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INTRODUCTION.

In preparing Part I. of this work it has been my endeavor to give as exhaustively as possible all instances of the working of Verner's Law in Gothic. In Sections 1-5 comparison is made with forms in the several Germanic dialects; in Section 6, however, where the accent variation in suffixes is treated, this is not done, since it is the Gothic that is primarily considered.

In Part II. I make no attempt to give every reduplicating verb. My object is to bring forward as much proof as possible to show that the reduplicating verbs are ablauting, and to indicate how this ablaut arose.

The following authorities have been consulted and have been found more or less helpful:

G. H. Balg, A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language. 1887-89.
———, Gotische Grammatik, 3te Aufl. Halle, 1887.
O. Bremer, Die lautgesetzliche Entwicklung des idg. ē in den ältesten germanischen Sprachen. PBB, XI., 1 ff.
Lorenz Diefenbach, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gothischen Sprachen. Frankfurt, 1851.
S. Feist, Grundriss der gotischen Etymologie. Strassburg, 1888.
Gallée, Gutiska II. De adiectiva in het gotisch en hunne suffixen Utrecht, 1882.
———, Altsächsische Grammatik. Halle, 1891.
M. Heyne, Ulfilsa, 8te Aufl. Paderborn, 1885.
J. Hoffory, Die reduplicirten Praeterita im Altnordischen. KZ, XXVII., 593 ff.
M. H. Jellinek, Germanisch ē. PBB, XV., 297 ff.
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Kluge, Beiträge zur Geschichte der germanischen Conjugation. Quellen und Forschungen, XXXII. Strassburg, 1879.
———, Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialecte. Halle, 1886.
———, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, 5te verbesserte Aufl. Strassburg, 1889.
H. Lichtenberger, De verbis quae in vetustissima Germanorum lingua reduplicatum praeteritum exhibeámt. Nancy, 1891.
Ljungstedt, Anmärkningar till det starka preteritum i germaniska språk. Upsala, 1887.
Leo Meyer, Die gothische Sprache. Berlin, 1869.
Adolf Moller, Die reduplicirenden Verba im Deutschen als abgeleitete. Potsdam, 1866.
A. Noreen, Altnordische Grammatik, 2te Aufl. Halle, 1892.
———, Abriss der urgermanischen Lautlehre. Strassburg, 1894.
H. Osthoff, Zum grammatischen Wechsel der velaren K-reihe. PBB, VIII., 256 ff.
———, Ueber Aoristpraesens und Imperfectpraesens. PBB, VIII., 287 ff.
———, Zur Reduplicationslehre. PBB, VIII., 540 ff.
———, Zur Geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen. Strassburg, 1884.
H. Paul, Zum Vernerschen Gesetz. PBB, VI., 538 ff.
Per Persson, Studien zur Lehre der Wurzelerweiterung und Wurzelvariation. Upsala, 1891.
Ernst Schulze, Gotisches Glossar. Magdeburg, 1847.
E. Sievers, Die reduplicirten Praeterita. PBB, I., 504 ff.
———, Angelsächsische Grammatik, 2te Aufl. Halle, 1886.
———, Zum germanischen ë². PBB, XVIII., 409 ff.
Verner, Eine Ausnahme der ersten Lautverschiebung. KZ, XXIII., 97 ff.

Other works have also been consulted, and reference is made to them where they aid in establishing any point taken in the dissertation.

My thanks are also due to Assistant Professor H. Schmidt-Wartenberg and Associate Professor Carl D. Buck for helpful suggestions and assistance in procuring material.
I. VERNER’S LAW IN GOTHIC.

Of all the Germanic dialects Gothic is the most uniform and the most subject to leveling. Comparatively few by-forms occur. This is natural, since it represents the speech of one community, practically of one man. It is quite probable that the Gothic known to us has yielded more to *systemzwang* than the language as spoken. Certainly it reached a stage of development that the other dialects did not attain till much later. Hence it is that there are few instances of "grammatical change," and so many forms that have been largely influenced by analogy. For example, instead of *gumans* the historically correct form would have been *kumans*, though this in turn goes back to a pre-Germanic *guumonoś*. And it is not improbable that *giman* may also be of secondary formation for an original *kuman*, which is seen in O.S., O.E. *cuman*, O.N. *koma*. Cf. Sievers, PBB, VIII, 80 ff. Such forms as O.H.G. *gidungan* from *dwingan*, with the disappearance of *w* before *u*, or *lårūn* from *lesan*, are never met with in Gothic. The stage of Gothic at the time of Ulfilas was reached later by O.H.G. when it wrote *gidwungan* and *läsun*. Consequently Gothic often has the appearance of preserving older formations. This is not the case, however, wherever analogy has been a disturbing element.

We must therefore expect to find in the workings of Verner’s Law a generalization in favor of either the surd or the sonant spirant. What we actually find is more frequently the former.

According to Verner’s Law there should be in Gothic an interchange, in allied forms, of *f–b, h–g, h–w, p–d, s–z*. Since the interchange of *h–g* brings in some points not raised by the interchange in the other cases, this will be treated by itself.

1. First then as to the development of nasal + guttural (whether velar or palatal) as affected by Verner’s Law, or not affected.

The verb *peihan*, with which cf. Lith. *tenkū*, may be put in pre-Germanic form as follows:


This would have yielded in Gothic if undisturbed by analogy,—

The form *heiha, however, has taken the verb out of the third ablaut-series and made of it a verb of the first series. So we have:

*heiha, *haih, haihum, haihans.

In O.H.G. dihan went through the same process, but retained the "grammatical change," giving:

dihan, déh, digum, gidigan.

As dwingan had originally the perf. part. gidungan, that may have helped to retire from use the *gidungan that belonged to dihan. In O.S. thiian has the perf. part. githigan, and also the old irregular form githungan.

In O.E. we may suppose the following development:

*plhan, *plh, plgon, plg

We have here forms belonging to three ablaut-series. These various forms, together with those in O.H.G. and in O.S. show that leveling had not taken place in Germanic.

With this verb is connected the noun *peih < *peihis (v. Brugmann, Grundr. II, p. 394) and German ding, Eng. thing, etc., and further Av. tanc-ista-, "most sturdy," tac-, "to rush," Skt. tak-ati, "flows," Lith. tek-ū, "flow," "run."

To this root belongs a numerous family: O.E. ge·pingan, O.S. thingon, O.H.G. dingōn, M.H.G. dingen, N.H.G. dingen, bedingen, etc.

The Goth. *preiha runs exactly parallel with *heiha. In the other dialects the development is different. The reason for this will be discussed later.

In fāhan the h has spread to all the forms. O.H.G. has fāhan, fang, fangum, gifangan. This more nearly represents the original state of affairs than the Gothic.

The sing. pret. was more readily assimilated to the plural, because the vowel was the same. O.S. and O.E. have forms corresponding to those of O.H.G. O.N. has occasionally in the pres. subj. fæge for the regular fāe. This presupposes an inf. fanga, which is found in O. Sw.

An unnasalized form of this root occurs in Goth. fagrs, and in O.H.G. fuogen, O.E. gefēgan, and in M.H.G. vēgen.

The verb hāhan is parallel in its development with fāhan, except that in O. N. the inf. is always hanga.

The noun *hūhrus < *xūhruz shows a difference in accent, as
compared with O.H.G., O.S. hungar, O.E. hungor, O.N. hungr < * xuŋgrus. The weak verb huggrjan, as it had the accent on the suffix, is regular in its development.

In the Goth. juggs and jũhiza we have an instructive illustration, as it shows that the comparative had the accent on the root-syllable, as Verner pointed out. In O.N. occurs the same interchange: positive ungr, com. ōre and the later yngre, superl. yngstr and once órstr. The last form proves nothing for the superlative, since the r shows that it was modeled after the comparative like German mehrst. In O.H.G. are jungir, jügirn, besides the usual jungiro. Kluge in Paul's Grundr., I, 400, derives jugiro, which he writes with a short u, from *juwīsa by Bugge's Law, comparing it with Skt. ydvīyāns. But Bugge's Law requires the accent *juwīsa to give jugiro, and that is authorized neither by the Skt. accent nor by the z of the comparative in Germanic. It is better therefore to explain it with Paul, in PBB, VI, 544, as a partial assimilation from an original *jühzō, so that it would be in line with the Goth. jũhiza and O.N. ōre.

The development of I.E. *penqe, "five," is peculiar. It probably represents an assimilation to *penpe, which regularly gave the Goth. fimf. This assimilation doubtless took place before the Germanic sound-shifting, at any rate before the disappearance of the nasal before χ, otherwise the Germanic form would have been *fίχι(ue) > Goth. *fēih. In like manner *paqtb- or *penqtb- would give Gothic *fũhta or *feih'ta. In two words so closely allied the development would certainly be parallel. This, however, does not shut out the possibility of dialectical variation. So Kauffmann, PBB, XII, 512, basing his conclusion on the *paqtb- set up by von Fierlinger, KZ, 27, p. 194, supposes a survival of the guttural in the Swabian fuchzen, 15, and fuchzk, 50, and in fūft, etc. This view is supported by Brugmann, Grundr., II, 476.

Now it is certain that the same dialect would not retain the guttural in the ordinal and change it to a labial in the cardinal. If these forms given by Kauffmann could be historically traced to O.H.G. there would be much better ground for supposing that the ch comes from the I.E. q. There seems to be a change here for which at present no reason can be given, though it seems similar to the change in Low German of ṣt>cht. And it is hardly necessary to hold to the presence of ch in order to explain the disappearance of n, when we consider how frequently a nasal disappears before a spirant throughout the Upper German. Staub, in Frommann, die d. Ma., VII, 31, lays down the
rule for the Swiss-Alemannic that \( n \) disappears before \( f, s, \) and \( ch, \) with compensative lengthening of the preceding vowel, e. g. \( haf<hanf, \)

\( g\dot{a}s<g\dot{a}ns, \) \( b\dot{e}c\dot{c}h<b\dot{a}nke. \)

A similar loss, either with or without vowel-lengthening, has been noted in other dialects. Cf. Scheiner, Die Mediascher Ma., PBB, XII, 140; Stickelberger, Con. der Ma. von Schaffhausen, PBB, XIV, 402; Michel, Ma. von Seifhennersdorf, PBB, XV, 51; Kisch, Bistritzer Ma., PBB, XVII, 385; Schild, Bienzer Ma., PBB, XVIII, 378 ff; Lumtzer, Leibitzer Ma., PBB, XX, 310.

The loss of the nasal, therefore, need cause us no difficulty. But how is the \( u \) to be explained? It is possible that it goes back to the sonant nasal in \( *pqto>*pumpto>*fumfa. \) But then we must explain the \( u \) in O.H.G \( funf \) by analogy from the ordinal, since here it would hardly be original. However the form \( finf \) can be traced back earlier than \( funf; \) and this is not the only word in which we find \( u \) where we should expect an \( i. \) Cf. O.H.G. \( munza \) and \( minza<Lat. \) mentha, and further the double forms \( geb"urge, geb"irse; \) \( h"uls: \) hilfe; \( g"ultig: \) g"ultig; \( m"uschen: \) mischen; \( zw"olf: \) M.H.G. \( zw"elf, \) etc. Cf. Kehrein, Gram. § 59, 91, Grimm, Gram. I, 457. The rounding of the vowel generally occurs in the neighborhood of liquids or nasals.

There are two words, however, that beyond question preserve the guttural of \( *pepqe, \) provided of course they are connected with it. Phonologically there is no difficulty. These words are “finger” and “fist.” Cf. Brugm. Grd. II, 288 f. Goth. \( f'ggrs.<*p\acute{e}q-ro-s; \) O.H.G. \( f\dot{u}st, \) O.E. \( f\acute{u}st<*p\acute{e}q-st-s, \) “a pentad”

Other words in which a nasal has been lost before a guttural are: \( \ddot{p}\ddot{a}ho, \) O.H.G. \( \ddot{d}\dddot{a}ha, \) O.N. \( \ddot{b}a, \) O.E. \( \ddot{b}\ddot{o}, \) N.H.G. \( ton; \) \( \ddot{p}\ddot{e}lu, \) “thunder”; \( uw\ddot{\acute{a}}hs, \) O.S. \( w\acute{a}h, \) O.E. \( w\ddot{o}h, \) O.N. \( vangr. \) Cf. Noreen, Urg. Lautlehre, p. 222.

The question remains unsettled, whether the nasalized vowel that developed from the vowel \( + \) the nasal preceding the guttural continued into the separate dialect life, or became a pure long vowel in general Germanic time. It is Sievers’ opinion, Gr. § 45, 5, that the nasalized vowel did continue, and his reason for thinking so is that Germanic \( \ddot{a}h<an\ddot{h} \) becomes O.E. \( \ddot{o}h, \) just as Germ. \( a\ddot{n}p \) and \( an\ddot{s} \) become O.E. \( \ddot{o}p \) and \( \ddot{o}s. \) This would be an unavoidable conclusion, were it not for the fact that there is no other Germanic \( \ddot{a}. \) Consequently we do not know how it might have developed in O.E. It may be that just as I.E. \( \ddot{a} \) became \( \ddot{o} \) in Germ., so Germ. \( \ddot{a} \) may have become \( \ddot{o} \) in O.E. The weight of the evidence, however, is in favor of Sievers’ view. But be
that as it may, the nasal tone was probably more persistent in the combination \textit{inh} than in the other combinations.

This may help to explain why we find O.H.G. \textit{dihan}, but also \textit{drigan}, \textit{dwingan}, \textit{slingan}. That is, the nasalized \textit{\textipa{t}u} would more readily yield to the leveling process in restoring \textit{g} from the forms in which it was regular, than would a long pure \textit{t}.

The development of Goth. \textit{finjan} as compared with the same verb in other dialects is instructive. Gothic has \textit{p} throughout, as we should expect. O.H.G. and O.N. in their older forms have the regular "grammatical change." O.S. has inf. \textit{fihan} and \textit{findan}. O.E. has \textit{findan, fond}, \textit{funden}. Here, then, \textit{findan, fond} have displaced \textit{*fipan, *fip\textipa{p}}, which did not become well established to produce a verb of the first ablaut-series, but yielded to the analogy of \textit{funden, funden}.

But to return to \textit{drigan, dwingan}, and \textit{slingan}. There is another element that has brought about a different treatment of these verbs than that of \textit{dihan}. If we refer the \textit{g} to an I.E. \textit{gh}, as Noreen does in his Urg. Lautlehre, p. 146, in the case of \textit{slingan}, then the difficulty is removed at a stroke. However, we will take his derivation given ibid., p. 184, where, as given by others, he connects it with Lith. \textit{slenk\~{u}}, and with O.N. \textit{sl\~{o}}<\textit{*slan\~{h}o}, O.H.G. \textit{slango}, etc. O.H.G. \textit{dwingan}, O.S. \textit{thwingan}, O.N. \textit{\textipa{f}uinga}, and O.H.G. \textit{d\~{u}hen}, O.E. \textit{\textipa{f}yn} leave no doubt as to their origin. The same is true of \textit{drigan} compared with Goth. \textit{preihan}. Now O.N. furnishes evidence that \textit{slingan} and \textit{drigan} were aorist-presents, or at least that that formation existed by the side of the other. Besides the O.N. sing. pres. \textit{pryng\textipa{r}} occurs \textit{preng\textipa{r}}<\textit{*prang\textipa{w}ir}<\textit{*tr\~{o}q-\textipa{\textipa{f}i}}. The \textit{R} in this instance does not prevent our assuming the accent indicated, since leveling has brought in the same ending for all verbs, regardless of the original accent. Upon the form \textit{preng\textipa{r}} an infinitive \textit{prang\textipa{u}}a was made, and also an inf. \textit{slongua} from a presupposed \textit{*slong\textipa{r}}, and these then are often conjugated weak. For \textit{slongua} O. Sw. has \textit{slunga}, a plain aorist-present formation.

So then the \textit{ng} in these verbs in all the dialects but Gothic is due to a suffix-accentuation, and the vowel that properly belongs to an imperfect-present was introduced from the regular type. The Goth. \textit{preihan} may be due to a by-form with root-accent, or may have generalized the \textit{h} from the sing. perf. O.H.G. \textit{dwingan}, O.S. \textit{thwingan}, etc., may also have been aorist-presents that have lost the semblance of that formation, or they may have been remodeled after the part. and plur. perf. The probabilities, however, in these three verbs \textit{drigan}, \textit{dwingan}, \textit{slingan}, are that there was suffix-accentuation. Otherwise
it would be hard to see why O.H.G. *dīhan, O.S. *thīhan, O.E. *thōn
should not have developed in the same way. To *dvingan we have
the weak verb *dūhen, O.E. *pūn < *pūnhan. This is a strange develop-
ment. We should expect rather O.H.G. *dungen, O.E. *pungan.
The ĕ here seems to be due to the sing. perf. Paul, PBB, VII. 147;
Sievers, PBB, IX., 563. Or *dūhen, *pūn, may be a denominative formed
on the root *pūnχ-, *pūh after Verner’s Law ceased to be operative.
It would then remain for us to explain how we could have root-accent
with a low-grade ablaut. But not a few such instances occur. Cf.
Osthoff, MU, IV, 73 ff.

2. Verner’s Law in the Ablauting Verbs. As we find these verbs in
Gothic, they are much influenced by leveling. Without leveling there
would be “grammatical change” as follows: (1) In imperfect-presents
the surd spirant would occur in the pres. and in the sing. perf., the
sonant spirant in the plur. perf. and in the perf. part. (2) In aorist-
presents the surd spirant would occur in the sing. perf., the sonant
spirant in the plur. perf. and in the perf. part., and in the present.
Furthermore, in the endings affected by Verner’s Law, those of the
imperfect-presents would show the sonant spirant, the others the surd
spirant.

The actual condition in Gothic is quite different. The personal
endings are those naturally developing in imperfect-presents. In all
imperfect-presents the surd spirant has been generalized. In aorist-
presents the sonant spirant has been generalized, though this cannot
be known in all cases with certainty. The development of the two
classes may be illustrated by sneīhan and biugan.

I. ablaut-series. In this series the vowel of the present cannot
help us decide whether we have to deal with an imperfect- or an
aorist-present. For Gothic ei may represent either pre-Germanic ei
or ĕ. Our only criterion must be the presence of a surd or sonant
spirant. If we have a surd spirant, however, we need not necessarily
conclude that the verb represents an imperfect-present, though the
presumption is in its favor. This remark applies to the verbs of the
other series as well. The ei in aorist-presents does not come from I.E.
i + nasal, as Hirt supposes, PBB, XVIII., 522 ff. Cf. my article in

The following verbs have generalized the surd spirant: leīvan,
gateīhan, peīhan, preīhan, weīhan; leīpan, sneīpan; reīsan.
Goth. weīhan represents, according to Brugmann, Grundr., II.,
913, 928, a Germanic ुईχो. That would be the only admissible con-
Verner's Law in Gothic.

clusion if the Gothic form stood alone. Cf. O.H.G. *wigant, wikant, O.S. *wigand, O.E. *wigend, and also in the fifth ablaut-series, O.H.G. *ubar-wihit, O.N. *vega, O.E. *vegan. So Osthoff, PBB, VIII., 291, had some grounds for concluding that in Germanic only *wigō occurred, and that Goth. *weiha was for *weiga, following the pret. *waih.

A clear aorist-present is *bi-leiban. Cf. O.H.G. *bi-liban, O.E. be-lifan; Skt. limpāmi. Doubtful are: dreiban, *sweiban (I.E. *bh- or *p-?) and *hneiban (I.E. *gh- or *q-?).

II. ablaut-series. With generalized surd spirant are: tiuhan, *plihan; hinfan; drivsan, kiusan, *fra-liusan.

Goth. hinfan cannot with certainty be placed among the imperfect-presents, since O.H.G. *hiiban (by the side of hitfan), O.S. *hiaban, O.E. *heofan, point toward a Germanic *χūbō, or at least a *χūbō by the side of a *χufsō.

Aorist-presents are biugan and skiuban. Biuga for *büga < bhūkō. The k here is inferred from O.H.G. buhilt and O.N. bōla. O.E. bügan is the historically correct form. Goth. biugan and O.H.G. biogon take their dipthong from analogy of other verbs of this ablaut-series.


As aorist-presents we may set down *twarzban, gildan, windan, and perhaps gairdan.

Goth. *twarzban, O.H.G. *werwan and *werban, the latter the regular form in Tatian and in Otfrid. In other writings there is evident confusion, since the f is found where it could not have been original, e. g. chi-hwurfi, gi-hworfan. We have good evidence here that a verb whose present stem has a strong ablaut form, or a surd spirant, or both, does not necessarily go back to an imperfect-present. Brugmann, Grundr., II., 927 f., refers Germ. verbs to Class II. A or II. B, according to the existing form. Osthoff, PBB, VIII., 290, recognized the fact that a verb may have the strong ablaut form and still not have come from an imperfect-present. O.S. *hwerban and O.E. *hwerfan are also in line with the Gothic hwairban.

An aorist-present, if it remained in this ablaut-series, would naturally bring in the vowel of the present common to other verbs of the series, since otherwise the present of the verb would have too strange
a sound. To illustrate: *garpō or *qarpō would give in Germ. *h(w)urbo or *hwarbo. This would cause confusion with the perfect stem. Consequently these verbs would make their present conform to other verbs of the series, or become weak verbs, or form another class like Gothic haldan. J. von Fierlinger, KZ, XXVII., 436 ff., has shown that several of the verbs in the VI. ablaut-series and in the reduplicating verbs with vowel a formerly belonged to the e-series. We may conclude, then, that from Germ. *hwarbo < qarpō arose, by analogy with other present-forms of this series, Goth. huarban, O.H.G. hwerban, O.S. hwerdan, O.E. hwierfan, O.N. huerfa. Now there is a weak verb with practically the same meaning: Goth. hvarbon, O.H.G. (h)varbon, O.E. hwearfian. This is not the causative O.H.G. hwerben, O.E. hwierfan, but is probably another development of the Germ. aorist-present *hwarbo. From the collateral *h(w)urbo comes the O.N. weak verb horfa. For a similar development compare O.H.G., O.S., O.E. spur-nan, regularly strong, but O.N. sporna, usually weak, and also O.H.G. spurnta. Goth. gildan, O.H.G. geltan, O.S. geldan, O.E. gildan, O.N. gialda from sqrtel + to with suffix-accentuation. O.Sw. gialla seems to indicate an accent on the root. Goth. windan, O.S., O.E. the same, O.H.G. wintan from sqrtel + to- with nasal infix. If Goth. gairdan, O.S. gurdian, O.H.G. gurtan, O.E. gyrdan are connected with Goth. gards, O.H.G. gart, etc., and with Grk. χόρτος, Lat. hortus, then Goth. gairdan has probably restored the strong ablaut to the present, since the d points to a suffix accent. We may suppose the original form to have been *gurdiō. This developed in W.G. a weak verb, in Gothic a strong verb with the regular type restored.

IV. ablaut-series. We have here but one verb to consider, viz., trudan. If, as Kluge suggests, it goes back to a pre-Germanic root dret-, then we must assume here that Goth. trudan, O.N. trođa, O.S., O.E. tredan, O.H.G. trelan come from *drdiō. The Goth. and O.N. have developed historically correct forms, whereas the other dialects have introduced the strong grade vowel.

V. ablaut-series. With surd spirant occur fraihnan, sailvan; hilfan; qťpan, niřan; lisian, ga-nisan, wisan.

Goth. fraihnan and O.N. fregna, O.E. frignan, show a possible variation in accent in the present.

With accent on the suffix: widan, O.H.G. wētan < *witō < sqrtel + -to-. Cf. Brugmann, Grundr., II., 1002.

VI. ablaut-series. With surd spirant: slahan, hwahan, hlahjan; hlařan, frařjan, sakřan, garařana; haffan.
According to Kluge, Etym. Wtb., followed by Brugmann, Grundr., II., 1047, Goth. kla\textsuperscript{a}dan, O.H.G. hladan, O.E. hladan, are connected with O.Ch.Sl. kla-\textsuperscript{a}d\textsuperscript{a}<\textsuperscript{*gl}\textsuperscript{a}-dh\textsuperscript{a}. This ought to develop in Goth. to *hladan and in O.H.G. to *hlatan. The O.E. hladan is supposed to be regular. The \textit{p} of Gothic and the \textit{d} of O.H.G. are explained as arising from an "unoriginal grammatical change" as if from I.E. \textit{t}. The probabilities are that it does come from an I.E. \textit{t}, in spite of O.Ch.Sl. kl\textit{a}d\textit{a}. We may set down the original form as *\textit{klåtō} (or *glåtō), interchanging with *\textit{klåtō}. This explanation causes less difficulty than the other.

With accent on the suffix: skaban, st\textit{a}dan. Goth. skaban, O.H.G. se\textit{a}ban, O.N. sk\textit{a}fu, O.E. sc\textit{a}fan from \textit{\textbf{v}}sqap-. Cf. Gk. σκαπάω, O.Lat. scaprēs.

Goth. st\textit{a}dan < *st\textit{a}-n\textit{tō}' has preserved a "grammatical change," compared with the pret. stō\textit{p}, stō\textit{p}um. The \textit{p} in this case has been generalized in the pret. Its retention is probably due to the law of finals in Gothic, which requires a final surd. Other instances in which the law of finals would bring about the same result as an actual "grammatical change," and where consequently it is impossible to say to which of these the interchange is due, are: bi-leiban, bi-laif; ski\textit{u}ban: ska\textit{f}u. The other dialects have abandoned the "gram. change" in this verb as regularly in all aorist-presents.

3. Preterit-presents. Among these verbs the surd spirant has been retained in lai\textit{s}, gads\textit{r}; ga-nah, bi-nah. With "gram. change" occur \textit{parf}: paur\textit{b}um; aih: aig\textit{um}.

Some of these verbs form a sort of connecting link between the ablauting verbs and the so-called reduplicating verbs. That is to say, like \textit{\textbf{t}}\textit{\textbf{a}}r\textit{bōn} mentioned above, having taken on the form of a perfect, it became necessary to express past time in some other form. This is done by retaining the reduplication as in Gothic, by the use of some other past tense that preserves a different ablaut, or by forming a weak preterit. The last course these verbs have adopted. As presents may be set down Goth. ga-dars, ga-da\textit{ur}sum, where the \textit{s} stands for a Germ. \textit{z}. Compare O.E. dear(r), North. darr, O.H.G. gi-tar, gitu\textit{rn}un, O.S. darr, inf. durr\textit{an}. These go back to ablaut forms dhē\textit{s}-, dhē\textit{s}-, and are related to Skt. dhē\textit{s}-\textit{nō}-\textit{mi}. Höfer, Germ. 23, 3.

In like manner \textit{parf}, paur\textit{b}um represents t\textit{r}p-, t\textit{r}p-, found according to de Saussure, Mém. de la Soc. de Ling., VII, 83 ff, in Gk. τιρ\textit{σωμα}, Skt. t\textit{r}p-\textit{nō}-\textit{mi}. So we have here also a present. Cf. Kluge, Paul's Grundr., I, 377.
Goth. aih : aigum is supposed to show “grammatical change.” It is true that in the sing. forms h is more common, while in the plur. and opt. g prevails. In O.E. the sing. is āg and āh, in which h may stand for final g. Elsewhere g occurs, except of course before s and t.

In O.N., however, we must explain the sing. ā < *aih, since *aig would give ę, Noreen, ais. Gr.2 § 95.

In O.H.G. the sing. is not found, but only plur. and opt., eigun, eigut, eigi, etc. O.S. preserves g throughout, except in one plur. form, Ess. gl. Luc. 22, 36, the thes naïhyin = qui non habent.

We probably have in aigan a pres. with suffix-accent, not a perf. A perf. ought to give aih, *igum. But all the dialects agree in giving aih or aig, plur. aigum. If this be really a pres., we may set up as the root ēgk-, seen perhaps in Skt. ṛ’ce. Even if it is a perf. we have probably to go back to a long diphthong.

4. The Weak Verbs.—Since these verbs in most of their forms had the accent on the suffix, we should expect final f, h, lv, p, s, of the root to change to b, g, w, d, z. But in most cases we do not find that. What is the explanation? Several have been given.

Paul in PBB, VI, 548, explains the s in hausjan, nasjan, etc., as a final s, and hence falling under the general rule in Gothic. That this cannot be is seen from the fact that b and d are not treated as finals before -jan. E. g. arbaídjan, usbaídjan, usdauñjan, daubjan, draiñjan, bilaibjan, where d and b are treated the same as in arbaídai, bileibai. In most cases the true explanation is that Gothic has leveled the weak verb to the corresponding strong verb or noun. This was the explanation given by Verner, KZ, XXIII, 120. An examination of the weak verbs in Gothic brings out this fact. Taking first the verbs with s before the suffix, we find that in almost every instance there are related words with s; and in no case is there a weak verb with s derived from, or connected with, a noun or strong verb with z. Hence kiusan : kausjan; liusan, laus : lausjan; paursus : paursjan, etc. On the other hand the verbs with z do have related forms with z, and do not have related forms with s, with the possible exception of wizōn, provided we connect that with wisan. The same is true with verbs in p. So daups, daupis : daupjan. Verbs in d, with two exceptions, have either allied words with d, or at least none with p. The two exceptions are sandjan : sins; and fra-wardjan : wairpan. Leveling did not take place here, perhaps, because the connection was not felt.

With f there are four verbs. Two of these have corresponding forms with f, viz., ufar-hafjan : hafjan; and tweifjan : tweifls. A
third, *sifnan*, has no related word in Gothic, cf. O.E. *sifan*. The fourth, *af-lifjan*, is connected with a strong verb with *b*, *bileiban*. Verbs in *b* have no related forms in *f* by which they might be influenced.

Verbs in *h* are no exception to the rule: *hauhjan* : *hauhs*; *uf-hlohan* : *hlahjan*. Several of these have no cognate forms in Gothic, except of course those derived from them. E. g. *tahjan*, Skt. *dar*, Gk. *dakuo*; *ga-tarhjan*, Skt. *dr*, Gk. *Δέρκωμα*; *pahan*, Lat. *taceo*. There may, however, have been related words that have not survived. For example with the last verb compare O.N. *bega*, O.H.G. *dagen*, O. S. *thagon*.

Verbs in *g* regularly have allied forms in *g* : *audagjan* : *audags*; *tagrjan* : *tagr*. There is one instance of *g < h*; *huggrjan* : *hūhrus*. Here, however, it is safe to assume that the difference was too great to be leveled out. Cf. *juggs* : *jūhiza*.

Where also we find *w < I.E. *q*", it does not occur independently of related words. So :—*ana-piwan* : *pius*; *gatēwjan*; *tewa*; *hnaiwjan* (v. *kneig-* or *kneigh-*): *hnaiws*, *hneiwjan*.

We can lay it down, therefore, as a rule in Gothic that weak verbs follow the analogy of the strong verbs or the nominal stems from which they are derived. And so far as Gothic is concerned, no other explanation would be necessary. But the other dialects present forms that are not so easily explained in this way, especially as outside of Gothic "gram. change" was not readily leveled out. In a few cases there is a possibility that the verbs were originally strong and regularly had the surd spirant. This seems probable, since we see some of them changing in historical time. E. g., Goth. *skafjan*, strong, but O.E. *secpjan*, weak.

Another cause that may have helped to bring in the surd spirant, was that the root-syllable in some forms of the pret. bore the accent. This theory was advanced by Paul, P.B.B., VII., 147, and by Sievers, P.B.B., IX., 563. But this had no such widespreading effect as they assume.

This theory would seem to militate against the theory of Collitz, Am. Journ. of Philg., IX., 42 ff. that the weak pret. is a middle perf. Yet there can be no doubt that in Germanic the root-syllable in the pret. of weak verbs bore the accent in some of its forms.

Otherwise there would be no explanation for Goth. *kunja*, O.E. *cũhe*, *ũhe*, O.N. *kuna*, *umna*, and *gnōde* = *gandhida* of Gothic from pres. *gnōgia*. This too may be the explanation of *ga-anpida*. Luke, V., 4, for *ga-anpida*, Cf. Con. Hofmann, Ger. VIII., 1. This form
would be more easily confused by the transcriber with *ga-nanpida than
would the form *ga-andida, conjectured by Bernhardt. We may sup-
pose that it was originally *andjan; *anpida, just as O.N. has gnōgia; gnōde. This would undoubtedly be leveled out to the surd or sonant
spirant, probably the latter on account of andeis; but ga-(n)anpida we
may regard as a survival of the original condition.

The following weak verbs in Gothic with the surd spirant are re-
presented in the other dialects by verbs with the corresponding sonant.
Verbs not of the same class, but from the same stem or root are
enclosed in parentheses.

1. Goth. af-drausjan: (O.H.G. trūrēn), trōren
   Goth. nasjan, O.H.G. nerēn, O.S. notian, O.E. nērigan.
   Goth. ga-pairsnan: O.N. þorna.
   Goth. balþjan: O.S. beholdan (?).
   Goth. ganōhjan: O.N. gnōgia.
   Goth. wrōhjan: O.S. wrōgian, O.E. wrēgan, O.H.G. ruogen,
                 O.N. rēgia.

Two weak verbs in Gothic have the surd spirant, though closely
connected with other words showing the influence of Verner’s Law.


The following show the influence of Verner’s Law, though con-
nected with words having the surd spirant.

   Goth. fra-wordjian, O.E. wyrdan: Goth. wairþan.
   Goth. huggrjan: hūhrus.
   Goth. wisōn: wisan.

In a few instances Gothic has yielded to Verner’s Law where one or
more of the other dialects has retained the surd spirant.

Goth. tagrjan, tagr: M.H.G. zeheren, zaher, zeher.

The following agree in two or more dialects in retaining the surd spirant.

5. Goth. us-gaisjan, O.E. gēsan.
Goth. af-hrisjan, O.E. hrissan, O.S. hrissian.
Goth. balpjjan, O.S. beldian (?).
Goth. blauhpjan, O.H.G. plōden, O.S. blōdian.
Goth. bleipjan, O.H.G. bliden.
Goth. ga-frihpōn, O.E. frihipan, O.S. frīdon.
Goth. lahpōn, O.H.G. ladōn, O.E. lāpian.
Goth. liihpōn, O.H.G. liudōn.
Goth. maurpjan, O.E. myrfrian.
Goth. swinhpian, O.E. ge-swīpan.
Goth. hauhpjan, O.H.G. hōhen, O.E. ħēan.
Goth. lauhatjan, O.H.G. lōhaszen.

The verbs in the last list are too plainly connected with their etyma to need any other explanation of the surd spirant.

5. Accent-shifting in Nominal-Inflection. Variation in accent in related words will be seen (i) by a comparison of different Gothic forms, and (2) by a comparison of Gothic with other dialects. This is intended to include not only the variation in accent in the same word, but also in related words, whether noun or verb.


Without variation occur:

28. and, anda, prep. and prefix, O.H.G. ant—, int—; cf. Lat. ante, Gk. âwrî; Goth. andeis, “end,” O.N. ender, etc. <*andia—.

29. Goth. brû‰s (a), O.H.G. brût, O.E. brîd<*brûdi—.


31. Goth. –fa‰s (d) “master” in bru‰-fa‰s, etc., Gk. πόσις, Lat. potis. Skt. pâti.


s–z.

21. The case endings, cf. iz-ei, tvaz-uh, hviz-uh, ānair-ei etc.

The examples given above show considerable variation in accent. It must be borne in mind, however, that on account of leveling this variation is not always as it appears. On the subject of accent-shifting in nominal inflection, compare especially Kluge, KZ, XXVI, 94 ff.; Osthoff, MU, IV, 73 ff.

In leveling Gothic has here as in the verb favored the surd spirant. E. g. ahana, hūhrus, slaks, swaihrō; alpeis, blōp, nauhs; asans, akso, etc. Compare with these O.H.G. agana, hungar, slag, swigar; alt, bluot, nōt; aru, ōra. It is very seldom that variation occurs within the same word in Gothic:—guda, guha; unfrōdans, unfrōpans. The variation h—ng was retained in two instances in related words, not in the same word, however.

It is evident that there are words that owe their surd spirant not to a root-accent in the word itself, but to related words. For example, the h in hūhrus must be due to root-accent in some forms of that word, for there is no other source for it; but swaihrō was doubtless leveled to swaihr̂a.

The variation that exists between Goth. alpeis and O.H.G. alt, O.S. ald, etc., is perhaps not original. Brugmann, Grundr. II, 126, suggests the possibility that alpeis may have been modeled after ninji-s. We should expect *alp̂s, gen. *aldis, since it is a to-participle to alan. The p might have been generalized in Gothic from the comparative. We may suppose it was originally *aldās, *alp̂zaz, (cf. O.H.G. elthiro, O.N. ellre) *aldistās.

In Goth. bairpei : ga-bairps (p) an original "gram. change" has been abandoned that is preserved in W.G. Here we do not need to suppose that Goth. gabairps represents a Germ. *gaburpi-, since it may have been leveled to an allied form.

Another instance of the same kind is Goth. dauhs : dauhs. Here the p of the latter word is probably due to that of the former.

So too asans may have preserved its s from analogy of asneis.

The variation given above between Goth. fairzna and O.S. fersna, etc., is hardly due to accent. The Sanskrit accent together with the W.G. forms points toward an original root-accent. Since the later Germanic accent fell on the first syllable, Goth. fairzna would represent neither an I.E. nor a Germ. accent. Goth. -faḥs (a) has not
developed as we should expect from the accent of Skt. pāti. This may be due to the fact that it was used only in compounds and thereby lost its accent. Cf. Verner, KZ, 23, 119.

Goth. hleiduma, if connected with O.H.G. hlita and Gk. κλήτος (cf. Brugmann, Grundr. II, 159) has developed from an accent such as is seen in similar formations in Sanskrit, e.g. adhamā, apamā. The same accent is indicated by the ablaut of fr-uma. But Goth. aihuma, aihumists, O.E. ānest indicate a root-accent. For such an accent here compare Skt. āntama.

6. Accent-Variation in Suffixes.—We have here to note the different development of the same suffix as affected by accent.

1. -ty-o-, -ty-a. fija-pwa, frija-pwa, sali-pwa : pwa-dw, gai-dw (ban-dwa, ni-dwa ?).
3. -tēr- -terā-. an-par, lva-par, wi-pra ; lva-prō, jain-prō, dala-prō, etc. : hin-dar ; hi-drē, Jain-drē, etc.
5. -go- -qā-. ainaha, bairgaheī, stoprahans, stainahs, unbarnaheīs, pariheīs, waǔrdahs : ansteiguns, audigs, gabigs, gabeigs, grēdags, handugs, hrōheigs, manags, mōdags, anda-nēmeigs, sineigs, πiuheigs, uhteigs, uhtings, ga-wairheigs, witwōdeigō, ga-wizneigs, wulpags, wairstweigs, gadiliggs, skilliggs ; juggs (with -ko-).
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8. -ter-. brô-par: fa-dar.

9. -t. dul-p-s, menô-p-s: mita-p-s (d), spaûr-d-s, weitwô-p-s (d).

10. -nt. tu-nþ-us (O.E. tôþ < *ta-nþ-): aîrva-tu-nd-i, hulu-nd-i, wi-nd-s, fija-nd-s, frijô-nd-s, etc., and all present participles.

11. -es-, -os-. The genitive is here given where occurring or known: agis-is, rimis-is, walwis-ðn (weak verb) ga-digis (ahs-is, þeihs-is, weihs-is, þlahs-jan): aiz-is, hatiz-is, riqis-is, bariz-eins, talz-jan, sigis, skaþis, swartiz-la, swartiz-a. -os-nâ-. hlaiwaðsôs: aîrvaða. -usjâ- -esjô-, aqizî, jukuði: O.H.G. acchus, O.E. ãx, O.N. ox.

As some of the suffixes above given were productive, they sometimes occur in what would be an impossible form if regularly developed with the stem to which they are attached. For example, hauhipa is an impossible combination from the standpoint of development. It must be a later formation, or else influenced by analogy. On the other hand, auþida and wairþida are quite possible; and the fact that the form of the suffix -ida, occurs in only three words makes it probable that these words are of early origin.

Of the words with the suffix -es agis, rimis, and *walwis may be set down with some reasonable certainty. The s of agis is seen in the derivatives of this stem, O.H.G. egiso, O.E. egesa. For the s of ga-digis there is no direct evidence. The low grade form of the root, however, compared with Gk. τâþos, may indicate an accent on the suffix. The forms ahs, weihs, þeihs, þlahs- are probably due to secondary assimilation. The development of ahs would be, we may suppose, *ähz > *ahz > ahs. Cf. O.H.G. ahir. Or the syncope, in some instances, may have taken place before the Germanic lautverschiebung.

With z we have aiz-, hatiz-, riqiz-, bariz-, tað(i)z. For the first four compare O.H.G. ër, O.N. hatr, rokkër, barr. The z of sigis seems probable from O.E. sigor, O.H.G. sigir-ôn. In skaþis the ñ points to a root-accent, consequently the genitive ought to be *skapîzis. We cannot be certain of this, however, since it may have been influenced by analogy.
II. REDUPLICATING VERBS IN GERMANIC.

With all that has been written on the reduplicating verbs, it may seem like presumption to try to offer anything new. But the fact remains that they have not reached their final solution, although the work of Karl Ljungstedt, Anmärkningar till det starka pret. i germ. språk, Upsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1888, has done much in that direction. Nearly all who have written on the subject have assumed that the Gothic represents the only regular development, and have attempted to derive therefrom the forms in the W. and N.G.


Before trying to explain the forms we have before us, let us find out their origin. Here again Grimm leads the way, Gk.¹ II, p. 72 ff., Gesch. d. d. Spr., p. 598 ff., by pointing out that the reduplicating verbs are derived from the ablauting verbs. Following closely in his track Adolf Moller in a dissertation, Die red. Verba im D. als abgeleitete Verba, Göttingen, 1865, shows pretty conclusively that there was some connection between the ablauting and the reduplicating verbs. He says, p. 20: “Sind, wie wir glauben, die reduplicirenden Verba durch die wortbildende Kraft des deutschen Ablauts von den ablautenden Verben abgeleitet, so muss es ablautende Verba geben oder gegeben haben, aus welchen unsere reduplicirenden Verba entstanden sind.”

Moller failed, however, to follow up the suggestion of Grimm, Gesch. d. d. Spr. p. 603, who expresses the possibility that O.H.G. *ia* in reduplicating verbs may have arisen, not from the contraction of an older reduplication, but from an original ablaut.

As originally ablauting verbs Ljungstedt considers the reduplicating verbs, and as such they will be treated here, and an attempt will be made to explain how this ablaut arose.
Let us see first wherein the old method of regarding the preterit of reduplicating verbs as the result of contraction or analogy or both is a failure. Let us briefly review Hoffory’s article, Die. red. Preterita im An. KZ, 27, 593 ff.; for this is the most ingenious that has been written from that standpoint on “unstreitig eins der schwierigsten capitel der deutschen grammatic.” The preterit vowel he explains by a process of reduction and contraction and analogy. This process is due to a change of accent. For example, the development of O.N. *fell* is given thus: *fēfall > *fēfāll > *fēfeīl > *fēll > fell.

Now if the accent *fēfall* had existed there would hardly have arisen an accent *fēfāll*, for that would be contrary to the Germanic tendency. It is also contrary to what we find in O.E. *heht, leole, leort, dreord*; for these forms could arise only under an accent on the reduplicating syllable. And as the preterit vowel is practically the same in N. and W.G., we must assume that it had a common origin. Furthermore there is evidence that the root syllable of the pret. bore the accent. This is seen from O.N. *hell < *helþ, fell < *felþ, sēra < *sēzo’, snera < snezo’,* and Goth. *sāzlep.* It is evident therefore that *helt* and *felt* can have no place in Hoffory’s scheme, since they are later analogical formations, *helt* being for *helð*, and the *d* arising from the plur. *heldom.*

If now we abandon this method of explaining the preterit vowel by contraction and analogy, and see what we really have, we shall find a practical agreement on the part of the N. and W.G., that points toward a well established ablaut. We shall further see that there are forms that can be brought in agreement with the Gothic reduplicated preterits. This means that Germanic had more than one past tense for these verbs. That the perfect is not the only past tense represented in Germanic has been recognized in several instances by different scholars. For a summary of such instances compare Ljungstedt, Anm. till det starka pret., p. 3 f., and Kluge, Paul’s Grundr. I, 375.

Now what I suppose to be the origin of the so-called reduplicating verbs is briefly this: Many of these verbs had the accent originally on the suffix. This caused a reduction of the root-vowel and a consequent similarity to the perfect, as will be seen later. These verbs therefore retained the reduplication in the perfect and also expressed past time by another tense having a different ablaut. Gothic, at least the Gothic that has come down to us, always made use of this reduplicated perfect. The N. and W.G., while retaining in a number of examples
this reduplicated perfect, forms the preterit of these verbs for the most part from another past tense, an imperfect or an aorist.

We will divide these verbs into five classes represented by Gothic (1) skaidan, (2) staftan, (3) haldan, (4) slepan and letan, (5) lividan.

In the first class we have aorist-presents having a root with a long diphthong eи. This diphthong under the accent would give Germanic close е, Jellinek, PBB, XV, 297 ff., Sievers, ibid. XVIII, 409 f., Noreen, Urg. Lautlehre, p. 30 ff. In its reduced form it would appear in Germanic as ai, i, i. Cf. besides the references given above, Persson, Wurzelerweiterung, p. 117. Verbs with this diphthong when not accented on the suffix would fall together with verbs of the first ablaut-series. For this class arose the ablaut: (1) ai; (2) е < еи; (3) ai < oи; (4) аи. (1) ai, which is the middle grade, is found in the present, (3) ai, which developed from the shortened diphthong oи < ои, in the perfect, and (4) аи, likewise reduced from еи, in the pret. part.

And to what tense shall we assign (2) е? There are two possibilities. It may be an imperfect of the normal type. That is, we may suppose that there existed a present of the normal type by the side of an aorist-present, as Gk. τρέπω и τράπω, τέμνω и τάμνω, or O.H.G. fiirstiprit и spillnu. In the present the aorist-present crowded out the normal type, but the normal type remained in the imperfect, because it was only through this type that there could be a difference of ablaut. That is as if the Greek had said τράτω but етретов. Another possibility would be a root-aorist like Skt. chedam from y/ chid. This method of forming the tenses applies to the other classes as well as this.

It shall next be our task to show what authority there is for assuming for verbs of this class a root with еи.

Persson, Wurzelerweiterung, p. 119, sets down under the root (s)me-и Goth. aisa-smi-pa, O.H.G. smid, smeidar, mei-zan, mei-zil, Goth. ma-i-tan. To the root me-и, “to think,” cf. Skt. māyā, belongs O.H.G. meinan. This verb, instead of following the type skaidan, went over to the weak conjugation. A similar case is O.E. tēsan, weak, but O.H.G. seisan, reduplicating. O.H.G. sweifen and sweben seem to be related, and this sets sweifan < Germ. *swatpan into the e-series. To skaidan belong O.H.G. scit, O.E. scide, prov. Eng. shide, and also O.H.G. seizan. These go back to an I.E. root skheit, sleheid. To the same root belong Skt. chid, Gk. σχείζω, Lat. scindo. This root in the form skheit has developed in Germanic an aorist-present, and in the form sleheid the normal type.
From a root stέίγη come Gk. στέικων, O.H.G. stigan, "to ascend," and stiega < *stēga, with ĕ < ĕi, O.N. stige, "ladder." So too O.H.G. ken, O.E. cēn, with ĕ < ĕi, are connected with O.E. cēnan, Goth. keenan. From the above examples it will be seen that verbal roots containing the diphthong ĕi develop in Germanic (1) verbs of the first ablaut series, (2) reduplicating verbs of the type skaidan, and (3) weak verbs.

Aside from the reduced form of the present there is other evidence that these verbs were not accented on the root-syllable. The d of skaidan plainly goes back to an I.E. t, as O.H.G. skeidan and O.S. skēthan show. It is not necessary to show further that Gothic favored the surd spirant in leveling. This is true even in words that had in nearly all the forms an accent on the suffix. An accent on the suffix might have given, from analogy of the perfect, the form *skaipan. A root-accent would certainly have given that. With Gothic agrees O.E. scēdan. In O.H.G. the verb has d throughout. Very rarely do forms with t occur. For a similar leveling in O.H.G. compare hladan, ubar-weenan. In O.S. occur in the present skēthan, scēdan, scēdit in C; scēdan, skēdit in M. In Fr.H. is found the part. pret. giscēthan. Taken all together, therefore, these forms speak for a suffix-accent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goth.</td>
<td>aikan</td>
<td>aiaik(um)</td>
<td>aikans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fraisan</td>
<td>faifrais</td>
<td>fraisans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haitan</td>
<td>haihait</td>
<td>haitans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>laikan</td>
<td>lailaik</td>
<td>laikans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maitan</td>
<td>mainait</td>
<td>maitans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ga-plaihan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.N.</td>
<td>haita(O.Gutn.)</td>
<td>hit(O.Gutn.)</td>
<td>hait (run.)</td>
<td>eikenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heita</td>
<td>het(om)</td>
<td>heit(om)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leika</td>
<td>lek</td>
<td>leikenn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sueipa</td>
<td>sueip</td>
<td>sueipenn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.H.G.</td>
<td>heizan</td>
<td>hiaz(um)</td>
<td>giheizan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meizan</td>
<td>miaz</td>
<td>gimeizan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skeidan</td>
<td>skiad</td>
<td>giskeidan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sweifan</td>
<td>swiaf</td>
<td>gisweifan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zeisian</td>
<td>zias</td>
<td>gizeisian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.</td>
<td>hētan</td>
<td>hiet, hēt(um)</td>
<td>gihētan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skēthan</td>
<td>skēth</td>
<td>giscēthan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scēdan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scēdan</td>
<td>for-swep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The vocalism of the above lists corresponds exactly with the ablaut as given. Gothic, it will be seen, uses only the perf. for the pret. O.N. and O.E. use the perf., column 3, and an imperfect (or aorist), column 2. The O.N. hét and lék are more easily explained as given, than to regard them with Noreen, Paul’s Grundr. I, 511, as perfects.

The O.Gutn., W.N. hit goes back to a Germ. *hité, with shortened diphthong eį.

O.E. heht < *hehet < *hehat < *hehát < *hehait, and leole, similarly developed, retain the reduplicating syllable. O.E. scéad for *scádd, like sceadan for scádan (Sievers, Ags. Gram. 76, 2), has lost this syllable.

O.H.G. and O.S. have abandoned the perf. in this class entirely. Still O.S. sketh could be regarded as a perf., since O.S. ě may come from Germ. ai or è.

The second class, type stautan, is composed of verbs with the long diphthong eį, having the accent on the suffix. This gave the ablaut: (i) au, (2) eu, (3) au, (4) au, in the pres., impf., perf., and part. pret. As ai developed from eį and oį, so au comes from eį and oį. For au of the perf. u may occur. The diphthong eį is shortened from ěu. Verbs with ěu would also give verbs of the second ablaut-series. As examples we may cite: stautan, O.H.G. stózan, Lat. tundō, Skt. tudāmi, M.H.G. stutzen, O.H.G. diozan, O.N. piota, O.E. piotan, Goth. stiur, O.H.G. stiør from the root s-teu-d. Cf. Noreen, Urg. Lautl. p. 230 f., and further on root-variation of s-teud-, s teub- and s-teug-, G. Ehrismann, PBB, XVIII, 215 ff.

O.E. a-hneapan, “to pick off,” Goth. dishniupan, “to tear,” O.Sw. niupa, “to pinch,” from the root kněyb-.
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O.H.G. *tâuwen, teuwen*, weak verb. These verbs may easily go back to the same formation. We have here a *-io-*present with the accent on the suffix, *dhauw-īo-*, in which *dhauw-* is the middle grade of *dhēw-*. In Gothic the normal type was restored, and as Germanic *dīw-* before vowels gave Goth. *diw-*, it fell into the fifth class. In the O.H.G. the verb became weak like many other *-i/o-*presents. In O.N. *devia* < *dawjan* went over to the sixth class of strong verbs, after the analogy of *hēfia* < *hafjan, kefia* < *kafjan, skepiā* < *skapjan*, etc. This change took place, of course, before the vowel of the present was unlauteled. Perhaps the *-i/o-*suffix prevented this verb from developing like *houwan*.

O.E. *hēofan* forms the pret. *hēaf* and *hēof*. The last form presupposes an inf. *hēfan*, for it would hardly arise in connection with *hēofan*. If we assume a root *kēyp-* forming an aorist-present, it would give O.E. *hēfan*. That this verb probably was an aorist-present is seen from O.H.G. *hiuban, O.S. hioban*, so that we must set down for the Germanic form *x*udo*’ or *χübo*’. In any case the verb in its present form is not historically correct, but is a restoration of the normal type.

From the examples given it is apparent that reduplicating verbs of the type *stautan* have roots containing the diphthong *ey*. After this type was formed, which would be soon after the change I.E. *o* > Germ. *a*, other verbs of different origin were added. This applies to all classes of reduplicating verbs. An example of this may be Goth. *aukan, O.N. auka*, in which is the reduced root *aug*, seen in Lat. *augeō*. The by-form *aueg* is in Gk. *άκτευω*.

The ablaut for the verbs of Class II is: (1) *au*, (2) *eu*, (3) *au(u)*, (4) *au*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aukan</td>
<td>stautan</td>
<td>aiauk(um)</td>
<td>aukans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hlaupan</td>
<td>(bauan,bnauan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>auka</td>
<td>iοk(om)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ausa</td>
<td>iοs(om)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.N.</td>
<td>(h)laupa</td>
<td>(h)liōp(om)</td>
<td>(h)lupum</td>
<td>(h)laupenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoggua</td>
<td>hiu(g)hiog(g)</td>
<td>hiō, hioggom</td>
<td>hogguen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>búa</td>
<td></td>
<td>[biō, bioggom]</td>
<td>būenn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the verbs of this class ought to convince any one that they are ablauting verbs. Here I follow Ljungstedt, Anm. till det st. pret., p. 126 ff., and Noreen, Paul’s Grundr. 511, more closely than in Class I; or I ought rather to say that I agree more closely, since I had substantially the same explanation for the reduplicating verbs as here given, before I knew of Ljungstedt’s work in this field.

Aside from the reduced vowel of the pres., there is no certain evidence that these verbs were aorist-presents. Scrōtan is the only verb that might cast light upon the subject. If this goes back to an I.E. root with final t, which it may do, then the accent of that verb is settled. The pret. of this verb in O.H.G. is scroet and scroed. The d of the latter form may be the survival of the Germanic p, for in this form the accent was on the root-syllable, and consequently may represent I.E. t.

Goth. bauan, O.N. būa, etc., probably does not belong here except by analogy. It is certainly better to explain the O.N. biō and bioggom by analogy pure and simple, than to attempt, with Noreen, to derive biō from *bebow. To derive hiō from *hehōw is quite different, since medial h disappears. O.N. hlupum and M.H.G. luffen are parallel, both showing the tiefstufe. O.H.G. biruun is plainly after the analogy of sterōz and scroet.
Other verbs that naturally belong here have gone into Class V. Such a verb is Goth. b-naua, O.N. g-niů, M.N.G. niuwen. To the same root belongs, as Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg suggests, perhaps Goth. nauₚs, O.H.G. nōl, M.L.Frc. ver-nōien. Here too O.N. snīa, which goes back to a root snē-y, snō-y. To this root belong Skt. snīwana, Gk. νεο-ποv (*ανυν-ποv), Goth. snīwan and snīu-mjan and perhaps sniu-han, O.E. snēowan and snōwan, snū-d and snō-d, snōo-me, O.H.G. sniu-mo, snuo-r, Goth. snō-rjō, etc. Cf. especially, Persson, Wurzel-"weiterung, p. 143, and Noreen, Urg. Lautl. pp. 35, 85.

To the root-form snēy would belong Goth. sniwan, which like diwan has gone over to the fifth class of ablauting verbs, and further sniumjan and sniuhan, and O.E. snēowan, sueome, etc. To snōy belong O.N. snīa, O.E. snōwan, O.H.G. snuor, etc.

The third class of reduplicating verbs, type haldaₚ, contains aorist-presents of the third class of ablauting verbs. The ablaut for this class is: (1) ł, ū, (2) el, en, (3) ol, on (ål, ūn), (4) ēl, ū. By ł, ū I mean what de Saussure, Mém., p. 239 ff., followed by others, calls long sonant liquids and nasals, and what others regard as another tieftüfe by the side of ł, ū, of el, en. Cf. C. C. Uhlenbeck, PBB, XVIII, 561 ff., and references there given. After all the difference is rather one of name than of fact. The Germanic form for this ablaut is (1) al, an, (2) el, in, (3) al, an (ål, un), (4) al, an.

Let us first show that these verbs, or at least those that formed the type, were not accented on the root-syllable. This is seen from Goth. haldaₚ, O.N. halda, O.S. haldan, O.H.G. haltan; Goth. staldan; O.H.G. spaltan, and perhaps scaltan, O.S. skaldan; Goth. waldan, O.H.G. waltan, O.N. walda (with suffix -to-, not -dho- as Brugmann, Grundr. II, p. 1051, gives, since otherwise we should not find O.N. olla, ulla-); O.N. falda, O.H.G. faltan. The last verb is in Gothic fal³an, and in O.H.G. also faldan. In these the ū (d) has been generalized from forms having the accent on the root-syllable, as in the sing. perf., or from a by-form *pēltō. The l'd in O.E. is doubtful, since that may come from Germanic lēd or lēp.

Secondly, as to the connection of these verbs with those of Class III of the ablauting verbs, compare von Fierlinger, KZ, XXVII, 436 ff. Proof for this we have in abundance, the same verb developing in different ways, sometimes with difference of meaning. Thus we have O.H.G. scaltan, "to push," scelitan, "to scold," O.H.G. waltan, O.N. velta; O.H.G. wallan and wellan, O.N. vella and valla; Goth. blandan, cf. blinds and Lith. blendas; O.H.G. spaltan, cf. Goth. spída,
REDUPLICATING VERBS IN GERMANIC.

O.N. speld; O.H.G. gangan, O.N. gingr, 3d sing. pres. to ganga, Lith. žengiu; O.Sw. halpa, O.N. hialpa; O.H.G. wallan, perhaps akin to wallan, wellan, with different suffix.

After the formation of this type other verbs were added that do not properly belong here. So Goth. fāhan, hāhan, which belong to the sixth ablauting class, but were drawn to this class because the nasal was generalized. Still fāhan may belong here if we connect it with M.H.G. vegen. In that case the O.N. part. pret. fingenn, which presupposes an inf. *finga (cf. Noreen, Aisl. Gram. § 431, A. 5) would not be after the analogy of gingenn.

Other additions to this class are Goth. us-alpan, cf. alpers and alan; Goth. saltan, cf. Lat. sal; O.H.G. bannan < *bhā-nā, √bhā-; O.H.G. spannan, similarly formed from 1/spē-, cf. Lat. spē-s, and O.H.G. spanan, O.E. spónan of the sixth ablauting class. These were early additions; later others were added.

The verbs of this class may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haldan</td>
<td>haid (um)</td>
<td>haldans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fāhan</td>
<td>fāhān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhan</td>
<td>āhān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us-alpan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saltan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goth.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blandan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wallan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fāhan</td>
<td>fāhān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhan</td>
<td>āhān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us-alpan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saltan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O.N. (O.Sw.) halpa, valda  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ganga</td>
<td>gekk, gingom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhan</td>
<td>hekk, hengom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fāna</td>
<td>fēkk, fēngom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O.H.G. faldan (-tan)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wallan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaltan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.H.G.</th>
<th>O.S.</th>
<th>O.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>waltan</td>
<td>saline</td>
<td>-eo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salzan</td>
<td>-ia-</td>
<td>-eo-,-o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wallan</td>
<td>wallan</td>
<td>bonnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fallan</td>
<td>fallan</td>
<td>bonnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wallan</td>
<td>wallan</td>
<td>spónnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blandan</td>
<td>blandan</td>
<td>blandan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fáhan</td>
<td>fáhan</td>
<td>fáhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>háhan</td>
<td>háhan</td>
<td>háhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erien, erren</td>
<td>erien, erren</td>
<td>erien, erren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skaldan</td>
<td>skaldan</td>
<td>skaldan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haldan</td>
<td>haldan</td>
<td>haldan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gangan</td>
<td>gangan</td>
<td>gangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fáhan (fanga,Ps.) feng (un) (-ie-)</td>
<td>fáhan (fanga,Ps.) feng (un) (-ie-)</td>
<td>fáhan (fanga,Ps.) feng (un) (-ie-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>háhan (heng (un))</td>
<td>háhan (heng (un))</td>
<td>háhan (heng (un))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spannan</td>
<td>-a-</td>
<td>-a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blóndan</td>
<td>blóndan</td>
<td>blóndan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fón</td>
<td>fón</td>
<td>fón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hón</td>
<td>hón</td>
<td>hón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feallan</td>
<td>feallan</td>
<td>feallan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weallan</td>
<td>weallan</td>
<td>weallan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fealdan</td>
<td>fealdan</td>
<td>fealdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healdan</td>
<td>healdan</td>
<td>healdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealdan</td>
<td>wealdan</td>
<td>wealdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sealtan</td>
<td>sealtan</td>
<td>sealtan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealcan</td>
<td>wealcan</td>
<td>wealcan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gongan</td>
<td>gongan</td>
<td>gongan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the Gothic list should probably be added us-staggan, to which the impv. usstagg occurs Mat. 5:29. This has been changed by the editors to usstigg — unjustifiably so. Goth. staggan and O.E. stingan furnish another example of the double development shown above.
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Compare also the O.N. *brongr < *brangwir, and *slongua, formed from *slongr, which might also have developed into reduplicating verbs if the normal type had not been restored. In the double forms given above, O.H.G. wallan and wellan, etc., it is impossible to say whether the forms with ë are restorations of the normal type, or whether both go back to original double forms. The latter is perhaps most frequently the case.

The vowel of the pret. formed from the imperf. is ë, as O.N., O.S., and O.E., as well as O.Fr. and M.L.Franc. show. Before n+-cons. this vowel would become i. Such we find it in O.N., with later e, and generally in O.Fr. and M.L.Franc. In O.N. the ia, io found in such forms as hialp, fiallo are the result of breaking. See Noreen, Aisl. Gram.* p. 60 ff. The ia of O.H.G. is after the analogy of skiad, of Class I and riat of Class IV. The forms kene, fene, etc., point toward an earlier *held, *feld, etc., after which they were modeled. The forms intphiec, intphiegum may have arisen, as Paul, PBB, VI, 544 suggests, from a partial assimilation. The development would be *finx > *fih > *fig > fiee. O.H.G. erren is the only verb of this class with r, though this is purely accidental. It may have been added to this class entirely by analogy, or may really go back, in its pre-Germanic form, to a root containing e. Cf. Goth. aiṛa, O.H.G. erda and ero, O.E. corpe and eard (< *ar-tōs), Gk. ẹp-α̣ξ. O.S. geng, feng, etc., owe their e for i to the other verbs, which regularly have e. The ie, which occasionally occurs, arose as the O.H.G. ia.

In O.E. the a of the pres. becomes o before n, and is broken to eo before l+-cons. The vowel of the pret. (imperf.) was e, which it has remained in blend, heng, etc., for an older *blind, *hing, etc. The force of analogy is very apparent here, since in O.E. ë before nasals even when not followed by a consonant becomes i. The eo in verbs with l+-cons. is the result of breaking; in beonn, speonn, geong after the analogy of these. This eo held its ground, since the second class already had eo.

Remains of the old reduplicated perf. are found in O.N. and the O.E. gang. W.N. oldo, O.Sw. foll and holdo Noreen regards as aorists, Paul’s Grundr. I, 512.

From the examples and explanations given we may consider it proved: (1) that these verbs differ from those of the ablauting Class III only in their development, retaining forms that the others have abandoned; (2) that the al, an of the pres. and of the part. pret. represents the long low grade of el, en; (3) that the el, in of N. and W.G. in the
Reduplicating Verbs in Germanic.

pret. represents the high grade of the root; (4) that the al, an in the pret. of all the dialects has developed from the I.E. ol, on of the perf.; and (5) it has been further shown that the Germ. form, especially of el, in, has been modified in the various dialects by analogy and by the laws peculiar to each dialect.

As Classes I and II of these verbs come from verbal roots with ĕi and ĕy, so Class III may come from roots with ĕl, ĕn (ār). It would then be exactly parallel with the others. The al, an of the pres., plur. perf., and part. pret. could then represent I.E. al, an < ĕl, ĕn. This gives the best explanation of the al, an of the plur. perf., where we should expect ul, un. This does occur rarely, and may be after the analogy of verbs of ablauting Class III, or be the regularly developed lowest grade ĭ, ī. This would also explain the al, an of the part. pret. The el, in of the pret. (imperf.) would go back to pre-Germanic el, en from I.E. ĕl, ĕn. So Streitberg, Zur germ. Sprachgeschichte, p. 71, would be right in his surmise that the ē in the pret. of these verbs comes from a long vowel. He is wrong, however, in the way he understands the development here.

To begin with the e of the O.N. fekk, O.E. feng, Isidor’s feng goes back to an original i, as the O.N. plainly shows, and this i was again changed (though not in O.N. till comparatively late) after the analogy of felt, helt, etc. So, of course, the e in fekk, felt, etc., does not go back to Germ. ā ( < I.E. ē), since the I.E. ē in this position was shortened, as he points out, but it may very well go back to I.E. ē, and the development would be the same as in O.H.G. fersana < *pe’rsna, and of wint < *wēntōs.

To the fourth class of reduplicating verbs, type slēpan and lētan, belong verbs with ā in the pres., followed by a vowel or a single consonant. There is no evidence here that the accent was on the suffix. In fact, O.N. blāsa, O.H.G. blāsan, Goth. blēsan point the other way, though this is not conclusive, since there is no "gram. change" in the verb.

In Gothic the perf. of slēpan has a different ablaut from that of lētan. In the other dialects this difference is not so apparent, yet it has not entirely disappeared. E. g., O.N. sera < *sēzo’ has the same ablaut as Goth. saisō and Gk. σώκα. Similarly E.N. lōt, Goth. laīlōt; but O.Sw. lāt, grāt with the vowel of saisēp. O.N. lēt has still another vowel, viz. Germ. ē < ĕī. We may set up, therefore, the following scheme for this class:

I.E. (1) ē, (2) ēi, (3) ē, ē, (4) ē
Germ. (1) ā, (2) ē, (3) ā, ē, (4) ā.
It is doubtful whether these correspond in tense to the schemes given before. Besides the vowels here, we find in the pret. of O.N. ei and i, which represent Germanic ai and i (perhaps from r). These would represent the reduced ei, and would be added to (2). For Goth. slépan, saislēp Holthausen, KZ, XXVII, 619, gives the ablaunt ā, ē, which he withdraws, Anz.f.d.A, XVII, 188. The explanation advanced by Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I, 356, was no ground for his doing so. The ē of O.S., O.E. slēp, O.N. lēt, cannot be compared to the ē of Goth. saislēp unless we make it different from the ē of slépan, but the two were doubtless alike, as was shown above by O.Sw. lät, grāt, preterits to lāta, grāta. Nor can we compare the ē of slēp to that of weldēs; since slēp was under the accent. Hence we must separate Goth. saislēp from O.H.G. sliaf, O.S., O.E. slēp.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slēpan</td>
<td>saislēp (um)</td>
<td>slēpan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blēsan</td>
<td>laitōt (um)</td>
<td>lētans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lētan</td>
<td>laitōt (um)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saian</td>
<td>saisō (um)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blāsa</td>
<td>blēs (om)</td>
<td></td>
<td>blāsenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>grāta</td>
<td>grēt (om), greit</td>
<td></td>
<td>grātēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lāta</td>
<td>lēt (om)</td>
<td></td>
<td>lātēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rāda</td>
<td>rēd (om), reid</td>
<td></td>
<td>rādēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sā</td>
<td>sera</td>
<td></td>
<td>sāenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rātan</td>
<td>rēt, riat (um)</td>
<td></td>
<td>girātan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lāzan</td>
<td>liaz (um)</td>
<td></td>
<td>gilāzan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slāfan</td>
<td>sis. fir-leiz</td>
<td></td>
<td>gisšāfan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.H.G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zí-plāhannēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(blāan)</td>
<td>sliaf (um)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.S.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>slāpan</td>
<td>slēp(un)</td>
<td>gislāpan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>látan</td>
<td>lēt(un), liet(un)</td>
<td>gilātan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sātan</td>
<td>sēu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.E.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drēdan</td>
<td>drēd(on)</td>
<td>dreord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lētan</td>
<td>lēt(on)</td>
<td>leort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rēdan</td>
<td>(rēd(on))</td>
<td>reord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blāwan</td>
<td>blēw(on)</td>
<td>rēden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Goth. lētan are grētan, tēkan, rēdan; like saian are waian and faian. The pret. to the last-named verb does not occur; but it is to be placed here, since it goes back to a root pēi, cf. fījan, Lat. pēior, Persson, Wz. 426.

To the O.H.G. list belong further bāgan, brātan, in-trātan, far-wāzan. The verbs whose stems end in ā have become weak, with the exception of a few forms of the strong part. pret. to blāan.

To the O.S. list belong brādan, ant-drādan, grātan, rādan, thrāan, biknégan (with ē retained as in sēhan).

The O.E. list includes further *hwōsan, clāwan, cnāwan, crāwan, māwan, sāwan (sēwan), frāwan, wāwan, and swāpan, which properly belongs to class I, O.N. sueipa, O.H.G. sweifan.

A few words need to be added to what has already been said on the ablaut of this class. Under (3) we have united perfects in I.E. ē and ō. Under (2) there is perhaps more than one tense included. The ē of O.N. blēs(om) is the same as that of hēt(om). The ei of O.N. greit and the ē of O.Sw. grēt come from Germ. aī, which may represent the reduced ēj or  öde.

A further reduced ablaut is in O.Gutn. līt, cf. hit above and the lowest grade in O.Sw. gritom. If these forms are not entirely analogical, they prove beyond a doubt that these verbs had roots in ēī. Like lata, lōt is taka, tōk, which has gone over entirely to the sixth ablauting class. The vowel of O.H.G. rēt, reat, riat, riet goes with that of O.N. blēs. O.H.G. leiz is exactly O.N. leit. O.S. regularly has ē in the pret., but beside this ie. O.E. has ē in drēd(on) and lēt(on), but ēo in verbs in āw, except in North., which has ē here too by the side of ēa = ēo. The origin of this ēow is ēw > ēuw > ēow. This development was further aided by analogy with the ēo of Class II.

The O.E. verbs in -āw- are especially interesting, since they have not gone over to the weak conjugation, but show the original condition. These are represented in the other dialects for the most part by

In O.H.G. with the exception of a few forms of blăen these are all weak. O.S. has retained a few strong forms of sāian, ḫrāan, bıklēgan. O.N. has preserved only sā, which may also be conjugated weak. Why have these verbs become weak? For this reason. They go back to presents formed from the root +ē+īo-. See Brugmann, Grundr. II, 1087. Now it is these very īo- presents that have most frequently gone over to the weak conjugation, because they fell together in form with the causatives and denominatives. In O.E., however, the į was not there to cause this similarity. How is this to be explained? Sievers, Ags. Gr. § 62, assumes that the įw in O.E. blāwan, etc., comes from aiw, comparing Goth. saian, waian, and the development seen in Goth. snaiws, aiw; O.E. snāw, ā. But the two cases are not parallel. In Goth. snaiws, aiw, the ai is a real diphthong; but in saian, waian the ai represents I.E. ē. Cf. Bremer, PBB, XI, 51 ff. That is, O.E. blāwe (for *blāwu) comes from an earlier *blāu, and that, it is supposed, from *blāju>*blēiō>*blē-įō. The į in O.E. is a transition sound, which could not have developed while j stood between the vowels. But in these verbs there is no trace of a j. There is no evidence that į ever disappeared between vowels in O.E. before causing umlaut. Intervocalic j caused umlaut in: hieg, (*hauja-), hiew, glig, ieg, frīgea and also frēa>*frie(j)a (cf. hēan<*hīehan>*hauhjan, Sievers, Ags. Gr. § 408, 4) cēgan (Ps. cēgan, North. ceiga, ceia), hēgan, (O.N. heyia), strēgan, and others. There is no sure case of the loss of intervocalic j without causing umlaut.

It is pretty evident, therefore, that there was no j in O.E. blāwan, clăwan, etc. In other words the only explanation possible is to adopt that given by Bremer, PBB, XI, 73, for Goth. saia<*sēō<*sēmi. Cf. also Möller, Anz. id A. XX, 119.

These verbs, then, had originally the athematic and the īo- inflection side by side. In O.E. the īo- inflection was crowded out entirely, unless we except sōrwan, which may be an unumlauted form. Like O.E. are O.N. sā and klā (for which also klēid). The O.H.G. forms are ambiguous, since these, at least in M.H.G., went over without exception to the īo- inflection.

The O.E. verbs in -ōw- of the next class are also not īo- presents. Germ. *blēiō could give nothing but O.E. *blēwe. (Cf. my
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To the fifth class of reduplicating verbs belong stems with " in the present. Several of these are "— presents, and have in consequence, in one dialect or another, become weak. Such are: Goth. hrôpjan, O.H.G. rufen (but also ruofen, strong); Goth. wôpjan, O.N. ðpa, O.H.G. wuofen (wuofan); Goth. swôgjan. We have here doublets, with and without the " formation, which go back to I.E. or at least pre-Germanic time. Compare also Goth. *flôkan with Gk. πλησσω < plâg-" , 1/plâg-, plâg-. Other verbs originally belonging here but which have become weak in some dialects are presents in "-. It is not always certain whether the " is a part of the root or an addition, whether for example we should write *spô-" or *sp-"-. Germ. "- in may come in some instances from I.E. "-, as O.E. grôwan, Lat. grâ-men; O.E. hlôwan, Lat. el-ä-mor.

Verbs of this kind that have given up the " inflection are O.E. blowan, flôwan, grôwan, hlôwan, rôwan, spôwan, O.N. rôa, grôa, Goth. *lawan. To these we may also add O.E. snôwan, which is usually referred to a stem snô-. Cf. Persson, Wurzelerweiterung, 143; Noreen, Urg. Lautl. p. 35; Streitberg, Zur germ. Sprachgsch. p. 101. Between O.E. snôwan and O.N. snûa, according to Streitberg, exists the ablaut ū; ū, and O.E. snôwan he regards as a new formation. But starting with snôwan from a root sn-"-, we can explain snôwan as coming from a root sn-"-. The development would be exactly the same as in flôwan from a root pl-"-, and Gk. πλέω from ple-. We should have then the proportion:

snôwan: snôwan = πλέω: flôwan.

The ablaut for the fifth class of reduplicating verbs is hard to determine. The perf. in N. and W.G., where not a reduplicated perf., is probably entirely analogical. This confusion may have been brought in by the verbs in "-(" ), which have a close connection with those in "-(" ). Thus, O.E. blowan: blâw an (roots bhl-" : bhl-" ); O.E. flôwan: Lat. pleo; O.E. rôwan: Lat. rêmus; O.E. spôwan: O.Ch.Sl. spê-" ; O.E. snôwan: Gk. ἐφή, O.H.G. nô-en.

This similarity of meaning would make the confusion more natural. Compare especially O.E. blêd, fem., "blossom," which in meaning corresponds to blowan, but in formation to blâwan; and blêd, mas., which combines the meanings of both verbs in "blow" (blâwan, "to blow") and "prosperity" (blôwan "to bloom," "to flourish").

The ablaut as we find it is seen in the following lists.
A glance at the above lists shows that we do not have a uniform ablaut to begin with. Nor could it be otherwise, since this is a composite class, and does not go back to one I.E. type.

The vowel of most of the preterits in column (2) may represent Germanic ē. The ē of O.N. bleť could be nothing else. The ē, ie, ia, io, eo of O.S. may all represent ē. The ēow in O.E. bleow, fleow, etc., may have arisen as in blōwan: ēow < ēuw < ēw.

On the other hand, all these forms except O.N. bleť and O.S. wēpin may be after the analogy of preterits having the regular development from Germanic eu. In any case it must be admitted that this class has suffered more disturbance than any other, and the ablaut as it now appears in N. and W.G. is largely the result of analogy.

The forms in column (3) more nearly agree in their ablaut: rēra < *rerō. But grēra is probably, and gnera certainly, an analogical formation. Still in grēra it is possible to see the type of reduplication found in Lat. steti. The same type seems to occur in O.H.G. pleruzzun < *blerutun < *blelutun. Cf. Osthoff, PBB, VIII, 540 ff.

There is difficulty, however, in explaining the ablaut of pleruzzun. It cannot come from Germanic u. The form should perhaps be written with a long u, plerūzzun, and this may be for *pleruoazzun. Cf. Braune, Ahd. Gr. § 40, Anm. 1.
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c. The reduplicating verbs in Germanic.

NAME OF BORROWER.

1s/2s VC