

REMNANT CASE FORMS AND PATTERNS OF SYNCRETISM IN EARLY WEST GERMANIC

1 BACKGROUND

- The old West Germanic languages (Old English, Runic Frisian, Old High German, Old Saxon) show use of minor morphological forms (*-i* and *-u* suffixes) in the masculine/neuter *a*-stems and feminine *ō*-stems for instrumental and locative functions.
- The WGmc languages can be divided into two groups according to which functions are found with each suffix.
 - In Old English (OE), instrumental and locative functions are found under the suffix *-i* (and its phonologically weakened form *-e*).
 - In Old Frisian (OF), Old Saxon (OS), and Old High German (OHG), only locative functions are found in the (rare) *-i* form, but *both* instrumental and locative functions are found with the comparatively frequent *-u*.
- The same continental (OF, OS, and OHG) versus non-continental (OE) division of WGmc extends to the case syncretism patterns in the feminine *ō*-stems.

Hypotheses:

1. The *-i* that we find in continental WGmc was different to the *-i* found in OE.
2. The semantic groupings of the minor morphological suffixes and the syncretism patterns found in the feminine *ō*-stems of the respective Germanic languages are **linked phenomena**.

2 *ō*-STEMS

TABLE 1. Development of *ō*-stems from PGmc into OE (West Saxon), OS, and OHG.

	PGmc ¹	PWGmc
NOM	*geb-ō	*geb-u
ACC	*geb-ō̄	*geb-ā
GEN	*geb-ōz	*geb-ā
DAT	*geb-ōi	*geb-ē
INS	*geb-ō [†]	*geb-u

¹ The DAT.SG form is less certain: Ringe and Taylor (2014) give trimoraic “-ōi (?)”. PGmc ACC.SG contains nasalised vowel since PIE source is **-m*, but changed to **-n* in Gmc, nasality then spread to vowel.

OLD ENGLISH			CONTINENTAL WGMC			
Pre-OE ²	Early WS	Late WS	Runic Frisian	OF ³	OS ⁴	OHG ⁵
*geb-u	gief-u	gif-u	*jev-æ	ieve	geb-a (-e)	geb-a
*geb-ǣ	gief-ǣ	gif-e	*jev-æ	ieve	geb-a (-e)	geb-a
*geb-ǣ	gief-ǣ	gif-e	*jev-æ	ieve	geb-a (-e, u)	geb-a
*geb-ǣ	gief-ǣ	gif-e	*jev-u	ieve	geb-u (-o, a, e)	geb-u
*?	(cæstr-i [†])	gif-e	*jev-u	(ieve)	geb-u (-o, a, e) [†]	geb-u

[†] Form not explicitly provided in paradigm in referenced literature.

Relevant phonological changes: PGmc > PWGmc (Ringe and Taylor 2014)

- NOM/INS — Word-final bimoric non-nasalized long *-ō > short *-u (PGmc > PNWGmc)
- ACC/GEN — Bimoric long ō-vowels > *ā
- GEN — Loss of word final *-z in polysyllables.
- DAT — Monophthongisation of unstressed diphthongs to mid vowels (e.g. -ōi > -ē).

N.B. This is a light-stemmed feminine ō-stem.

2.1 State of Old English

- By pre-OE:
 - the vocalic distinction between the ACC, GEN, and DAT had been lost.
 - the NOM form *gebū is reliably reconstructed, but there is no evidence to show that the -u suffix was used in the INS (hence *? in cell).
- By late OE (WS):
 - the ō-stems have become fully syncretic in all oblique cases under *-e. Only the nominative remains distinct, which is either -u or endingless depending on the weight of the root syllable (cf. heavy-stem NOM.SG *lār*).

Syncretism pattern in early WS: NOM≠ACC=GEN=DAT≠INS.

2.2 State of Old Frisian

- By the time of most Old Frisian records, all distinctions in the vocalic final syllables had been lost.
- Evidence of Runic Frisian INS in -u, which also spread to the DAT.

² Ringe and Taylor (2014: 114) reconstruct ACC.SG PWGmc -ā and pre-OE *-ǣ (2014: 152). Evidence of this is provided in Dahl (1938: 119-121).

³ The Runic Frisian forms are based on the observations found in Versloot (2016a). The OF forms are from Bremmer (2009: 62).

⁴ Gallée et al. (1993: 203-4).

⁵ Braune and Heidermanns (2018: §207).

- The ACC ending must have spread to the NOM at a very early stage – there is very little evidence to show that the historical *-u* form was used in the NOM, but plenty of evidence which shows the maintenance of *-u* in the INSTR (and DAT).

Syncretism pattern in Runic Frisian: NOM=ACC=GEN≠DAT=INS

2.3 *State of Old High German*

- In a very small number of the oldest OHG texts, the occasional NOM.SG form is found with *-u*, e.g. *ladungu* ‘call’ (*Benediktinerregel*), but lost early.
- Tendency in the oldest sources is that the NOM and ACC were syncretic in *-a* (Braune and Heidermanns 2018: §207.A2).
- This results in a syncretic *-a* suffix for the NOM, ACC, and GEN, and a *-u* suffix for the DAT, which had merged under the INS form.

Syncretism pattern in Old High German: NOM=ACC=GEN≠DAT=INS

2.4 *State of Old Saxon*

OS resembles the pattern found in OHG and OF, although a greater variety of forms is found. The most frequently occurring form is the primary non-bracketed form listed in the table above.

Syncretism pattern in Old Saxon: NOM=ACC=GEN≠DAT=INS

In summary, in continental WGmc:

- the *ō*-stems syncretise in the NOM and ACC;
- the *ō*-stems are distinct in the oblique cases (ACC and GEN, DAT and INS);
- the historical *-u* survives both for INS and DAT.

3 *A-STEMS*

TABLE 2. Development of masculine and neuter *a*-stems from PGmc into OE, OF, OS, and OHG, based on Ringe (2017) and Ringe and Taylor (2014) and Goering (2023), unless otherwise stated.

<i>Masculine</i>	PGmc ⁶	PWGmc ⁷
NOM	*dag-az	*dag
ACC	*dag-a	*dag
GEN	*dag-as	*dag-as
DAT	*dag-ai	*dag-ē
INS	*dag-ō	*dag-u
<i>Neuter</i>		
NOM	*word-a	*word
ACC	*word-a	*word
GEN	*word-as	*word-as
DAT	*word-ai	*word-ē
INS	*word-ō	*word-u

<i>Masculine</i>	Pre-OE	Early WS	Late WS	Runic Frisian ⁸	OF ⁹	OS ¹⁰	OHG
NOM	*dæg	dæg	dæg	*bām(-u)	bām	dag	tag
ACC	*dæg	dæg	dæg	*bām(-u)	bām	dag	tag
GEN	*dæg-æs	dæg-es	dæg-es	*bām-es	bām-es	dag-es/-as	tag-es
DAT	*dæg-ā	dæg-ā	dæg-e	*bām-e	bām-e	dag-e/-a	tag-e
INS	*?	(uueg-i) [†]	dæg-e [†]	*bām-u	[*bām(-e)] [†]	dag-u	tag-u
<i>Neuter</i>							
NOM	*word	word	word	*word(-u)	word	word	wort
ACC	*word	word	word	*word(-u)	word	word	wort
GEN	*word-æs	word-æs	word-es	*word-es	word-es	word-es/-as	wort-es
DAT	*word-ā	word-ā	word-e	*word-e	word-e	word-e/-a	wort-e
INS	*?	(spell-i) [†]	word-e [†]	*word-u [†]	[word(-e)] [†]	word-u	wort-u

[†] Form not provided in referenced literature.

Relevant phonological changes: PGmc > PWGmc (Ringe and Taylor 2014)

- NOM/ACC — loss of *-z after unstressed vowels; loss of word-final *-a/-a.
- DAT - *ai > *ē (PGmc > PNWGmc)
- The only difference between continental WGmc and OE is the form of the instrumental:
 - OF, OHG and OS have -u, for which there is no evidence in OE.
 - Instead, OE has -i in a small number of tokens.

⁶ Ringe (2017: 300)

⁷ Ringe and Taylor (2014: 114).

⁸ This column is a composition of the material found in Versloot (2016).

⁹ Bremmer (2009: 60). The tree lexeme *bām* is used since OF *dei* does not show a distinct dative vowel.

¹⁰ Gallée et al. (1993: 203-4).

- The syncretism patterns are otherwise the same: NOM=ACC≠GEN≠DAT≠INS.
- A consistency between the *a*- and *ō*-stems in OE is the loss of final *-u* in the INSTR, which is replaced in both instances with an innovative suffix *-i*. This suggests that language-internal developments must have taken place in OE which did not affect continental WGmc.

4 DEVELOPMENTS IN THE WEST GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Change common to WGmc — short high vowels **i* and **u* were lost word-finally after a heavy syllable and after an unstressed syllable preceded by a stressed light syllable (Ringe and Taylor 2014: 284-5).

4.1 Old English

***ō*-stems:**

- Short high **u* retained in light stems, NOM/INS: PGmc **gebō* > PNWGmc **gebu* > WS *giefu*, Merc. *geofu* (Ringe and Taylor 2014: 288).
- By contrast, heavy syllable *ō*-stems lost the NOM *-u*, leaving endingless forms such as *lār*.
- This meant that there was a morphophonological alternation between *-u/-∅* in the NOM.SG of *ō*-stem nouns, depending on syllable weight of the root.
- Reduction of unstressed syllables causes the rest of paradigm to become almost entirely syncretic in the oblique cases, with slightly different phonological pathways that tend towards the same destination: ACC/GEN *-e* < *-ā* < PWGmc **-ā*; DAT *-e* < *-ā* < PWGmc **-ē* (Ringe and Taylor 2014: 195).
- The only case for which *-u* ever unambiguously and autonomously marked a form in the *ō*-stems by the time of pre-OE was in the NOM.SG of light stems
- This suggests the original INS form had to have been lost before the main effects of vocalic weakening took hold.
- There is no surviving evidence that shows the use of an INS form in *-u*, despite having been formally identical with the NOM historically.
- Instead, minor evidence of a functional instrumental survives in OE, but the form of the suffix (*-i*) does not resemble what is found in the other WGmc languages (*-u*).

Question: why motivated this development to happen in OE but not in the continental WGmc languages, which do show a feminine INS in *-u*?

INS *-i* form:

- Briefly attested INS ending *-i* appears in both *ō*-stems and *a*-stems.
- Eventually becomes strong INS inflection (*-e*) of the masculine/neuter adjective (early OE *-i* > OE *-e*) (Ringe and Taylor 2014: 379).

- (1) *apparition-e* — *ġifūng-i*
 preparation-ABL — preparation-INS
 ‘with preparation’ (Épinal Glosses, 97)
- (2) *affect-ui* — *megsibb-i*
 affection-ABL — affection-INS
 ‘with affection’ (Épinal-Erfurt Glosses, 109)

The unambiguous nature of the instrumental reading of some of the early OE *-i* forms is confirmed by the fact that each renders the Latin ablative. Forms with *-i* are also found with locative prepositions.

- (3)¹¹ *in Rom-ae* *ċæstr-i*
 in Rome-GEN city-INS
 ‘in the city of Rome.’ (Franks Casket)
- (4) *on rod-i*
 on cross-INS
 ‘On the cross’ (Ruthwell Cross 56)

Early *a*-stem examples:¹²

- (5) *ast-u* — *facn-i*
 cunning-ABL — cunning-INS
 ‘with cunning’ (Erfurt Glosses, 83)
- (6) *oper-e plumari-o* — *bisiuuisid-i werc-i*
 work-ABL sown-ABL — sown-INS work-INS
 ‘with embroidery’ (Erfurt Glosses, 699)
- (7) *on berg-i*
 on hill-INS
 ‘on the hill’ (Thornhill Stone 3)
- (8) *horn-ō* — *thys ġēr-i*
 this_year-ABL — this.INS year-INS
 ‘this year’ (Épinal-Erfurt Glosses, 494)

¹¹ The status of OE *ceaster* as an *ō*-stem is confirmed in Bammesberger (1994: 101 nt 21), who rejects Sweet’s interpretation that it was an *i*-stem.

¹² Examples taken from Pheifer (2020) and Hogg and Fulck (2011: 17).

But:

- *-i* does not trigger umlaut of the preceding vowel, which would be expected. This raises four *explananda*: the source of the suffix, the motivations for its emergence, when it emerged, and why it did not interact with the phonology in the expected way.

Where did *-i* come from?

- Traditional view (Versloot (2016, 2017), Bammesberger (1994), Bazell (1940), Sievers (1882)) = old Gmc locative, primarily motivated by the semantics of some of the tokens.
 - e.g. PIE **-ēy* > PGmc **-ei* > Pre-OE **ī* > OE *-i* (Bammesberger 1994)
 - First in *a*-stems then spread through analogy to the *ō*-stems.
 - Bammesberger (1994: 102) accounts for umlaut absence by explaining that some OE *a*-stems simply did not umlaut their root vowel and concluding that these locative forms levelled analogously. The problem with this is the difficulty of motivating why root vowel mutation should be levelled away on a semantic basis.
- Recent view (Ringe and Taylor (2014: 379)) = internal analogical extension.
 - Do not expect two locative suffixes to have survived in a daughter language (PIE **-oy* and **-ēy*).
 - Due to the security of the reconstruction that PIE locative **-oy* led to dative OE **-ai*, the validity of the interpretations which rely on the inheritance of PIE **-ēy* are undercut.
 - Solution = *-i* arises through an internal extension process, source = INS form of the interrogative pronoun (OE *hwȳ* < PGmc **hwī*) which had itself influenced the instrumental form of the demonstrative (OE *þȳ*).¹³ This development is paralleled in the ON DAT.SG demonstrative and interrogative *því* and *hví*. The adjective inflection in the masculine and neuter survives for longer into OE with the weakened suffix *-e*, which is distinct from the DAT.SG ending *-um*.

The pathway proposed in Ringe and Taylor (2014: 388), but spelled out with the relevant additional processes, is as follows for pre-OE:

1. **-ī* (from interrogative **hwī*) levels to demonstrative **þī*
2. the quantity of **-ī* reduces to **-i* ('high-vowel shortening', Goering (2023: 63)).
3. **-i* spreads to masc/neut strong adjectives, replacing **-u*.
4. **-i* spreads to masc/neut *a*-stems, replacing **-u*.
5. **-i* spreads to fem *ō*-stems, replacing **-u*.

Ordering important – Ringe and Taylor propose *-i* spread to the masculine/neuter before the feminine.

¹³ The rounding of the vowel to *ȳ* in the pronouns is suggested by Ringe and Taylor to be a later development that is not found in the noun forms.

But why innovate a new instrumental morpheme?

- In the light-stemmed \bar{o} -stems, the innovative INS $-i$ would have been a replacement of $*-u$.
- Based on stem-weight-based morphophonological alternation between $-u/-\emptyset$ arose in the NOM, the same alternation is expected to have existed in the INS.
- This means that both the NOM and INS of the light stems would have been syncretic under $*-u$, but heavy stems under $*-\emptyset$ for a period of time.
- However, the \bar{o} -stems would not have been the only class of noun subject to a morphophonological alternation. The a -stems would have also been affected—except in the instrumental only—since there was no inflectional ending in the nominative.

TABLE 3. Proposed nominative and instrumental forms in pre-OE heavy and light-stemmed \bar{o} - and a -stems after the effects of high vowel deletion.¹⁴

	\bar{o} -stems		a -stems	
	HEAVY	LIGHT	HEAVY	LIGHT
NOM	*feþer	*geb-u	*word	*dæg
INS	*feþer	*geb-u	*word-u	*dæg

- Stem-based morphological alternation in two cases across a whole class of nouns created fertile ground for morphological renewal.
- The renewal strategy in OE was to repurpose $*-i$, but there is no reason why the pre-existing $*-u$ morphology could not have been the candidate instead, given it survived in continental WGmc.
- The fact that the $*-u$ in the feminine NOM.SG persists later into OE appears to be significant.

Solution?

- Reanalysis of the salience of the $-u$ suffix in the light-stemmed \bar{o} -stems in pre-OE.
- If the $-u$ suffix was primarily interpreted as a NOM.SG form in the pre-OE \bar{o} -stems, this would have been a factor in shaping the nature of the renewal in the instrumental: an innovative INS suffix would have the benefit of formally dissimilating from the NOM.SG in the \bar{o} -stems.
- Supporting evidence: $-u$ as a NOM.SG marker spread to nominals elsewhere: e.g. the feminine abstract $*\bar{m}$ stems, where original ending $-e$ ($< *-i$) was replaced by $-u$, and also the abstracts ending in $-þ$ (Ringe and Taylor 2014: 380-1).¹⁵ The only source for this can be the form found in the light-stem \bar{o} -stems.
- It should be noted, however, that the $-u$ suffix never regenerated into the heavy \bar{o} -stems which had historically borne the suffix: the analogical process only took place beyond the scope of the \bar{o} -stems.

¹⁴ The masculine and neuter can be considered together for this purpose since their paradigms did not differ in the singular.

¹⁵ It is worth highlighting that this interpretation is not without controversy, since the notion that $*u$ was lost in such stems comes from Ringe's theory about high-vowel deletion, which is not uniformly accepted. Pairs of words like *frymð* and *frymðo* would be evidence for this, but there is variable analogical loss in long-stem words like *strengð* and *strengðo*. I thank Nelson Goering for this observation.

- Although it is hard to identify precise cause and effect, the morphosyntactic competition in the *-u* morpheme likely shaped the nature of the renewal with the innovative *-i* suffix.
- There had been two morphosyntactic categories associated with **-u* (NOM and INSTR); the generalisation of the **-i* suffix reciprocally reinforces the NOM status of the *-u* and halves the number of values associated with *-u*.

But where did this start? The masculine/neuter or the feminine?

- Masculine/neuter were inflectionless in NOM.SG — generalisation of either **-i* or **-u* would not have created any syncretism in the paradigm.
- Ringe and Taylor pathway relies on the **-i* suffix spreading first to the masculine/neuter demonstrative, then through the strong adjective before finally arriving in nouns. They claim that the generalisation to the feminine was a later development.

Feminine demonstrative pronoun

TABLE 4. Developments in the feminine demonstrative, following Ringe and Taylor (2014).

	PWGmc ¹⁶		OE	
	FEM	MASC/NEUT	FEM	MASC/NEUT
GEN	*þaiza	*þas	þære	þæs
DAT	*þaizē	*þammē	þære	þæm
INS	*þaizu	*þan	þære	þon/þȳ

PWGmc /ai/ monophthongises to OE /a:/: therefore, why is the root vowel always fronted in OE? Would expect *þære, not *þære. The development of *a* > *æ* is a classic umlaut change.

Ringe and Taylor (2014: 390): the GEN/DAT demonstrative represents a shortened variant (based on evidence from another disyllabic demonstrative, the GEN.PL, having an alternant with a short vowel). This would result in a short form *þaræ, which, in turn, was reanalysed as *þæræ due to *a~æ* alternations found throughout paradigms. However, this solution requires many assumptions without direct evidence.

Alternative:

- the **-ī* of **hwī*—which was both the masculine *and* feminine form of the interrogative—spread to the demonstrative of all genders, not just the masculine and neuter first.
- This would then give a pre-OE feminine INS demonstrative of *þārī, which would then develop into *þæri under the effects of umlaut and high vowel shortening. The long-fronted vowel of the instrumental could have then levelled throughout the genitive and dative. This would happen before effects of umlaut, and ending does not spread to nouns until *after* the effects of umlaut.

¹⁶ Ringe and Taylor (2014: 123).

- A development like this, where the instrumental exerts pressure on the dative and genitive, is not without precedent: in OHG and OS, the feminine dative demonstrative *deru/dero* and *theru/thero* is originally an instrumental, which too spreads to become syncretic in GEN/DAT/INS.

TABLE 5. Alternative solution to the development of the feminine demonstrative in OE.

	PWGmc ¹⁷	Pre-OE ₁	Pre-OE ₂	Pre-OE ₃	OE
GEN	*þaiza	*þār	*þār	*þær	þære
DAT	*þaizē	*þāræ	*þāræ	*þæræ	þære
INS	*þaizu	*þārī	*þærī	*þæri	þære

- It is possible that the noun class to which *-i* then first spread was the \bar{o} -stems, rather than the *a*-stems.
- If so, generalisation was, in part, shaped by the \bar{o} -stems, where there was competition in the function of the old INS *-u* morpheme, rather than the masc/neut *a*-stems, where no such syncretism existed.
- The establishment of the NOM status of *-u* in the \bar{o} -stems would have been a concomitant motivator for the analogical use of the INS *-i* suffix from the pronouns in the way Ringe suggests.
- A further motivation for innovation in the \bar{o} -stems before the other noun classes is that the \bar{o} -stems were almost all inanimate nouns, and hence were more likely to be used as an instrumental, particularly compared to the *a*-stems where the relative rate of animacy is higher.

Circumstantial evidence which supports this sequencing:

- The NOM *-u* is much more salient in OE than any other old Gmc language.
- Although there are scattered relics of the *-u* in the NOM.SG in OHG and OS, these are tiny in number and very early, and the form had effectively merged with the ACC *-a* in even the earliest texts. The non-salience of the *-u* in the NOM.SG of the continental WGmc languages is also supported by the fact that each syncretises the NOM and ACC. In these languages, the *-u* suffix had instead seemingly been analysed as a salient marker of instrumentality (and subsequently dativity), as will be shown in §4.2 and §4.3.

4.2 Runic and Old Frisian

- Old Frisian (OF) is a Germanic language that is grouped under Ingvæonic with OE, and partly with OS (Stiles 2013: 10), but most literary material dates from the late thirteenth century onwards (Versloot 2017), around the same time as late ME/MHG.
- The primary evidence for early Frisian is runic material (presented in Versloot (2016a), Versloot (2016b), Versloot (2017)) – contemporaneous with the OE, OHG, and OS periods.
- Offers a glimpse into nominal forms before the effects of OF final syllable weakening, which obscures case distinctions.

¹⁷ Ringe and Taylor (2014: 123).

- Enough survives to demonstrate that Frisian had a five-part case system at some point in time.

\bar{o} -stems

	PGmc	PWGmc	Runic Frisian	OF
NOM	*geb- \bar{o}	*geb-u	*jev- \bar{a}	ieve
ACC	*geb- \bar{q}	*geb- \bar{a}	*jev- \bar{a}	ieve
GEN	*geb- $\bar{o}z$	*geb- \bar{a}	*jev- \bar{a}	ieve
DAT	*geb- $\bar{o}i$	*geb- \bar{e}	*jev-u	ieve
INS	*geb- \bar{o}^\dagger	*geb-u	*jev-u	(ieve)

- NOM.SG of the Frisian \bar{o} -stems clearly syncretised with the ACC.SG at a very early stage, since Runic Frisian evidence shows of an *-a/-æ* suffix, e.g. *jibāda* ‘fortune’ (*Westeremden B*) (cf. OS *gibada*) and *katae* ‘knuckle’ (*Hamwic knucklebone*) (Versloot 2016: 390) (Looijenga 234).
- No evidence of *-u* in the NOM.SG, which contrasts with OE.¹⁸
- Runic evidence shows that *-u* survives as a DAT.SG (< INSTR.SG via intraparadigmatic extension¹⁹).
- Heavy-root high-vowel apocope shared by both OE and OF — if *-u* had survived in the NOM.SG, then evidence of the morphophonological alternation between *-e/-∅* would be expected. However, there is none: the ending in OF is always *-e* (< RF *-a/-æ*). The conclusion reached by Versloot (2016a: 387) is that NOM and ACC levelled with one another sometime before the year 700.
- This contrasts with OE, where NOM/ACC remained distinct.

Evidence for Frisian *-u* instrumental:²⁰

(9) *me(b) jisuhfjild-u*

with Gisahild-INS

‘with Gisahild’ (*Westeremden A*)²¹

(10) *aib kobu deda habuk-u*

Aib comb.ACC made Habuke-DAT

‘Aib made this comb for Habuke.’ (*Oostum*)²²

-u form functions:

The primary instrumental suffix in early Frisian was **-u*, which was also used in locative expressions. Again, the main source of evidence is Runic Frisian:

¹⁸ The main source of evidence in (Versloot 2016b) is the Riostring dialect of OF, which is thought to be the most representative glimpse into pre-OF, since it maintains the richest final-syllable vocalism of any OF dialect.

¹⁹ Versloot (2017: 225) also highlights that the instrumental form spreads to the dative in several parts of the OF linguistic system, not just in the \bar{o} -stems. The feminine *u*-stems, the *i*-stems, the adjectives ending all demonstrate a merger where the dative is marked by what was historically solely instrumental morphology.

²⁰ I follow the syntactic and semantic interpretations given in Versloot (2016).

²¹ ‘A weaving-slay of yew wood’ found in Groningen in 1928 (Looijenga 2003: 311).

²² ‘Two halves of an antler comb’ found in Groningen in 1908 (Looijenga 2003: 304).

- (11) *op hām-u jibāda ämluþ* [MASC A-STEM]
 at homestead-INS confidence thrives
 ‘Confidence thrives at the homestead.’ (Westeremden B)²³

light-stem *u*-stem *frethe* (Versloot 2017)

- after *to*, always *fretha*.
- after *mith* (INSTR governing preposition), always *frethe*.
- The instrumental form is consistent with what would be expected to have developed from PFri **frethu*.

heavy-stem *a*-stem *āth/ēth* (<PGmc **aiþaz*) (Versloot 2017)

- Frisian monophthongisation /ai/ > /a:/ before a back vowel.
- *Āth* forms are found in the ACC.SG and ACC.PL (< PWGmc **aiþa* and **aiþōz*). Moreover, *āth* is found in Unia twice in the phrase *mit ene athe*.²⁴
- Versloot (2017) sees presence of /a/ as coming from PWGmc **aiþū* (although, following Ringe, this would be **aiþu*).

-i form:

- Semantics: locative functions only, unlike OE which is instrumental and locative.
- Phonology: causes mutation, unlike OE.

Forms which speak to an underlying **-i* are invariably in locative collocations (from Versloot 2017):

- (12) *a betse-e* [NEUT A-STEM]
 on back-LOC
 ‘On the back.’ (Ems Old Frisian E1)

- (13) *bi like pend-e*
 by equal pawn-LOC
 ‘by an equal pawn.’ (Ems Old Frisian B)

In example (12), *betse* shows velar mutation, and in example (13) *pende* shows root vowel mutation (cf. other terms like *thindze* v *thinge*; *Wetsens* v *Wetsinge*).²⁵

There is one Runic Frisian example which directly shows an *-i* suffix, taken from Versloot (2016a):

²³ ‘A small yew-wood stick’ found in Groningen in 1917 (Looijenga 2003: 312).

²⁴ Some forms as *ēth* forms are also found, such as in *mith* [...] *ēthe*.

²⁵ The relevant phonological change for OF palatalisation in this context is also given in Bremmer (2009: 30): MEDIAL -ng- > -ŋgⁱ- > -ŋdⁱ- > -ndz before **j*.

- (14) *iw-i* *ok* *up* *duna* *[a]le* [MASC *A*-STEM]
 yew-LOC also on hill ?grow
 ‘May it grow up on the hill near the yew.’ (*Westeremden B*)

Source?

- A separate locative case is not reconstructed for PGmc, as mentioned.
- The crux of the Ringe OE theory for the origin of the OE *-i* is reliant on the internal analogical spread of **-ī* from the interrogative/demonstrative.
- No evidence that PGmc **hwī* survived in OF, so this does not work.
- Phonological differences — mutation of vowels and consonants: palatalisation and umlaut happened early in the pre-history of Frisian, which supports the idea that this was an inherited *-i* < **-ī*, not an analogical *-i*.
- OF *-i* is only found in the masculine *a*-stems (Versloot 2017: 201), whereas the OE form is common to multiple noun classes.
- The OF *-i* is exclusively used for locative expressions, whilst the OE form is only an instrumental suffix.
- Possibly *was* an inherited and regeneralised locative suffix?

Summary

- Functional divide between the forms that ended in *-i* and *-u* in Frisian:
 - *-i* forms are found in a small set of nouns with locative semantics only.
 - The *-u* forms are found in both instrumental (which syncretised with the dative in the feminine) and locative contexts.
- Despite the usually understood proximity between OF and OE, the form and function of the minor morphological forms conveying locative/instrumental functions *and* the syncretism pattern of the feminine *ō*-stems clearly differed from OE.

4.3 Old High German & Old Saxon

- OHG and OS are linguistically more proximal to one another than to any other WGmc language. For this reason, they will be explored in tandem
- Morphological and morphosemantic landscapes of OHG and OS very closely resemble that of OF. Both the morphosemantic distribution of *-i* and *-u* and the syncretism pattern in the *ō*-stems are very similar in both language varieties. The evidence will be consulted in the same order as for OE and OF, beginning with the morphological forms of the *ō*-stem NOM, DAT, and INS singular; then the morphosemantic domain of INS.SG in the *ō/a*-stems; and finally, evidence of a locative **-i* across both *ō/a*-stems.

ō-stems

	PGmc	PWGmc	OS	OHG
NOM	*geb-ō	*geb-u	geb-a (-e)	geb-a
ACC	*geb-ō̄	*geb-ā	geb-a (-e)	geb-a
GEN	*geb-ōz	*geb-ā	geb-a (-e, u)	geb-a
DAT	*geb-ōi	*geb-ē	geb-u (-o, a, e)	geb-u
INS	*geb-ō	*geb-u	geb-u (-o, a, e)	geb-u

- INS *-u* was widespread in the feminine *ō*-stems in both OHG and OS.
- *-u* is found on both heavy and light stems, which suggests that it was re-generalised as an INS suffix after the effects of apocope.

(15) *thia mit thiu truhtin gisah **miltid-u** giruorit* [FEM *ō*-STEM]

her.ACC when lord.NOM saw mercy-INS moved

Quam cum vidisset dominus misericordia motus...

‘When the Lord saw her, he was moved by mercy...’

(*Tatian*, 48)

(16) *hofn-u cumda Lazarus-es farlust* [FEM *ō*-STEM]

groan-INS lamented Lazarus-GEN loss.ACC

‘She lamented the loss of Lazarus with groans.’ (*Héliand* C, 4069-70)

- In OHG, the feminine *ō*-stem INS and DAT are syncretic with one another from the earliest texts.
- The forms in OS are in most instances the same as OHG, but show some variation: forms with *-a* are found in DAT, which later weakens forms in *-e* (Gallée et al. 1993: 204). This is a testament to the central position OS has between Ingvaenic and High German: it reflects features of both, but mostly High German.
- Significantly, this means that OF, OHG and OS reflect the same tendency: for the *-u* of the NOM.SG to have been lost, but the *-u* of the INS.SG to have survived, re-generalised after apocope, and to have spread to the DAT. This directly contrasts with OE where the opposite is true: *-u* in NOM.SG is retained (and partly generalises to other noun classes), but *-u* in INS.SG is lost.

***-u* form functions:**

- Further examples of the instrumental functions need not be recounted: numerous in several classes.
- Locative usages of *-u* are attested across both OHG and OS in several noun classes.

Old Saxon:

(17) *ôðr-u sîð-u* [MASC *A*-STEM]

another-INS occasion-INS

‘On another occasion’ (*Héliand* M, 1076)

- (18) *thuris* ***thritt-en*** ***stab-u*** [MASC *A*-STEM]
 thorn third-INS letter-INS
 ‘Thorn, [in the position of] the third letter.’ (*Abecedarium Nordmannicum*)

- (19)²⁶ *te hui* [...] *gifaran* ***an fodi-u*** [MASC *JA*-STEM]
 to what travel on foot-INS
 ‘Why are you travelling on foot?’ (*Héliand* M, 556)

Old High German:

- (20) *in* *themo* ***sted-u*** [NEUT *JA*-STEM]
 on that-INS shore-INS
in litore
 ‘on the shore’ (*Tatian*, 70)

- (21) *bi* ***sted-u*** [NEUT *JA*-STEM]
 along shore-INS
secus litus
 ‘along the shore’ (*Tatian*, 77)

- (22) ***haoh-ero*** ***stet-eo*** [FEM *I*-STEM]
 high-? place-LOC
excelso *loco*
 ‘in a high place’ (*Abrogans*, PA)

- (23) *kimartrot* ***in kiuualt-iu*** *Pilat-es* [FEM *I*-STEM]
 suffered in violence-DAT Pilate-GEN
passus *sub* *Pontio Pilato*
 ‘suffered under the violence of Pontius Pilate’
 (*St Gall Credo*)

-i form:

- Both OHG and OS show evidence of a minor *-i* form with a locative function in the *a*-stems, but not the *ō*-stems, like in OF.
- Many of these forms are associated with proper place names in OS (e.g. found in Gallée et al. 1993: 89-90).

²⁶ MS C shows the phrase with the dative instead of instrumental: *an fothie*.

(24) *Bôchurst-i*
 Bokhorst-LOC
 ‘in Bokhorst’ (Cartularium Werthinense)

(25) *Tuiant-i*
 Drenthe-LOC
 ‘in Drenthe’ (Cartularium Werthinense)

Cf. NOM.SG forms *Threant* and *Bochurst*.

OHG shows similar forms in early texts, the forms of which are distinct from the usual NOM.SG:

(26) *Chuzinhūs-i*
 Kutzenhausen-LOC
 ‘in Kutzenhausen’

(27) *Uitreshūs-i*
 Wittersheim-LOC
 ‘in Wittersheim’

(28) *pi* *dorf-i*
 in village-LOC
 ‘in the village’ (Gl 2,736,30)

- Evidence that the historical distribution of **-i* was found in other common nouns in endingless, apocopated forms.
- Both OHG and OS show endingless forms of the noun *hus*, *dorf*, and *holz* after semantically locative prepositions (Braune and Heidermanns 2018: §193), which otherwise regularly govern the dative case (e.g. *te/za*, *at/az*). The endingless forms of these nouns contrast with the usual dative singular inflection: *-e*. Some examples of this are:

(29) *te* *hus-∅*
 at home-LOC
 ‘at home’ (Homilie Bedas)

(30) *than find-is* *thu gesund* *at hus-∅* *magoiungan* *man*
 then find-2sg you healthy at home-LOC child_young man
 ‘You will find the child-young man healthy at home’ (Héliand M, 2150-1)

- (31) *tér gánge bediu chórnlôs-êr ze holz-∅*
 he go.SUBJ for_that corn_less-NOM in wood-LOC
 ‘for that reason, he would go to the woods without corn’.

(Notker *De Cons* I)

Similarly, *hus* is found as both ‘locative’ and dative in the Tatian:

- (32) *Maria saz in hus-e*
 Maria sat in house-DAT
Maria autem domi sedebat
 ‘Maria was sitting in the house’ (Tatian, 135)

- (33) *mit iru uuarun in themo hus-∅ inti sia fluobritun*
 with her were in that.DAT house-LOC and her.ACC consoled
erant cum illa in domo et consolabantur eam
 ‘They were with her in the house and were consoling her.’ (Tatian, 135)

- (34) *in thero zit-i mittiu her in hus-∅ uuas*
 in that.DAT time-DAT when he in house-LOC was
in illa hora cum domi esset
 ‘At the time when he was at home...’ (Tatian, 114)

- Considering that the loss of the high vowels **i* and **u* after heavy stems was common to WGmc, the data from OHG and OS present a puzzling picture. Examples (29) to (34) match phonological expectations since each example contains a heavy stem. The suffix would be expected to survive after light syllables, but not heavy root syllables, making the endingless forms the phonologically expected form but the place name forms ‘deviant’.
- Since *-i* would not be expected to survive in place name terms and *dorfi*, these can only be understood as analogical restorations.
- This requires a consideration of the motivational mechanism for this development and the source of the ending:
 - There could have been a morphological exception to a phonological rule and place names were not affected by apocope.
 - Alternatively, it is plausible that the restoration of the suffix from light stems to heavy stems (e.g. place names) proceeded on a syntactically-semantically motivated basis. There might have been a rule such that place names did not pair with prepositions, whereas a preposition was syntactically necessary with a common noun. On this basis, the *-i* was analogically restored from light stems to disambiguate the form from the NOM.SG forms. This was not necessary in common nouns, which did seem to pair with prepositions. In these situations, the locative meaning is marked with the preposition and endingless form.

- Unlike the *-i* in OF, the OHG/OS suffix does not appear to cause umlaut, or, at least, there are no tokens which survive which speak to umlaut; however, the effects of umlaut took hold earlier in OE and OF than they did in German.

Summary

- In summary, OHG and OS also evidence the use of minor morphological forms to convey old instrumental and locative semantic functions.
- *-i* was very minor, found (nearly only) on the surface only in place names.
- The instrumental use of the *-u* is clear, but it is also used to express the locative in a frequency and distribution which was greater and wider than the use of *-i*.

5 SYNTHESIS

Morphosemantic distribution of minor morphological forms

- Every WGmc language shows evidence of a fifth case: the instrumental, which had instrumental and locative functions.
- The continental WGmc languages have forms which speak to the existence of a separate relic case in *-i*, which had a locative function only.

TABLE 6. Distribution and function of *-i* ending in West Germanic.

	<i>a</i> -stems	<i>ō</i> -stems	instrumental function	locative function	Relevant phonological mutations
OE	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
OF	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
OS	YES	NO	NO	YES	N/A?
OHG	YES	NO	NO	YES	N/A?

TABLE 7. Distribution and function of *-u* ending as oblique case marker in West Germanic.

	<i>a</i> -stems	<i>ō</i> -stems	instrumental function	locative function
OE	NO	NO	NO	NO
OF	YES	YES	YES	YES
OS	YES	YES	YES	YES
OHG	YES	YES	YES	YES

- It appears difficult to refute that there was a WGmc locative form in $*-ī$ which formed the basis of the locative forms in continental WGmc, as is the traditional understanding.
- OE, however, must have lost this and renewed an innovative suffix in $-i$ which had both instrumental and locative functions. The source of the OE is technically the same origin as the original WGmc $*-ī$, but from a later point in time. It must have left the OE noun system before being re-generalised from the last place where it had survived: the interrogative pronoun.
- Clearly a semantic overlap between the instrumental case and locative meaning. The instrumental case in WGmc looks to have absorbed functions of the locative, since we see locative expressions under instrumental morphology in every Germanic language which maintains an instrumental. The instrumental case looks to have absorbed the functions of the remnant locative.

Consequences for patterns of syncretism in the \bar{o} -stems

- Concomitant developments in OE:
 - salience of $-u$ was analysed as NOM over INS.
 - $-i$ was generalised in OE as an INS suffix, firstly in feminine nominals.
- The ordering of the two phenomena is not transparent, but morphophonological alternation of $-u/-\emptyset$ in the feminine provided fertile ground for morphological renewal.
- The inverse was true for continental WGmc:
 - The retention (and proliferation) of the instrumental function of $-u$ acted as a suppressing factor of the NOM $-u$ of the \bar{o} -stems in continental West Germanic, motivating its merger under the ACC.
 - Supported by functional evidence in the use of their $-i$ and $-u$ morphological forms.
 - Those languages which generalise towards instrumental and locative functions in the $-u$ suffix also share a similar syncretism pattern in the \bar{o} -stems. There is a correlation between those languages that both demonstrate the loss of $-u$ in the NOM (which is replaced by a form syncretic with ACC) and a DAT $-u$ in the feminine dative (which comes from the historical instrumental).

TABLE 8. Distribution of form and function of $-u$ and $-i$ suffixes in West Germanic, with elements adapted from Versloot (2017: 224).

	NOM \bar{o} -stem	$-u$ DAT \bar{o} -stem	$-u$ form a -stem	$-i$ form a -stem	INS DEM PRON	INS ADJ
OE	$-u/-\emptyset$	—	—	INS, LOC	$\bar{þ}\bar{y}$	$-e < -i$
OF	= ACC	Yes	INS, LOC	LOC	<i>thiu</i>	$-e < *-u$ (?)
OS	= ACC	Yes	INS, LOC	LOC	<i>thiu</i>	$-u$
OHG	= ACC	Yes	INS, LOC	LOC	<i>thiu</i>	$-u$

Summary

- INS *-u* was lost early in the prehistory of OE.
- OE generalised its instrumental and locative functions to the innovative *-i* suffix. The motivation for this repurposing in OE was the reanalysed significance of *-u* in the NOM SG of the \bar{o} -stems, at the expense of the historical instrumental which had been of an identical form. This happens first in the \bar{o} -stems since they are predominantly abstract and more likely to have been used in instrumental functions than nouns in other classes. This interpretation also accounts for the fronting of the vowel in the feminine demonstrative. A generalisation of INS *-i* to other nominals in OE then follows.
- By contrast, OHG, OS and OF retain the use of both of historical *-i* and *-u*.
- They generalise locative and instrumental functions under a singular form, but in the opposite direction to OE: these functions were diverted primarily to *-u*, with some remnant locative functions persisting in *-i*.
- *-u* was taken as a salient marker of instrumentality over nominativity in the \bar{o} -stems. The evidence for this is seen in how each of these languages show syncretism of their dative feminine forms under the historically instrumental suffix *-u*. When *-u* became the dominant marker that encoded both minor instrumental and locative functions, this motivated the syncretism in the nominative and accusative of the \bar{o} -stems under a non-*u* form. This motivates the generalisation of the accusative form (*-a*), the analogical template for which already existed in the *a*-stems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAMMESBERGER, A. 1994. Two Archaic Forms in the Ruthwell Cross Inscription. *English studies*, 75, 97-103.
- BAZELL, C. E. 1940. Case-Forms in *-i* in the Oldest English Texts. *Modern language notes*, 55, 136-139.
- BRAUNE, W. & HEIDERMANNS, F. 2018. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik I*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- BREMMER, R. H. 2009. *An Introduction to Old Frisian : History, Grammar, Reader, Glossary*, Amsterdam ;, J. Benjamins Pub.
- DAHL, I. 1938. *Substantival Inflexion in Early Old English : Vocalic Stems*, Lund, C.W.K. Gleerup.
- FREEMAN, A. 2018. Patterns of Retention of the Instrumental Case in Old English. *North-western European language evolution (Odense, Denmark)*, 71, 35-55.
- GALLÉE, J. H., LOCHNER, J. & TIEFENBACH, H. 1993. *Altsächsische Grammatik*, Tübingen, M. Niemeyer.
- GOERING, N. 2016. *The Linguistic Elements of Old Germanic Metre : Phonology, Metrical Theory, and the Development of Alliterative Verse*. University of Oxford.
- GOERING, N. 2023. *Prosody in Medieval English and Norse*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- LOOIJENGA, T. 2003. *Texts & Contexts of the Oldest Runic Inscriptions*, Leiden, The Netherlands, Brill.
- MIDDEKE, K. 2021. *The Old English Case System : Case and Argument Structure Constructions*, Leiden, Brill.
- RINGE, D. 2017. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*, Oxford, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RINGE, D. A. & TAYLOR, A. A. 2014. *The Development of Old English*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- SIEVERS, E. 1882. Kleine Beiträge Zur Deutschen Grammatik - Der Ags. Instrumental. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 8, 324-333.
- STILES, P. V. 2013. The Pan-West Germanic Isoglosses and the Sub-Relationships of West Germanic to Other Branches. *North-western European language evolution (Odense, Denmark)*, 66, 5-38.
- VERSLOOT, A. 2016a. The Development of Old Frisian Unstressed *-U* in the Ns of Feminine \bar{O} -Stems. In: BANNINK, A. & HONSELAAR, W. (eds.) *From Variation to Iconicity: Festschrift for Olga Fischer on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus.
- VERSLOOT, A. 2016b. Unstressed Vowels in Runic Frisian. The History of Frisian in the Light of the Germanic 'Auslautgesetze'. *Us Wurk*, 65, 1-39.
- VERSLOOT, A. P. 2017. Mith Frethe to Wasane 'to Be in Peace': Remnants of the Instrumental and Locative Case in Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century Old Frisian. *Filologia germanica = Germanic philology*, 9, 201-230.

