

УДК 811.11'01

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/APULTP.2020.40.140-155>

**Andriy V. Botsman**

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3083-6637

**Olga V. Dmytruk**

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7540-7708

## TRANS-GERMANIC PECULIARITIES OF PRETERITE- PRESENT VERBS

**Abstract.** *This article contains systematic and detailed analysis of morphological and semantic parameters of Germanic preterite-present verbs, dividing them into major and minor subgroups. The development of both preterite-present subgroups and their steady transformation into the modal verbs is a specific feature of all Germanic languages. Since the modal verbs of the Modern Germanic languages are morphologically defective, it is commonly assumed that preterite-present verbs of the old Germanic languages lost some of their morphological features in the process of turning into modal verbs. The semantic aspects of this process are rather obscure. All Germanic languages were losing some preterite-present verbs in the process of transformation from the Gothic language, which had fourteen preterite-present verbs. In OE there were twelve preterite-present verbs. Six of them survived in NE. The morphological description focuses on the finite and non-finite forms of the preterite-present verbs, which belong to the minor subgroup. The detailed description helps to see the origin and development of the minor subgroup in the new light. The description encompasses the data of classical Indo-European languages and Old Germanic languages. The authors emphasize the expediency of turning to the theory of preterite/strong verb origin, the verbs in question may be regarded as inter-group, hybrid units. In order to gain insight into the origin of the Germanic languages it is necessary to look into the history of the Gothic and West Germanic and North Germanic languages. The authors find it useful to compare common and different phenomena, highlighting individual specific processes taking place in the process of development of the Germanic languages. These languages are analyzed on different stages of their development, but inline with the view that the languages co-operated and coexisted in the same area. The data given in the article are used to analyze the problem implementing comparative grammar tools. The authors were particularly careful to take all grammatical forms into consideration while working with the lexical units from the ancient sources. Some additional information was taken from Greek, Latin and Sanskrit to produce reliable and consistent comparison of the German language with the rest of Indo-European languages.*

**Key words:** *preterite-present verbs, Germanic languages, Common Germanic roots, semantic derivation, grammatical cooperation.*

***Information about the authors:** Botsman Andriy Vasylovych – Ph.D. in Chemistry, Ph.D. in English Philology, Associate Professor; Associate Professor of the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication; Institute of Philology; Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.*

*Dmytruk Olga Viktorivna – Ph.D. in English Philology, Associate Professor; Associate Professor of the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication; Institute of Philology; Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.*

***E-mail:** a.botsman@knu.ua; o.dmytruk@knu.ua.*

**Боцман А.В.**

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3083-6637

**Дмитрук О.В.**

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7540-7708

## ТРАНС-ГЕРМАНСЬКІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ПРЕТЕРИТО-ПРЕЗЕНТНИХ ДІЄСЛІВ

***Анотація.** Стаття містить системний опис і детальний аналіз морфологічних і семантичних параметрів германських претерито-презентних дієслів, розмежовуючи їх на головну і другорядну підгрупи. Розвиток обох претерито-презентних підгруп та їхня поступова трансформація у модальні дієслова є специфічною рисою усіх германських мов. Оскільки модальні дієслова всіх сучасних германських мов є дефектними в морфологічному аспекті, науковці припускають, що претерито-презентні дієслова давніх германських мов втратили деякі з їхніх морфологічних рис на шляху перетворення на модальні дієслова. Семантичні аспекти цього процесу є доволі нечіткоокресленими. Одночасно на цьому трансформаційному шляху усі германські мови втрачали окремий претерито-презентні дієслова у порівнянні з готською мовою, яка оперувала чотирнадцятьма, тоді вже давньоанглійська мова мала у своєму складі лише дванадцять, а сучасна англійська зберегла лише шість претерито-презентних дієслів. Морфологічний опис претерито-презентних дієслів охоплює як особові, так і виявлені неособові форми дієслів, окреслених нами у межах другорядної групи. Опис допомагає побачити по-новому походження даної другорядної дієслівної групи. Дослідження базується на даних як класичних індоєвропейських мов, так і на зіставленні наявних даних давніх германських мов. Підкреслюється доцільність повернення до теорії претерито/сильних дієслів з метою з'ясування походження відповідних претерито-презентних дієслів, які можуть розглядатися як гібридні, міжгрупові утворення. З метою глибшого проникнення до глибини розвитку германських мов беззаперечно необхідно звертатися до історії як готської мови, так і до західногерманських та північногерманських ареалів з метою порівняння і співставлення різноманітних явищ, як спільних, так і відмінних, для виокремлення закономірностей, які спостерігалися у процесі розвитку окремих*

## Актуальні проблеми української лінгвістики: теорія і практика

германських мов. Германські мови аналізуються у межах різних стадій їхнього розвитку, але у паралельному ракурсі, коли вони взаємодіяли, збагачувалася за рахунок ареального співіснування. Усі необхідні дані наведені з метою вивчення проблеми у рамках порівняльної граматики. У процесі опрацювання матеріалу була приділена значна увага кожній граматичній формі, знання яких є необхідним для аналізу давніх джерел. Має місце додавання необхідної інформації з грецьких та латинських джерел, а також санскриту для чіткого і послідовного порівняння германських мов з іншими індоєвропейськими мовами.

**Ключові слова:** претерито-презентні дієслова, германські мови, спільногерманські корені, семантична деривація, граматична взаємодія.

**Інформація про авторів:** Боцман Андрій Васильович – кандидат хімічних наук, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент; доцент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації; Інститут філології; Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.

Дмитрук Ольга Вікторівна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент; доцент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації; Інститут філології; Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.

**Електронна адреса:** a.botsman@knu.ua; o.dmytruk@knu.ua.

**Боцман А.В.**

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3083-6637

**Дмитрук О.В.**

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7540-7708

## ТРАНС-ГЕРМАНСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПРЕТЕРИТО-ПРЕЗЕНТНЫХ ГЛАГОЛОВ

**Аннотация.** Статья содержит системное описание и детальный анализ морфологических и семантических параметров германских претерито-презентных глаголов, разделяя их на главную и второстепенную подгруппы. Развитие обеих претерито-презентных подгрупп и их постепенная трансформация в модальные глаголы является специфической чертой всех германских языков. Поскольку модальные глаголы всех современных германских языков являются дефектными в морфологическом плане, допускается, что претерито-презентные глаголы утратили некоторые морфологические характеристики на пути превращения в модальные глаголы. Семантические аспекты этого процесса очерчены весьма нечетко. Одновременно на этом трансформационном пути все германские языки потеряли отдельные претерито-презентные глаголы в сравнении с готским языком, который оперировал четырнадцатью глаголами, тогда как древнеанглийский язык имел в своем составе только двенадцать глаголов, а современный английский язык сохранил только шесть. Морфологическое описание претерито-презентных глаголов охватывает как личные, так и

.....

обнаруженные безличные формы тех глаголов, которые очерчены в составе второстепенной группы. Описание, приведенное в статье, помогает по-новому посмотреть на происхождение этой второстепенной глагольной группы. Данное исследование базируется на данных как классических индоевропейских языков, так и на сравнении имеющихся в наличии данных древних германских языков. Подчеркивается целесообразность возвращения к теории претерито / сильных глаголов для выяснения происхождения отдельных глаголов, которые можно рассматривать как гибридные, межгрупповые образования. С целью более глубокого проникновения в особенности развития германских языков безоговорочно необходимо обращаться к истории как готского языка, так и языков западногерманского и северогерманского ареала для сравнения и сопоставления разнообразных явлений, как общих, так и отличительных, которые наблюдаются в процессе развития отдельных германских языков. Германские языки анализируются на различных стадиях развития, однако в параллельном ракурсе, когда они взаимодействуют и обогащаются за счёт ареального сосуществования. Все необходимые данные представлены с целью выявления проблемы в рамках сравнительной грамматики. В процессе обработки материала было уделено внимание тому, чтобы учесть все грамматические формы, значение которых необходимо для анализа древних источников. При необходимости авторы обращались к греческим и латинским источникам, а также к санскриту для более чёткого и последовательного сравнения германских языков с другими индоевропейскими языками.

**Ключевые слова:** претерито-презентные глаголы, германские языки, общегерманские корни, семантическая деривация, грамматическое взаимодействие.

**Информация об авторах:** Боцман Андрей Васильевич – кандидат химических наук, кандидат филологических наук, доцент; доцент кафедры английской филологии и межкультурной коммуникации; Институт филологии; Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко.

Дмитрук Ольга Викторовна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент; доцент кафедры английской филологии и межкультурной коммуникации; Институт филологии; Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко.

**Электронный адрес:** a.botsman@knu.ua; o.dmytruk@knu.ua.

There is a minor group of verbs that cannot be referred neither to strong, nor to weak verbs. The most important group of these verbs belongs to the so-called *preterite-present* or *past-present* verbs [1, p.78]. Originally the Present tense forms of these verbs were Past tense forms (or, more precisely, IE perfect forms denoting past actions relevant for the present) [16, p. 91]. Later these forms acquired a present meaning, but preserved many formal features of

the Past tense. Most of these verbs had new Past tense forms built with the help of the dental suffix [21, p. 245]. Some of them also acquired the forms of the verbals (participles and infinitives); most of the verbs did not have a full paradigm and were in this sense "defective" [3, p. 114].

Preterite-present verbs take a peculiar place within the system of the Germanic languages. The origin of this peculiar type of the verbs will be clear if we consider the fact that the tenses of Germanic strong verbs developed from the original aspect and that the past tense was derived from the original resultative aspect [5, p. 342]. With strong verbs, the resultative aspect was merged with the past tense. However, there was also a different interpretation of the meaning of resultative aspect. It could also be interpreted as signifying the present result of a past action [9, p. 108–109]. This is what happened with preterite-present verbs. The weak past form was derived later, by analogy to the weak verbs, whose past form denoted a tense category from the outset [13, p. 201]. In some preterite-present verbs the development of a present tense meaning deriving from a resultative aspect can be clearly seen: the meaning *know* develops from the meaning *have learnt*; the meaning *can* from the meaning *have learnt* [20, p. 287]. It is possible to find an analogous development of the meaning in several Latin verbs whose perfect has acquired a present meaning: *meminī* (remember), *nōvi* (know), *ōdī*(hate) [4, p. 285]. Most preterite-present verbs can be classified according to classes of gradation which their present tense belongs to. However, some of them do not fit into this system as their vowels do not correspond to the gradation system of strong verbs [2, p. 148–149]. Most of the preterite-presents did not indicate actions, but expressed a kind of attitude to the action denoted by another verb, an infinitive, which followed the preterite-present. They were used like modal verbs and eventually developed into modern modal verbs [14, p. 193].

The profusion of preterite-present verbs and their gradual transformation into the modal verbs is a striking feature of all Germanic languages. Since modal verbs of modern Germanic languages are morphologically defective, it is commonly assumed that preterite-present verbs of the Old Germanic languages lost some

.....

of their morphological features in the process of turning into modal verbs. The semantic aspects of this process are rather obscure. In OE there were twelve preterite-present verbs. Six of them survived in NE: OE *āz*; *cunnan*; *can*; *dear(r)*; *sculan*; *sceal*; *mazan*; *mæz*; *mōt* (NE *owe*; *ought*; *can*; *dare*; *shall*; *may*; *must*) [22, p. 118].

The **purpose** of the article is to find out trans-Germanic and shared Indo-European roots of preterite-present verbs. The reconstruction involves the phonological transformation, morphological changes and semantic derivation. This integrated multi-aspect investigation stipulates the **topicality** of the article. The **scientific novelty** of the research is connected with the first attempt to grasp the peculiarities of the minor group of preterite-present verbs. The **object** of the investigation is Germanic preterite-present verbs. The **subject** of the investigation is morpho-semantic features of preterite-present verb minor subgroup, their morphological, semantic and phonological peculiarities.

**Literature review.** The preterite-present verbs attract the attention of linguists who are the experts in the field of Germanic verbs. The combination of ablaut with the tense-suffix was the result of mixing two different subclasses which involved strong and weak verbs and different ways of creating the Germanic preterite. The semantic aspect of these verbs is also very dynamic and this peculiarity created the ground to involve these verbs in further Germanic analytization. Magdalena Tomaszewska analyzed the finite and non-finite forms of a limited number of preterite-present verbs. The scholar concentrated on six of the preterite-present verbs which have survived as Present-day English modals (*ought*, *can*, *dare*, *may*, *must*, *shall*). Her investigation encompassed Old and Middle English data, as well as other Germanic and classical Indo-European languages. New insights into the origin of such verbs were represented, too. The investigation of morpho-syntax (with elements of phonology) and semantics was focused on. The main synchronic and diachronic tendencies in the evolution of the mentioned verbs were described and compared [19].

Another research was focused on the process of change behind the development of the preterite-presents. Stig George makes an

attempt to ascertain whether a revised take on Grimm's theory, the earliest such approach to these verbs, can be formulated using up-to-date analytical apparatus, as has been forthcoming with more recent advances in the field of semantics. He contends that it is advisable to return to the theory of a preterite/strong-verb origin, and makes an attempt to show that alternative frameworks come with a certain set of problems. The researcher offers a string of theory-based arguments seeking to resolve some fundamental conceptual difficulties which are believed to challenge Grimm's theory. He develops a new theory of change explaining the supposed Past to Present transition. The attempt to gain insight into how preterite-present verbs handle Modality was made. By appealing to this semantic domain, it is shown that something of the change defined as Past > Present can be accounted for semantically. However, it is impossible to transport the existing modal theory if it is approached to in isolation. The author works out a basis with which to account for the preterite-present verb by scrupulously reformulating the crucial ideas associated with Modality, along with measured forethought of how the categories Realis/Irrealis can be integrated into a wider semantic model. The achievement of the research is showing how more accurate alterations of current theory can solve the current challenges associated with subjectivity, and that by incorporating the Realis/Irrealis distinction it is possible to show the diachronic links that could be found between lexical and modal meanings in verbs [18].

Anna Wojtyś devoted her monograph to five verbs which disappeared from (southern) English during the Middle Ages: *\*dugan* (*avail*), *munan* (*remember; must, may*), *\*-nugan* (*suffice*), *\*þurfan* (*need*), and *unnan* (*grant*). The researcher approached the analysis of the verbs uniformly: first she summarized and compared the entries on the verbs in the major dictionaries, then presented the corpus data from OE and ME, and finally suggested some reasons for the loss of the verbs in question. Each verb was given a careful attention with a string of examples, a list of all excerpted forms, and for the ME period a table showing the number of attestations in the separate corpus texts. The author also offered the raw and

.....

normalized frequencies of each verb per corpus, but as the corpora involved in the research are not comparable from the sampling point of view, included text types, or dialectal coverage, these calculations are only of limited value. However, the validity of the conclusions as to why the given preterite-present verbs disappeared are rather speculative and questionable [6].

A classical investigation of William Randall and Howard Jones deals with the origins of the Germanic preterite presents within the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) verb system, with the emphasis on the problems that the authors faced when they tried to link these verbs to the PIE categories that exist in linguistics. The authors challenge the existence of a PIE 'derived stative' verb category which is supposed to be formed by adding stative inflections to eventive (aorist) roots. They contend that morphologically this category resembles the PIE perfect, but it is unreduplicated; semantically, it denotes a pure state, not a resultant state. It is argued that this category might stem from most of the fifteen Germanic preterite presents. The derived stative category might also be identified as the lacking tie between the PIE root stative and the PIE perfect [15].

**Results.** The advantages of a systematic study of the preterite-present verbs are connected with the correct and logical division of this verb group into two subgroups. The second subgroup was singled out in order to gain a clear insight into the development of grammatical and semantic derivatives. The second subgroup was singled out on the basis of semantic and functional resemblance. These verbs are analysed on the different phases of their development side-by-side, so that they may be studied in the relation they bore to one another and to the English language in particular. The research attempts at not missing any grammatical form whose knowledge is required for the study of ancient sources. Two thirds of Germanic roots are known to belong to Indo-European heritage [10, p. 45].

All the Germanic verbs are either of primary or secondary formation. The first group is formed directly from the root, the second one derived from nominal or another verbal theme. Verbs belonging to the first class are commonly called primary verbs or stem verbs, the rest are derived ones. The preterite-present verbs



migrate between these two groups demonstrating their ancient origin and structure.

All other Old Germanic languages have the same conjugation forms of this verb *witan* (know) as in the Gothic Language. The first person singular is reflected in Gt. *wait*, OHG. *weiz*, OE. *wát*, OIcel. *veit*; the second person singular is reflected in Gt. *witum*, OHG. *wizzum*, OE. *witon*, OIcel. *viton*.

The absence of flexions in the first and third person singular forms is explained by the law of word ending. The peculiarity is connected with the form of the second person singular. The ending of this form is Germ. *-t* < IE. *-tha*. The reflection of IE. *-th* is expected to be Germ. *þ*, but instead there is *-t*. There is some resemblance when the preposition contains a voiceless spirant (*gadars-t*, *þarf-t*). According to the laws of Germanic phonetics, *\*wait-t* was expected to be reflected in *\*waiss*, like the past tense of *\*wit-dō-m* > Gt. *wiss-sa*. The ending *-t* was reconstructed by the analogy of the patterns *nam-t*, *gaf-t*, *bar-t*, *þarf-t*. The past tense form *wissa* is also common Germanic (OHG. *wissa*, OSax. *wissa*, OE. *wisse*, OIcel. *vissa*). This verb illustrates Germanic-Celtic language analogy. In the Celtic languages the group *d+t* was changed into *ss*: OIr. *fiss* (knowledge) < IE. *\*wid-tós*; compare Gt. *wiss* (known).

The Indo-European diphthong *ei* loses its diphthong nature and is monophthongized in the Germanic languages (it occurs in the Slavonic languages and Latin, too), changing in  $\bar{i}$  (*ei > ij > \bar{i}): Gt. *wetwoþs* (witness); Gr. *ειδώς* [*<weidw-*] (informed, knowing). The change of IE. vowels *o*, *a* into Germanic *a* caused the formation of two Germanic diphthongs from four IE diphthongs: IE. (*oi*, *ai*) > Germ. *ai*, IE. (*ou*, *au*) > Germ. *au*. On the other hand, IE. *io* > Germ. *ai* may be seen in Gt. *wait*, OHG. *weiz*, OSax. *wēt*, OE. *wát* (I know); Gr. (*ϕ*)*οῖδα*, Skr. *védā*, OSlav. *Вѣдѣ* [Sck. *ě*, OSlav. *ǫoi*]. The preterite-present verb *witan* shows the Germanic consonant peculiarities, in particular, sonorant semi-vowel [*w*] is a bilabial voiced consonant, more precisely, not syllable making vowel *u*, that may occur at the beginning of the word before vowels: *wait* (I know).*

One peculiarity of the Germanic consonant system was their *gemination*. This peculiarity caused the formation of long

consonants. Gemination may occur as a result of ancient evolution of groups  $t+t$ ,  $t+d$ : Gt. *wissa* (I knew) < \**wit-d-*, it may be represented schematically:  $t, \text{þ}, \text{ð}, d+ t, d > ss$ . In many cases in terms of morphology and word formation there is *st* instead of *ss* (it may occur based on the analogy): Gt. *waits* (thou know): *wait* (I know) [ $t+t$ ], but compare: *wissa* (he knew) [ $t+\text{ð}$ ].

In the Gothic language the consonant change was common, it happened as a result of a combination change. From the historical point of view, it is necessary to distinguish the cases when the initial consonants were *þott*: *witan* (with the initial *t*): *waits* (with *s* which developed from *t* before *t*). In the Gothic consonant system this differentiation is really considerable because different changes in the consonant system occurred. This had been caused by the disappearance of grammatical interchange. The most frequent consonant gemination in Gothic is *ss*: *wissa* (I knew). It is necessary to emphasize the existence of the active participle *wetwoþs* (witness) from *witan* (to know). It has a derivative *un-wiss* (unknown, uncertain) [Gr. *ἄ-ιτοϚ*], it is past participle and an ancient form. The nature of this verb is evident. It belongs to the first weak conjugation that encompasses transitive verbs with durative and occasionally frequentative meanings: *witan* (past tense *witaida* (observe)). Compare with L. *vidēre*; OSlav. *ВИДѢТИ* from *witan* (first person *wait* (to know)). It is necessary to take into consideration that the Germanic third weak conjugation corresponds to the Latin second conjugation; it is evident if we compare Gt. *witan*: L. *vidēre*. From the point of Indo-European comparative morphology these verbs belong to the stem types *-\*ei-*, *-ē*; compare L. *vidēre*, OSlav. *ВИДѢТИ*, Gr. *ειδῆ-σω* (I shall know), OHG. *gi-wizzē-t* (he observes). There may be a question about the correlation between Gt. *-ai-* and IE. *\*ē*. All the forms of present tense optative and all secondary forms (infinitive, participles, past forms) are created from the root of the plural indicative mood.

The minor subgroup of the preterite-present verbs contains the verb *daug* (do for). Its meaning is the same in other old Germanic languages. It is found in other Old Germanic languages: OHG. *toug*, OSax. *dōg*, OE. *Déag* [7, p. 231].

The second verb under consideration in the minor subgroup is an ancient Indo-European verb, which occurs not only in the Germanic, but also in the Slavonic languages. It is *ga-daúr-san* (dare) and its specific feature is its unconventional morphology. Its suffix *-ta-* (*ga-daúrsta*) may be explained (as in the case of the major subgroup verb *þaúrfta*) by taking into consideration the position of Germ. *-\*ð-* after voiceless spirant *s*. This verb is found in other Old Germanic languages: OHG. *turran*, OSax., OE. *durran*. Indo-European root of this verb (*\*dhers-*) occurs in other Indo-European languages: Gr. *υρασος* (courage) [12, p. 425-426], Skr. *dháršati* (he dares), OSlav. *ДРЪЗНЖНТИ*, Rus. *дерзкий*, Ukr. *дражнити* (коза-дереза), Ch. *drzký*. This verb illustrates the second phase of the Consonant Shift. The development of Indo-European voiced aspirated plosives *bh*, *dh*, *gh* is connected with the second phase of the Germanic Consonant Shift. In the Proto-Germanic language all of these sound combinations lost aspiration and were transformed into voiced plosives of the same place of articulation. Later, under certain conditions they again became voiced plosives: IE. *dh* > Germ. *ð*, *d*, Gt. *ga-dars*, OE. *dearu* (I dare): Skr. *dháršati* (he dares), Gr. *véρσοσ* [*v* < *dh*] (bravery), Rus. *дерзкий*, Ukr. *коза-дереза*.

*Munan* (think, suppose), the next verb under scrutiny, correlates with OSax., OE. *munan*, OIcel. *muna*. IE. root of this verb (*\*men / mon; тьн :mη*) occurs in Gr. *μέ-μον-α*, L. *memoni* (I remember). These verbs, like Germ. *man* are the perfect forms with the present form ending. The comparison of Lith. *menu* (I remember), OSlav. *МЪН-БЪТИ* (think), *ПА-МАТЬ* demonstrates this tendency. IE. vowel [*b*] during the development of the Germanic ground transformed into [*u*] (IE. *b* > Germ. *u*) : Gt. *munan* (think, perform mental activity) : L. *man-ēre* (remain), Gr. *έ-μάv-ην*, OSlav. *МЪН-ЪТИ*. This verb demonstrates durative meaning: *munan* (past tense *munaida*) (remember) from *munan* (the first person singular *man*) (think).

The verb *ga-mōtan* (take place, be able to) was found in other Germanic languages: OHG. *muozan* (be able, have to, dare). OSax., OE. *mōtan*. The form *\*gamōst* was reconstructed according to the pattern of waist. Past Tense *\*ga-mōsta* (*gamostēdum*) originated

from *wissa*. It becomes evident if we compare *daúrsta*, *kaupasta* from *kaupatjan* (to strike the back of the head) [8, p. 146].

The most significant verb in the minor subgroup has the meaning of ability to do something. ***Magan*** (be able to), which we focus on, was found in all Old Germanic languages: OHG., OSax., OE. *magan*, OIcel. *mega*. Compare: OSlav. *МОГА*, Lith. *magóti* (be useful), Gr. *μηχανή* (Dor. *μᾶχανᾶ*) (tool), Gt. *māhts* (strength). Some linguists [7, p. 719, 849; 8, p. 66] connect this word with Gt. *magap̃*, OHG. *mahad* (maiden, girl) and Gt. *magust* (boy, young man). The primary meaning of the verb *mag* as ancient perfect form should be *I am grown up, I became strong* from the primary root Germ. *meγ*. But this supposition is wrong and groundless because root *\*meγ* < IE. *\*megh* is unknown in the in the Indo-European morphology. Gr. *μηχανή* and homonyms *μήχαρ* and *μήχος* point at IE. *\*māgh-* with possible variants *\*magh-* (*\*mogh-*) or *māgh-*, in the Gothic language *mag*, in the Old Slavonic language *МОГ-А*. The meaning *big* is connected with root *\*meg*; compare: Gr. *μέγας*, Skr. *māha-*, Gt. *mikis*, OHG. *mihhil*. But the meaning is still controversial and unknown [12, p. 374]. Among separate forms the one that stands out is *magt*, the second person, Present Tense. In all other Germanic languages this form contains phonetically correct *-h-*: OHG., OS ax. *math*, OE. *meaht*. Form *magt* is explained by the influence of other forms with *-g-*. It is possible that *magt* may be explained by the morphological graphic traditions and does not reflect the pronunciation. There are the same cases in the German language of XVII–XVIII cent. (spelling *gemügt*, *mogte*, *mögte* instead of *mochte*) [7, p. 849]. There is some doubt about the correlation of letter *g* and its pronunciation in the Gothic language. In the past tense forms there is an appropriate *h* interchange: *mahta*. There was a tendency of consonant gemination under the influence of two adjacent consonants in the Gothic and Scandinavian languages. This tendency took place in these two Germanic groups in the period of Common Germanic language Community. It was very strong in the Scandinavian languages: OIcel. *matta*, Gt. *mahta* (I was able) [17, p. 327]. There is a transformation of *g* into *h* [*χ*] before *t*, as a result the interchange *g:h* occurs: *mag* (I am able): *mahta* (I was able), but

*magt* (you are able). Indo-European voiceless plosives were stable and unchanged in the Germanic language group. In particular, consonant *t* is preserved in the Germanic languages in groups IE. *pt*, *kt*. Thus, only the first component is transformed (*kt* > *χt*): Gt. *maths*, OHG. *maht* : OS lav. *МОЩУ [ЩУ > kti]* (strength).

In the Proto-Indo-European language nasal consonant *m* interchanged with syllable making *m*. In the Proto-Germanic language those consonants were preserved: Gt. *mag* (I can): OSlav. *МОГА* (I can). Germanic voiced spirant *γ* had the tendency of transforming into fricative *g*. The reflection of Germ. *γ* in the Gothic language is an obscure and disputable issue. Letter *g* does not reflect any interchange in any position (there is only one exception *mag*: *mahta*) and it may present spirant *γ* (or *χ*) and plosive *g*. To avoid confusion, it is a good idea to follow the idea that Germanic *γ* was transformed into *g* in all positions in the Gothic language. This preterite-present verb demonstrates the consonant gemination which is connected with the proto evolution of groups: *t+t*, *t+d* (*k*, *χ*, *γ*, *g+t*, *d>χt*): Gt. *mahta* (I was able): *mag* (I am able) [*γ+γ*]. There is a very interesting exception in the Gothic language: *magt* (you are able), compare OE. *meaht*, OHG. *maht*. The Gothic language demonstrates the consonant interchange in this verb (*g* > *g*): *mag* (I am able): *mahta* (I was able). The interchange possibilities for back palatal consonants are very restricted: *g:h* [*χ*] (*χ* originated from *g* before *t*): *magan*: *mahta*.

The minor subgroup includes three more verbs with different meaning, *aigan*, *aihan* (have), *ga-nah* (be enough) and *wiljan* (want). The verb *aigan*, *aihan* (have) is common Germanic, compare OHG. *eigan* (in the Indicative mood it was always used in plural *eigum*): OSax. *ēgan* (only plural was found), OE. *āgan*, OIcel. *eiga*. The feature of this verb is oscillation between root *h* and *g*, which is a very old grammatical interchange. The Old English and Old Icelandic languages preserved grammatical interchange in this verb: Gt. *a* and *h*: *aigum*; OE. *āh*: *āgon*; OIcel. *à*: *eigom*. Past tense form *aihta* may be interpreted as *\*aiγ-ðōm*. This verb preserves grammatical interchange in conjugation: *aih* (I have): *aigum* (we have) [*h* : *g* < *χ* : *γ*], this interchange occurs in preterite present verbs *þaúrban* and *aigan*. Past Participle has passive meaning in the system of transitive verbs. This

form is created in the strong conjugation involving suffix *\*-ana-* (<IE. *-ono-*). The North-Germanic languages use suffix *\*-ina-* (<IE. *\*-eno-*) instead of *\*-ana-*. In the Gothic language there are only a few old past participles, isolated from the verb system, that preserve this suffix: *aigih* (property) from *aih* (I have).

The verb ***ga-nah*** (be enough) appears in other Germanic languages as well its forms are: OHG. *g-nah*, OE. *be-*, *ge-neah* (enough).

Gothic conjugation of ***wiljan*** (want) in the present tense correlates with conjunctive (old optative) of Latin *velle* (want): Gothic singular: first person *wiljan*, second person *wileis*, third person *wili*; plural: first person *wileima*, second person *wileiþ*, third person *wileina* [11, p. 625]. Latin singular: first person *velim*, second person *velis*, third person *velit*; plural: first person *velimus*, second person *velitis*, third person *velint*. Short vowel [i] may occur in all syllables of the word (stressed, unstressed, initial, final). This vowel is a peculiar feature of the Gothic vowel system, especially in the unstressed syllables: *wili* (he wants). In the period of Proto-Germanic language Community, the final consonants relating to IE. *t*, *d* disappeared. The same process can be observed with the nasal *n*, *m*: Gt. *wili* : L. *veit* (he wants). The open final syllable preserves long vowels if there is no nasal consonant after them; compare, before dental (*i>i*): Gt. *wili* (he wants), L. *velit* < *\*velit*, but Gt. *wileis* (you want). This verb is a relict example of preserving Germanic diphthong *au* in unstressed syllable: *wiljau* (I want).

**Conclusions.** The minor subgroup of the Germanic preterite-present verbs includes seven units (*ga-daúr-san*, *munan*, *wiljan*, *daug,ga-mōtan*, *aigan*, *ga-nah*). All of these verbs have different meanings. They are not involved into the analytization of the Germanic languages (except *wiljan*), but they have common IE roots with a general lexical meaning which is rather transparent and well understood. *Wiljan* was included as an auxiliary verb in the system of verb grammatical categories, gradually losing its semantics and undergoing the process of grammaticalization. The rest of the verbs preserved their meaning, but they were excluded from the further grammaticalization. The promising investigation

needs the involvement of function analysis, revealing the position of these verbs in the sentence.

## REFERENCES

1. Bennet, W. H. (1980). *An Introduction to the Gothic Language*. New York: Modern Language Association, 190 p. [in English].
2. Braun, F. (1922). *Die Urbevölkerung Europas und die Herkunft der Germanen*. Berlin: Halle a.d. Saale. 278 s. [in German].
3. Braune, W. (1981). *Gotische Grammatik*. 19. Auflage. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 205 s. [in German].
4. Feist, S. (1924). *Indogermanen und Germanen*. Berlin: Halle a.d. Saale. 348 S. [in German].
5. Gamkrelidze, T. V. & Ivanov, Vjaceslav V., Jakobson, R. et al. (2010). *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and Proto-Culture*. Part I: The Text. Part II: Bibliography, Indexes. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 864 p. [in English].
6. Gregersen, S. (2019). Anna Wojtyś. 2017. *The Non-Surviving Preterite-Present Verbs in English: The Demise of\* dugan, munan, \*-nugan, \*þurfan, and unnan*. *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 51. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 258 pp., 12 tables. *Anglia*, 137(1), 163-167. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2019-0012> [in English].
7. Heyne, M. (1906). *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Halle. 1298 s. [in German].
8. Holthausen, F. (1934). *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Halle a.d. Saale. 1376 S. [in German].
9. Jellinek, M. H. & Hermann, P. (Ed.). (2017). *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 209 S. [in German].
10. Kluge, F. (1913). *Ungermanisch*. Strassburg: Halle. 348 S. [in German].
11. Lehmann, W. (1986). *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. 712 p. [in English].
12. Menge, H. & Güthling, O. (1910). *Menge-Güthling griechisch-deutsches und deutschgriechisches Wörterbuch, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Etymologie*. Berlin: Halle a.d. Saale. 989 s. [in German].
13. Mossé, F. (1949). *Manuel de la langue gotique. Grammaire. Textes. Glossaire*. Paris: Aubier. 272 p. [in English].

14. Plotkin, V. (2008). *The Evolution of Germanic Phonological Systems: Proto-German, Gothic, West Germanic, and Scandinavian*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press. 230 p. [in English].

15. Randall, W. & Jones, H. (2015). *On the early origins of the Germanic preterite presents*. *Trans Philologic Soc*, 113: 137-176. <https://doi:10.1111/1467-968X.12045> [in English].

16. Rauch, I. (2003). *The Gothic language: grammar, genetic provenance and typology, readings*. New York: P. Lang. 192 p. [in English].

17. Snædal, M. *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic*. (1998). Reykjavík: Institute of Linguistics, University of Iceland; University of Iceland Press. Vol. 1 = Introduction. Texts; pp. xxxiv, 70. Vol. 2 = Concordance. 1257 p. [in English].

18. Stig, K. J. George. (2018). *The preterite-present: an investigation into the underlying origin process*. (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen), 483 p. [in English].

19. Tomaszewska, M. (2019). *The evolution of surviving English preterite-present verbs (āgan, cunnan, \*durrān, \*magan, \*mōtan, \*sculan): a corpus-based study*. (PhD diss., Uniwersyte Warszawski), 256 p. [in English].

20. Voyles, J. B. (1992). *Early Germanic Grammar: Pre-, Proto-, and Post-Germanic Languages*. San Diego, California: Academic Press. 302 p. [in English].

21. Wright, J. (1997). *Grammar of the Gothic Language*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 366 p. [in English].

22. Wright, J. & Wright, E. M. (1925). *Old English Grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). London: Oxford University Press, 870 p. [in English].

**Дата надходження до редакції – 24.01.2020**

**Дата затвердження редакцією – 03.02.2020**