THE GERMANIC THIRD WEAK CLASS

JAY H. JASANOFF

Harvard University

Germanic verbs of the 3rd weak class form presents characterized by an alternation between predesinential **ai* (e.g. Go. 3sg. *habaiþ*) and **a* (e.g. 1pl. *habam*). These verbs are usually compared with the '*ē*-verbs' of Italic and Balto-Slavic, but no IE present built on the stative suffix **-ē-* will account phonologically for the form of the suffix in Germanic. Instead, it can be shown that the characteristic Germanic paradigm results from the 'activization' of an older middle paradigm in which a 3sg. in **-ai* (< IE **-oi*; cf. Skt. *duhé* 'milks') was further suffixed by the productive active ending **-þi* (< IE **-ti*).

1. The inflection of the third class of weak verbs (exemplified by the verb 'to have': Gothic *haban*, Old Norse *hafa*,[1] Old High German *habēn*, Old Saxon *hebbian*, Old English *habban*) presents one of the classic problems in the historical morphology of Germanic. Not only do the verbs of this class show peculiarities in all the older Germanic languages, but they differ remarkably in their conjugation from one language to another, so that it is not at all obvious how the Common Germanic paradigm should be reconstructed. Given this diversity of forms, we will do well to begin with a short review of the morphological facts themselves.

The situation is simplest in Old High German. The entire conjugation of *habēn* is athematic (to the extent that this term still has any meaning), and is based on the single stem *habē-*: 1sg. *habēm*, 3sg. *habēt*, 3pl. *habēnt*, impv. 2sg. *habe*, opt. 3sg. *habe*, *habēe*, pret. 1sg. *habēta*, pres. ptc. *habēnti*, past ptc. *gihabēt*. Except for the *ē* of the stem, this paradigm is completely parallel to that of a 2nd class weak verb like *salbōn* 'anoint' (1sg. *salbōm*, 3sg. *salbōt*, like *habēm*, *habēt* etc.) The resemblance between the two classes extends to at least one set of forms which cannot be old. These are the longer optatives 3sg. *habēe*, *salbōe*, 2sg. *habēēs*, *salbōēs* etc., which seem to have been created analogically. The genesis of this formation, which will not concern us further in this paper, is discussed by Cowgill (1959:11–12).

The OHG pattern is not found in any other Germanic language. In Gothic the corresponding verb *haban* exhibits a systematic opposition between stem forms *habai-* (phonetically probably [habɛ··-]) and *haba-*. To the *habai-* group belong 2sg. *habais*, 3sg. *habaiþ*, 2pl. *habaiþ*, the corresponding imperatives (2sg. *habai* etc.), the weak preterit 1–3sg. *habaida* etc., and the past ptc. *habaiþs*. The rest of the paradigm is indistinguishable from that of a normal strong verb: 1sg. *haba*, 1pl. *habam*, 3pl. *haband* (with impv. 3pl. *habandau*), opt. 1sg. *habau*, 3sg. *habai*, passive 1–3sg. *habada* etc., pres. ptc. *habands*. The Gothic alternation of stems *habai-* and *haba-* is not completely isolated. It recurs almost exactly in Old Norse, where a typical 3rd class weak verb, *vaka* 'wake', is conjugated in the pres.

indic. as 1sg. *vaki*, 2-3sg. *vakir*, 1pl. *vǫkum*, 2pl. *vakið*, 3pl. *vaka*. Except for 1sg. *vaki*, each term is directly equatable with its Gothic counterpart; and *vaki* itself is almost certainly an analogical form, created to conform to the otherwise regular pattern 1sg. = 3sg. minus -*r* (cf. 3sg. *grefr* 'digs', 1sg. *gref*; 3sg. *heyrir* 'hears', 1sg. *heyri*). In the other moods and tenses the picture is the same, Old Norse in general showing forms in -*i*- < older *-ē*- < *-ai*- where Gothic has -*ai*- (e.g. impv. sg. *vaki*, syncopated pret. *vakða*), and forms in -*a*- where Gothic has ·*a*- (e.g. inf. *vaka*, pres. ptc. *vakandi*). This inflection is documented in North Germanic from the 7th century; cf. the archaic runic compound *wita(n)daha-laiban* 'protector of the bread', semantically parallel to OE *hláford* 'bread-guard, lord'. (For ON *hafa, segja* 'say', and *þegja* 'be silent', see §3 below).

The greatest complexity is found in Old Saxon and Old English. In both languages, the 3rd weak class is a mere vestige of a category, the great majority of originally 3rd class verbs having been absorbed into the productive 2nd, or ō-class. Old Saxon has carried this development to an extreme, and only two verbs, *hebbian* 'have' and *seggian* 'say', are usually considered to represent the unmixed type.[2] Their inflection is characterized by an alternation between a stem in -*e*- (or -*a*-), from older *-ē*- < *-ai*-, and a stem in -*ja*-. The forms in -*e*- correspond in distribution to the -*ai*- forms of Gothic (e.g. 2sg. *habes, habas*, 3sg. *habed, habad*) with the significant exception of the short preterit 1-3sg. *habda* and the matching ptc. *gihabd*, which have the appearance of archaisms. The remaining forms, corresponding to those with the simple thematic vowel in Gothic, show general agreement with the 1st weak class: 1sg. *hebbiu*, pl. *hebbiad*, opt. 1sg. *hebbie*, pres. ptc. *hebbiandi* (cf. *libbiandi* 'living'), inf. *hebbian*; to these must be added the umlauted forms *habbiu, habbiad* etc., which occur with considerable frequency in the Monacensis manuscript of the *Heliand*. The situation is very similar in Old English. *Habban, secgan* 'say', and one or two others follow a paradigm essentially identical to that of Old Saxon; the relevant West Saxon forms of *habban* (the absence of umlaut is no doubt secondary) are 1sg. *hæbbe*, 2sg. *hæfst*, 3sg. *hæfþ*, pl. *habbaþ*, opt. 1sg. *hæbbe*, pres. ptc. *hæbbende*, inf. *habban*, pret. 1-3sg. *hæfde*, past ptc. (*ჳe-*)*hæfd*. In a number of other verbs, however, Old English has introduced a regularized paradigm (type Anglian *lifჳan* 'live', 1sg. *lifჳe*) which has no counterpart in Old Saxon. This type appears to have been created analogically on the basis of the inherited 2sg. and 3sg. forms with *ē* stem vocalism (earlier *ai*). It is itself subject to replacement by the productive 2nd class (cf. Cowgill 1959:13–14).

Although it displays an extraordinary degree of paradigmatic diversity in the older Germanic languages, the 3rd class is not a late category. Its archaic character can be seen from the fact that a significant number of 3rd class verbs correspond outside Germanic to formations built on a late IE deverbative suffix *-ē*-: typical examples are OHG *dagên* 'be silent', Lat. *tacēre*; Go. *witan* 'watch', Lat. *vidēre* 'see', OCS *viděti*, Lith. *pavydėti* 'envy' (both < *ụidē*-, with the Balto-Slavic lengthened zero-grade discussed by Kuryłowicz 1956:291–3); OHG *dolên* 'suffer', Lith. *tylėti* 'be silent'; OHG *habên*, Lat. *habēre* (from parallel roots

---

[2] OS *libbian* 'live' already represents a significant departure from the pattern of *hebbian* and *seggian*. It is discussed in §4, below.

*kap- and *ghabh-). This suffix, in which a 'stative' value is usually clearly recognizable, has enjoyed considerable productivity in a central group of IE languages comprising Germanic, Italic, Balto-Slavic, and Greek. It is very probably related to a homonymous suffix *-ē-, equally well-established in IE but somewhat less prominent in Germanic, which serves to derive stative and inchoative verbs from nouns and adjectives. Denominative 3rd class verbs are synchronically important only in OHG, but their IE pedigree is assured by the important word equation OHG *rotēn* 'turn red', Lith. *rudéti* 'rust', Russian Church Slavic *rъdĕti sę* 'blush', OIr *·ruidi* 'blush', Lat. *rubēre* 'be red', all presupposing a verbal stem *rudh-ē- < adj. *rudh-ro- (cf. Watkins 1972). It is hardly surprising that scholars have been virtually unanimous in connecting both Germanic types with the 'ē-verbs' of other IE traditions. But while the fact of the relationship has been universally admitted, there has been very little agreement on how the morphological details of the Germanic situation are to be explained. Accordingly, it will not be amiss to survey a few of the IE and Pre-Germanic formations most commonly assumed to have played a role in the prehistory of the 3rd class.

ATHEMATIC PRESENTS IN *-ē-. The OHG inflection *habēm, -ēs, -ēt* etc. suggests the possibility of an inherited athematic present in *-ē-mi, *-ē-si, *-ē-ti. Such a formation is actually found in Hittite verbs of the denominative type (e.g. *dannattet* 'became empty', *dannattaš* 'empty'; cf. Watkins 1972) and may lie at the root of a Lat. 3pl. like *lūcent* 'shine' < *-ēnti if this is not simply analogical. But while perfectly acceptable from an IE standpoint, the hypothesis of an athematic ē-conjugation is not easy to reconcile with the Germanic forms. The view that OHG *habēt* continues a Common Germanic *habēþ(i)[3] has most recently been argued, and with considerable resourcefulness, by Polomé (1967:83–92), who is quite correct in noting that there are no insurmountable obstacles to his theory as far as West Germanic is concerned. On the other hand, his identification of *habēþ(i) as the source of Go. *habaiþ* seems wrong, and leaves the simple thematic forms *haba, habam, haband* unexplained.[4] Perhaps the most telling objection to his view is the state of affairs in Old Saxon: Why, if Old Saxon inherited 1sg. *haben < *-ēm, did it replace this form by the wholly irregular *hebbiu* while retaining—if not actually creating—the parallel 1sg. *salbon* in the second class? It seems more likely that 1sg. *haben never existed in Old Saxon; and that the athematic (and thoroughly 'regular') appearance of OHG *habēm,*

---

[3] Here and below, I have somewhat arbitrarily chosen to ignore the effects of Verner's Law on the Common Germanic verbal endings of the 2nd and 3rd persons, singular and plural. In the reconstructions that follow, these endings will appear with a uniformly voiceless spirant; the actual situation, of course, must have been considerably more complicated.

[4] Even assuming that *haband* is the regular reflex of CGmc. *habēnþ(i)—and this is by no means certain—I find it hard to understand why this 3pl. form should have served as the starting point for a new and anomalous paradigm, when in the parallel 2nd class the regular 3pl. *salband < *-ōnþ(i) has simply been remade to *salbond*. There seems to be little to recommend Polomé's suggestion (p. 90) that 1sg. *haba* derives phonologically from *habēm(i).

In fact, the Latin inscriptional forms *Lubaini* (= Go. *lubains* 'hope') and *Vanaenia* (= Go. *wanains* 'lack') argue rather forcefully that the *ai* of Go. *habaiþ* etc. is an etymological diphthong (for discussion see Krahe 1961:37–9).

-*ēs*, -*ēt* is an innovation based on the inherited forms where *ē*, of whatever origin, is old. But if this is so, then the assumption of an athematic conjugation in *-ē- is superfluous: there are no forms in any Germanic language which require it.

THEMATIC PRESENTS IN *-$\bar{e}\underbar{i}^e$/$_o$-. The equation 3sg. Go. *habaiþ* = OHG *habêt* = OS *habed* (-*ad*) points most naturally to a Common Germanic 3sg. *habaiþ(i)*, from which the development of *habēþ* in North and West Germanic would be entirely regular. Many scholars, before and after Brugmann, have in turn sought to derive *habaiþ(i)* from *kapēi̯eti*, an *ē*-present extended by the productive thematic suffix *-$\underbar{i}^e$/$_o$-. While not necessarily an IE formation, presents of this type are common in Balto-Slavic, where they are found only with denominatives, e.g. Lith. *rudéti*, *rudéja*; Russian Church Slavic *rъděti sę*, *rъdějetъ sę* (but Lith. *smirdéti*, *smìrdi* 'stink', OCS *smrъděti*, *smrъditъ*). Even though no other examples are known for the putative development *-$\bar{e}\underbar{i}e$- > *-$\bar{e}ji$- > *-$\bar{e}i$- > *-*ai*- in Germanic, there are no very serious phonological obstacles to explaining the *ai*-forms in this way. The real difficulty lies in the cases where the thematic vowel is IE *o*, i.e. in the 1sg., 1pl, and 3pl. Neither Go. *haba*, -*am*, -*and* nor OS *hebbiu*, -*ad* can represent the normal phonological continuation of a pre-Germanic *habējō, *habējamě(s), *habējanþi; thus, while it is not impossible that a suffix *-$\bar{e}\underbar{i}^e$/$_o$- may have played some role in the creation of the 3rd weak class, this suffix alone will not account for the attested paradigm in any Germanic language. One is inevitably led to speculate on the possibility of admixture with one or more other inflectional types, but explanations of this kind have proved difficult to motivate.

PRESENTS IN *$\bar{e}(i)$-/-$\bar{\imath}$-. Certain scholars, most recently and notably Schmid (1963:94–7), have taken as original the alternation of 1sg. OS *hebbiu*, OE *hæbbe* with 3sg. OS *habed*, OE *hæfþ*, comparing these forms with Lith. 1sg. *smirdžiù*, inf. *smirdéti*; Wagner (1950:50–54) would add Hitt. 3sg. *ḫalzai*, 3pl. *ḫalziyanzi* 'call'. Schmid's reconstruction assumes an ablauting suffix *-$\bar{e}i$- with zero-grade *-$\bar{\imath}$-, both optionally followed by the thematic vowel and so distributed as to yield a paradigm 1sg. *kap$\underbar{i}\bar{o}$, 2sg. *kapē$\underbar{i}$esi, 3sg. *kapē$\underbar{i}$eti, 1pl. *kap$\underbar{i}$ome, 2pl. *kapē$\underbar{i}$ete, 3pl. *kap$\underbar{i}$onti. In IE terms this is an unlikely inflection at best, and the extra-Germanic evidence adduced in its support will not stand scrutiny. As Kuryłowicz (1964:79–84) has now shown, the Balto-Slavic 'semi-thematic' *i*-presents ultimately reflect a transformation of the IE perfect,[5] while the Hittite forms are in all probability an Anatolian innovation (cf. Jasanoff 1968:19–55).

---

[5] I am indebted to Warren Cowgill for pointing out several difficulties with Kuryłowicz' explanation as presented in the work cited. In particular, there seem to be serious phonological objections to deriving the theme vowel of the Baltic forms from an *i*-diphthong shortened in final position; Latvian and Old Prussian evidence points rather to Common Baltic short *i*. In my opinion, this *i* has been analogically generalized from an athematic 3pl. ending *-*int* < *-*ņt* or *-*ir* < *-*ŗ*, but a detailed presentation of the arguments which support this conclusion must be reserved for a separate study. For present purposes, it is enough to say that Kuryłowicz' theory, while needing some revision in detail, is substantially correct in explaining the Balto-Slavic *ī*-verbs as the reflex of an athematic formation built directly on the root. Whether this formation should be thought of as identical to the IE perfect (rather than, e.g., the athematic middle) is an important and still unresolved question; it does not, however, affect the interpretation of the Germanic forms in any immediate way.

Even on a-priori grounds, there are good reasons for regarding the Old Saxon and Old English forms in *-ja- as secondary. Old Saxon and Old English are precisely the languages in which the 3rd class, as a moribund category, is most open to influences from the other weak types; note such borrowings from the 2nd class as OE 2sg. *hafast*, 3sg. *hafaþ*, OS 2sg. *libos*, 3sg. *libod* (cf. *libbian* 'live'), or forms like OE inf. *lifȝan* < *libaijan*, pl. *lifȝaþ* < *libaijanþ* etc., ultimately created on the model of the 1st (*nerian*) class. The genesis of the characteristic Northern West Germanic paradigm 1sg. *habjō, 2sg. *habais, 3sg. *habaiþ, pl. *habjanþ is a problem that will concern us at greater length in §3; for the moment it is enough to observe that neither internal evidence from Germanic nor comparative data from any other IE language suggests that this type is anything but the late creation of one specific dialect area (cf. the conclusion reached on other grounds by Polomé, 85).

It emerges, then, that all three major West Germanic languages have innovated significantly in their treatment of the 3rd class. We can now assert that the Common Germanic paradigm is essentially preserved in Gothic and Old Norse, and is to be reconstructed in the present as 1sg. *habō, 2sg. *habais(i), 3sg. *habaiþ(i), 1pl. *habamē(s), 2pl. *habaiþ(e), 3pl. *habanþ(i). The mere agreement of Gothic and Old Norse, as against West Germanic, in showing this inflection, is strong prima-facie evidence for its Common Germanic character. But as a matter of fact—and the importance of this seems not to have been properly appreciated before—West Germanic itself directly attests reflexes of at least one diagnostic member of the Gothic–Norse paradigm, the 1sg. *habō. The regular 1sg. of *habban* in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English is *hafo* (-*u*), a form which notably contrasts with West Saxon *hæbbe*. *Hafo* is matched by *sæȝo* (= WS *secge*); the usual pattern in the Northumbrian Lindisfarne Gospels is 1sg. *hafo* (*sæȝo*), 2sg. *hæfes* (*sæȝes*), 3sg. *hæfeþ* (*sæȝeþ*), pl. *habbaþ* (*sæcgaþ*).[6] These forms have been explained as due to analogy with the normal strong paradigm (e.g. by Flasdieck, 23), but this is most unlikely in view of the frequency with which Northumbrian maintains the geminated/ungeminated alternation in regular *ja*-presents. Further evidence that *hafo* and *sæȝo* are archaisms comes from Old High German, where Tatian (scribe γ) preserves the completely isolated 1sg. forms *habu* (2×), *sagu* (1×) beside normal *haben, sagen* < *habêm, sagêm*. These are not, as has sometimes been asserted, back formations froms the problematic 2sg. *hebis, segis*, 3sg. *hebit, segit*, which do not occur in Tatian. *Habu* and *sagu* are found embedded in the normal *ê*-paradigm in two interesting contexts:

> 87.5 Antuurtanti daz uib inti quad: ni *habu* gomman. Tho quad iru der heilant: uuola quadi thaz thu ni *habes* gomman.
> 'Respondit mulier et dixit: non habeo virum. Dicit ei Jhesus: bene dixisti, quia non habeo virum.'
> 88.10 Oba ih giuuizscaf *sagu* (corr. ʃ: sagen) uon mir min giuuizscaf nist uuar. Ander ist der dar giuuizscaf *saget* uon mir ...
> 'Si ergo testimonium perhibeo de me, testimonium meum non est verum. Alius est qui testimonium perhibet de me ... '

---

[6] Cf. further 1sg. *liofo* (Lindisfarne), *lifo* (Rushworth II). Here and elsewhere, Old English forms are quoted after Flasdieck 1935.

The pattern *habu, habes, habet* (*sagu, sages, saget*) which emerges from these passages accords perfectly with Northumbrian *hafo, hæfes, hæfeþ* and Go. *haba, habais, habaiþ*. It is hard to escape the conclusion that this inflection is old.[7]

The distribution of forms in *-a-* and *-ai-* in the Gothic (and Common Germanic) 3rd class paradigm is not easy to motivate historically. A recent attempt to go beyond vacuous 'mixture' theories is that of Bennett (1962:136–41), who proposes to derive all the principal Gothic forms from a single earlier type in *-əi̯e/o-*: 1sg. *kapəi̯ō, 2sg. *kapəi̯esi, 3sg. *kapəi̯eti > CGmc. *habō, *habais(i), *habaiþ(i) > Go. *haba, habais, habaiþ*. Bennett considers *ə the zero grade of the suffix *-ē- (i.e. *-eə₁-); his rules call for the loss of antevocalic *əi̯ except before *i < *e, where *əi̯ > a. This is not a convincing reconstruction. The suffix *-ē- is notable for not showing a clear zero grade in any other IE language. Besides being completely ad hoc, Bennett's rules assume the retention of *ə as a separate vowel until well into the Germanic period—an assumption which other evidence, such as the form of the word 'daughter' (Go. *dauhtar* etc. < IE *dhug(h)əter-), speaks rather strongly against. For us the main interest of Bennett's theory lies not in the details of his reconstruction, but rather in his explicit recognition that the Germanic paradigm *habo, *habais(i) etc. CANNOT be explained on the basis of an inherited present in *-ē- or *-ēi̯(e/o)-.

There should be nothing too surprising in this result, for there is very little evidence that the deverbative suffix *-ē- played a role in the formation of an IE present. In Greek the main older function of the suffix is to provide aorists, denoting entry into a state, to otherwise characterized presents—*ekhárēn* to *khaírō* 'rejoice', *ekáēn* to *kaíō* 'burn', *emánēn* (post-Hom.) to *maínomai* 'rage'. This is the usage from which the classical aorist passive in *-thē-* develops (cf. Chantraine 1925:105, and Prévot 1935:86–100). Particularly in view of its expanding role in the formation of the future (*skhḗsō < ékhō* 'have', *pithḗsō < peíthō* 'persuade') and perfect (*nenémēka < némō* 'distribute', *meménēka < ménō* 'wait'), the exclusion of *-ē-* from the present system is remarkable. This aspect of the Greek situation recalls the state of affairs in Baltic and Slavic, where the suffix *-ē-* supplies preterits (aorists) and infinitives to 'stative' verbs whose presents typically continue a formation akin to the IE perfect. Parallel to Gk. aor. *emánēn*, pres. *maínomai*, Lithuanian has inf. *minéti* 'remember', pret. 3sg. *minéjo*, but pres. 3sg. *mìni < pf. 3sg. *mₒne-i; the matching OCS forms are inf. *mьněti*, aor. 3sg. *mьně*, pres. 3sg. *mьnitъ < *mₒne-i + 3sg. pronoun *tъ (cf. Kuryłowicz 1964:81–3, Watkins 1969:222–5). Only Latin, with *ē-*presents like *habeō* 'have', *maneō* 'remain', *taceō* 'be silent' etc. departs significantly from the Greek and Balto-Slavic pattern. It is far from clear that this situation is old. The Latin 2nd conjugation is notoriously a mixed category, comprising in addition to the *habeō* type both denominal formations (e.g. *albeō* 'be white', *seneō*, be old', *rubeō* 'be red') and iterative-causatives in *-ēi̯e/o-* (e.g. *moneō* 'warn', *noceō* 'harm', *doceō* 'teach'). In all probability the *ē-*inflection of deverbal statives in the present tense is an innovation of Latin; a stative present like *habeō* follows the model of denominal *rubeō* (and/or causative *moneō*, where *-ē- < *-ei̯e-*) in

---

[7] The later forms *habo* and *sago* (Notker etc.) do not seem to belong here. They can easily be motivated analogically, and are best omitted from the present discussion.

precisely the same way that the dialectal Lith. pres. 3sg. *minéja* (for *mìni* <
*m₀ne-i) follows that of denominal 3sg. *rudéja* 'rubet'.

These facts bear importantly on the problem of the 3rd weak class. We have
seen that while the stems **habē-*, **witē-*, **munē-* (< **kap-ē-*, **u̯id-ē-*, **m₀n-ē-*)
may be old in Germanic, it is difficult to interpret them as directly underlying
the corresponding 3sg. presents **habaiþ(i)*, **witaiþ(i)*, **munaiþ(i)*. The con-
clusion suggested is that in the oldest Germanic, as in the oldest Greek and
Balto-Slavic, the stative suffix **-ē-* was restricted to one or more non-present
functions. Such a function might well have been that of aorist, but the exact
original value of the *ē*-extended stem forms is of no special importance to the
present discussion. My main assumption will simply be this: at some time in the
pre-history of Germanic, a verb like 'have' was characterized by an opposition
between a stem **habē-*, serving in a non-present function, and an independently
formed second stem, unsuffixed by **-ē-* and supplying the present. The origin
of the historical *-ai-/-a-* present may therefore reasonably be sought in some
semantically and formally appropriate IE category which, like the Greek in-
trans. pres. middle in **-i̯e/o-* (*maínomai*) and the Balto-Slavic perfect (*mìni*,
mьnitъ), has come to be secondarily associated with the extra-present formation
in **-ē-* (cf. *emánēn*, *minéjo*, *mьně*). Such a category can indeed be found in
Germanic, as I shall attempt to demonstrate in the following discussion.

2. The Gothic verb *hāhan* 'hang' (tr.) agrees with its cognates in the other
old Gmc. languages (OHG *hāhan*, OE *hōn* etc.) in belonging to the 7th strong
(reduplicating) class. In meaning, *hāhan* contrasts with the partly homonymous
3rd class weak verb *hāhan* 'hang' (intr.); the semantic relation between the two
is the same as that which Greek expresses by an opposition of voice (*krémnēmi*,
kremánnumi vs. *krémamai*) and Latin by the presence vs. absence of the suffix
*-ē- (*pendō* vs. *pendeō*). The functional opposition between strong *hāhan* and
weak *hāhan*, which recurs exactly in OHG *hāhan* vs. *hangēn*, gives the appear-
ance of an archaism; note that the later languages typically utilize more 'modern'
devices to express the same contrast—e.g. earlier New High German, which
opposes *hängen* (tr., < iterative-causative **hangjan*) to *hangen* (intr.) The Com-
mon Germanic 3rd class weak verb **hangai-/*hanga-* 'hang' (intr.), 3sg.
*hangaiþ(i), is not etymologically isolated. It is clearly to be connected with the
Sanskrit thematic deponent *śáṅkate* 'hesitates, doubts', a verb first directly at-
tested only in the Brahmanas, but presupposed by the deverbative Rigvedic
hapax *śaṅkú-* 'hanging'. *Śáṅkate* in turn is related to Lat. *cunctor, -ārī* 'hesitate',
frequentative to a lost deponent most naturally to be restored as **concor, -ī*.
Hittite *gangaḥḥi* 'I hang' (tr.) is a further cognate; though transitive and active,
this verb resembles other thematic members of the *ḥi*-conjugation in seeming to
presuppose the former existence of a thematic middle 1sg. **gangaḥḥa* 'I hang'
(intr.) (cf. Meid 1971:77–8, Watkins 1969:117). The root **konk-* thus appears
to have been inflected in the middle voice from a very early period; outside Ger-
manic no fewer than three independent IE traditions attest directly or indirectly
to a thematic middle paradigm with intransitive meaning. This fact can be ex-
ploited to provide an explanation for the formally problematic 3sg. **hangaiþ(i)*.

I propose to see in 3sg. **hangaiþ(i)* the reflex of an archaic 3sg. middle in

*-ai < IE *-oi (*-o + deictic *i), suffixed secondarily by the normal Gmc. 3sg. pres. termination *-þ(i). The position of the ending *-o(i) in the scheme of the IE verb has recently been discussed exhaustively by Watkins (1969, passim), who shows how an inherited 3sg. in *-o (apophonically an alternant of the 3sg. perfect in *-e) is renewed as *-to, *-eto, and *-oto in the majority of IE traditions. These dental-extended forms of the basic ending, themselves subject to optional enlargement by the particles *r and *i, underlie the 'classical' 3sg. middles in *-to(i), *-eto(i), *-oto(i) (Indo-Iranian, Greek, Germanic) and *-tor(i), *-etor(i), *-otor(i) (Hittite, Tocharian, Italic, Celtic). However, the archaic t-less forms *-o(i), *-or(i) are not purely hypothetical constructs; they are preserved intact in 3sg. middles, athematic and thematic, in Indo-Iranian (Vedic athematic duhé 'milks', later dugdhe, impf. áduha(t); thematic śóbhe 'praises', later śobhate) and Hittite (athematic eša, ešari 'sits' beside pret. eštat; thematic neya, neyari 'leads' beside neyatta). Cf. further Umbrian ferar 'ferātur' and OIr. passive berar 'is carried', beside deponents like do·moinethar 'thinks'. Within Germanic, where the IE middle is continued in the Gothic passive (e.g. 1–3sg. bairada 'am, is carried' < *beraþai), a similar replacement must be assumed: the 3sg. desinence Go. -ada, CGmc. *-aþai ultimately points to an older ending *-a (or suffixed, *-ai) which is nowhere attested as such. However, interesting indirect evidence for a 3sg. in *-ai is still to be seen in the peculiar and isolated use of the Gothic ending -ada in the 1sg., a feature which recurs in OE hātte 'am, is called' = Go. haitada. Since IE *a and *o both appear as a in Germanic, the inherited ending of the 1sg. middle *-ai < *-oi must early have fallen together—at least in the athematic type—with the 3sg. *-ai < *-oi. Following their phonological merger, the two endings were treated as identical, and the subsequent replacement of *-ai by *-aþai affected the 1st and 3rd persons equally (cf. Watkins 1969:138).

It is therefore reasonable to assume dentalless *hangai, *berai etc. as the oldest forms of the 3sg. middle in Germanic. Such forms, I shall argue, have had a twofold development in the historical languages—yielding, on the one hand, the Gothic (and Common Germanic) passive in 3sg. -ada (< *-aþai); and on the other, via a process now to be described, the Common Germanic 3rd weak class in active 3sg. *-aiþ(i). At the earliest stage of Germanic accessible to us, the middle 3sg. *hangai must have been bifunctional: like the Greek middle, it invested the root meaning 'hang' with intransitive value, and at the same time optionally signaled the grammatical passive to the transitive active 3sg. *hanhiþ(i). This situation, of a type frequently encountered in older IE languages, was conducive to the introduction of a new formal contrast to differentiate the two functions. In the passive (in Kuryłowicz' terms, 'primary') function,[8] the 3sg. hanga(i) was renewed via the replacement *-a(i) > *aþa(i) as the

_____

[8] In this respect the Germanic hierarchy of functions is the exact opposite of that in Indo-Iranian, where the dentalless ending *-ai (Skt. -e) is typically specialized as a mark of the passive (Skt. gṛṇé 'is praised', bruvé 'is said', śṛṇvé 'is heard'). There is no real contradiction here. In Indo-Iranian the passive function of the old middle is taken over by a new category, the derived passive in -yá-; the use of inherited middle forms with the same value is a marginal archaism. In Germanic, on the other hand, the (originally peripheral) passive signification of the IE middle is developed as its sole productive function, and it is as a mark of the passive that the inherited middle ending of the 3sg. undergoes formal renewal (cf. Watkins 1969:88 and Kuryłowicz 1960:79).

familiar Germanic passive of the handbooks, *hangaþai, Go. *hahada (with regular loss of grammatischer Wechsel). The spread of the dental ending thus came to be associated with the growth of a new grammatical category, the passive, while the dentalless ending was restricted to intransitive ('secondary') functions alone. With the subsequent loss of the middle as an autonomous category in Germanic, the status of the archaic *hangai, now re-interpreted as a derived present unmarked for voice, would have become precarious in the extreme. Like over-short 3rd singulars generally, it was liable to be resegmented as a bare stem form with desinence zero, i.e. as hangai+∅ instead of the historically correct *hang+ai. But this new segmentation made possible the accretion of a new and overt mark of the 3sg. in place of the null ending. The result was the suffixation of *hangai by the unmarked (active) 3sg. desinence *-þ(i), and the creation of CGmc. 3sg. *hangaiþ(i)—the form directly accessible to us through comparison.

Once established as a 3sg. active in form, *hangaiþ(i) was free to serve as the starting point for a new active paradigm. It is possible to give a sketch of how the transformation from a middle to active might have proceeded outside the 3sg.: Germanic, like Hittite, Tocharian, and the neighboring Baltic, appears to have inherited from dialectal IE a thematic conjugation with persistent o-color of the thematic vowel. This is directly visible in the Go. passive 1sg. haitada, 2sg. haitaza, 3sg. haitada, pl. haitanda; cf. further Hitt. middle 1sg. neyaḫḫa(ri), 2sg. neyatta(ti), 3sg. neya(ri), 3pl. neyanta(ri); Toch. deponent 1sg. A mäskamār, B mäskemar 'I am, ich befinde mich', 2sg. A mäskatār, B mäsketar, 3sg. A mäskatär, B mäsketär, 3pl. A mäskantär, B mäskentär;[9] Lith. 1sg. vedù < *-ō 'lead', 2sg. vedì < *-ai, 3sg. vẽda etc. Following Watkins (1969:213), we may display the terminations of this type, so far as known, as follows:

1sg.	$*-o\text{-}ʕ_2 o$	1pl.	——
2sg.	$*-o(-tʕ_2 o)$	2pl.	——
3sg.	$*-o$	3pl.	$*-o\text{-}r$ (?)

Replacing the unattested r-ending of the 3rd plural by its successor *-nto, and adding the particle *i of the hic et nunc, we obtain, after regular phonological changes,

1sg.	*hangō (-ōi ?)	1pl.	——
2sg.	*hangai[10]	2pl.	——
3sg.	*hangai	3pl.	*hanganþai

This is the paradigm which is 'activized', via the 3sg. *hangai, in the manner described above. Re-interpreted as a bare stem, *hangai engenders the new 3sg. *hangaiþ(i) and the corresponding 2sg. *hangais(i). These active forms in turn lead to the elimination of the remaining middle endings: the 1sg. and 3pl. appear

---

[9] This verb is representative of the Krause–Thomas 3rd present class (1960:200–201). The correspondence a(A) = e(B) points to IE *ē or *o as the predesinential vowel in this type, but only *o will explain the consistent non-palatalization of the root-final consonant.

[10] I see no need to assume a 1st person ending *-ōi for Germanic; on the putative 1sg. *haitōi 'I am called', see below. In the 2nd person it is simplest to reconstruct *-ai, an ending which recurs in Baltic; but this choice is of no particular importance. In principle we could just as easily operate with a form *hangasai, or even *hangaþai.

with the regular active endings as *hangō and *hanganþi respectively, while the 1pl. and 2pl., discarding older middle forms, become *hangamĕ(s) and *hangaiþ(e). Note that the 2pl. shows an assimilation in stem form to the 3sg., in conformity with the normal pattern elsewhere in Germanic (e.g. Go. 3sg. bairiþ = 2pl. bairiþ etc.) The result is a new paradigm, from which the historical forms of *hangana(n) 'hang' (intr.) are derived:

1sg.	*hangō	1pl.	*hangamĕ(s)
2sg.	*hangais(i)	2pl.	*hangaiþ(e)
3sg.	*hangaiþ(i)	3pl.	*hanganþ(i)

The importance of the verb 'hang' for the history of the 3rd class as a whole should now be quite clear. Comparative data indicate that the root *konk- inherited a thematic middle inflection from late PIE, while there is no evidence outside Germanic to support the assumption of an ē-extended stem *konk-ē-. Our derivation of *hangaiþ(i) and its associated paradigm from an old thematic middle is consistent with these findings, and at the same time provides a fairly natural explanation for some of the historically troublesome details of the 3rd weak class inflection. This suggests in turn that the hypothetical renewal *hangai → *hangaiþ(i), rather than being an isolated analogical replacement affecting only one lexical item, may in fact be part of a quite general Germanic process which has led to the creation of the characteristic, and hitherto unexplained, present type in *-ai-/*-a-.

It should be noted that no part of the development assumed for 'hang' lacks clear typological parallels elsewhere in IE. We have already seen examples in Indo-Iranian (śóbhe → śóbhate) and Hittite (neya → neyatta) of a formal renewal in these languages directly comparable to the Germanic replacement of *hangai by *hangaþai in the passive function. A third branch of the family, Celtic, shows evidence of the same replacement, and agrees further with Germanic in specializing the endings *-o and *-to in different values—the first as the normal thematic passive 3sg. (OIr. berar 'is carried'), the second as the deponent 3sg. (OIr. do·moinethar 'thinks'). The Germanic replacement of middle by active forms outside the 3rd singular (3pl. *hanganþai → *hanganþ(i) etc.) is quite unremarkable in itself, and ultimately comparable to the loss of deponent inflection in Late Middle Indo-Aryan and Vulgar Latin (cf. already in Old Latin morō for moror 'delay', nāscō for nāscor 'be born', pacīscō for pacīscor 'bargain', etc.) The special aspect of the development which may seem bizarre—the direct application of the ending 3sg. *-þ(i) to the already complete middle 3sg. *hangai—has in fact an almost exact parallel in the history of Vedic imperfects like áduhat 'milked', áśayat 'lay': these, as Wackernagel showed long ago, owe their final -t to a secondary amplification of older dentalless forms áduha, *áśaya. There is a second and even more striking example of the same process in Hittite, where, particularly in the later language, certain apparently thematic ḫi-conjugation verbs like tarna- 'leave' (1sg. tarnaḫḫi, 2sg. tarnatti, 3sg. tarnai) tend to develop an alternative mi-conjugation inflection. The starting point for the new paradigm is the dentalless 3sg. tarnai, which is directly suffixed by the productive 3sg. ending -zi < *-ti; the resulting mi-conjugation forms *tarnami (cf. išgāmi < išgaḫḫi 'I anoint'), 2sg. tarnaši, 3sg. tarnaizzi are quite reminiscent of

the reconstructed Gmc. *hangō, *hangais(i), *hangaiþ(i). A morphological re-
placement of this kind appears to be responsible for the creation of a consider-
able number of Hittite verbs in 3sg. -aizzi (for discussion cf. Watkins 1969:102,
Jasanoff 1968:69–92).[11]

It would be well to observe, before proceeding further, that Germanic pre-
serves a well-known example of a thematic middle which has been refashioned
to an active in a manner strikingly similar to that sketched above. The Old
Norse strong verb heita 'bid, call' has two presents: one the regular 1sg. heit,
2–3sg. heitr etc.; the other, in the special meaning 'be named, be called, heissen',
1sg. heiti, 2–3sg. heitir etc. The latter forms are clearly medial in origin and con-
nected in some way with Go. 1–3sg. haitada, OE 1–3sg. hātte, both regularly
reflecting a CGmc. passive *haitaþai. Neither heiti nor heitir can directly con-
tinue *haitaþai, however; the expected reflex of this form in Old Norse would
be *heitti. Accordingly, many scholars have seen in 1sg. heiti the persistence of
an IE middle desinence *-ai (< *-ə₂o-i), as in Skt. bháre, or (more plausibly)
*-ōi (< *-o-ə₂o-i)—as, formally at least, in Old Hittite tarnaḫḫe 'I leave' (1sg.
ḫi-conjugation) (for discussion, see Cowgill 1968:24–31). Such scholars implicitly
regard 3sg. heitir as an analogical form, created by adding the productive ending
-r to the inherited 1sg. heiti. The difficulty with this view lies in the fact that,
as already noted, elsewhere in Old Norse the 1sg. tends to be remade on the
model of the 3sg., not vice versa. From both a typological and a purely Norse
standpoint, an analogical progression heiti → heitir would be an anomaly, com-
pletely at variance with later re-formations like grefr 'digs' → gref and vakir
'wakes' → vaki. We shall do better to seek an explanation for heitir on its own
terms; and such an explanation is in fact available if we see in heitir the continu-
ation of a pre-form *haitaiþ(i), remade from an old dentalless 3sg. *haitai via
suffixation of the ending *-þ(i). In this way we account directly for the fact that
the present tense paradigm of heita is completely identical to that of a 3rd class
weak verb. The twofold development of *haitai to *haitaiþ(i) in North Ger-
manic, *haitaþai in East and West Germanic, would then reflect the real seman-
tic ambiguity inherent in the notion of 'being called', which is variously treated
as a middle or as a true passive in the individual IE languages.[12]

[11] However, it must be noted that, outside the 3sg., the correspondence between Hittite
and Germanic is not exact. Forms like 3sg. tarnaizzi were identified in Hittite with inherited
3rd singulars like ḫatraizzi 'he writes', where -aizzi apparently continues older *-āi̯eti;
thus *tarnāmi, tarnasi etc. are not simply thematic, but rather imitate ḫatrāmi, ḫatrāši
etc., where the connecting vowel a (usually written with the scriptio plena) reflects original
*-ā i̯o-.

[12] The Runic 1sg. forms haite and haiteka, found as early as the fifth century (haite,
Kragehul, early 6th century; h(a)ite, Jursberg, 500–550; ha(i)teka, Lindholm, early 6th
century; haitika, Seeland II, 450–550; cf. Krause–Jankuhn 1966) do not constitute a real
argument against the assumption of an original 3rd class 1sg. *haitō, even though the 1sg.
ending -u < *-ō is retained in strong verbs during this period. In view of the absence of an
attested 1sg. to a 3rd class weak verb in early Runic Norse, it is perfectly possible that the
inherited 1sg. in *-ō had already been remade to *-ē after the 3sg. in *-ēþ < *-aiþ. The model
for this development would have been supplied by the 2nd weak class (cf. Go. 1sg. salbo,
3sg. salboþ), where the rule 1sg. = 3sg. minus *-þ(i) is Common Germanic; given the second-
ary creation of OHG 1sg. habêm after the model of 1sg. salbôm, a like analogical origin for

3. In conformity with the preliminary conclusion reached at the end of §1, I am now prepared to make the following claim: THE THIRD WEAK CLASS ULTIMATELY CONTINUES AN EARLY GERMANIC TYPE IN WHICH A THEMATIC MIDDLE INFLECTION IN THE PRESENT CONTRASTED WITH FORMS BUILT ON A STEM IN *-ē- IN ONE OR MORE NON-PRESENT CATEGORIES. If this is correct, it means that at some time in its pre-history, Germanic came secondarily to pair its inherited (late IE aorist?) stems in *-ē- with presents of an etymologically entirely unrelated type.[13] This, of course, parallels completely the situation we have seen in Balto-Slavic, where the present of 'ē-verbs' is supplied by a congener of the IE perfect (Lith. pret. minė́jo, turė́jo; pres. mìni, tùri < *mₒne-i, *ture-i). But it should hardly be necessary to emphasize that I do not mean to imply that all, or indeed even most, attested 3rd class weak verbs were originally middle or deponent. Thus verbs meaning 'have' are not characteristically middle in the older IE languages; and there is little reason to believe that, in the oldest stages of Germanic, the ancestor of Go. haban, OHG habên etc. was an exception. By the same token OCS viditъ 'sees', Lith. pavýdi 'envies' cannot be old as perfects; the inherited perfect of the root *u̯eid- is still preserved with its original meaning in the archaic Slavic 1sg. vědě 'I know' < *u̯oidai. Both cases must be explained from the fact that the association of stative stems in *-ē- with middles in Germanic and perfects in Balto-Slavic has become productive. Starting from relatively small beginnings in both traditions, a new pattern has established itself and spread. In Balto-Slavic the infinitive-aorist stems *u̯īdē-, *turē- automatically entail perfect-presents *u̯īdei, *turei (> -výdi, tùri); in Germanic the corresponding stems imply middle (deponent) presents *witai, *habai (> Go. witaiþ, habaiþ).[14]

1sg. haitē would hardly be surprising. The tendency of the 1sg. to be remade on the model of the 3sg. is old in any event; cf. 1sg. gibu for gebu on the same bracteate as the form 1sg. haitika. In the case of heita in particular, the creation of the new 1sg. haitē would have been favored by the need to distinguish the active and middle senses of the inherited *haitō, and perhaps also by the ambiguity of the common form haiteka (either *haitō + *eka or *haitē + *eka).

The interpretation of heita offered here should lead us to expect a 3rd class weak pret. 1sg. *haitaidōm, standing in the same relation to the present *haitaiþ(i) as Go. habaida stands in relation to habaiþ. No such form can be traced in Gothic or Old Norse, where the preterit of this verb in the intransitive sense is simply supplied by the copula + past participle. Yet *haitaidōm, I would suggest, has survived; it is the direct antecedent of OE hātte, pl. hātton, the anomalous preterit to the 'passive' pres. 1-3sg. hātte discussed above. Taken together in this way, Old English and Old Norse attest the complete 3rd class paradigm.

[13] In fact, my only reason for assuming the former existence of stems in *-ē- in Germanic is that they provide a convenient way of accounting for word equations like Go. þahan = Lat. tacēre 'be silent' or Go. þulan 'endure' = Lith. tylė́ti. Forms like *þag-ē- and *þul-ē- have left no direct trace in any Germanic language.

[14] Indeed, it is perfectly possible that the productivity of the 3rd class may belong partly to a period later than the restructuring of the thematic middle as an active in 3sg. *-aiþ(i). In particular, note that if the phonological reflex of IE *-ēi̯eti is *-aiþ(i) in Germanic, then the membership of denominatives like OHG rotên in the 3rd class could simply reflect the merger in the 3sg. of a thematic type in *-ēi̯eti (cf. Lith. rudė́ja) with the renewed 3sg. middle in *-ai + *-þ(i). This would make it unnecessary to assume the former existence of a middle paradigm for denominatives.

It is a significant fact, as observed before, that 3rd class weak verbs in Germanic commonly correspond semantically to middles in other IE languages (cf. Meid 1971:7). This is hardly surprising, for the 'internal' value of the IE middle (see especially Benveniste 1966:168–75) is very close to the stative, generally intransitive, value of formations in *-ē-: one is reminded of the development of the Greek aorist passive in *-(th)ē- from such pairings as *phaínomai* 'I appear', *ephánēn* (aor.) 'I appeared'; *trépomai* 'I turn', *etrápēn* (aor.) 'I turned'. Among the Germanic 3rd class verbs which translate the middle or deponent presents of other languages, we may cite Go. *sifan* 'rejoice', Skt. *hárṣate*, Lat. *laetor*; OHG *hogên* 'ponder, meditate', Gk. *dianoéomai*, Lat. *mēditor*; Go. *þulan* 'suffer, endure', Skt. *kṣamyate*, Lat. *patior*; OHG *folgên* 'follow', Skt. *sácate*, Gk. *hépomai*, Lat. *sequor* etc. Further examples are not hard to find. Special interest, of course, attaches to those cases where a Germanic 3rd class weak verb can be related etymologically as well as semantically to middle formations elsewhere. We have already seen that Go. *hahan*, OHG *hangên* is such a verb; another may be the Germanic verb 'live' (OE *libban*, OS *libbian* etc.), which has a striking formal counterpart in the Tocharian 3rd class present *lipetär* 'is left, remains' < *lipotor*. Yet another lexical item is 3sg. *wunaiþ(i)* 'is content' (represented by OHG *wonêt*, Go. *unwunands* 'unsatisfied' etc.), which it is tempting to compare with Skt. *vánate* 'desires'; both verbs can be derived from a thematic middle prototype 3sg. *u̯n̥-ói*, contrasting with the inherited active 3sg. *u̯n̥-néu-ti*, Skt. *vanóti* 'overcomes', OE thematized *winneþ* < *winwiþ* 'struggles'. (On the semantics of the root *van-*, cf. Grassmann 1873, sub voce.)

Important historical information is furnished by an archaic group of 3rd class weak verbs which occur beside preterit-presents formed from the same roots. This type is well represented in Gothic: *munaiþ* 'thinks', *man* 'remembers'; -*kunnaiþ* (*ga-kunnaiþ* 'finds out', *uf-kunnaiþ* 'realizes' etc.), *kann* 'knows'; *witaiþ* 'watches', *wait* 'knows'; *gaþarbaiþ sik* 'abstains', *þarf* 'lacks, needs'. To these we may add *agaiþ* 'takes fright', *og* 'is afraid' on the strength of the adjective *unagands* 'unafraid', wrongly taken by Krause (1968:234) to represent a lost strong verb *agan* (3sg. *agiþ*). The former existence of several other such pairs can be concluded from the evidence of North and West Germanic forms: ON *dugir* 'helps, is useful' is the 3rd weak class counterpart to Go. impersonal *daug* 'is useful', and OHG *lirnêt* 'learns', though with a nasal suffix, otherwise stands in the same relation to Go. *lais* 'knows, understands'. Besides confirming several of the Gothic pairs, OHG preserves the 3rd class weak verbs *magêt* 'is strong', *sculêt* 'owes', alongside the preterit-presents *mag* 'can', *scal* 'ought'. The co-occurrence of preterit-presents and 3rd class weak verbs cannot be motivated synchronically in Germanic, and must be regarded as continuing an old pattern. Wagner (passim) has explained weak verbs like *kunnaiþ(i)*, *dugaiþ(i)* etc. as the product of a derivational process whereby stative stems in *-ē- were formed to underlying perfects in late IE. This view is probably correct as far as it goes: within Germanic at least two pairs—Go. *munaiþ, man* and *witaiþ, wait*—correspond term for term to ē-statives and perfects in other branches of the family. The root *men- attests both formations in Gk. *mémona* (= Lat. *meminī*) vs. *emánēn* (post-Hom.); Lith. *mìni* vs. *minéti*; OCS *mьnitъ* vs. *mьněti*; *u̯eid-,

beside its familiar perfect *$u̯óida$ 'I know' (Gk. $(w)oida$, Skt. $veda$ etc.), shows the stative stem *$u̯idē$- seen in Lat. $videō$, Lith. $pavydéti$, OCS $viděti$. But while the association of the perfect and $ē$-stative may indeed date back to a very early period, it seems even more important in an IE context to take note of the relationship of the perfect to a third and older verbal category—one to which it may ultimately be etymologically identical. This is the IE middle.

I have already alluded above (§2) to the common origin of the perfect and middle in IE. A mechanism whereby the two categories may originally have come to be differentiated is suggested by Kuryłowicz (1964:62–3); see further Watkins (1969:112–3) and, for a somewhat different view, Meid (1971:32–9). Although some of the details of the intervening stages lie outside our view and probably always will, the basic identity of the perfect and middle endings (in particular the pf. 3sg. in *-e and the middle 3sg. in *-o) is as firmly established a result as any IE morphology, and may be taken as a point of departure. The assumption of a common origin for both categories helps explain the fact that a significant number of verbs whose perfects are of IE date also preserve traces of an old middle inflection. Two striking examples are the roots *men- and *$u̯eid$- just discussed. In Vedic, where both are well-attested, the most archaic non-perfect forms are the aorists $ámata$ and $ávidat$. Of these, the former is a hapax root-aorist middle, superseded in the later Vedic language by the sigmatic $ámaṃsta$; the latter is a thematic aorist, quite possibly the original representative of its type. The nature of the relationship between these two aorist formations has now been elucidated by Watkins (1969:88 ff. et passim), who shows that both the athematic middle in -ta and the thematic active in -at presuppose an old middle 3sg. in *-$ᵉ/ₒ$. $Ámata$, like $ámṛta$ 'died', $ágata$ 'went' etc., ultimately continues a 3sg. *$moₙn$-$ᵉ/ₒ$ (*$moₒr$-$ᵉ/ₒ$, *$gᵘₒm$-$ᵉ/ₒ$), which has been remade to *$mṇ$-to (*$mṛ$-to, *$gᵘ̣ṃ$-to) via the now familiar replacement *-o → *-to. The thematic aorist $ávidat$ rests on a different renewal, the same as the one seen above in discussing the forms $áduhat$ < $áduha$ and $ásayat$ < *$ásaya$. We may set up, with Watkins, a pre-Indic *$ávida$, or in IE terms a 3sg. *$u̯id$-$ᵉ/ₒ$; this hypothetical form is in fact directly confirmed by the archaic dentalless 3sg. present $vidé$ 'is found'.

For IE it is legitimate to assume perfects *$(me)món$-e, *$u̯óid$-e and middles *$moₙn$-$ó$, *$u̯id$-$ó$ (with the usual generalization of o-timbre in the middle ending). The assignment of the latter two forms to the aorist category in Sanskrit seems to have been a relatively late and, it would seem, incomplete development: in the case of *$u̯id$-$ó$ it was probably the aoristic nuance of the root itself, in that of *$moₙn$-$ó$ the encroachment of a specially characterized present *$mṇ$-$i̯ᵉ/ₒ$- (Skt. $manyate$, cf. Gk. $maínomai$) which led to the specialization of $ávidat$, $ámata$ as aorists. In most of the remaining IE languages, the middles *$moₙn$-$ó$, *$u̯id$-$ó$, unlike the comparatively stable perfects *$(me)món$-e, *$u̯óid$-e, were eliminated or drastically restructured; and only in one branch of the family, Germanic, were they actually maintained as part of a coherent system in which the functional opposition of perfect and middle is preserved intact. This opposition, I suggest, is still perceptible in Go. man 'remembers' vs. $munaiþ$ 'thinks' and Go. $wait$ 'knows' vs. $witaiþ$ 'watches', where the 'middle' terms $munaiþ$ and $witaiþ$ represent the normal Gmc. reflexes of presents *$moₙn$-$ói$ and *$u̯id$-$ói$ (= Vedic

vidé), transformed by the process detailed in the preceding pages. The same contrast of state vs. what we may call 'internal activity' is typical of several other such pairs: 'know, understand' vs. 'learn', 'be able' vs. 'become able', 'lack' vs. 'abstain from' etc. Formally and functionally, 3rd class weak verbs of this type continue an IE category with remarkable fidelity.

The Vedic present *vidé* constitutes an important support for the assumption of a pre-Germanic 3sg. **witai* (> Go. *witaiþ* etc.) Beside the double equation *véda* : *vidé* = *wait* : *witaiþ*, I now propose to add a second, Vedic *duduhé* (2sg. active *dudóhitha*) : *duhé* = Go. *daug* : ON *dugir*. The etymological connections of the Indo-Iranian root **dhugh-* have long been disputed; most scholars have been hesitant on semantic grounds to accept an equation with Gmc. forms meaning 'be suitable, help' (see literature in Mayrhofer 1953). Yet the phonological side of the comparison is unexceptionable, and the semantic objections have been persuasively answered by Meid in his recent study of the Gmc. preterit. Meid's remarks (1971:24–5) on the IE root **dheugh-* deserve to be quoted at some length:

> *daug.* Das Verbum ... stammt ab von idg. **dheugh-*, dessen ursprüngliche Bedeutung im weitesten Sinne etwa mit 'Ertrag produzieren, nutzbar machen' (Akt.), 'Ertrag geben, Nutzen bringen' (Med.) angesetzt werden kann. Die Bedeutung impliziert den Begriff der MENGE, FÜLLE, auch die QUALITÄT. Im ALTINDISCHEN, das hier früheste idg. Viehzüchterkultur wiederspiegelt, ist *duh-* ein Begriff der Milchwirtschaft und erst von da aus bildlich erweitert: *duh-* bedeutet ... a) aktivisch '(heraus)melken' (auch bildl.), b) 'Milch geben', übertr. '(reichlich) strömen, spenden' u. dgl. Vgl. RV 3, 57, 1: '(Wer sich meine Dichtung ausersehen hat, hat eine) Milchkuh (gefunden), die viel an Labung milcht': *dhenúṃ ... yā́ duduhé bhū́ri dhāsér*.

The peculiar sense of the root *duh-* is thus secondary, the result of its early incorporation into the expanding Indo-Iranian lexicon of terms connected with cattle breeding. The ON 3sg. *dugir* 'helps, avails' (< **dugaiþ*) continues, in the guise of a 3rd class weak verb, the same isolated IE form **dhugh-ói* that survives almost unchanged in Skt. *duhé*. In both Germanic and Indo-Iranian, the retention of the corresponding pf. **(dhe-)dhóugh-e* (*daug*; **dudóha, duduhé*) is a characteristic archaism, entirely comparable to the survival of *véda* beside *vidé* in Sanskrit, and *wait* beside *witaiþ* in Gothic.

We can now appreciate the significance of the verbs just discussed for the 3rd weak class as a whole. Pairs like **ɥóide* vs. **ɥidó(i)*, **móne* vs. **mₒnó(i)*, **dhóughe* vs. **dhughó(i)* are inherited, and ultimately reflect the common origin of the perfect and middle in IE. In a central group of languages including Germanic, such pairs appear to have been augmented by a third series of forms built on a stem in **-ē-*: **ɥidē-*, **mₒnē-*, **dhughē-*. These forms were probably aorists; but while their original function in Germanic is impossible to determine exactly, we can be reasonably sure that they did NOT play a role in the formation of the presents **witaiþ(i)*, **munaiþ(i)*, **dugaiþ(i)*. It seems instead that, at some time in the pre-history of Germanic, the middle paradigms corresponding to 3sg. **ɥidó(i)*, **mₒnó(i)*, **dhughó(i)* were thematized owing to the identity of the thematic and athematic types in the 3sg.; from this point on, their history in the present system became indistinguishable from that of originally thematic middles like Go. intrans. *hahan* and (probably) ON *heita*. Thus these verbs sup-

ply an early set of examples in which a thematic middle present (3sg. *$ų id ói$ > *$witai(þi)$ etc.) came to stand beside a non-present form in *-$ē$- elsewhere in an extended paradigm. Once established in the language, this pattern was free to spread to verbs like 'have', where the stem in *-$ē$- is apparently old, but where middle inflection in the present can only be secondary.

The OHG 3rd class weak verb *lirnên*, *lernên* (= OE *liornian*, also with 3rd class forms) belongs etymologically with the Gothic preterit-present *lais* 'knows, understands'; the two verbs constitute a pair that cannot be separated from those discussed above. Formally, however, CGmc. *$liznaiþ(i)$ presents a problem: since IE deverbal *-$ē$- was applied directly to roots rather than present stems, the seeming occurrence of a present in *-$nē$- is difficult to account for in traditional views of the 3rd class. In terms of the theory just put forth, nothing is more natural than to assume that *$liznaiþ(i)$ continues an older *$liznai$, the form we would expect as the regular middle 3sg. to an IE nasal present (cf. Skt. *gṛṇé* 'is praised' < *$g^u ṛ$-$nₐ_2$-ói beside active *gṛṇā́ti* < *$g^u ṛ$-$neₐ_2$-ti). In the same fashion it is possible to derive Go. *kunnaiþ* (= OHG *kunnêt*) from a pre-Germanic prototype *$kunnai$ < *$gṇ$-$nₐ_3$-ói. This etymology has the advantage of accounting for the -nn- of the historical forms without appeal to an ad-hoc phonetic rule, and at the same time permits us to explain the difficult forms Go. *kann*, OHG *kann* etc. as a CGmc. back formation from *$kunnaiþ(i)$, after the model of other such pairs. *$Liznaiþ(i)$ and *$kunnaiþ(i)$ are not the only 3rd class weak verbs with a nasal suffix. A small but significant number of others, such as OHG *hlinên* (= OE *hlinian*) 'lean', OHG *mornên* 'grieve', and ON *tolla* 'stick to'—all intransitive—show fairly clearly that the type is old, and that a group of 3rd weak class nasal presents must be assumed for Common Germanic. Apart from their interest for the history of the 3rd class as a whole, these forms are important for a second reason: they may shed valuable light on the prehistory of another problematic category, the so-called 4th weak class of nasal inchoatives (type *fra-lusnan* 'become lost') in Gothic.

The Gothic nasal inchoative class is characterized by a 'strong' present (3sg. *fra-lusniþ*) beside a weak preterit formally indistinguishable from a preterit of the 2nd class (*fra-lusnoda*). While these verbs do not form a distinct conjugation in any other Germanic language, Old Norse has a large number of nasal presents like *vakna* 'wake up', *losna* 'become loose', and *sortna* 'become dark', which belong to the 2nd class and clearly continue the same original category as the Gothic type. On the strength of the Norse forms and the Gothic preterit, most scholars (e.g. Meid 1967:252–4; Krause, 246) have sought to derive the Germanic nasal inchoatives from the IE present type in *-$neₐ_2$-/-$nₐ$- (whence *-$nā$-/-$nₐ$-, Gmc. *-$nō$-/-na-) which underlies the Skt. 9th class (3sg. *kṝṇā́ti* 'buys', 3pl. *kṝṇanti*). The Germanic and Sanskrit formations are clearly related in some way. Two facts, however, stand in the way of equating them directly: first, the Gothic present, unlike the IE type, is thematic; second, the Germanic forms are inchoative and intransitive, while the IE type is characteristically transitive and even causative (cf. Skt. *rámate* 'rests', *ramṇā́ti* 'brings to rest').

Both the form and function of the Gothic 4th class can be explained on the assumption that the Germanic nasal inchoatives were originally inflected as

middles. We have just noted that Germanic preserves remnants of a group of nasal presents which belong to the third class. Several of these verbs, such as OE ʒinian (OHG ginên) 'yawn' beside ʒīnan,[15] or OHG mornên beside OE murnan, exhibit a tendency to appear with strong but synonymous by-forms. Within the context of the theory presented above, it is natural to interpret such doublets as the result of an original contrast, in at least some nasal presents, between active and middle forms; when Germanic subsequently lost the active vs. middle opposition, there resulted, in semantically favorable cases, synonymous or nearly synonymous pairs which could provide a model for other originally middle verbs to adopt active inflection.[16] It is probable that the Gothic verbs in -nan, 3sg. -niþ represent the result of just such a transfer. At the outset of the Germanic development we may assume three present types: an athematic active in 3sg. $*$-nōþ(i) < IE $*$-neₐ₂-ti, e.g. $*$waknōþ(i) 'wakes' (tr.); a thematic active in 3sg. $*$-niþ(i), probably thematized from the preceding type, e.g. $*$wakniþ(i) 'id.'; and a thematic middle in 3sg. $*$-nai < IE $*$-nₐ₂-oi, e.g. $*$waknai 'wakes up' (intr.) A-priori, we might expect that this state of affairs would be reflected in the attested stages of Germanic by three formations, two transitive and one intransitive. In fact, however, the existence of isofunctional pairs like OE ʒinian vs. ʒīnan, OHG mornên vs. OE murnan, together with the expansion of the iterative-causative type in $*$-ja- < IE $*$-eᵢᵉ/ₒ- ($*$wakiþ(i) > Go. wakjiþ 'wakes', tr.) led to a breakdown in the inherited system of oppositions. The nasal suffix, replaced in its transitive functions by the formally unrelated causative suffix, was re-interpreted as a mark of intransitivity, thereby rendering the 3rd class (originally middle) inflection of intransitive-inchoatives entirely redundant. The 3rd class presents were thus free to be replaced by the inherited active types in 3sg. $*$-nōþ(i) and 3sg. $*$-niþ(i), Old Norse in general preferring the former alternative and Gothic the latter. In the more or less confused situation of the attested languages, the nasal presents continue three distinct types in form— but only one, the middle, in function.[17]

4. In the preceding pages I have tried to show that an archaic core of 3rd class weak verbs can most easily be derived, at least in the present system, from a Common Germanic transformation of the IE middle. Before concluding this study, I will briefly survey, language by language, the major formal innovations which have occurred between the Common Germanic period and the time of our written records. The point of departure, it will be recalled, is the type presented in §2, with endings 1sg. -ō, 2sg. -ais(i), 3sg. -aiþ(i), 1pl. -amĕ(s), 2pl. -aiþ(e), 3pl. -anþ(i).

---

[15] The long ī here (and in the rhyming strong verbs cīnan 'gape', dwīnan 'waste away', scīnan 'shine') is surely secondary; perhaps it arose by back formation from the earlier forms of the preterits gān, cān, dwān, scān, either before or after these had acquired their nasal from the present.

[16] Pairs of this kind, of course, are not confined to the nasal presents. We may assume a transfer of the same kind in Go. bauan 'live, dwell', strong pres. 3sg. bauiþ, but 3rd class weak pret. bauaida. The weak pres. $*$bauaiþ is still normal in East Norse and has left traces elsewhere in Germanic (see Flasdieck, 89–93, for an inventory of forms).

[17] On the semantic overlap of the IE middle with the Gothic 4th class, see now Meid (1971:7).

GOTHIC: The Gothic 3rd class paradigm preserves the Common Germanic situation essentially unchanged. The only analogical form in the present is the 2sg. impv. *habai* (for phonologically regular **haba*), probably created to 3sg. *habaiþ* on the model of the 2nd class impv. *salbo* beside 3sg. *salboþ*. The optative 2sg. *habais*, 3sg. *habai* etc. is indistinguishable from that of any other thematic present, and continues the Common Germanic type intact; note that, since I have assumed the exclusion of **-ē-* from the present system, there is no need to envisage an athematic optative **habē-ī-s*, **habē-ī* etc. An archaic feature seems to be preserved in the anomalous pret. 3sg. *uf-kunþa* to (weak) *uf-kunnan* 'recognize'; cf. OS *habda*, *sagda* etc., likewise formed without a connecting vowel. The regular type *habaida*, although perhaps already Common Germanic, rests on an analogy with the other weak classes: *habaiþ* : *habaida* = *salboþ* : *salboda* = **nasiþ* (replaced by *nasjiþ*) : *nasida*.

OLD NORSE: The treatment of the 3rd weak class in North Germanic is quite conservative: in verbs of the normal type only the 1sg. in *-i* is not an inherited form; and this, as already seen, reflects a very general Norse repatterning. The three verbs *hafa*, *segja*, and *þegja* are conjugated irregularly. *Hafa* shows umlaut in the singular, but not in the plural: 1sg. *hef*, *hefi*, 2–3sg. *hefr*, *hefir*, 1pl. *hǫfum*, 2pl. *hafið*, 3pl. *hafa*. In the longer sg. forms *hefi*, *hefir*, it is simplest to see the result of a contamination of the short forms *hef*, *hefr* with the regular 3rd class forms **hafi*, **hafir*. (These latter have also played a role in the formation of Old Swedish *havęr* < **hafr*; cf. Flasdieck, 117–22.) The remaining present forms of *hafa*, in particular *hef*, *hefr* and the entire plural, are indistinguishable from those of a normal strong verb of the 6th class. From a Norse point of view, it is simplest to assume the original presence of two paradigms, one originally middle (**habō*, **habais*, **habaiþ* etc.), the other originally active (**habō*, **habis*, **habiþ* etc.); the relation between the two would be entirely comparable to that between pre-Norse **būaiþ* and **būiþ* 'lives' or pre-English **ginaiþ* and **giniþ* 'yawns'. Note that there is no unambiguous Norse evidence for a stem **habja-*. In North Germanic, stems in **-ja-* play a role in the 3rd weak class only insofar as they are needed to account for the forms of *segja* and its rhyming companion *þegja*, which have the same forms as *hafa* in the singular but resemble verbs of the 1st weak class in the plural (1pl. *segjum*, 2pl. *segið*, 3pl. *segja*). The absence of gemination in the plural and the long forms *segi*, *segir* in the singular point to a mixture of two inherited paradigms—**sagō*, **sagais*, **sagaiþ* etc. (3rd class), and **sagjō* **sagis*, **sagiþ* etc. (1st class). The latter forms will be discussed below in connection with the situation in Old English and Old Saxon.

OLD HIGH GERMAN has drastically simplified the inherited 3rd class paradigm by generalizing the stem **habai-* (> OHG *habê-*) and utilizing it to create a new athematic paradigm modeled on that of *salbôn* (cf. 1sg. *habêm*, opt. *habêe* etc.) The isolated 1sg. forms *habu*, *sagu* (Tatian) are the only relics of the old system in the present; in the preterit, *hapta* (cf. OS *habda*) is archaic beside regularized *habêta* and secondary *hebita*. The difficult 2sg. and 3sg. forms *hebis hebit*, *segis segit*, *libis libit* are probably to be taken at face value and compared with ON *hefr*, *segr*. This would imply that OHG, like Old Norse, inherited alternate paradigms **habō*, **habis*, **habiþ* etc. and **sagjō*, **sagis*, **sagiþ* etc.

(*libjō, *libis, *libiþ etc.) beside the normal 3rd class presents *habō, *habais, *habaiþ etc. Ad hoc as it may appear, this interpretation of the OHG facts seems far preferable to assuming that hebis, hebit etc. somehow reflect an older paradigm *habjō, *habais, *habaiþ etc. (as maintained, e.g., by Flasdieck, 157–8) in which the 1sg. *habjō (> *hebbu) gave rise to analogical *habis, *habiþ (> hebis, hebit), then disappeared without a trace. In any case, note that neither habên, sagên, lebên nor any other OHG verb provides direct evidence for an original alternation between stems in *-ja- and *-ai- within a single paradigm. Pace Flasdieck, a form without a-umlaut like Upper German lirnên (for phonologically regular lernên) can as easily be attributed to a lost 3sg. lizniþ (cf. Go. fra-lusniþ) as to a questionable 1sg. *lizn(i)jō.

OLD ENGLISH AND OLD SAXON: Very little remains of the 3rd class as an autonomous category in Northern West Germanic. We have already seen how Old English has created a new type in 1sg. *-aijō (1sg. lifȝe < *libaijō beside libbe), which itself loses ground to the expanding 2nd class. The 2nd class has expanded enormously at the expense of the 3rd in Old Saxon also; as in Old English, only the three verbs 'have', 'say', 'live' retain any features of morphological interest. The characteristic innovation of both languages is the replacement of simple thematic forms like 1sg. *sagō, pl. *saganþ etc. by corresponding forms in *-ja-: OE secge secgaþ; OS seggiu, seggiad < *sagjō, *sagjanþ. In my opinion, these ja-forms belong properly not to the 3rd class, but to the alternate paradigms *sagjō, -is, -iþ etc., and *libjō, -is, -iþ etc., attested indirectly in Old Norse (*sagjō only) and in OHG. (The pattern of these two verbs seems to have been extended to produce *habjō, -is, -iþ etc. in Northern West Germanic, as against pre-Norse *habō, -is, -iþ etc.) The co-occurrence of 1st and 3rd class presents in the same verb is not confined to the handful of verbs under discussion, but recurs in such pairs as Go. hugjan 'ponder' vs. OHG *hogên (pret. hogêta; cf. hycgan and hoȝian in Old English), ON fylgja 'follow' vs. OHG folgên, Go. hatjan 'hate' (cf. OE hettend 'enemy') vs. hatan, OHG hazzên. Here the 1st class present probably reflects the IE type in *-i̯e/o- which can be seen in Gk. maínomai, Skt. púṣyati 'prospers' etc. Within the present framework, the simplest way to account for the twofold inflection of *hug-, *fulg-, and *hat- is to assume that they originally opposed a non-present stem in *-ē- to an inherited present with the suffix *-ja-; in keeping with the productive Germanic pattern, the 'aorists' *hugē, *fulgē, *hatē would then have given rise to new and regular 3rd class presents *hugaiþ(i), *fulgaiþ(i), *hataiþ(i). Some similar set of circumstances may well be responsible for the creation of the doublets *libjō, *libō, and later, *habjō, *habō; in the case of *sagjō, *sagō, the forms in *-ja- can most plausibly be taken from an iterative *sokⁱ̯eᵢō.[18] In each case the link connecting the two presents must have been the non-present stem in *-ē-.

The subsequent fate of the three verbs 'have', 'say', and 'live' has been dictated in large part by the fact that, in the inherited 3rd class paradigm, the two stems in *-ai- and *-a- (West Germanic *-ē- and *-a-) are, from a descriptive point of view, suppletive—i.e., they cannot be predicted from each other on the basis

---

[18] This suggestion is due to Patrick Hollifield.

of any other morphophonemic alternation in Germanic. Given the gradual reduction of the 3rd class to a mere three lexical items, and the existence of competing 1st class paradigms for each of these, it is not hard to see why forms in *-ja- have tended to become more common. In the 1sg. (and, mutatis mutandis, the 3pl., infinitive etc.) neither *sagō nor *sagjō is 'regular' with respect to 3sg. *sagaiþ. *Sagjō, however, has at least the advantage of being normal in a productive class of weak verbs; it has spread at the expense of *sagō, replacing this form in Old Saxon and the 'Saxon' dialects of Old English (but cf. Northumbrian sago). By the same token, the 2sg. and 3sg. may be replaced without reference to the form of the 1sg.: Old Saxon (*Heliand* C) has *habis habit, sagis sagit*—forms which cannot be separated from OHG *hebis hebit, segis segit*, and where the absence of umlaut is clearly the result of contamination with the proper 3rd class forms *habes -as, habed -ad* (*Heliand* M). In Old English the 2sg. and 3sg. forms *hafas(t) hafaþ, sagas(t) sagaþ, leofas(t) leofaþ* show a different substitution, reflecting the now familiar tendency of the 2nd class to encroach upon the third; one may compare further OS *libos, libot* for *libes -as, *libed -ad*. These 2nd class forms, like those in *-ja-, are comparatively late intruders in the 3rd class paradigm. The manner in which 1st and 2nd class forms have penetrated into the normal inflection of the verbs 'have', 'say', and 'live' is instructive: even when inherited 3rd class forms are eliminated, the new forms which replace them preserve intact the archaic opposition of two synchronically unrelated stems, one characteristic of the 2sg. and 3sg., the other of the remaining members of the paradigm.

REFERENCES

BENNETT, WILLIAM H. 1962. The parent suffix in Germanic weak verbs of class III. Lg. 38.135–41.
BENVENISTE, ÉMILE. 1966. Actif et moyen dans le verbe. Problèmes de linguistique générale, 168–75. Paris.
CHANTRAINE, PIERRE. 1925. Les verbes grecs en *thō*. Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Joseph Vendryes par ses amis et ses élèves, 93–108. Paris.
COWGILL, WARREN. 1959. The inflection of the Germanic ō-presents. Lg. 35.1–15.
——. 1968. The first person singular medio-passive in Indo-Iranian. Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian, and Indo-European studies presented to F. B. J. Kuiper, ed. by J. C. Heesterman et al., 24–31. The Hague.
FLASDIECK, HERMANN. 1935. Untersuchungen über die germanischen schwachen Verben III. Klasse. Anglia 59.1–192.
GRASSMAN, HERMANN. 1873. Wörterbuch zum Rigveda. Leipzig.
JASANOFF, JAY. 1968. Studies in the historical morphology of the Hittite verb. Harvard dissertation.
KRAHE, HANS. 1961. Altgermanische Kleinigkeiten. IF 66.35–43.
KRAUSE, WOLFGANG. 1968. Handbuch des Gotischen. Munich.
——, and HERBERT JANKUHN. 1966. Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark. Göttingen.
——, and WERNER THOMAS. 1960. Tocharisches Elementarbuch I. Heidelberg.
KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY. 1956. L'apophonie en indo-européen. Wrocław.
——. 1960. Esquisses linguistiques. Wrocław.
——. 1964. The inflectional categories of Indo-European. Heidelberg.
MAYRHOFER, MANFRED. 1953. Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Heidelberg.

MEID, WOLFGANG. 1967. Germanische Sprachwissenschaft, III: Wortbildungslehre. Berlin.
——. 1971. Das germanische Präteritum. Innsbruck.
NOREEN, ADOLF. 1923. Altnordische Grammatik, II. Halle.
POLOMÉ, EDGAR. 1967. On the origin of the Germanic class III of weak verbs. Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie: Julius Pokorny zum 80. Geburtstag, ed. by Wolfgang Meid, 83–92. Innsbruck.
PRÉVOT, ANDRÉ. 1935. L'aoriste grec en -thēn. Paris.
SCHMID, WOLFGANG P. 1963. Studien zum baltischen und slavischen Verbum. Wiesbaden.
WAGNER, HEINRICH. 1950. Zur Herkunft der ē-Verba in den indo-germanischen Sprachen. Zürich.
WATKINS, CALVERT. 1969. Indogermanische Grammatik, III.1: Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion. Heidelberg.
——. 1972. The Indo-European denominative statives in *-ē-. To appear in TPS.

[Received 3 November 1972.]