issue, **h₃erH-*, can be related to (Type II) **h₃r-eg-* (and also **h₃re-i-g-*, Position 2a infixation of **-i-*; cf. Karstien 1971: 146). I omit an analysis of verbal forms from these bases.

8) I assume without any argument that the long radical vowel in *ār-hi* and *ār-ti* (1st and 2nd sg. pres.) is innovative and that the short radical vowel in *ar-i* (3 sg. pres.) is original. For the vocalic alternation concerning this verb, see Kronasser (1966-87: I. 516), Puhvel (1984: 108ff.), etc.

(or at least does not deny) the existence of PIE **h₃orH-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be in the state of rising' (cf. the fourth clause in (2) above), which is also suggested by the Vedic perfect, *ā́r-a, ā́ri-tha*. The Vedic middle *ī́r-te* may point to PIE **h₃erH-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be in the process of rising' though this Vedic form shows the zero-grade stem.[9] The relevant PIE process-denoting inactive verb might also be (indirectly) reflected by Latin *orior* though this stem is extended by the *y*-element.

As regards aorists, no athematic root aorist reflecting ***(e-)h₃erH-m̥* is found in the relevant materials (cf. the second clause in (2) above). Attested aorists are innovative to the extent that they are thematic (e.g., Ved. *ā́r-a-t*), extended by the **-ā-* element (e.g., Arm. y-*areay*), sigmatic (e.g., Gk. *ὦρσα*), reduplicative (e.g., Gk. *ὄρορα, -ον*). These must have been created in each dialect in the process of paradigmatisation. The Vedic middle aorist *ā́r-ta* (3 sg) is descriptively classified into the athematic root class (i.e., the 2nd Class), but it must be noted that the corresponding active (i.e., non-middle or Parasmaipada) form, *** ā́r-a*, descending from ***e-h₃erH-m̥*, is unattested.

No agent noun ascribable to the form ***h₃erH-te/or* 'one who rises (?)' is attested among ancient IE dialects (cf. Pokorny 1994: 326ff., s.v. 3. *er-*: *or-*: *r-*).[10] Apparent exceptions are found in Old Indic, where this type of agent nouns is very productive. They are *-ī́ritar* (Upanishads), *-arpitar* (Epic Skt. onwards) and *-arpayitár* (Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa) (cf. Whitney 1885: p.10 √*ī́r*, p.14 √*r̥, r̥ch*). Given that they appear only as compounds, are unattested in Vedic and show unexpected morphologies, they are most probably later innovations in Old Indic.

It follows from these observations that an active verb ***h₃erH-mi/si/ti* '(voluntarily) rise' is hardly supposable in PIE but only inactive **h₃e/orH-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be in the process of rising', 'be (in the state of being) afloat'.[11] It seems likely that Old English (Anglian) 2 sg. *ear-Þ* is a direct reflex of this inactive verb (or more exactly, the stative variant **h₃orH-h₂e/th₂e/e* 'be afloat').

---

9) A zero-grade mediopassive is frequently observable in IE dialects; e.g., Hit. *kittari* 'sit' (< **ḱey-*), etc. This may be due to polarization (i.e., to show a morphological difference from an *e*-grade active-durative > a later present). The IE aorist also shows this phenomenon. Presumably, in the Late PIE period, both the zero-grade and *e*-grade forms were optionally used for the later mediopassive and aorist categories.

10) Cf. the third clause in (2) above.

11) Sihler (1995: 457f.) supposes that by means of the *new*-suffix, the verb now at issue constituted a present-imperfect paradigm at the PIE period, reflected by the corresponding paradigms in Vedic, Greek and Hittite, as shown below (the plural paradigm and irrelevant details are left out here for the sake of simplicity):

(i) **(h₃)r̥-new-*

pres.	PIE	Vedic	Greek	Hittite
1 sg	**r̥newmi*	*r̥ṇomi*	*ὄρνῡμι*	arnumi
2	**r̥newsi*	-----	*ὄρνῡς*	arnuši
3	**r̥newti*	*r̥ṇoti*	*ὄρνῡσι*	arnuzi
impf.				
1 sg	**r̥newm̥*	-----	*ὤρνῡν*	arnunun
2	**r̥news*	-----	*ὤρνῡς*	-----
3	**r̥newt*	-----	*ὤρνῡ*	arnut

4. Conclusion

This paper has examined two of the cases which scholars so far occasionally proposed to interpret as 'hidden' preterite-presents in Germanic, within the theoretical framework advanced by Tanaka (2001a, forthcoming). As a result, it has been brought to light that these two cases are positive, i.e., OHG *bibēn* and Anglian *earþ* may be granted a status of a 'hidden' preterite-present to the extent that they, as well as preterite-presents, can be construed as stemming from original inactive verbs.

References

Birkmann, Thomas 1987. *Präteritopräsentia: Morphologische Entwicklung einer Sonderklasse in den altgermanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Brugmann, Karl 1895. *A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages*, vol. IV (Morphology, Part III), tr. by R. Seymour Conway and W. H. D. Rouse. New York: Westermann.

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

Cardona, George 1992. "On the Development of Presents Like BIBHÉTI." In Srivastava et al., 1-13.

Cowgill, Warren 1960. "Gothic *iddja* and Old English *ēode*." *Language* 36, 483-501.

Cowgill, Warren 1979. "Anatolian *hi*-Conjugation and Indo-European Perfect: Instalment II". In Neu and Meid, 25-39.

Flasdieck, Hermann M. 1936/37. "Das altenglische Verbum Substantivum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des altenglischen." *Englische Studien* 71, 321-349.

Flasdieck, Hermann M. 1937/38. "Nachschrift." *Englische Studien* 72, 158-160.

Godel, Robert 1975. *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Hogg, Richard M. 1992a. "Phonology and Morphology." In Hogg, 67-167.

Hogg, Richard M. (ed.) 1992b. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, Vol. 1: *The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Krahe, Hans and Wolfgang Meid 1969. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 7th edition, 3 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

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*.

My opinion differs from Sihler's. In my view, only the inactive morph *$*h_3e/orH$-$h_2e/th_2e/e$* 'be in the process/state of rising' belongs to an older layer of PIE and no verbal paradigm according to tense and aspect was constituted in the proto-language. But it seems possible to infer that at a later stage of PIE (e.g., immediately before dissolution into dialects) another verb was derivable from the original verb in question by means of the causative formant *-*n*- (plus additional elements). In other words, it seems surmisable that such a derivative as *$*h_3e/orH$-*neu-mi/si/ti* 'make oneself in the process/state of rising' > '(voluntarily) rise' was available at such a later period. This derivative verb may have been inherited by paradigmatised presents (and imperfects/preterites) in the relevant dialects.

Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

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

Meid, Wolfgang 1971. *Das germanische Praeteritum: Indogermanische Grundlagen und Ausbreitung im Germanischen*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

Mezger, F, 1937. "Ae. *eart, earð, arð* "du bist" und got. *sijum* "wir sind". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 64, 137-141.

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

Neu, Erich and Wolfgang Meid (eds.) 1979. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

Onions, C. T. (comp.) 1966. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Clarendon.

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

Prokosch, Eduard 1939. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

Puhvel, Jaan (comp.) 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1: *Words beginning with A* and Vol.2: *Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin: Gruyter.

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

Srivastava, R. N. et al. (eds.) 1992. *Language and Text: Studies in Honour of Ashok R. Kelkar*. Delhi: Kalinga.

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. "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." *Linguistic Science* 36, 29-59.

Tanaka, Toshiya 2001b. "The Indo-European Background of Old English *ge-neah* 'is sufficient': Application of a Non-Brugmannian Method." *Studies in Languages and Cultures* 14, 127-141

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

Wackernagel, Jacob 1907. "Indisches und Italisches. 1. Ahd. *bibén*: ai. *bibhéti*." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 41, 305-309.

Watkins, Calvert (comp.) 1985. The *American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Boston: Mifflin.

Whitney, William Dwight 1885. *The Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit*

Language. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel.

Whitney, William Dwight 1896. *A Sanskrit Grammar, including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*, fourth edition. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel.

ゲルマン語における隠れた過去現在動詞二例について: それらのInactive起源を論じる

従来の古ゲルマン語研究においては，14の過去現在動詞をゲルマン祖語に認めるのが，標準的な考えであると言ってよい。しかしながら，これまでかなりの学者が，これら14の明白に過去現在動詞と認められるもの以外に，いくつかの「隠れた過去現在動詞」がゲルマン諸方言に認められると論じてきた。それらのうち本稿が考察の対象とするのは，次のふたつの動詞である。

(1) 古高ドイツ語　bibēn「震える，恐れる」

(2) 古英語　earþ，arþ（アングリア方言），eart（西サクソン方言）「(汝は) ～である」(二人称単数繋辞)

(1)については，Wackernagel(1907)，Pokorny(1994)，Meid(1971)，Cardona(1992)などが，そして(2)については，Prokosch(1939)，Cowgill(1960) などが，元々は過去現在動詞に相当する特性を持つ動詞であったと主張している。

本稿の目的は，これらの動詞が，Tanaka(2001a, forthcoming) で提案する非ブルークマン的な祖語再建モデルを採用した場合，どのように解釈できるか考察することである。特に Tanaka (2001a) では，任意の印欧語動詞に関して印欧祖語での形態－意味クラスを推測する一般的方法を提案しており，その方法を用いて，これらの「隠れた過去現在動詞」の祖語における形態－意味特性を推定するのが本稿の課題である。

伝統的に認められている14の過去現在動詞は、本質的に言って，印欧祖語において **CoC-h_2e/th_2e/e* という形態を持ち，非行為者的で静的な意味を現していた動詞 (inactive 動詞) が，固有の意味－形態特性を文献時代まで保持した動詞であると考えられる (Tanaka 2000　参照)。本稿の「隠れた過去現在動詞」二例についても，同様の意味－形態特性を祖語において持っていたと示すことができるならば，上記の，伝統的枠組み内で「隠れた過去現在動詞」の存在を示唆した学者たちの論は，本稿で仮定する異なる枠組みにおいても成り立つと主張できるであろう。

具体的な分析の結果，(1)，(2)双方の動詞について，印欧祖語においては，**Ce/oC-h_2e/th_2e/e* という形態を持ち，非行為者的な意味を現した inactive 動詞であった可能性が高いことを明らかにした。その結果，それらが「隠れた過去現在動詞」であるという考え方は，非ブルークマン的祖語再建モデルの元でも，依然成立すると主張した。