A Comparative Grammar of the Early Germanic Languages

Nelson Goering

Published online: 27 Jan 2021.

Submit your article to this journal ⤤

View related articles ⤤

View Crossmark data ⤤

pursued in an insightful reading of the late novel *Our Mutual Friend* (1865) and the diverse readerly communities created therein by the circulation of news. The second chapter focusses on Anthony Trollope and the recurrence, across his fictional world, of characters thrown into crisis by reading misleading depictions of themselves in the press. Trollope's distrust of the press is explored both through these characters in crises and through caricatures of untrustworthy editors and journalists. Trollope's novels, according to Valdez, valorise the novel over the newspaper as the "ultimate form of political representation". (p. 78)

The monograph then moves onto the sensation novel and finds symbolic meaning invested in the newspaper in Wilkie Collins's *Armadale* (1866) and Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *Aurora Floyd* (1863). Pushing against the conventional view that sensation novels took inspiration from contemporary news stories to emphasise their modernity, Valdez argues that newspapers are more closely aligned with the uncanny, the fatalistic or the melodramatic in Collins and Braddon's work. The jangled nerves and status anxiety of the novels are nicely captured in this chapter that asks us to re-think the type of community-building we see in sensation novels. The final chapter takes us towards the end of the century and shifts the focus onto Israel Zangwill's writings of Jewish life, particularly *The Children of the Ghetto* (1892). Although the novel is positioned in a realist tradition following on from Dickens and Trollope, different debates are brought to bear here around the politics of Jewish identity and assimilation. This chapter moves furthest from the central argument to situate the novel in relation to oral traditions, Yiddish literature, fairy tales and other forms alongside the newspaper.

These chapters, although focussed on specific authors and texts, reach out to a wide range of intertexts to draw comparisons and contrasts with authors ranging from Jane Austen to George Eliot. This creates a broader feeling of engagement with Victorian literary culture and demonstrates Valdez's wide-ranging knowledge of the period. Ultimately the work offers a fresh take on some familiar novels and invokes the power of Victorian fiction to theorise the concept of "the news" for its readers.

Beth Palmer
University of Surrey
✉ b.palmer@surrey.ac.uk ⓘ http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7485-3813

A Comparative Grammar of the Early Germanic Languages, by R. D. Fulk, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2018, $149 (hb), ISBN: 9789027263124, free e-Book, ISBN: 9789027263131

Germanic comparative grammar is in many ways a peculiar field. It bridges not only the study of the various older Germanic languages—principally Old English, Old Frisian, Old Saxon, Old High German, Old Norse, Early Runic, and Gothic—but also the wider Indo-European background of Germanic, and it further depends on methodologies and insights drawn from general linguistics. At the same time, it encompasses a large body of distinctive scholarship, facts, arguments, and traditions all its own. The difficulties in defining the scope of the field were laid out clearly by Tolkien many years ago:

> English Philology is only a department, a special application, of the general study; any important results in the wider or more general fields will affect it; its methods and aims are the same as those in each of the other departments, and are modified by their experience. If, therefore, it is difficult to decide what should come under General English philology and what under that of special periods, it is still more difficult to draw the line that should exclude writings of Indo-European, Germanic, or universal reference that do not deal specifically with English. (Tolkien 1926, 27)

In his comprehensive overview of the subject, Fulk takes an approach that is at once expansive and focused. He traces the development of a single language family from the beginnings of its separate history in "late" Proto-Indo-European through Proto-Germanic and up to the earlier Germanic languages as actually recorded in later Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The focus is solely on historical phonology and inflectional morphology, the two main sections of the book. Derivational morphology, syntax, semantics, lexicon, and so forth come up only incidentally when they have some bearing on the book's main subjects, and things like the external histories of Germanic speakers and Germanic dialectology are treated helpfully but very briefly in the introductory chapter.[1]

These topics, phonology and inflection, are the traditional core of Germanic comparative grammar, and Fulk treats them both methodically and thoroughly, providing the first book-length, English-language synthesis since Prokosch's *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*—a work published posthumously in 1939, a year after the death of the author, and characterised as "in some respects already out of date" when it appeared.[2] Fulk's approach is steadfastly bibliographical: he cites a very great deal of earlier literature (the references at the end run to some 38 tightly-packed pages), and often presents his own views as responses to or comments on earlier scholarship. The goal, as he states in the preface, is "to provide students with an overview of early Germanic phonology and inflectional morphology and to furnish such bibliographic references as may be required in the pursuit of further research on any given topic" (p. xiv).[3]

---

[1]Certain preliminaries, such as the discussions of reconstruction and subgrouping, could have benefited from more reference to the literature on these topics, such as Hoenigswald or Hale.

[2]Kufner, ix. The main earlier attempts in English at filling the gap are Coetsem and Kufner, as well as Voyles, of which the former is self-avowedly heterogeneous and misses coverage of many important topics (Kufner, x–xi), and the latter is primarily concerned with theoretical linguistic approaches to historical phonology. The ongoing *Linguistic History of English* (Ringe; Ringe and Taylor) is of course an extremely valuable treatment of many classic topics in the field, but it is not structured as a reference grammar, and is in any case biased (by intention) towards Old English, especially in the second volume. Effectively contemporaneous with Fulk's *Comparative Grammar* is the excellent new collection of essays on Germanic in Klein, Joseph, and Fritz; these are rather broader in their coverage of topics, including substantial treatments of things like syntax and the lexicon, but each topic is still covered somewhat more briefly. We are fortunate to have three excellent and complementary works appear in such a short span of time, and each is worth consulting alongside the others.

[3]While this goal is generally admirably met, there are of course some holes. To take just one possible example that may be of particular interest to scholars of Old English: Fulk endorses without comment the old idea that the variation in weak class II preterites in Old English between forms like *egsode* "terrified" (with *o* from older *u*; the form *egsude* is in fact also attested) and *egsade* was originally created by a raising of pre-Old English *$\bar{o}$ to *$\bar{u}$ before a following *u, which occurred in some endings (as in *eg(e)sodon* < *egisudun*), with a change of *$\bar{o}$ > *a* in other contexts. Under this theory—sometimes called van Helten's rule—the third-person singular *egisōdæ* should have given *egsade* by regular sound change, and forms like *egsode* have the *o* (< *u*) introduced by analogy from the plural. Stausland Johnsen, in an article not cited in this book, has now shown convincingly that this old theory cannot be correct. Rather, it is more likely that the development of *$\bar{o}$ > *u* occurred in all medial syllables, regardless of what vowel followed, so that the development *egsōdæ* > *egisude* > *egsode* is perfectly regular. The development of *$\bar{o}$ to *a* occurred, by contrast, when no further syllables followed, which was mainly the case in the past/passive participle: *egisōd* "(was) terrified" would regularly become *eg(e)sad*. This new theory—which we might call Stausland Johnsen's rule—empirically accounts significantly better for the distribution of vowels in early West Saxon, where *a* still predominates in final syllables, and *o* (*u*) in medial syllables. A few other minor omissions which might nonetheless have been cited as useful recent contributions: the thesis of Johannsson on the Old High German verbal ending *-mĕs* (p. 276); the controversial but important work of Dyvik on "breaking" in Old Norse—arguing that the development of older *$berga^n$* "protect, save"

This book is, however, by no means merely an annotated bibliography. If nothing else, the sifting and selection of what references to feature, and the range across the full breadth of Germanic historical phonology and morphology, would make the work a valuable and original resource, but Fulk goes considerably further in providing critical evaluation of the scholarship and data. In a typical example, such as his discussion of how the dental preterite of weak verbs came to be (pp. 292–94, cf. 321–23, 331–34), Fulk surveys some key past scholarship (focusing especially on recent works, and referring to older bibliographies for earlier treatments), and breaks down the various approaches into two broad groups: in this case, derivation of Germanic *d from either Indo-European *d^h (usually as part of the root *$\sqrt{d^heh_1}$- "put, set", the etymon of our word *do*), or else from *t (especially associated with the old verbal adjectives in *-tó-, found in the Germanic past/passive participles of weak verbs). Fulk's commentary does not stake out a position on every detail, but he makes it clear that both origins were probably involved to an extent, outlines what family of explanations can be considered plausible and mainstream, and highlights the problems that make it so difficult to resolve the matter completely satisfactorily.

At times, Fulk's conservativism and reserve can lead to questionable results. Some of these are effectively quirks of notation, such as the Proto-Germanic phoneme *o which appears in many of his reconstructions (pp. 256, 314, etc., cf. §§4.3 and 5.5).[4] In other cases, there are apparent relics from Prokosch, of which this book serves as an update in many ways, despite certain differences in overall structure and approach. This is clear, for example, in the statement that the two different vowel grades of the verb "to come"—one with an *e*-grade (e.g., Gothic *qiman* and Old High German *queman*) and one with a zero-grade (e.g., Old English *cuman*, Norse *koma*, Old High German (again) *kuman*)—reflects an old, Indo-European distinction between a "durative" and "aorist" aspect (p. 288, cf. 264).[5] More likely—as Fulk indeed remarks in a different context (p. 255)—there was a single Proto-Germanic form, reflecting the Indo-European aorist, and the variation within Germanic is due to later developments.[6] In other cases, certain errors, usually fairly minor, seem to stem from an overreliance on outdated reference works. Fulk draws heavily, for instance, on Pokorny's *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, still the only comprehensive

---

into Norse *bjarga* is due to the following consonant cluster rather than the following (nasalized!) vowel—which would have nicely rounded out the comparisons to parallel vocalic developments in Old English (cf. *beorgan*); Kümmel (*Ungeklärtes *u*) on early anaptyctic vowels in Germanic; Gąsiorowski on the possible sound change *$Vzr > *\bar{V}r$; and the useful synthesis of Hyllestad on the early interactions between Germanic and Celtic. Naturally preferences about just what should have been cited will vary between individuals.

[4]The suggestion that Indo-European *o had not become *a in all positions seems exceptionally implausible. Somewhere between a notational question and a matter of substantive reconstruction is the placement of many final segments that were lost early in brackets. This leads to odd anachronisms, such as *$six^wiþ(i)$ "she sees", *$sax^w(e)$ "she saw", and *$sē\ʒun(þ)$ "they saw" all given as "Proto-Germanic" (pp. 64, 41, 108). In theory, the bracketed sounds are ones that existed in Proto-Germanic, but disappeared earlier, so that the parentheses are a kind of mnemonic to this loss (pp. 274, 277), but of these three forms, this was only true of Proto-Germanic *$six^wiþi$ (cf. Gothic *saiƕiþ*). The proper Proto-Germanic forms of the latter are simply *sax^w and *$sē\gun$ (using <ɣ>, from the International Phonetic Alphabet, rather than Fulk's <ʒ>, which to most linguists symbolizes the "zh" sound of words like *measure*, and supplying the delabialization that occurred before *u), with loss of final *-t and *-e happening (in that order) before the Proto-Germanic stage; cf. §5.2 of the present grammar, and the clear discussion by Stiles, 120–22. Such anachronisms are perhaps sometimes intended as artificial shorthands for the sake of exposition or as mnemonics, but in very many cases the brackets produce needless clutter and some hybrid forms appear to sacrifice accuracy for no useful purpose. More explicit recognition of the early loss of *-t (*-þ), for instance, would have saved Fulk from a certain amount of anxiety about why the vowel of the weak preterite ending "*-ðē(þ)" was shortened in Gothic -da (e.g. p. 292).

[5]Cf. Prokosch, 171.

[6]Fulk reports the opinion of Ringe, in Ringe and Taylor, 141f., that Proto-Germanic had *$k^wemanan$, and the reduced forms are due to phonological developments in Northwest Germanic. Alternatively, Proto-Germanic may have had only *$k^{(w)}umanan$, which was replaced by the *e*-grade forms analogically, this being a very common vowel in the presents of strong verbs of classes 1–5; see Seebold, 315; Rix and Kümmel, s.v. *g^uem-.

etymological dictionary of Proto-Indo-European, but severely problematic in its inclusive and speculative approach to roots. There is no total substitute for this, but there are partial replacements, such as *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon* and, especially, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Both these works are mentioned in an overview of materials for Proto-Indo-European in the introduction (p. 4), but as far as I can tell, no reference is made to either in the body of the grammar. This leads to curious reconstructions, such as writing the Proto-Indo-European word for "water" not as the usual *$\mathring{u}\acute{o}d\mathring{r}$, but as *$h_2\mathring{u}\acute{o}d\mathring{r}$ (p. 180). This looks like a mechanical update of Pokorny's *au̯e-* into laryngeal notation, but is unfounded.[7]

A more extended example where Fulk's indebtedness to the older scholarship and reluctance to commit to a single critical judgement do lead to genuine confusion and inconsistency comes with the admittedly tangled question of "trimoric" vowels in Proto-Germanic. This is precisely the sort of area where someone working on, say, Old English specifically might seek guidance on the earlier Germanic background, perhaps in order to better understand the discussions surrounding the phenomenon of "Kaluza's law" in *Beowulf*. Such a reader will, in one place, find a reasonably clear (at least, as clear as possible given the inherent thorniness of the topic) and sensible overview of the question with, as usual, plenty of references (pp. 84–7). There is also a very helpful table of the various developments of the different *$\bar{o}$ vowels of early Germanic (p. 85). Unfortunately, the ideas laid out in this general section are not always reflected elsewhere in the grammar. For instance, the genitive singular of a noun like Old English *giefe*[*] "gift" (an *$\bar{o}$-stem noun; cf. Gothic *gibōs*, Old Norse *gjafar*, Old High German *geba*, etc.) is asserted here to go back to a "trimoric" ending *$-\hat{o}z$. This is a view with a long history in the literature,[8] but supported by no Germanic evidence at all,[9] and not strongly motivated from an Indo-European perspective.[10] The alternative view that the ending goes back to Proto-Germanic *$-\bar{o}z$ is also common, especially in more recent literature,[11] and is much less problematic; Fulk does note this perspective, but only rather offhandedly, presenting it in a note as an assertion by Ringe (p. 155).

Examples of this sort are not isolated, but they are also not typical. Fulk is, by and large, very much in touch with the recent literature, as well as the traditional, on Germanic and (perhaps with more qualifications) Indo-European, and this is reflected in many particulars. He gives a reasonable hearing, for instance, to the revived defences of Kluge's law by Kroonen and Scheungraber,[12] and some attention is given to the sizable body of research into Germanic prosody and metrical phonology that has developed over the past decades. Fulk groups the

---

[7]Compare Rix and Kümmel, s.v. *u̯ed-*, and, especially, Wodtko, Irslinger, and Schneider, s.v. *u̯ed-* and *u̯eh₁-r-*, n. 1. Fulk also gives a dubious lengthened grade in *reḭ-rēḭ-é-ti* "trembles", which is not in keeping with the standard view that such Indo-European lengthened grades are generally morphologically much more restricted than some earlier research thought. LIV suggests the reconstruction *h₃réḭ-h₃roḭH* instead (see Rix and Kümmel, s.v. *h₃reḭH-* and nn. 9 and 10, with references). This update of *ēi* to *oi*, far removed as it first appears from Germanic, is actually of some direct relevance to the formation of the class III weak verbs—the class to which the descendent of this Indo-European verb belongs, cf. Gothic *in-reiraida* "trembled"—which are now thought to contain reflexes of Indo-European *oi* in the stem rather than *ē(ie)*.

[8]Streitberg, 236f.; Flasdieck, 57ff.; Dahl, 133; Sievers, 206 (§252, Anm. 2); Campbell, 234.

[9]The problem is that Proto-Germanic *$\hat{o}z$ ought to develop into Old High German *-o* and Old English *-a*, but the ending in question is actually found as *-a* and *-e*, respectively, as if from bimoric *$-\bar{o}z$. Rewriting Old High German *geba* as *gebā* does not really help matters.

[10]Rix, 132 (§143); Schaffner, 368.

[11]Stiles, 139, n. 17; Bammesberger, 102f. (§4.2.3.3); Schaffner, 368.

[12]Though it must be said that Fulk's suggestion (§6.9 and n. 3), following Marchand, that Kluge's law operated only after the breakup of Proto-Germanic and the divergence of Gothic is impossible to credit. Like Verner's, Kluge's law depends on the position of the Proto-Indo-European mobile accent—a conditioning which Fulk does not doubt—and so, if it took place at all, it did so before the fixing of the accent on the root (a sound change which itself preceded a number of other Proto-Germanic sound changes, and can hardly be regarded as particularly late). A reference back to Kluge's law in the discussions of class II and IV weak verbs might have also been helpful.

early Germanic preference for bimoric trochees, along with various sound changes related to this prosodic system, under the loose heading of "Prokosch's law", and gives due attention to this in contexts such as Sievers' law, West Germanic gemination, and Old English high vowel loss, reflecting current trends that see these as coherent, related processes rather than disparate and random phenomena. Fulk himself is also, of course, an eminent Germanicist who has made a number of substantial contributions to the study of comparative grammar, and he draws effectively on his close engagement with specific problems at a number of points, such as in the very useful discussion of class 7 strong verbs in North and West Germanic (§12.20).[13]

Fulk's expansiveness and caution mean that even in cases where his own preferences may not be well founded, the reader usually has all the tools they need to compensate. A particularly clear example of this is the problem of how to explain the difference between forms of the second-person singular of the past tense of strong verbs in West Germanic —where we find things like Old English *þū wǣre* "you were"—and in North and East Germanic (Gothic *þū wast* "you were"). Why doesn't Old English have ˣ*wæst*, which would make a more regular paradigm with *ic wæs* "I was" and *hēo wæs* "she was"? Fulk (pp. 277–79) outlines the two classic approaches to the problem very clearly: one idea is that West Germanic has somehow inserted some type of Indo-European aorist into the strong verb preterite; the other is that West Germanic has adopted the subjunctive form for the indicative in this particular instance (for reasons of syntax or politeness, perhaps with a little phonological prompting). Further scholarship on both approaches is referenced, and the extreme weaknesses of the aorist model are largely noted. Rather surprisingly, Fulk's own conclusion is that "an aorist model, insecure as it is, seems the likeliest explanation offered to date for the 2 sg. ending in WGmc." (p. 278)—a striking contrast with the recent assessment by Ringe, who fairly describes the whole theory as "not merely implausible, but incredible"[14]—but this can largely be dismissed as a personal idiosyncrasy. The reader has all the tools they need to make up their own mind.[15]

As several of these examples have already shown, this book moves readily from the fine details of Germanic philology—the runic scratchings on stone and wood, and the squiggles of ink on treated animal skins—back into the reconstruction of never-recorded speech forms in Proto-Indo-European. A question such as the possible aorist origin of forms like *wǣre* at once touches on inner-Germanic dialectology (West Germanic

---

[13]Fulk is, perhaps, a little overzealous in fighting his corner on certain details, such as with the rather improbable theory that the medial *r* of Old High German preterites like *ki-scerot* "cut" is some sort of hiatus filler, from an earlier **skeōt*. Compare the discussion by Ringe, in Ringe and Taylor, 88–92, who is deeply indebted to Fulk's 1987 article, but who is also more open to the kinds of irregular reductions, e.g. of *-scerot* from **ske-skrōt* (from **ske-skraut*), advocated by Jasanoff. It is nonetheless clear that Fulk's overall approach has been deeply influential, and the discussion in the current grammar is valuable.

[14]Ringe and Taylor, 68f.

[15]The only really unfortunate thing is that Fulk presents his view as the communis opinio, commenting that the aorist theory is "now usually" the explanation adopted by scholars. This is no longer true, whatever popularity the aorist theory enjoyed among previous generations: from a glance at the references cited over the course of Fulk's discussion, it is apparent that there have been few, if any, serious defences of the aorist theory in the past four decades—aside from Fulk's own discussion in Hogg and Fulk, 222, which presents the aorist theory as relatively uncontroversial—in contrast with the array of rejections of this idea in favour of the subjunctive origin that have appeared in more recent years. There are one or two other places where Fulk's judgements about what is "normally" or "usually" thought do not seem entirely accurate. For instance, commenting on the three "laryngeal" consonants of Proto-Indo-European, he claims that Greek is "more commonly" now regarded as producing a single schwa from the "vocalization" of any laryngeal, which usually developed into **a*, paralleling the development in many other Indo-European languages. This is not true, and the "triple reflex of schwa" is the mainstream view in Greek and Indo-European linguistics, and is indeed a crucial component of the trilaryngealistic model that Fulk himself follows for Proto-Indo-European; cf., among others, Rix, 72; Tichy, 41; Rau, 175f.; Fortson IV, 62; Beekes and de Vaan, 148; Bubenik, 641.

versus North and East) and on the Indo-European verbal system. One of the greatest strengths of this book is the clear explanatory style and presentation which ties this mass of detail together. Fulk does not assume that the average Germanicist will have a background in Indo-European linguistics, and is careful to provide a useful introduction to the standard current views on "late" Indo-European, including the "trilaryngeal" approach to its phonology (pp. 43–45, 53–54, 101–102), the system of accent-ablaut patterns adopted by scholars during the twentieth century (p. 144), and the modified "Greco-Aryan"[16] model that is the usual touchstone for the very tangled reconstruction of Indo-European verbs. Fulk largely avoids getting into the controversies and uncertainties surrounding many aspects of Indo-European reconstruction. He does discuss the "glottalic theory" of Indo-European stops, only to reject it (p. 144), and alludes to the profound controversies surrounding the Indo-European verb[17] without getting into the details. Thus some of the major reconsiderations and controversies that have caused so much upheaval in Indo-European studies over the last century are folded into this comparative Germanic grammar, while other fault lines are carefully delineated by Fulk as outside the remit of the field. This is not (just) a way of setting some reasonable limits on the scope of the book, but is also part of Fulk's argument that Germanic is derived from a variety of Indo-European largely consistent with that back-projected from Sanskrit rather than representing a particularly archaic branch of the family (§1.4, §12.1, n. 5).[18]

On the "niggly" philological details within Germanic, Fulk is generally very rigorous and precise. He several times draws on his long experience with Old English and Old Norse skaldic metrics to good effect, and his summaries of the philological contexts of the various Germanic languages are clear and useful. Unsurprisingly for a grammar of this sort, there is a certain amount of normalisation: Old Norse words, in particular, are typically cited in the idealised Old Icelandic orthography of *Íslenzk Fornrit* rather than their manuscript forms. Paradigms are usually given with a single word inflected in all its possible forms, even when (as is very often the case) they are not all directly attested for the example word specifically.[19] There is at least one real ghost word cited, and it is one of some consequence for prosody: in the section on Sievers' law, Fulk refers to a Gothic verbal form *swōgateiþ* "sighs"; if this form existed, it would require some reconsideration of Sievers' law in Gothic, but it in fact is nowhere to be found in the corpus.[20] It was not so long ago that Kiparsky helped set the study of Sievers' law on better footing by pointing out that the once-oft-cited **glitmuneis* "you shine" is a ghost word, observing that no words of this shape (stems with a heavy syllable followed by a light syllable followed by a

---

[16]That is, based especially on Homeric Greek, Vedic Sanskrit, and Old Avestan. The "Aryan" part does not refer to the distorted and racialized sense once far too popular in European culture, but to the Indo-Iranian (better: Indo-Iranic) branch, of which Sanskrit and Avestan are the oldest representatives; cf. Fortson IV, 209f.

[17]On which now see the excellent book by Willi.

[18]Fulk's focus is evident in the *index verborum*, which includes only some dozen Hittite words, and just two from Tocharian (both from Tocharian B). There are a few points where a little more attention to these languages might have been useful: when considering possible *o*-grades in the verbal root $*\sqrt{d^heh_1}$- "set, put" (whence English *do*), Tocharian B *tättā-* should probably have been mentioned as possible evidence (see Malzahn, 650), as should Luwian *dai* (see Morpurgo Davies, 225, n. 47). Also compare Rix and Kümmel, s.v. $*d^heh_1$-. Here we do have a possible example of Germanic grouping with these more archaic branches against its more immediate European neighbours—though it might still group with Indo-Iranic, since Vedic *dádhāti* and Young Avestan *daðāiti* could go back to either $*d^he$-δ^heh_1-*ti* or $*d^he$-d^hoh_1-*ti*. Nonetheless, Fulk's arguments against a particularly archaic position for Germanic are generally well grounded and convincing.

[19]Fulk (p. 159) does comment on this, but only well into his first chapter on morphology. It is worth noting that nearly every paradigm in the book contains such reconstructions, not merely the few for which explicit caveats are given.

[20]Magnús Snædal, 1010.

j-formant) are attested in a form relevant for Sievers' law;[21] it is unfortunate that Fulk's book, which in so many respects deserves to be a standard reference work, should introduce a similar non-existent and misleading form. Errors of this sort are, however, extremely rare, and by and large Fulk is careful and scrupulous about his data.

Taken as a whole, this book represents an exceptional and valuable achievement. Anyone interested in Old English (or any other older Germanic language) as a language will find a great deal that is useful here, and it will make an excellent first port of call for further research into any aspect of Germanic phonology or inflection. Fulk is a sensible and critical guide to the field, and his book deserves to be on the shelf—or more likely, on the hard drive, especially given its availability as an "open-access" PDF[22]—of any philologist. This work will surely prove indispensable to anyone attempting to make their way through the tangled mirkwood of Germanic comparative grammar.[23]

---

[21]Kiparsky, 353.

[22]In this case, the exhorbitant costs typical of an academic book were assumed by various bodies at Indiana University, Bloomington rather than by the reader. The PDF may be found online: https://doi.org/10.1075/sigl.3 The price tag of the printed book remains, typically but unfortunately, high, beyond the reach of most students and independent scholars.

[23]There are inevitably a few typos and small errors of fact, few of which are of any real significance. I list them here in hopes that they may be corrected in a future printing or edition: the merger of short *a* and *o* was only opposite in Slavic, not Baltic (p. 6); that Wulfila "certainly knew the Runic alphabet" is an overstatement, since the claim that any Gothic letters derive from runes is dubious (p. 22); ϛυναγωγῇ should be συναγωγή (p. 20); "ultima" should be "penult", "penult" should be "antepenult" (p. 35); Avestan *saēni-* can hardly reflect *$\hat{k}h_1$-i-n-*, which would give ˣ*sin-* or the like, but comes from something like *$\hat{k}eh_3$-in-* (Mayrhofer, s.v. *ŚĀ*) (p. 50); *$\hat{k}h_1id$-* should be *$\hat{k}eid$-* or *$\hat{k}oid$-*, cf. Sogdian *'n-s'yδ*, Ossetic Iron *sidyn*, Digoron *sedun*, etc. (Cheung, *Vocalism*, §§0.7.2.3, 0.7.2.5; *Verb*, s.v. *$said^2$*) (p. 50); *$deh_2i̯u̯ers$* should be *$deh_2i̯u̯ers$*, with no *ā* ever arising, as suggested by, e.g., Sanskrit *devár-*, not ˣ*dāivár-* (p. 50); in *laiþjána^n* the accent would never have stood there, cf. *loitéjonom* (p. 52); Hittite has been omitted from the tables in §3.7; *o* did not occur in any environment in Proto-Germanic (p. 55); forms like *Segimerus* may have more to do with Latin phonology or folk etymology than Germanic phonology (p. 58); PGmc *ē* > NWGmc *æ* > OE *æ* requires more sound changes elsewhere, and so is not clearly "simpler" (p. 61); *baðjaz* should be *baðja^n* (p. 65); *Bergelmir* is only evidence for *iʀ*-umlaut (p. 66); the change of *ǫ* to *á* is only graphic, and the resulting vowel was probably /ɔː/ (see Hreinn Benediktsson) (p. 68); *ā* also appears several centuries earlier than Ellestad on the Thorsberg and Vimose Chapes (p. 70); Norse *eru* may not be an example of lowering (p. 71, cf. 325); the first two rows of the table in §4.18 are repeated from p. 77 at the top of p. 78; on this table, the long vowel reflexes (from *ˣVnx* sequences) of short vowels are inconsistently given, and umlaut reflexes for *ō* are missing, as is *ý* as a reflex of *eu* in Norse; the relevance of Anglian *milc* for Gothic syncope is opaque (p. 80); *ˣi* and *ˣu* need not have developed in parallel in Gothic (p. 81); Proto-Germanic *-âi* does not fit with the assumptions of Proto-Germanic phonology laid out elsewhere, and it is unclear why anything more complex than *-ōi* > Gothic *-ai* is needed (p. 85); the lack of fronting in the OE genitive plural *-a* is because it was formerly trimoric, not from nasalization (p. 85); *-ō^n* was never trimoric, it just remained unshortened in early OE (p. 87); the partial failure of *-st-*, *-sk-* clusters to heterosyllabify is only potential evidence of syllabification rules, not that they formed a "unitary phoneme" (pp. 91, 94); the lack of syncope in Mercian *lȳtelu* is not an "exception" (see Goering) (p. 92); *ˣs* is missing from the table of PIE consonants (p. 99); "allophones of the voiced aspirates" should be "allophones of the voiceless stops before *h_2*" (p. 99); Ossetic is "Iranian" but not "of Iran": the linguistic term "Iranic" has been suggested precisely to avoid confusions of this sort (Kümmel, *Iranic*) (p. 100); *uncer* is a further important possible example of Germanic *k* from a laryngeal (p. 101); *dheu̯b-* should probably be *d^heub^h-* (p. 103); the etymology of *igqis* does not entail a synchronic structure /kw/ (p. 104); *vawžaka-* should be *vaβžaka-* (and in general the notation of Avestan forms in the book reflects Bartholomae rather than the more philologically precise transcriptions now standard; see Hoffmann's important article) (p. 105); an old root accent in *auhns* is implied, though not guaranteed, by the voiceless fricative as well as the lack of gemination (p. 116); for a recent accentual approach to Holtzmann's law, see Kroonen, xxxviii–xl (p. 118); the *f* of *þarft* is not from devoicing, but from *pt* (p. 122); Thöny argues that final devoicing only began late in the Early Runic period (p. 125); final *ˣn* is regularly retained in Old Frisian monosyllables such as *in* (p. 133); "paaradigm" should be "paradigm" (p. 142); the reasons for doubting the simple scenario of PGmc *-ōi* > Gothic *-ai*, PGmc *-ai* > Gothic *-a* (both > West Germanic *-æ*) are not clear from this discussion (p. 147); it is no longer the "usual formulation" to group all polysyllables with heavy stems under Sievers' law (p. 150); in the paradigm in §7.11, the Old Icelandic accusative and genitive singulars have been swapped; *holtijaz* is more likely a nominative adjective than a genitive noun (cf. final *z*, not *ˣs*) (p. 152); it is not clear that *mawi* goes back to a heavy stem on any relevant scale (a two-phoneme *ˣɣw* in PGmc is at least very speculative) (p. 156); Sanskrit *vṛkyàm* rather reflects *$ul̥k^wíh_2m̥$* or the like (p. 157); the genitive singular of *jō*-stems is potentially distinct in original length from that of the plain *ō*-stems (Schaffner, 368) (p. 157); PIE *-on-m̥* is robustly attested alongside *-en-m̥* in the older branches (p. 170); in the first paradigm in §8.2, the tonic forms *$n̥h_1u̯e$* (*$n̥h_3u̯e$*?), *mebhi*, and *n̥smei̯* are missing their accent marks (p. 181); *vit* has a boldface *v-* (p. 182); raised *ˣik* could be regular in unstressed position (p. 182); PGmc *ˣwiz* could itself be from "*ˣu̯es*, with raising to *ˣwiz* when unstressed, and lengthening when restressed" (p. 184); *ˣunʀar-*

References

Bammesberger, Alfred. *Die Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1990.

Bartholomae, Christian. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1904.

Beekes, Robert S. P., and Michiel de Vaan. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2011.

Bubenik, Vit. "The Phonology of Greek." In *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, edited by Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, and Matthias Fritz, vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2017.

Campbell, Alistair. *Old English Grammar*. Corrected Reprint. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Cheung, Johnny, ed. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———, ed. *Studies in the Historical Development of the Ossetic Vocalism*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2002.

Coetsem, Frans van, and Herbert L. Kufner, eds. *Toward a Grammar of Proto-Germanic*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1972.

Dahl, Ivar. *Substantival Inflexion in Early Old English: Vocalic Stems*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1938.

Dyvik, Helge J. J. "Breaking in Old Norse and Related Languages: A Reassessment of the Phonetic Conditions." *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi* 93 (1978): 1–37.

Flasdieck, Hermann M. "Zur Geschichte der femininen ō-Flexion im Westgermanischen." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 48 (1930): 53–66.

Fortson IV, and Benjamin W. *Indo-European Language and Culture*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Fulk, R. D. "Reduplicating Verbs and Their Development in Northwest Germanic." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 101 (1987): 1–29.

Gąsiorowski, Piotr. "The Germanic Reflexes of PIE *-sr- in the Context of Verner's Law." In *The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, Phonemics, and Morphophonemics*, edited by Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, Brigit Anette Olsen, and Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, 117–28. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2012.

Goering, Nelson. "Early Old English Foot Structure." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 114, no. 2 (2016): 171–97.

Hale, Mark. *Historical Linguistics: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Hoenigswald, Henry M. *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

---

cannot regularly become *ór-* (would give ˣ*uðr-*), which must either be from **unsar-* or involve some other analogy (p. 189); *eis* could reflect **ei̯es* (Sihler, 391f.) (p. 191); *Erebnis* should be *Ergebnis* (p. 193); **þanō* would give OE ˣ*þonu* (p. 194); Early Runic *hino* (and the precise equation of *hi-no* = Gothic *hi-na* = OE *hi-ne*, all < PGmc **hi-nōⁿ*) suggests a greater age for the inflected **hi-* demonstrative than implied, and creates problems for some of the suggestions here (pp. 198–99); long **-ī < *ij*, not short **-i < *j* (p. 214); the section header is repeated at end of §9.12, obscuring part of note 1; PGmc **seƀun*, not **siƀun* (p. 226); "anvetovalic long vowel" should be "antevocalic short vowel" (p. 227); voicing in Gothic *ainlibim* is not informative about Germanic stress, only the IE accent (p. 228); completion is a property of verbal aspect (p. 242); the injunctive is also a distinct formation in Avestan (p. 243); the contrast between λείπω and **√leikʷ-* is unclear (p. 248); the change of **-h₂e* to simple **-a* is post PIE, as the laryngeal is required in IIr. to block Brugmann's law (p. 250); **-oi̯h₁-* should be **-oi̯h₁-* (p. 252); causitivity is not part of aspect (p. 254); Schumacher's "*bigetun* rule", rather than the aorist theory, is perhaps now the "commonest explanation" (p. 257); Verner's law only tells us about the IE accent, not the position of Germanic stress (p. 261); if **xaƀjan-* is from **√kh₂p-*—as suggested by, e.g., Rix and Kümmel, s.v. **keh₂p-*—no full-grade **a* is required (p. 263); for *skaidan*, now compare Rix and Kümmel, s.v. **skʰei̯d-* (p. 265); remove second mark for note 4 (p. 265); *sēgon* is surely the phonological development and *sāwon* analogical (p. 271); **-is* and **-iz* should be **-iz(i)* (better, **-isi* and **-izi*) (p. 274); **-þ(i)* should be **-iþ(i)* (better, **-iþi*) (p. 275); *iʀ*-umlaut is a complicating factor in the discussion of verbal umlaut in §12.24 note 1; "fricative consonant" should be "obstruent consonant" (p. 277); Runic *-da* should be *-de* (p. 294, correct on p. 303); "**-þ-* (> **-t-*)" should be "**-t-*" (GL never affected second obstruents in clusters, and cf. *wissa*) (p. 300, also 321f.); **salƀōðēþ* should be **salƀōðē(þ)* (better, **salƀōðē*) (p. 304); "ƕ*arbōīdēdun*" should be "ƕ*arbōdēdun*" (p. 305); since the longer Ingvaeonic forms must have been formed centuries before any surviving Old Saxon texts, they would be real archaisms by the time of Old Saxon verse (p. 308); Pinault's rule poses a problem for the Bennett model of class III weak verbs advocated for here (p. 311); *ai* should be *ē* in the Ingvaeonic paradigm of **xaƀ-* (p. 312); preterites like OHG *hapta* are plausibly archaisms, from PGmc **xaƀða- < *kₐpₑtó-*, itself < **kh₂p-h₁-tó-* or the like (p. 313); Gothic *magt* is just the proper spelling of /maxt/, ˣ*maht* being only for /maht/ (p. 317); Gothic *aih* is strong evidence, since *h* does not synchronically represent the voiceless counterpart of *g* (p. 321); "sj. (opt.)" should be "sj.": the true PIE subjunctive is meant (p. 322); roots should not be cited in the zero-grade (p. 323); "-mi" should be "**h₁és-mi*" (p. 323); **izunþ* should be **izun(þ)* (better, **izun* or **ezun*) (p. 325); for earlier suggestions of **ui̯ > *ij*, see Rix and Kümmel, s.v. **bʰu̯eh₂-*, with references (p. 327); if *ēode < *ē-udæ*, with regular **u < medial *ō* (Stausland Johnsen), then many of the objections to seeing the endings as class II do not hold (p. 336).

Hoffmann, Karl. "Zum Zeicheninventar der Avesta-Schrift." In *Festgabe deutscher Iranisten zur 2500 Jahrfeier Irans*, edited by Wilhelm Eilers, 64–73. Stuttgart: Hochwacht Druck, 1971.

Hogg, Richard M., and R. D. Fulk. 2011. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 2: Morphology. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hreinn, Benediktsson. "The Vowel System of Icelandic: A Survey of Its History." In *Linguistic Studies, Historical and Comparative*, edited by Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir, Höskuldur Þráinsson, Jón G. Friðjónsson, and Kjartan Ottosson, 50–73. Reprint, Reykjavík: Institute of Linguistics, (1959) 2002.

Hyllestad, Adam. "The Precursors of Celtic and Germanic." In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, edited by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine, 107–28. Bremen: Hempen, 2010.

Jasanoff, Jay. "From Reduplication to Ablaut: The Class VII Strong Verbs of Northwest Germanic." *Historische Sprachwissenschaft* 120 (2007): 241–84.

Johannsson, Ellert Thor. 2009. "Old High German 1st Person Plural Ending -*mēs* and Cod. Sang. 916." DPhil diss., Cornell University.

Kiparsky, Paul. "Sievers' Law as Prosodic Optimization." In *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, edited by Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver, 345–60. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 92. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1998.

Klein, Jared, Brian Joseph, and Matthias Fritz, eds. *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*. Vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2017.

Kroonen, Guus. *The Proto-Germanic n-stems: A Study in Diachronic Morphology*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 18. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011.

——— *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Kufner, Herbert L. "Foreword." In *Toward a Grammar of Proto-Germanic*, edited by Frans van Coetsem and Herbert L. Kufner, ix–xi. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1972.

Kümmel, Martin Joachim. "Iranic vs. Iranian." Update of Mar 30, 2018 to ResearchGate Project *Urindoiranische Grammatik (Grammar of Proto-Indo-Iranic)*. https://www.researchgate.net/project/Urindoiranische-Grammatik-Grammar-of-Proto-Indo-Iranic, 2018.

——— "Ungeklärtes **u* neben Liquida in germanischen Nomina." In *Per Aspera ad Astericos: Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, edited by Anders R. Jørgensen, Jenny H. Larsson, and Thomas Olander, 291–303. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2004.

Magnús Snædal, ed. *A Concordance to Biblical Gothic*. Reykjavík: University of Iceland Press, 1998.

Malzahn, Melanie. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Marchand, James W. "The Proto-Germanic Long Stops." *General Linguistics* 2 (1957): 51–59.

Mayrhofer, Manfred, ed. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992–2001.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna. "'To Put' and 'To Stand' in the Luwian Languages." In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985)*, edited by Calvert Watkins, 205–228. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.

Pokorny, Julius, ed. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern and München: Francke Verlag, 1959.

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

Rau, Jeremy. "Greek and Proto-Indo-European." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, edited by Egbert J. Bakker, 171–88. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Ringe, Don. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. 2nd ed. A Linguistic History of English, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Ringe, Don, and Ann Taylor. *The Development of Old English*. A Linguistic History of English, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Rix, Helmut. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.

Rix, Helmut, and Martin Kümmel, eds. *LIV: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert, 2001.

Schaffner, Stefan. *Das vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 103. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 2001.

Scheungraber, Corinna. *Die Nasalpräsentien im Germanischen*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 147. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 2014.

Schumacher, Stefan. "'Langvokalische Perfekta' in indogermanischen Einzelsprachen und ihr grundsprachlicher Hintergrund." In *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*, edited by Olav Hackstein and Gerhard Meiser, 591–626. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2005.

Seebold, Elmar. *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Sievers, Eduard. *Altenglische Grammatik nach der angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers*. 3rd ed. Edited by Karl Brunner. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1965.

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

Stausland Johnsen, Sverre. "Vowel Reduction in Verbs in King Alfred's Pastoral Care." In *Historical Linguistics 2013*, edited by Dag T. T. Haug, 19–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015.

Stiles, Patrick V. "The Gothic Nominative Singular *Brōþar* 'Brother' and the Reflexes of Indo-European Long Vowels in the Final Syllables of Germanic Polysyllables." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 86, no. 2 (1988): 115–43.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. *Urgermanische Grammatik: Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der altgermanischen Dialekte*. 4th ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, (1896) 1974.

Thöny, Luzius. "The Chronology of Final Devoicing and the Change of *z to ʀ in Proto-Norse." *Futhark* 7 (2016): 47–62.

Tichy, Eva. *A Survey of Proto-Indo-European*. Translated by James E. Cathey. Bremen: Hempen Verlag, 2006.

Tolkien, J. R. R. "Philology: General Works." *The Year's Work in English Studies* 5 (1926): 26–65.

Voyles, Joseph B. *Early Germanic Grammar: Pre-, Proto-, and Post-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Willi, Andreas. *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, and Carolin Schneider, eds. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2008.

Nelson Goering
University of Oxford
✉ nelson.goering@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk

Check for updates