# The Usage of OE/EME āgan and OHG eigun compared with OE/EME sculan and mōtan with their OHG/MHG Cognates

Kousuke Kaita

#### 1. Introduction

This paper deals with the comparison of usages both similar and distinct between OE/EME āgan (> MnE owe and ought (to)), sculan (>MnE shall and should), mōtan (MnE mote and must) and their OHG/early MHG cognates eigun, sculun, and muozun at times. I select the transitional period as the field of this study because it is a crucial period for capturing the change of them. The six verbs all belong to a certain verb class called the preterit-present verb (henceforth PPV). The members in this class are characteristic in at least three aspects of morphology (their conjugation), syntax and semantics. On syntax they take a noun phrase or an infinitive in their older stages (e.g. in OE and OHG). From this aspect some members of this class have survived until today as modal auxiliaries both in English and in German grammar. On semantics the original meanings of the members are said to be diminished when they become auxiliaries. The latter two aspects, syntax and semantics, are considered to be interrelated. The process is described as grammaticalization where modal auxiliaries have been made of older main verbs, though oversimplification should be avoided. It is not my intention to give close examination of grammaticalization. Instead, I take a look at usages of PPVs particularly on OE agan, sculan and, though less, motan and OHG eigun (we cannot see as modal in Modern High German) and other correspondents. Taking a closer look at several examples we can say that their syntactic and semantic behaviors are distinct among them, so that this paper serves as an example that verbs in the common category are distinct in their behavior between two languages. First I refer to what PPV is, and then compare their usages in earlier English and German.

In the examples cited, italics are mine unless otherwise noted. The short titles of OE texts are based on the abbreviation of *The Dictionary of Old English*, *Web Corpus*.

#### 2. On PPVs

#### 2.1. Defining PPV

Preterit-present verb is a verb whose original strong past conjugation has come to entail the present meaning, so that new preterit forms were made through adding dental suffix endings (/t/ or /d/) of weak verbs. For instance, MnE *shall* does not conjugate as \*he *shalls*, but he *shall*, because

<sup>1</sup> For the headwords of these respective three verbs, I use OE forms āgan, sculan, and mōtan also for EME forms and OHG eigun, sculun, and muozun also for MHG. These forms in German are in the plural form according to Schweikle (2002<sup>5</sup>: 186, 188).

<sup>2</sup> In OE (and ME) verbs are classified into four categories including preterit-present verbs: (1) strong verbs (e.g.  $cw\bar{e}\bar{o}an$  'to say'), (2) weak verbs (e.g. habban 'to have'), and (3) anomalous verbs (e.g. willan 'to wish, will'). Note that willan (> MnE will) does not belong to the preterit-present verb, but has become a member of MnE modal auxiliaries.

shall is said to be an older preterit form, as in Present-day German (Modern High German) not \*ich weiße, but ich weiß, and its preterit form should has the /d/ sound like regular verbs such as MnE listened or started. Even if the definition above has been established by seeing conjugation of the verb and purporting that it was the older past form with present meaning, this definition is seen in several literatures on the Germanic grammar.

## 2.2. PPVs corresponding in several Germanic languages

In OE some of the twelve PPVs have become obsolete through the history of the English language, and others in this class, called "pre-modals" by Lightfoot (1979), have been remaining as MnE modal auxiliaries with *will* and *would*. In older Germanic languages there are at least fourteen kinds of PPVs. In the Table in the following page I list these members (with cognates though not all) in Gothic (cited from Braune 1961<sup>16</sup>: 116-118), Old Saxon (from Gallée 1993<sup>3</sup>: 268-9), OHG (from Braune 1970<sup>13</sup>: 64, with Gothic and OS forms in p. 63), MHG (from Paul 1998<sup>24</sup>: 262), Modern High German, OE (from Ogura 1996: 6), ME (from Mossé 1968 [1952]: 82-83), and MnE. The Table shows us the close correspondence between those Germanic languages, although some verbs are lacking, and each usage, meaning, or syntactic behavior among them (e.g. Goth *wait* and OE *wāt*) has to be checked individually. Also it tells us what PPV members have survived in a Germanic language varies cross-linguistically. For example, English *āgan* has still remained as several MnE words, while its OHG cognate *eigun* has been obsolete within MHG.

In each cell in the Table the upper form is in 1st or 3rd person, singular, present, and lower form is its infinitive. Italicized forms in round brackets indicate that the form is (1) a cognate word, or (2) in the person, number and tense other than the upper and lower forms, in which case the identification of form is given on its side or in the footnotes.

## 3. Usages of English *āgan* and German *eigun*, and those of English *sculan | mōtan* and German *sculun | muozun*

## 3.1. Main verb denoting 'to possess'

This usage is often seen in both languages. OE āgan shares the meaning with its cognate āgnian, the ancester of MnE verb own. In the following OE example (1), agan is taken by another PPV moton. And (2) is an example of OHG éigun appearing three times.

<sup>3</sup> As I introduced on the verb classes in OE, what is termed as "strong" or "weak" verb is sometimes different from what MnE grammar terms as "irregular" and "regular" verbs respectively. For example OE weak verb teecan is now treated as an irregular verb because it does not conjugate as \*teached, but taught in MnE. This fact, with MnE buy exemplified, is explained by Wrenn (1949: 17) with a note by Nakajima (p. 208).

<sup>4</sup> Fries (1940: 172-173), using the term "preteritive-present verbs", gives a clear explanation of PPV from the viewpoint of MnE, although his account gives no precise period except for "Old English".

<sup>5</sup> According to his difinition (p. 101) "pre-modals" are "the antecedents of the modern modals" and its members in OE are *cun-nan*, *sculan*, *magan*, *mōtan*, *agan*, and *durran*. Other members but members of "preterite-presents" are *witan*, *dugan*, *unnan*, *purfan*, *munan*, and *benugan*.

<sup>6</sup> For the detail, Ono (1998: 28-38) gives the difference of verbs of possession in some OE texts. And "Northumbrian agnian and Mercian agan correspond to West Saxon habban" (Ogura 1996: 85).

Table:	Preterit-present \	/erbs (with 1	their Cognates)	Table: Preterit-present Verbs (with their Cognates) in Several Germanic Languages	Languages				
Ablaut Class	l. Gothic	_	2. Old Saxon	3. Old High German	3. Old High German 4. Middle High German 5. Modern High German	5. Modern High German	6. Old English	7. Middle English	8. Modern English
_	wait	wêt		weiz	weiz	weiß	wāt	wōt	L* -
-	_	witan	witan, witen	wizzan	wizzen	wissen	witan	wite(n)	•
,	áih	- (êgu	- (égun Pl. Pres.)	- (eigum Pl. Pres. 1st.)			āh	owe	owe, ought (to), (own) *4
7		áihan	êgan		eigen	eigen - (eigen Adjective)	āgan		owen, ō3en owe, ought (to), (own)
,,	lais					- (lehre) *4			
0		'	•	-	•	- (lehren)	•	-	-
-	dang	dôg		toug	tonc	- (tauge) *5	*s deag	dowe	
		'	*dugan	-	tugen, tügen	- (taugen)	dugan	dugen	'
V		- (-ous	(-onsta Sg. Pret. 3rd.) an		gan	- (g önne) *5	3 ann, onn	-	
)		-	unnan	unnan	gunnen, günnen	- (g önnen)	unnan	unnen	-
4	kann	kan, can		kan	kan	kann	cann, conn	can, con	can
<b></b>	ku	kunnan	*kunnan	kunnan	kunnen, künnen	können	cunnan	cunne(n)	can
1	þarf	tharf		darf	darf	darf *6	þearf	þarf	
,	[baún	[þaúrban]	*thurban	durfan	durfen, dürfen	dürfen	þurfan	burven	-
œ	ga-dars	-dar		gi-tar	tar	-	dearr	dar	dare
0	gadaı	gadaúrsan	*gidurran	-	turren, türren	•	durran	durren	dare
0	skal	scal		scal	sol (sal)	soll	sceal	shal	shall, should
7	[sk	[skulan]	*sculan	scolan	suln, süln	sollen	sculan	-	shall, should
10	man	farman	ın	_		-	man, mon	mom	-
	m	munan *mur	*munan, *farmunan	•	_	•	munan	-	•
=	ga-nah, bi-nah			gi-nah			neah		
Α.		-	-	_	-	•	(ge)nugan	-	-
12	*3 mag	mag		mag	mac	mag	mæg	may, mei	may
!_	] Im	magan	*mugan	magan, mugan	magan, mugan mugen, mügen, magen, megen	mögen	magan	-	may
13	*ga-mōt	môt, muot		zonu	zonw	ssnu	mōt	mōt	must
5 5	[gamôtan]	ôtan]	*môtan	•	müezen	müssen	mōtan	-	must
4		[ôgan]	-	,		_		-	

Heliand), which is taken by another PPV movium. Paul (1998<sup>24, 2</sup>61) gives MHG eigen as plural form (also termed as infinitive form in p. 262), but no example is given and I have found no usage as main verb in MHG 1; For this line 2, Braune (1961). (18) is not sure of the belonging of Gothic aith. According to him, its infinitive form aithan is "nur einmal in fairaithan teil haben". The infinitive form in OS is seen as Egan (line 86 in text, although the adjective form eigen is found (e.g. line 693 in Nibelungenlied).

<sup>\*2 :</sup> According to Braune Gothic daug is in impersonal use. So does OHG toug (Braune) and MHG touc often (Paul). In OHG Evangelienbuch V. 25.29 the usage whose subject is pronoun that is seen.

<sup>\*3 :</sup> For the verbs in this ablant class V, Braune finds difficulty in classifying Gothic ga-nath and bi-nath into this class: "Die Zuteilung von ganath zu Klasse V ... ist wegen des Ablants nicht möglich" (1961 16, 117). Braune (1961 118 and 1970<sup>13</sup>: 66) and Mosse (1968 [1952]; 83) are not sure of the classification of Gothic, OS, and OHG mag, and MEmay and met in line 12 respectively. They do not have the class V. Ogura (1996: 6) For the usage of verbs in lines 11 and 12, Gothic ga-nah is in impersonal use (Braune). The example of OE bermgan (given in Lightfoot 1979. 101) is seen in line 48 in The Husband's Mexsage, in personal use. puts OE magan and (ge) nugan, Gallee (1993<sup>2</sup>: 269) does OS mugan, and Schweikle (2002<sup>2</sup>: 188) does OHG mag (MHG mac) into this class, whose classification I followed for convenience. \*4 : Modem High German lehren 'to teach' and MnE own are not PPVs.

<sup>\*\*</sup> S. Modem High German tangen and gönnen have regular conjugation, so that it is irrelevant to classify them simply into PPV. Paul (1998\*\*) adds erbunnen and verbunnen "to envy to the line S in MHG.

## (1) nu hie drihtne synt

wurðran micle and moton him bone welan agan

be we on heofonrice habban sceoldon,

rice mit rihte. (Gen B 421b - 4a)

(Now they are worthier for the Lord so much and are allowed to possess for themselves the happiness that we must have in heaven, the kingdom righteously.)

(2) Thes éigun sie io núzzi in snélli joh in wízzi;

ni intrátent sie nihéinan, unz se ínan eigun héilan.

Er ist gizál ubar ál, io so édilthegan skál,

wíser inti kúani; thero éigun sie ío ginúagi. (Evangelienbuch I. 1. 97-100)

(They always enjoy benefit by valor and by intellect of him; they fear nothing so long as they have him healthy. He is always bold over everything, as a noble hero should (be), savvy and brave; they always have enough of them.)

### 3.2. Usage of the verbs accompanying infinitive

This usage can be counted as the ancestor of MnE *owe* and *ought to*, whose syntactic characteristics lie in taking *to*. Modern High German does not have this auxiliary, only seen in an adjective *eigen* 'own' as the remnant of older *eigun*.

## 3.2.1. Agan with to geldanne

According to *OED*, OE *āgan* with *to*-infinitive appears first as *āgan to geldanne*, 'to have to pay' (*s.v. owe* 2.a.) and *āhte to geldanne*, 'had to pay' (*s.v. ought* †2.a.), both of which appear with the first example dating *c*950 from translation of Latin verb *debere* or *debebat*, which has become MnE *owe*. Lk 7.41 (*Tatian* 138.9) is an example of the correspondence between OE *Lindisfarne Gospels* (*s.v. ought* †2.a.a.), *West Saxon Gospels* and OHG *Tatian*, where *Li*. uses *āgan to geldanne*, while OE *Ags.* (*West Saxon*) and *Tatian* have *sculan | sculun* in the use of main verb 'to owe'.

## (3) Lk 7.41 (Tatian 138.9)

Latin: [duo debitores erant cuidam feneratori unus debebat denarios quingentos alius quinquagenta]

OE (Li): tuoege scyldgo woeron sume rice menn an ahte to geldanne penningas fif hūnd oðer fif-teih

OE (WS): Twegen gafol-gyldon wæron sumum lænende. án sceolde fif hund penega. 7 oðer fiftig;

OHG (*Tatian*): Zuene sculdigon uuarun sihuuelihemo inlihere: ein *solta* finfhunt pfenningo,

ander solta finfzug.

MnE(Authorized Version): There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty.

<sup>7</sup> This context shows typical usages of *mōtan* (auxiliary meaning 'to be allowed to'), *āgan* (main verb 'to possess'), and *sculan* (auxiliary meaning 'must') respectively.

<sup>8</sup> E.g.: Wer fremde Sprachen nicht kennt, weiß nichts von seiner eigenen. (Goethe, Maximen und Reflexionen 1.14) (Whoever does not know foreign languages, knows nothing of his own.)

<sup>9</sup> Modern High German (Menge) uses adjective schuldig:

Ein Geldverleiher hatte zwei Schuldner; der eine war ihm fünfhundert Denare schuldig, der andere fünfzig;

So long as I cannot find any OHG rendering by *eigun* like OE *ahte to geldanne*, this comparison can be an instance that the cognate words between different languages do not always behave in the same way. In OE *sculan* 'to owe' and  $\bar{a}gan$  to *geldanne* 'to have to pay' are synonymous, where  $\bar{a}gan$  is in the use of main verb whose structure is ' $[\bar{a}gan] + [to geldanne]$ '. This phrase seems to result in the meaning of 'obligation'.

For the reading of *ah to seldene* in c1175 (?OE) *Bodleian Homilies* 34/2 in MED (s.v. ouen 4a.(b)), however, the interpretation of MED seems to be '[ah to] + [seldene]' meaning 'to have to, ought to pay', considering from other examples with infinitive other than seldene under this signification. The same sentence is cited also in MED shulen 1.(a) with longer context, which seems to me that shulen 1.(a) and ouen 4a.(b) are similar in usage. My interpretation of ah to seldene is therefore '[ah] + [to seldene]', where ah ( $\bar{a}gan$ ) retains possessive meaning. In LOE examples there is this kind of ambiguity. The detail is introduced in Ono (1989: 62-63, 77).

(4) Ælc mon eornestlice *ah to 3eldene* sum þing, ant hæfð oðerne mon þe him *sceal* sum ðing.

(Bod. Hom. 34/2 in MED shulen 1.(a))

(Everyone truly has to pay something, and has another one who owes him something;)

- (5) a. *MED ouen* 4a.: As modal verb expressing moral or legal obligation, necessity, propriety, etc.: to be supposed (to do, undergo, or be sth.), ought, should; have a duty or right (to do or have sth.); be obliged (to do sth.); -- with complementary inf.:
  - (b) with selected verbs: ~ beren, ~ comen (ben comen), ~ don (ben don), ~ haven, ~ holden, ~ loven, ~ nimen, ~ wernen, ~ worthen, ~ yelden
  - b. *MED shulen* 1.(a): To owe (sb. money, a debt, etc.); owe (tribute to sb.), have to pay (a sum to the king or an official); ~ **to**, owe (tribute) to (the government); also, owe (a duty, fee) for (the customs, weighing)

In ME examples, *MED shulen* 1.(a) (and 1.(b)) also has a citation from *New Testament* (Rom.13.7), which are shared with *OED shall* †1.a. 'to owe (money)'.

(6) a. a1400 New Test. (Paues) Rom. xiii. 7 (s.v. OED shall †1.a.):

3elde se to alle men soure dettes: to hym bat se schuleb trybut, trybut.

b. c1400 Bible SNT (1) Rom.13.7 (s.v. MED shulen 1.(a)):

3elde se to alle men soure dettes: to hym bat se schuleb trybut, trybut.

c. c1400 Bible SNT (1) Rom.13.7 (s.v. MED shulen 1.(b)):

3elde 3e to alle men 3oure dettes .. to hym þat 3e *schuleþ* drede, dred; & to hym þat 3e oweb worschup, worschup.

<sup>10</sup> The Latin text (from Irvine 1993: 39) is:

Quia omnis homo et debitor est Dei, et debitorem habet fratrem suum.

<sup>11</sup> MnE (Authorized Version): Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

Judging from this MnE version, the reference to second "owed" thing of *custom* is not cited on the two dictionaries.

Note that *shulen* 1.(b) does not contain the same lexical form in *OED shall*  $\dagger$ 1.a. and *MED shulen* 1.(a), but can be considered as having the same meaning. What is remarkable is that *owep* and *schuleb* coexist in the parallel phrase. Here we can see the synonymy of the two yerbs.

### 3.2.2. *Agan* with infinitive other than *geldanne*

For MnE 'ought to', "The most frequent use throughout" (*s.v. OED ought* 5.b.) dates *c*1175 with infinitive other than *geldanne*. But the examples of Ono (1969: 205) (more precisely in Ono 1989: 68-75) tell us that the phrase of *āgan* with *to*-infinitive is not limited only to *geldanne* even in OE.

(7) a. hwilce gerihtæ he ahte to habbanne to xii monbum of ðære scire

(Anglo-Saxon Chronicle [E] (the Laud MS.) 216/21 [E 1085])

(what dues he ought to have in twelve months from each shire)

b. & ic nelle gepafian b him anig man fram hande teo anig bare gerihte bes be he mid rihte to habbene ah (Ch 1096 (Harm 43) 6) (from Ono 1989: 73)

(And I do not wish to endure that any man deprives his hand of any of the right that he righteously ought to have.)

In (7), the infinitive is *habban* 'to have', synonymous with  $\bar{a}gan$ . Therefore this sentence seems better to be read as 'ought to have [OBJECT]' rather than 'to have [OBJECT] that should be had'. In addition, an adverbial *mid rihte* 'with rightness, righteously', expressing propriety, collocates in (7b) and this phrase seems to emphasize the meaning of obligation, because we have seen this phrase also in (1), the context for obligation expressed by *sceoldon* 'must, should'. Therefore  $\bar{a}gan$  with *to*-infinitive in (7) can be regarded as an auxiliary.

The citations (3) - (6) show us that  $\bar{a}gan$  to geldanne corresponds to sculan in OE and EME. But the corresponding parts do not show the correspondence between auxiliary sculan and  $m\bar{o}tan$ , and  $\bar{a}gan$  (to) and  $m\bar{o}tan$ . In OE  $m\bar{o}tan$  often means 'to be allowed to' rather than 'to have to, must'. In some parts of Lasamon's Brut at EME period, however,  $\bar{a}gan$  (to) and  $sculan / m\bar{o}tan$ , and sculan and  $m\bar{o}tan$  are corresponding between two MSS. From (8) in Brut there is a possibility that these three verbs have come to show semantic overlapping in the transitional period between OE and ME.

<sup>12</sup> s.v. ought 5.b.(a)a.: c1175 Lamb. Hom. 5 Pes we ahte[n] to beon be edmoddre.

<sup>13</sup> When seeing 266/22 [E 1140] (in Ono 1969: 205), the infinitive form remarkably differs from - anne (1085) to - en (1140), showing the difference on infinitive form between LOE and EME. Italics and translation are his.

Pe eorl heold Lincol agænes be king. 7 benam him al ð he ahte to hauen. (266/22 [E 1140])

<sup>(</sup>The earl held Lincoln against the king, and deprived him of all that he ought to have.)

<sup>14</sup> This text with italics and translation is by Ono (1969: 205).

<sup>15</sup> His examples are collected from A Microfiche Concordance to Old English. Italics are his.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. German adverbial phrase *mit Recht* 'righteously': e.g. Es wird *mit Recht* ein guter Braten gerechnet zu den guten Taten (Wilhelm Buschs Sammlung >>Kritik des Herzens<< (1874), *s.v. Recht* in *Duden* Bd. 12 (2002)). This sentence can be translated like 'A good roast is righteously counted as a good deed.'

<sup>17</sup> There are examples of agan followed by both to- and bare infinitive at this period, which is a remarkable syntactic characteristic. See (8a, d, and e).

<sup>18</sup> For example, in *The Battle of Maldon*, the former meaning is more than the latter.

<sup>19</sup> Both manuscripts Cotton Caligula and Otho date about late 1200's.

(8) Caligula Otho

a. Pus dude bes riche mon; Pus dude bis riche man;

swa Locrin hine hefde ihaten. ase he was ihote.

for euer ulc god mon; for euerech god mon;

ah his lauerdes heste to don. mot his louerdes his don. (Brut 2376-9)

(Thus this rich man did, as Locrine had commanded him  $\slash$  as he was commanded,

for every good man ought to / must do the command of his lord.)

b. Pe king lette witen his durren; He lette witie his dores;

þat ne *moste* þer na mon in cumen. þat no man ne *solde* in come. (*Ibid*. 6711-2)

(The king / He made his doors guarded so that no one was allowed to / should come in there.)

c. he *scal uaren* of londe. he *mot* neod *wende*.

bilæuen scullen þa fiue;

ba sexte scal forð liðe.

ut of ban leode;

to ucuðe londe.

ne beo he na swa leof mon; ne beo he noht so riche;

uorð he scal liðen. he mot lond seche. (Ibid. 13860-6)

(He must needs depart from land. The five shall remain; the sixth shall depart forth out of the land to strange land. If he be not so beloved a man / so rich; he must depart forth / he must seek land.)

d. Þus tok Samuel on; Þus toc Samuel an;

and swa bu asest Hengest don. and so bou salt Hengest don. (Ibid. 16705-6)

(Thus Samuel took on and so you ought to / should do to Hengest.)

e. Ælc mon mot liðen; Ech man mot wende;

ber his lauerd hine hateð gan. woder his louerd hoteb.

nah na man demen; ne sold no man deame; erendes-mon to dæðen. herendrake to deabe.

bute he weoren swa ufele biwiten; bote he were so for-sete;

bet he weore lauerd-swike. bat he were louerd-swike. (*Ibid.* 24859-64)

(Each man must go where his lord commands to go; no one ought to / should judge a messenger to death except he were kept so evilly / so forgetful; as if he were a traitor of the lord.)

<sup>20</sup> Lines 2378-9 are cited also in Ogura (1996: 93).

<sup>21</sup> Lines 13861-4 in Otho are lacking

For (8b) *MED* (s.v. mōten 1a.(d)) contains *Caligula* part and defines as "To be allowed ...", and the heading (d) is "in neg. clauses". Here the reading "not to be allowed to come in" can mean prohibition. For (8d), according to *MED* (s.v. ouen 4b.(a)), asest in *Caligula* means "to be supposed (to do ...) ... with **don** or **ben** used as a substitute for a specific verb or verb phrase (usually supplied in the preceding clause)". The *don* substitutes tok here. For (8e) sold in *Otho* is cited in *MED shulen* 3a.(c) "expressing what is appropriate, reasonable, right, prudent, etc.". Here *ne sold* (with *nah* ...demen in *Caligula*) expresses prohibition.

An example like OE  $\bar{a}gan$  with to-infinitive is seen in OHG Evangelienbuch once as far as I browsed. Other usages of eigun are main verb 'to possess' (see (1) in section 3.1.) and a variant form of a perfect auxiliary haben (see 3.3.).

(9) Thes hábet er ubar wóroltring giméinit einaz dágathing, thíng filu hébigaz, zi sorganne éigun wir bi thaz. (Evangelienbuch V. 19. 1-2) (Therefore he has decided a trial all over the world, very severe trial, (and) we have to care for it.)

In the MHG period, as for *Der arme Heinrich*, however, there is no *eigun* as a verb. But two lines have a variation of *sculn* and *muozun*, both meaning 'should, to have to, must': according to Paul's edition (1984<sup>15</sup>) *müeset* (line 224) is *soldet* in MS B (1320-30) and *muoz* (line 1292) is *sol* in MS D (the latter half of the 14C).

(10) a. ir *müeset* haben eine maget

diu vollen manbære

und des willen wære

daz si den tôt durch iuch lite. (Der arme Heinrich 224-7)

(You must have a girl who is completely undefiled and of the intent that she endures the death on behalf of you.)

b. muoz ich alsus verlorn hân

die rîchen himelkrône? (*Ibid.* 1292-3)

(Must I then have the heavenly crown lost?)

Here we can see that in both language EME sculan and  $m\bar{o}tan$  / MHG sculun and muozun are synonymous, while MnE has kept the ' $\bar{a}gan + (to$ -)infinitive' construction and shares the sense, and German has lost the verb corresponding to it within MHG.

## 3.3. As a seemingly perfect auxiliary

As an incidental but remarkable usage,  $\bar{a}gan$  is said to have partly an usage like a perfect auxiliary have. Neither OED (s.v. owe, ought, nor own) or MED (s.v. ouen) refers to this peculiar usage. Nakajima and Terasawa (ed.) (1970: 297) (s.v. owe) give an account that  $\bar{a}gan$  is sometimes used as a temporal auxiliary like habban, seen in The Seafarer (line 27) and Wulfstan, although controversial. Gordon (1960: 37) gives a commentary for the line 28 that Miss Kershaw points out that ah with past participle, "probably" retaining "a more literal force than with hafað" (Gordon), is found in Wulfstan's Address to the English Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, (1948<sup>11</sup>) p. 84, line 56, and the same usage is found in the OHG Ludwigslied (line 24).

This usage is often seen in OHG Evangelienbuch. Paul (1968: 137) gives three examples of eigun with past participle and they are said to express the perfect. Some other examples are seen in the selected edition by Shimbo (1993). These examples tell that eigun might be a variant of auxiliary haben 'to have', as Paul puts it.

In addition, I found a similar example from OS *Heliand*: al that sea bihlidan  $\hat{e}gun$  (line 41b) 'all that have covered them (= heaven and earth)'. This problem, uncommon to OE  $\bar{a}gan$  and  $\bar{a}gnian$  unless enough examples are provided, seems irrelevant to the present study.

#### 4. Conclusion

This paper has briefly examined mainly the usages of OE āgan together with sculan and mōtan, in comparison with their OHG cognates. Among them a main verb āgan in OE has come to function as auxiliary with infinitive (other than geldan) from āgan to geldanne, sharing the meaning of obligation with sculan and mōtan in Brut (EME period). On the other hand OHG eigun shows a different usage as perfect auxiliary with past participle rather than the usage with zi-infinitive. English sculan and mōtan have come to show the semantic overlapping at the EME period, and MHG period for their German correspondents alike. What is to be noted is that early MHG lacks or has few PPV eigun but English has retained āgan (with its cognate āgnian, MnE own) in the use of main and auxiliary verbs in MnE, i.e. owe and ought (to). Further studies on the individual usage among these three verbs between two languages are significant to obtain a more definite conclusion.

The āgan (line 27) on Seafarer is in the following (the text is from Gordon 1960: 37):

For þon him gelyfeð lyt, se þe ah lifes wyn

gebiden in burgum, bealosiþa hwon,

wlonc ond wingal, hu ic werig oft

in brimlade bidan sceolde. (The Seafarer 27-30)

<sup>(</sup>Therefore, he believes little, who has the pleasure of life experienced in the dwellings of men, little of hardship, rich and merry with wine, how exhausted I should often remain on sea-way.)

<sup>23</sup> They are eigun ... ginomanan 'have taken' (V. 7. 29), eigun ... gisprochan 'have spoken' (I. 25. 11), and eigun ... gidân 'have done' (III. 18. 36).

<sup>24</sup> Eigun here is termed by Paul as "das später untergegangene Synonymum" 'the synonym declining later' of haben (1968:137).

#### References

#### Dictionaries

Duden. Zitate und Aussprüche. 2002<sup>2</sup> (Der Duden Bd. 12) Die Dudenredaktion (ed.) Mannheim: Dudenverlag. Kenkyusha's Little Dictionary of English Etymology. 1970 Nakajima, F. and Terasawa, Y. (ed.) Tokyo: Kenkyusha. [in Japanese]

MED = Middle English Dictionary. 1952 Hans Kurath et al. (ed.) Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

OED = The Oxford English Dictionary, 1989<sup>2</sup> J. M. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner (ed.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

#### Editions

Doane, A. N. 1991 The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon Vatican Genesis. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Fricke, H. (ed.) 1993 Johann Wolfgang Goethe, Sämtliche Werke Bd. 13, Sprüche in Prosa. Sämtliche Maximen und Reflexionen. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag.

Gordon, I. L. (ed.) 1960 The Seafarer. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Madden, F. 1970 Lasamons Brut, or Chronicle of Britain, 3 Volumes. New York: AMS Press. (rpt. from the Edition of 1847, London.)

Menge, H. (tr.) 1994 [1949] Die Heilige Schrift. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Paul, H. (ed.) 1984<sup>15</sup> Hartmann von Aue, Der arme Heinrich. besorgt von G. Bonath. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek Nr. 3), Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Irvine, S. (ed.) 1993 Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343. (EETS o.s. 302), London: Oxford University Press.

Shimbo, M. 1993 Otfrids Evangelienbuch. Text mit japanischer Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und Wörterverzeichnis, Tokyo: Daigaku-shorin. [in Japanese]

Sievers, E. (ed.) 1966 [1892] Tatian. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.

Skeat, W. W. (ed.) 1970 [1871-1887] The Gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, rpt. Darmsatdt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Szadrowsky, M. (ed.) 1947 *Heliand: ausgewählte Teile*. (Altdeutsche Übungstexte Band 7), Bern: A. Francke. The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments: King James Version. New York: American Bible Society.

#### Studies

Braune, W. bearbeitet von Ebbinghaus, E. A. 1961<sup>16</sup> [1880] Gotische Grammatik, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Braune, W. bearbeitet von Ebbinghaus, E. A. 1970<sup>13</sup> [1891] *Abriβ der althochdeutschen Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung des Altsächsischen*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Fries, C. C. 1940 American English Grammar: The Grammatical Structure of Present-day American English with Special Reference to Social Differences or Class Dialects, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. (Published by Maruzen Asian Edition, 1964).

Gallée, J. H. 1993<sup>3</sup> [1891] Altsächsische Grammatik, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Lightfoot, D. 1979 Principles of Diachronic Syntax, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mossé, F. translated by Walker, J. A. 1968 [1952] *A Handbook of Middle English*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ogura, M. 1996 Verbs in Medieval English; Differences in Verb Choice in Verse and Prose, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ono, S. 1969 The Development of the English Modal Auxiliaries, Tokyo: Kenkyusha. [in Japanese]

Ono, S. 1989 On Early English Syntax and Vocabulary, Tokyo: Nan'un-do.

Ono, S. 1998 *Philology-no-Tanoshimi*, Tokyo: Nan'un-do. [in Japanese]

Paul, H. 1968 [1920] Deutsche Grammatik, Band. IV, Teil IV. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Paul, H., überarbeitet von Wiehl, P. und Grosse, G. 1998<sup>24</sup> [1881] Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Schweikle, G. 2002 Germanisch-deutsche Sprachgeschichte im Überblick, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.

Wrenn, C. L. 1949 The English Language, edited with Notes by F. Nakajima [in Japanese], Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1954.