Внутрішня взаємна семантична і морфологічна кореляція германських претерито-презентних дієслів

Анотація. Група претерито-презентних дієслів має важливе морфологічно-семантичне значення, оскільки вже в ранньохристиянські періоди з'являється нова синтаксична будова дієслів. Вона була ще більш активна у східних, західних і північних германських мовах. В результаті історичного співіснівання претерито-презентних дієслів була сформована нова морфосемантична підгрупа аналогових дієслів. Це сталося, коли група претерито-презентних дієслів здобула свою стабільність і потенційність у межах германського дієслівного корпусу. Індукуюча сила претерито-презентних дієслів так була сильна, що навіть індивідуальна функція дієслова була залучена до процесу граматикалізації. У результаті цього наслідування була сформована нова морфосемантична підгрупа аналогових дієслів. Це сталося, коли група претерито-презентних дієслів здобула свою стабільність і потенційність у межах германського дієслівного корпусу. Індукуюча сила претерито-презентних дієслів так була сильна, що навіть індивідуальна функція дієслова була залучена до процесу граматикалізації.
Problems statement. The analysis of morphological and semantic changes gives the opportunity to understand what preterite-present verbs are and why they were involved into the formation of analytical tense forms. Comparison of these changes in the Germanic Languages on different areas is not realised on the appropriate level. That is why the unsolved issue under consideration is the selective involvement of the preterite-present verbs into the creation of analytical verb constructions.

The latest research and published works analysis. The Germanic preterite-present verbs were in the focus of linguistic research in terms of modality formation in the Germanic languages [2] and in terms of this verb subgroup etymology [7]. There were some attempts to analyse the parameters of these verbs and to trace the process of desquamation when the preterite-present verbs separated from the group of strong Germanic verbs [15]. In the second part of the XIX century there was a fundamental and vast description of the preterite-present verbs in the morphological aspect [5, p. 515–525], but that work lacked systemic and integrated research; and there was no correlation between morphological and semantic aspects.

The main task of our comparative historical investigation of the relative language groups is not the reconstruction of archetypes and system of archetypes of the proto-language, in other words, the reconstruction of hypothetical model of the proto-language. This task looks essential, yet optional.

The main aim of this class research is connected with finding out inner development tendencies which are reflected in the historically conditioned differences and resemblances between these relative languages. The article’s purpose is to reveal the specification of the preterite-present verbs within the East, West and North (Scandinavian) areas from the ancient times to the nowadays. The scientific novelty of the research arises from the attempt to retrace the integrated changes in the group of preterite-present verbs in all three lingual areas. The subject of the investigation is the preterite-present verbs by morphological (conjugation paradigms) and semantic peculiarities of the preterite-present verbs in the process of historical development of the Germanic languages. The object of the research is the preterite-present verbs of all Old and New Germanic languages, which were identified in the manuscripts of Old Germanic and Middle Germanic periods (involving some patterns of the classical languages).

Results. The advantages of the systemic investigation of languages are evident and certain, they don’t need further explanations when there are new attempts and ideas, aspects in the academic linguistic research. Among different linguistic investigations in this sphere the comparative-historical method may be regarded as the most complicated, but the most detailed and accurate as it gives the opportunity to find out the whole architectonics of linguistic processes that have been present in the language since ancient times and are still relevant [6, p. 18]. Phonetic and morphological component variation caused the semantic fluctuation of the linguistic units [12, p. 819–820]. These phenomena are quite distinctive by comparison, when the Indo-European languages, and Germanic languages in particular, are compared and confronted [14, p. 318–320]. To solve the problems arising with the involvement of comparative-historical method one needs accurate selection of the language material and usage of analysis methods which help to find-out the phenomena responsible for the evident changes in the linguistic objects [10]. The main linguistic research direction is outlined with the selection of preterite-present verb group within the macrogroup of strong verbs of the Germanic languages, and the detailed comparison of morphological forms in the East, West and North Germanic languages on the stages of their historical development [11, p. 6–7].

There is only one effective way to fill in the informational lacunae concerning the Germanic preterite-present verbs. This way integrates three aspects: phonetic, morphological and semantic. These aspects are reflected in the subgroup of preterite-present verbs. It directs the investigation into the definite and efficiently outlined way. The choice of the linguistic material is an essential initial stage for further research and comparison. Even now there is an unsolved problem of borders of some Germanic languages in certain areas. On the initial research stage, it is reasonable to apply a mediary triangular model which combines two triangles. The outer marco pan-Germanic triangle is formed with three corners: the East Germanic, West Germanic and North Germanic languages correspondingly. The inner microtriangle is formed with the dialects of English: the South-West (Saxon), Northern (Anglian), Kentish (Jutes). This model of
macro- and micro-triangular shape gives the opportunity to find out common structural components and trace changes that happened in continental and insular Germanic dialects.

Dialectal variability of New German (Modern German) is the reflection of Old Germanic languages. There are no definite boundaries between the German and Dutch languages of the South-West, but the dialectal boundaries of the German and Fristinian languages are well-determined. The Low German language is still being used in spite of belief of its disappearance. The West Low Germanic dialects are divided into Low Frankish and Low Saxon. The Low Frankish dialect has a special position and creates a transitional zone between the dialects of Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany. The Low Saxon dialect falls into Westfalen, Eastfalen and North-Saxon. This dialectal and variant differentiation shows that the triangle model gains more complicated outlines on the level of the New Germanic languages.

There are some unsolved and obscure problems on the level of the Old Germanic languages, too. In particular, among the Old Germanic languages that had no writing traditions there are languages of the East-Germanic tribes (Vindelic and Burgundian), and lexical relics of Hepidians, Rugians, Skirians. The language or dialect of Herulians belonged to the no writing tradition too, but its area location is still discrepant. The Herulians are identified as an Eastern, or Western, or Scandinavian tribe. They are recognised as a certain social group, too. Area identification of the Herulians was introduced on the basis of non-linguistic facts.

In the West Germanic area, the Langobardian language did not have its own writing tradition, but there were substantial examples of lexical material which was represented in the Latin writing fixation. These patterns don’t indicate the belonging of that language to the East Germanic languages (dialects). It is reasonable to emphasise that solving the problem of Old Germanic relic language and lexical relic, in particular, the definite data should be taken into consideration for further comparison and correlation with the vast collection of linguistic fund data. Such exotic languages as the languages of Rugas, Skyras, Hepidias may be recognized as tribal dialects of some East-Germanic languages. They don’t have any definite data for correct and informative correlation. In this case the Gothic language with its substantial lexical material is the reliable and dependable source of information for fruitful comparison and research. The Gothic corpus includes calendar fragments, deeds of purchase, Alcuin’s manuscript, separate Gothic glosses in the texts of early medieval Greek and Latin authors, saint names of Gothic martyrs in Orthodox church calendars, Ostgothic and Visigothic onomastics, toponymical relic that were borrowed from the Gothic language to the Romanic language. Concerning the classical Gothic languages these facts come form ‘relic Gothic’ or ‘Gothic of small corpus’, but the informativity of materials represented in these lexical units is much more valuable than Burgundian and Vandalic, which don’t have such a comparative fund.

Within the Gothic languages there is a Crimea-Gothic sub-branch, which has some features of relic. It should be mentioned that its relic specification is not associated with the period of the Gothic language existence. It is mostly associated with 1200 years of ‘time gap’ between different times of linguistic cutting off (Busbek wrote the letter about his travels in Frankfort on the Main in 1562). All this witnesses that the research of preterite-present verbs has the features of integrated process involving the linguistic material of as many Germanic languages as possible, grasping all three Germanic sub-branches. Indefiniteness and rather discrepant, contradictory interpretation of the Crimea Gothic language data may take into consideration only the data of the ‘classical’, ‘church’ Gothic language which was used for Ulfila’s translation of the Gospels (Silver Codex). Only this source is taken from the East Germanic area.

The Scandinavian area is restricted to Old Norse or Old Scandinavian, the language of the Elder Edda [4]. The West Germanic area is represented with large sources, grasping Old English [1, p. 8–9], Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Friussian [3]. Within the Indo-European verb system there is one specific feature associated with a verb group of original development and meaning. The verbs included into that group in the process of their development had lost archaic forms of the Present Tense (Presence) and for further filling the morphological-semantic gap they used the Preterite form for present meaning. Classical Latin also has corresponding examples (odi, coepi, memini). In the Germanic languages the verbs of that group have the property to use the new preterite form and to move it to the gap, which had formed when the Old preterite form had been used for present meaning. That new preterite form had been used for present meaning. That new preterite form was created using a dental suffix -da of weak verbs. The suffix was added to the form of Old Strong Preterite in plural. As a result of multistage transformations, the preterite forms of this class verbs grasp in their structure ablaut of strong and dental suffix of weak conjugations.

According to the meaning investigation of all these verbs it is reasonable to analyse common features of the Gothic and other Old Germanic languages. After that it would be informative and logical to distinguish phenomena which are absent in Gothic. From the logical point of view the Germanic-Latin comparison may be very informative: Gothic kann (Latin novi) has its origin in the verb Gothic kinnan (Latin gignere) with which it is possible to compare Old High German chind, German kind (Latin proles); Gothic kann, the preterite of kinnan was identical in meaning to the Latin genui. The Gothic verb parf (Latin egeo) is the preterite form of lost infinitive Gothic pairban (Latin agere, facere, operari) and they were expressions of the religious services with the meaning ‘I have spent, offered. I am without a sacrifice and wait for another’. The Gothic verb dars (Latin audeo) from dairson, may, with the original meaning ‘I have fought’. The Gothic verb skal (Latin debeo) originated from the present tense form of Gothic skila with meaning ‘I kill’. Here it is possible to compare it with Gothic skilja (butcher). The form skal meant ‘I have killed’, ‘I must pay penance, wergeld’ or ‘I am under the obligation’, ‘I am obliged’, ‘I must’. The Gothic verb man should be compared in the connection with the
form of the present tense Gothic mina (Latin cogito) and has the meaning of Latin memini 'I have thought over, I remember'. The Gothic verb nah (Latin sufficere) with the infinitive form naihan has the same meaning as the previous verb. The Gothic verb mag (Latin possum) is the preterite form of the old verb Gothic migan (Latin crescere, gignere) and it has meaning 'I have produced', 'I am able'.

The Gothic verb aih (Latin habeo) originated from the infinitive eigan (to work), but the preterite form had meaning 'I have worked'. 'I have earned', therefore 'I possess'. Gothic lais (Latin didici) originated from the lost form of the present tense leisa (Latin calce, pede, premi), with the definite meaning 'I have traced', 'I am on track'; And it may be compared with Old High German leisa (trace), Latin vestigium. Gothic váit (Latin scio) originated from the root vit and needs the present tense form veitan (videre), which was preserved in the compound verb in-veitan (Latin adorare), fravetian (Latin adscire); Gothic váit had the meaning 'I have seen', hence 'I know'. If Sanskrit veda is compared with corresponding Gothic verb, it is evident that both verbs originated from the common root vid (to see) with the hidden shared meaning 'I know'. Gothic daug (Latin prusum, valeo) comes from a present form diugan, maybe, with the hidden meaning of 'gignere', 'to beget'. Gothic mót (locum habeo) arises from a present form mata, whose origin and meaning are uncertain. The origin and signification of Gothic og (timeo) is more evident and definite. It demonstrates the origin from a present form aga (tremo), the present participle is preserved too in the form unagands (without fear, fearless). The Gothic language does not operate the verb an (Latin fateo) occurring in Old High German and some other dialects. It originates from an infinitive innan. The verb kna (Latin possum) occurs only in Old Norse. Undoubtedly, it is related to the Old High German knuit (natura), the Gothic knōda and the Sanskrit root jan (gignere). The two Old Norse words muna (recordari), munu are of the same common origin, as their meanings are alike: there is a remarkable difference of the infinitive forms, the muna is the present infinitive, the munu is a remnant of the ancient preterite infinitive in Old Norse.

Semantic analysis does not reveal all specific features of the preterite-present verbs. The system of their conjugation demonstrates the definite outline of their origin and further development. The paradigms of preterite-present verbs in the separate Germanic languages demonstrate common Germanic features of that verb group, paradigmatic forms and underline individual properties, too. The specific feature of Gothic preterite-present verbs is reflected in their endings. These endings are the same as the endings of preterite forms in strong verbs. There is an ending -t in the form of the second-person singular of the present tense (this form may be regarded as the Ancient, Archaic Preterite), and -um in the form of the first-person plural. The preterite suffix -da functions similarly to weak verbs and is connected with the preterite stem without a connective vowel, so the consonant of the ending -da and the preceding consonant of the preterite stem were often mutually modified. This phenomenon may be traced if the present and preterite forms are compared: kann (present tense, singular) – kunþa (preterite); þarf (present tense, singular) – þaurþum (present tense, plural) – þaurþta (preterite); mag (present tense, singular) – mahtta (preterite). There are two consonants f and h owing to the succeeding -t, vást (present tense, singular) – vitum (present tense, plural) – vísa (preterite). Since a dental sound before another dental changed into s, we have instead of *vis-ta > vissa, vit-ta > vissu. According to the Gothic phonetic laws möt (present tense, singular) – mōsta (preterite), where mōsta happened instead of *mōl-ta. Taking into consideration the Ablaut, the root of the present tense (ancient preterite) plural is changed in skulum to *skēlum, munum for *mēnum, while māgum (plural) preserves a in the form of preterite singular instead of the common plural form in ē. The infinitive form always has the root of the present tense (ancient preterite) plural. Ōgan has in the second-person singular, imperative mood form ógs. According to this example, it is possible to reconstruct imperative forms möts, duugs. Regarding the forms of verbs kunnan, munan, vitan, it is possible to anticipate that their group-mates munan (mende, agitare, velle), vitan (observare), go-kunan (observare) demonstrate the third weak conjugation pattern.

In the Old High German language preterite-present verbs have the same ending (inflections) as the strong verbs in general. The archaic flexion -t is preserved in the form of the second-person singular, present tense (ancient preterite), but the second-person preterite of all other strong verbs lost that flexion. There is a tendency of adding -s to -t in the verb chan, chan-st. Maybe, this flexion -st arose on the analogy of the s-t in verbs vaist-t, faist-t, where the Gothic phonetic law requires the change of a dental consonant into -s before the -t ending. The flexion -st gradually expanded into the second person of the present and preterite forms. The ancient -t occurs in some of the preterite-present verbs up to the present days. In particular, an creates preterite forms onda, onsta; kann has preterite forms konda, konsta, kunda, kunsta; in the same way bi-ginnan creates simultaneously with the strong preterite bi-gan two different forms bigonda, bi-ganst. In the Old Saxon language in the form of the second-person singular there is flexion -t, except in can-st, far-manst; the verb biginnan strong preterite form began and form begansta.

In the Old English (or Anglo-Saxon) Language the verb form of the second-person singular had the flexion -t, but later the vocalic ending of the common preterite of strong verbs gradually replaced the ancient ending. This process of replacing was reflected in forms an, unne, can, canne,Pearf, purfe; only the verb dear has new form durre and ancient form dearst. Some ancient forms are preserved too: canst, gemanst, åhst. All these forms have -s before the -t ending.

In the Old Frisian language, the change of the second-person singular occurs only once, for the verb skila it is the form skalt. Forms skiliu, mugii are dual ones. Some of the Old Frisian preterite-present verbs involved the forms of weak conjugation, for example, wêt (infinitive form wita) has sometimes the weak form wit, plural witath; of duga there is the third person singular ducht; plural form in Late Frisian is dâged; of åga it is
possible to find the third person singular form acht. The verb bijenna has the forms of regular preterite; and weak forms bigunde, bigonste.

In the Old Norse language, the -t flection occurs in the preterite forms of strong conjugation, the second-person singular. Under the influence of the -t ending consonants are affected in the same way as was shown above with regard to strong verbs. In particular, þora (Latin andere), duuga (Latin valere) create the forms of the present tense pori, dugi, preterite tense þorda, duðgð; ogã (Latin mettere) follows the second weak conjugation. The infinitives skuly, munny is likely to be the remnants of the ancient form of a preterite infinitive in Old Norse. This group includes also fóru, (ivisse), stóðu (stetisse); there are forms skyldu, myndu and bendu, the last one is the preterite infinitive of benda.

The Germanic languages have a small group of verbs which bear some resemblance to the preterite-present verbs. This resemblance is connected with such common features as the Ablaut of the strong conjugation, the preterite suffix of the weak ones, and no connective vowel in the group of analogous verbs. The so-called ‘analogous’ verbs share two basic features with the preterite-present verbs. The first point is connected with the pattern of the strong verb Ablaut. The second point is connected with the pattern of the preterite suffix of the weak conjugation. The second point has some peculiarities in the pattern, there is no connective vowel before the preterite suffix. These analogues verbs occurred in all branches of the Germanic languages.

There are six analogous verbs in the Gothic language. The verb þagkjan (to think, Latin cogitare) has the root -pak, preterite form -hahta; the verb þugkjan (Latin videri, German diennen), preterite form -hta; the verb brükjan (Latin uni, German brauchen), preterite form brûhta; the verb bugjan (to buy), preterite form bought; the verb vaûrkjan (to work, Latin operari), preterite form vaûrhta (wrought); the verb káupatjan (Latin colaphefare), preterite form káupasta. The Old High German language has five analogous verbs: the verb denkan (to think, German denken), the preterite form dâhta and participle dâht. The verb dunkan (Latin videri, German diennen, to seem, appear), preterite form dûhta; the verb wurkan, wirkan (to work) with preterite forms worhta, wurhta, warahta, participle forms worht, wurht, woraht; the verb furhtan (German fürchten, to fear) with preterite forms forhta, forahta, participle forms forth, forthat, furfht. The verb bringan (to bring) has two different variants: forms of strong preterite bringan, bragunums, and anomalous forms brâhta, brahtumâs. The Old Saxon language also has five analogous verbs. The verb thenkjan (to think) with preterite forms thàhta, thünkjan (Latin videri, German diennen) thûhta; the verb wirkjan (Latin operari) has the preterite form warhta; the verb buggjan (to buy) has only the participial form gi-boht; the verb brèngjan (to bring) has only the preterite form brûhta.

The Old English language as its close language relative also has five verbs of that morpho-semantically sub-group, in particular, the verb þencan (to think) has the preterite form þohte (thought), the verb þyncan (Latin videri) has the preterite form þûhte; the verb weorcian, wircan wyrkan (to work) has the preterite form worthe, weorhte; the verb bycyan (to buy) has the preterite form bohte (bought). The verb bringan has the forms of strong preterite brang, brungon and anomalous forms brûhote, broth. The Old Frisian language uses only four verbs of that morpho-semantic sub-group: the verb werka (Latin laborare) has the preterite form wrohte (wrought), the verb branga, brendza (to bring) with its preterite form brochte; the verb thanka, thenja (to think), trochte; the verb thinszja has in the West-Frisian variant of the preterite form tüchte instead of a standard thûchte; the verb bijenna (to begin) has the strong preterite and anomalous forms bigunde, bigonste. In the Old Norse language this sub-group is very small where the verb þynkja (Latin videri) has the preterite form þotta; the verb þenkja (to think) has the preterite form þenk-ta instead of þutta.

Besides the verbs incorporated into the analogous morphosemantic sub-group, the Germanic languages have individual closely related verbs with the general meaning ‘will’. The Gothic verb viljan has seven forms, three features with the preterite-present verbs, but it differs in some specific, individual points. Viljan (I will) in the present form has only this variant of the conditional mood, which originated from the ancient preterite. Judging by this form, there was an ancient indicative preterite singular vâil, plural vilum, and a present singular veila (Class V). The preterite conditional mood form is used with the meaning of the present indicative, and a new anomalous preterite vilda is formed out of the plural form vilum. The present form originated from the preterite of the conditional mood, has the traditional flexion for this tense form in the strong conjugation viljan, veleis, vili. The new preterite creates forms vilda, vildës in the indicative mood, in the conditional mood there is vildédjau using the dental suffix. In the Old High German language, the verb willan has the features of the indicative mood in the present tense and individual conjugation. There are three preterite conditional forms willi, willis, wili; but the present tense forms of the conditional mood plural look like wëllemës. There is a tendency of involving the indicative forms, the second person singular wili, this form has strong resemblance to the preterite-present verbs. In the case of the third person plural, there are forms wulent, wëlent, wëlant, they are related with wilen; wilt occurs in the third person singular, this form is related to witi. Preterite forms of the indicative mood always demonstrate some features of preterite-present verbs, wâlta, rarer form wëlta, and the form of the conditional mood woliti.

The Old Saxon language has a steady and definite tendency of involving the forms of the indicative mood for the verb willjan. In particular, there is a strict differentiation between the forms of the indicative and conditional moods. The forms of the indicative mood willj, will or wili, wili or wili and the plurale form willjadi are in the opposition to the structures, where the forms of the conditional mood dominate willje (-ea), willjes (-ens), plural forms willjen (-eän). The morphological difference is more evident if the forms of the preterite tense welda, wolda and the conditional forms weldi, woldi are compared.
The Old English language has the same tendencies: forms of the present-tense singular wille, wilt, wille, plural wille, preterite wold. The Old Frisian language has forms of the present-tense singular wille, wille (and also wyl, wyl); plural wylath; preterite forms wolde, wolde. In Old Norse the verb vilja, velle has corresponding forms: in the present tense singular vil, vilt and vilt (for vilt-r), plural viljum, vilô, vilja conditional mood vilt, preterite vilde. The tendencies distinguished in the Old Germanic languages have their continuation in the Middle and New Germanic languages. In the process of historical development these languages gained more distinctive and stable outlines of the morphological forms which were associated with certain semantic correspondences and correlations.

The English language demonstrates vast varieties of the morphological processes that occurred at the edge of the Old and Middle English periods. To provide more accurate and detailed research it is reasonable to involve and compare examples of the Gothic language and The English Language of Early and Late Old, Early and Late Middle and corresponding Early New periods. The Gothic kann, Early Old English can (con) occurred in all the periods of the English language. In the Middle English period (canst); in the plural forms there is the u-Ab laut (cunnen, kunnen). In the New English period singular and plural forms became alike. The n of the Gothic preterite form kunpa disappeared in the Old English period: cûde, Ormulum cûfe, Late Old Englishcoupe, Middle English could, New English could. In the New English period, maybe, the preterite form could was formed under the influence of would, should. Having provided the comparison of the Gothic parf; Early Old English fearf, one can analyse the functioning of the plural form purfen, preterite purfte in the Old Saxon dialects, all these forms corresponded to the Old English parf; in the New English period this verb disappeared.

The Gothic dars, Early Old English dear were reflected in the early New English as der, dar. In the New English period there is dare. The ending of the second-person singular -st was stable. The ending of the third-person singular (as in all other preterite-present verbs) were identical to the first person. In the New English period two forms dars and dare coexisted. It is possible to see the correlation of this verb forms in the line of Old Saxon durren, Old English durre, Middle English durn, New English dare. The preterite forms of Gothic dauursta, Early Old English dorste are reflected in the old Saxon dialect durste, Old English and Middle English dorste, New English durst.

The Early Old English gemunan occurred only in the manuscript Ormulum in the conditional mood form mune, preterite form mund. The Early Old English verb unnan was found in the manuscript Laymon in the form on, plural form i-unnen, preterite form üde; in the manuscript Ormulum übe, the Old English infinitive and the form of the present tense singular became identical and functioned as an.

There is a definite correlation in the line of the Gothic skald, Early Old English seal, Ormulum variant shall, Old English and Middle English schall, New English shallo. The form of the second person is always marked with -t ending. The plural forms are represented with the patterns of Early Old English sculon, Layamon sculen, Ormulum variant shulenn, Old English schulleþ, Middle English schullen, New English shall. The preterite forms are very well observed in the line of the Gothic skulda, Early Old English sceoda, Layaman variant scode, Ormulum variant sholdde, Old English and Middle English schilde, New English should. The letter i is mute under the influence of could, which was coude in Middle English.

The Early Old English deāh occurred only in the third person singular done (Ormulum) and in Old English deah. Form variations is seen in the line of Gothic mag, Early Old English moeg, Layamon variant moei, Ormulum variant moaʒ, Old English, Middle English, New English may; the second person forms occurred steadily in all periods: Early Old English meah, Old English miht, mizt, Middle English maist, New English mayst. There are also forms of the Oblique Mood Early Old English möge, Old English moew, New English might.

There is a definite line of Gothic vilja, Early Old English wâl, Old Saxon wæt, Old and Middle English wot(e), New English wot. The second person is represented with forms wast, wost. In the New English period all these forms were lost, and the plural forms witon, witen disappeared too. The preterite forms happened in all periods: Early Old English wiste, Layamon variant wiste, Ormulum variant wisste, Old English and Middle English wiste, New English wist. Infinitive forms took place in all periods too: Early Old English witan, Late Saxon witen, Old and Middle English witen, wite, New English to wit.

There is another specific correlation line starting with the Gothic aih, Early Old English að, Late Saxon ah, Old English aw, awe, New English owe. The second person forms have -est, -ist endings, in plural there is -en. There are also preterite forms Gothic aihæ, Early Old English ahte, Late Saxon ahte, ahhte, Old English aye, Middle English owte, New English ought. In the manuscript Layamon this verb is used in two different meanings (possession and duty), that is illustrated with the example he ah to don ‘he has to do, he ought’. In connection with this meaning this verb developed the meaning of being in debt, ‘to owe’. The verb absorbs the weak conjugation, the verb ought is restricted for expressing the moral obligation. The meaning of possession in the New English period is connected with the verb to own, which originated from the participial forms agen, awen, o wen, or from the Early Old English agnian (to possess).

There is a definite correlation in all periods of the Early Old English möt. The present tense form disappeared in the Early New English Period. Preterite forms Gothic mösta, Early Old English möste are reflected in Early New English moste, New English must. There is a definite and steady realisation of Early Old English wille in the very common and similar forms wille, wol, wulle, in different periods of the English language. The final step is represented with will. The second-person singular was represented with will (or wilt, wult in the Early Old English). The plural forms were represented with patterns willeþ, wulþ or wilen, wolen. All of them were reflected in the New English form will. The preterite forms were...
steady represented in the Early Old English wólde, wulde, New English would. The letter 1 was not pronounced in analogy to the patterns: Middle English coude, New English coulde.

The German language in the Middle period experienced the processes of the same nature as in The Middle English period. In particular, there are the patterns for the first person of Middle High German muoz, for the second person there is muost, for the plural muenen, the preterite forms are represented with mueste, muosta, muese. In New High German there are muß, müßt, müßen, müßte. The Middle High German variants weiz, weist, wizzen, wiste (weste, wisse, wesse) were realized in the New High German period as weiß, weißen, weßte, weßten, weßte. The Middle High German forms toue, töht, tügen, tohte were transformed into tauge (weak conjugation) in the New High German language. The Middle High German forms mac, maht, mügen, mohte (mahte) were reflected as mag, magst, moegen, machte. In the Middle High German period there were forms sol, solt, sülten, solte, which in the New High German period were reflected as soll (weak conjugation). The Middle High German language had forms gan, ganst, günnen, gunde. In the New High German they were reflected as gönne (weak conjugation). There is a definite correlation of the Middle High German forms (kan, kannst, können, kunde), the New High German (tar, tarst, türten, türtste), in the New High German period the last verb disappeared. The Middle High German forms darf, dürfen, dorfte transformed into darf, darfst, dürfen, durfte in the New High German period. In the Middle High German period the individual verb wil (welle), wil (wellsten, wellen, wolle) was reflected as will, willst, wollen, wollte in the New High German period. There is a specific (inorganic) Umlaut in the plural forms of the present tense, indicative mood and in the infinitive (muozen, tugten, kunnen, dürfen and moezten, tügten, kännen, dürften) are supposed to have functioned simultaneously in the Middle High German language. The preterite forms of the Oblique Mood never have Umlaut in the weak verbs, for example: Brennen, the preterite of the Oblique Mood in the Middle High German brante, the New High German brannte, but forms brennte, bräunte were impossible.

The Dutch language, in its middle period, demonstrates in the first person moet, in the second moete, in the plural moeten, in the preterite moeste; in the New Dutch language the first person functions as moet, the plural moeten, the preterite moest; the participle functions as gemoeten. The Middle Dutch forms doch, doghers, doghent, dochte are reflected in the New Dutch forms deug, deughen, doht. In the same way the Middle Dutch forms mach, moghes, moghen, mochte were transformed into the New Dutch forms mûg, mûgen, mûcht gemocht. The Middle Dutch variants sal, sullen, sulde (soude) were reflected in the New Dutch forms zal, zullen, zoude (zou). The Middle Dutch an, onnes, onnen, onnte disappeared in the New Dutch period. The Middle Dutch forms can, conen, conen, conste were reflected in the New Dutch as kan, konnen, konde (kon, konst), geleonnen (gekost). The Middle Dutch forms dar, dorres, dorren, dorste were transformed into derre (weak conjugation) in the New Dutch period. The Middle Dutch forms dârfe, dârves, dârven (dorfe) in New Dutch were transformed into durf, durven, dorst (this preterite variant derived from der). The Middle Dutch individual verb forms wille, willen, wilde (woude) were transformed into wîl, willen, wilde (vulgar woude, wou), gewill in the New Dutch period. The Middle Dutch forms wêt, wêtes, wêten, wist, gewêten.

In the Scandinavian languages the processes of adaptation took place too. The Middle Scandinavian forms were reflected in the separate national languages: Swedish vêt, plural vête, present tense viste; Danish vêd, vide, vidste. The Swedish forms må, måge, måtte; Danish maa, maace, maatte; Swedish skal, skôle, skulle; Danish kan, kenne, kunde; Swedish eger (Latin habeo, weak conjugation); Danish ejer (weak conjugation); Swedish förs (passive form), preterite torso; Danish toer, turde. The Swedish forms of present and preterite måste (Latin debei, debeo). Old Swedish mân, Old Danish mon, monne, bore some resemblance to Old Norwegian man, mundi. The Swedish variant of the individual verb vill, vilja, preterite ville are closely connected with the Danish forms vil, ville, wilde.

The verbs that developed the forms in the analogues ways as the forms of the preterite-present verbs (they were distinguished as analogous verbs) functioned in the Old, Middle and New Germanic periods. They are traced in the West and North Germanic languages. In English there are nine verbs belonging to the analogous morphosemantic sub-group: Early Old English bringan, brohte are traced in Late Old English broste, brouhte, New English brought. Early Old English bygean, bohte, Late Old English and Middle English boste, bouhte [1], New English bought. They all maintain the general tendencies of morphological formation patterns. The same evidence may be found in the patterns of Early Old English pensean, pohte, Late Old English pozte, Middle English thoȝte, thouht, New English thought; Early Old English þynce, þoste, Middle English thinketh, thoȝt (thoȝt), New English thinks (me-thinks), thought; Early Old English wyrcean, worhte, Layamon wurchen, worhte, Orulum wyrkenn, wrohhte (the metathesis case), Old English wyrc, wyro, wyroht, Middle English worche (wyrke), wyrote (wrohute), New English work, wroght, worked. The analogous verb group grasps the Early Old English cláðjan, cläd-ode, which was transformed into Old English cloopen, and preterite forms eloped, cladde, New English clothed, clad; Early Old English makjan, mak-ode, Old English maked, made, New English made; Early Old English sagjan, seeg (to say), preterite forms sägde, seude, Old English and Middle English seide, New English said; Early Old English laigjan, leegan, preterite forms lagode, ledede, Old English leide, New English laid.

There are three analogous German verbs, in particular, Middle High German bringen, brâhte, New High German brachte; Middle High German denken, dâhte; New High German dachte; Middle High German dunken, dûhte, New High German dûnken, dâuchte (dâuchte); the form dûichtet instead of dûnkt in the present tense is wrong; Middle High German wîrken (wirken), worhte; würhten, vorhte; New High German wirken, fûrchten (weak conjugation). In the Dutch language there are four verbs of that mor-
pho-semantic sub-group: Middle Dutch *bringhen*, *brochte*, New Dutch *brenget*, *brocht*; Middle Dutch *denken* (*dinken*), *dachte* (*dochte*), New Dutch *danken*, *docht*; Middle Dutch *werken*, *wrochte*; New Dutch *werken*, *vroom*, *vuurten* (metathesis; compare Middle Dutch *vürhten*, *vrochte*; *ducht* (*to fear*), *dochte*.

In the Scandinavian languages there are only two verbs of that morpho-semantic subgroup: Swedish *bringe*, *bragte*; Danish *bringe*, *bragte*; Swedish *tänka*, *tycka* (weak conjugation); Danish *tænke*, *tykkes* (passive, weak conjugation).

Conclusions and suggestions for further research. All the preterite-present verbs as a separate morpho-semantic group appeared and were formed in the period of the Proto-Germanic language background. The process of this group formation seems obscure and uncertain. When solving the problem of their development it is necessary to take into consideration that the preterite-present verbs are rooted deeply and used intensively in the system of Common Germanic Vocabulary. It is demonstrated with the help of the fact that there is mutual coexistence of the preterite-present verbs *witan*, *agan* and strong verbs *witan*, *agan* (compare participle *unagands* (fearless) in the Gothic language). The verb *witan* is connected with archaic *weitwōs* (*un-wiss*), and weak verbs *fair-weitjan* (to see), *witan* (to observe) (compare Latin *videre*). The preterite-present verbs became the centres of creating the specific patterns of tense formation. The present and preterite tense patterns with the preterite-present verbs attracted analogous verbs and the individual verb. These morpho-semantic sub-group followed the models of the tense formation. The semantic aspect of the preterite-present verbs, its polyaspectedness and variations, transformation in the process of historical development of the Germanic languages caused the involvement of the preterite-present verbs (part of them) for further creation of the tense forms (their analytical patterns). The semantic aspect is still on the periphery of the linguistic research and it is waiting for its turn to be harnessed into the orbit of the morphological investigation.
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