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INTRODUCTION

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON MEDIAEVAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

INMACULADA MEDINA BARCO
UNIVERSIDAD DE LA RIOJA

1. Preliminaries

The English Middle Ages keep attracting contemporary scholarship in tantalizing ways. A focus of that fascination assuredly runs in the twofold direction of linguistic analysis and literary criticism. The new trends in investigation are fostering new degrees of competence in the revision and understanding of these fields, much as the technological era is facilitating novel instrumental ways to delve into traditional issues and to address a complex jostling of new claims. The present volume is intended as a scientific conversation between that pioneering work and the traditionally leading disciplines of medievalism. With that aim, the following collection presents a selection of crucial essays in the contemporary discussion which, however convergent and synchronous in approach, also pull in heterogeneous distinct ways, enhancing the multiple perspectives which are currently embraced in the study of English medievalism. The chapters, fifteen in all, constitute a peer-reviewed selection of papers presented at the 22nd International Conference of the Spanish Society for Mediaeval English Language and Literature (SELIM), which brought together a large number of scholars worldwide, and was held at the Department of Modern Languages of the University of La Rioja in 2010.¹

The different parts of this book promote a diversity of theoretical and methodological perspectives, in a running thread which is both chronological and thematic. Thus, major issues are critically scoped on the

¹ Funding for this book has been provided by the research projects FFI2008-04448/FILO, FFI2009-08178-E/FILO and FFI2011-29532.
broad axes of the Old and Middle English periods in the domains of linguistics, literature, language teaching and translation, respectively. Linguistically, new nodes of frequency and demise are explored within the inflectional and derivational junctures of Old and Middle English. Traditional cruxes of verbal, preverbal and adverbial casuistics are unraveled. Insightful approaches record the precise shifts and turns ruling English word-formation processes from the early stages of the language to the present. Manuscript analysis is reinforcing our acquaintance with hitherto unfamiliar scientific corpora. Unquestionably, great assets to the ongoing accomplishments are the profuse array of specialized tools and interpretive drives which expand meaning classification and recategorise lexical creation in mediaeval England, at the height of the digital era.

The dialogue between past textualities and cutting-edge research has similarly engaged with current perspectives of literary studies. Criticism is transcending traditional approaches to the canonical texts of the great tradition, from the Anglo-Saxon period to Chaucer. Some intellectual realignments are starting to dislodge the monolithic readings of Old English verse in a direct call to syncretism, which clarifies historical merging and the poetic text as aesthetic artifact of that cultural blend. In addition, new deconstructions are reshaping the purely theoretical hermeneutics of Old and Middle English literature by adding the collaborative focus of numerous interdisciplines, like psychology and the arts, which enable the reader to consider the creative page as a shock of self-recognition and a space for self-reflection.

A similar impulse to bridge past and present operates on the cogent bases of English teaching methodology. The foundations of second language instruction are today illuminated by the cross-sectional comparison with multilingual schooling in the English Middle Ages (which had Latin, French and English, as educational coalescence). Specialised research is expanding the knowledge of virtual environments as they become preferent site for English language instruction. Some key issues arising from the new teaching modes within the Bologna framework are telematic drives, videoconferences, and computerized means of e-learning with the still indispensable teacher figure at stake, and the availability of blended learning processes. Equally interesting are the approaches underlying the philosophy of translating mediaeval English texts today. Some scholarly perspectives reveal an all-inclusive understanding of the textual harmonies behind the philological jewels, giving rise to an all encompassing methodology of translation that acknowledges editorial, translating and poetic nuance at the same time. Translatorial hermeneutics are also pushing boundaries towards new documental encounters behind essential
corpora from the late Antiquity to the times of Chaucer, and are broadening our acquaintance with current topics in the diachrony of English.

2. Fifteen Contributions on Mediaeval Language, Literature, Teaching and Translation

The above mentioned are some chief issues raised in the present volume. In what follows, a synopsis of each chapter is given with the aim of guiding the reader on individual interests. Part I opens with a chapter by Luisa García García, which continues previous analysis of deverbal *jan*-verbs by examining the stem-based alternations of verbal derivation in Old English. While earlier research by the scholar elucidated the syntactic and semantic relationships of deverbal *jan*-verbs to their corresponding strong verb in Old English and Germanic, on this occasion she explores the fate of their causative meaning in Old English which, as she attests, is only residual in a considerable number of *jan*-verbs or no longer functional, bringing about a progressively less analyzable formal display. The author scrutinizes extensive allomorphy in *jan* verbs and sound alternation patterns, while tackling the question of whether they are subject to morphological restructuring within Old English *jan*-formations or they stand as lexicalized relics. To a large extent, Luisa Garcia’s chapter stands as a valuable contribution to the phenomenon of extensive morphophonemic restructuring that took place in early English.

This volume also brings a study by Dieter Kastovsky, who examines the prolific productivity of word-formation processes in Old English. The scholar immerses us in a period of the English language which relied fervently on its native lexical resources to accommodate the new linguistic demands, be they poetical or Latin loan-translations which, albeit often mechanical, avoided direct borrowing at this early stage. The author engages in an overall assessment of the main processes of word-formation in Old English that stresses the relative importance of compounding and prefixation over suffixation and zero derivation. Kastovsky’s analysis places the lexical productivity of Old English in a wide chronological frame and signals the switch from this basically monolingual situation to partial bilingualism during the Middle English period (with the incorporation of French borrowings), the Early Modern period (with an increasing use of loans), up to Present-day English (with a situation of an already clearly mixed vocabulary). The study adds a qualitative framework for thorough lexical examination by envisioning diverse socio-cultural circumstances that might have influenced those linguistic changes,
including among others, the substantial shift from the purely didactic purposes of Old English translation to the later literary demands of an, at least partly, bilingual readership.

This section also contains a chapter by Christian Kay which highlights the importance of the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (HTOED) in current research and addresses relatively unexplored questions like the validity of sound symbolism as a force of semantic change in English. As the scholar remarks in relation to the decisive advances of the *Historical Thesaurus* project, its aim is “to provide new ways of exploring the lexical development of the English language by displaying its vocabulary in chronologically-stratified conceptual categories.” To that effect, Kay’s study centers upon the particular range of categories from Section 01.03.08 Hearing/noise in the HTOED, and attests the potential of onomatopoeia and phonaesthesia as factors of lexical change during the mediaeval period. The author’s revealing conclusions are directly linked to the pioneering work started at the University of Glasgow in 1965 by the eminent founder of the *Historical Thesaurus* project, Professor Michael Samuels, to whose memory this chapter is dedicated. The linguist announces further substantial research, specifically on the metaphorical connections across semantic categories like those of Sense and Emotion, again with the invaluable tool of the *Historical Thesaurus* without which, many of these associations and their precise development in history could not have been acknowledged.

Roberto Torre’s chapter on the role of suffixation in Old English recursive derivation furthers scholarly endeavour in relation to the Old English lexicon. The author engages in a detailed account of the word formation processes of suffixation. With that aim, he retrieves the data of analysis from the lexical database of Old English *Nerthus*. The examination proceeds by means of a twofold approach. It firstly deals with suffixed nouns by identifying an extensive range of up to 3,000 predicates from *Nerthus*. The chapter analyses the derivational processes occurring before final suffixation, which makes it possible to study the affixal combinations of nominal suffixes with both prefixes and suffixes. Additionally, the recategorising properties of suffixation are surveyed by considering the category of the base that undergoes suffixation. The second side of the approach focuses on those nouns, whether suffixed or not, which undergo suffixation pre-finally. All in all, Torre’s examination reveals an exhaustive 1,554 predicates (prefixed, suffixed and compound), which stresses the importance of suffixation as a creative source of innovative lexemes. The analysis leads to the conclusion that although
suffixation is the second most frequent device in the Old English nominal paradigm of lexical creation; it is also qualitatively speaking, the richest of all derivational processes when these phenomena interact.

Part II of the book focuses on varying issues concerning the next stage in English history, the Middle English period. No exception to that is Javier Calle-Martín’s anatomization of what befalls on decline of the unsupported negative adverb *ne* during this time of history. His scrutiny takes account of earlier central literature (Jack, Baghdikian, Fischer and particularly, Iyeiri), to reach relevant conclusions on the linguistic transitions of this adverb. Calle-Martín’s study traces the gradual shift from the early realizations of preverbal *ne* to *ne...na(h)t*, into the eventual periphrastic form *do not*. To pursue his analysis, the scholar handles detailed evidence taken from both the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts and the Innsbruck Corpus of Middle English Prose. The data guarantee a principled approach to this construction in a substantial number of ways relating to its occurrence, its dialectal stratification, and the different levels of connection between the negative adverb and the finite verb. As a result, the study brings clarification on some of the hitherto unexplored vicissitudes of this adverbial phenomenon, thus following in the track of previous leading inquiry into the field.

Traditionally, Middle English has attracted scholars on varying considerations pertaining to its distinctive lexical domains. One such lexical field is the medical, which Laura Esteban-Segura analyses on account of the scribal practice in two manuscripts of the fifteenth century, namely Hunter 307 and Hunter 509, housed in the Hunterian Collection at Glasgow University Library. Even though they both contain a miscellany of textualities— including uroscopy, gynaecology, bloodletting, migraine, etc.—, the analysis concentrates specifically on the parallel sources to both as held in the crucial medical compendium *System of Physic*. The study also centers on the Middle English Gilbertus Anglicus, a translation from the Latin *Compendium medicinae*, and a key source for early mediaeval medicine written by the leading authority, Gilbertus. The comparison of both manuscripts involves ample tracking of scribal practice—including deletions, annotations, decoration, manicules, etc.— which the analysis brings forth. The overall conclusions are valuable to understand the scribal practice of textual amendment in the Middle English period, surely instrumental to the modern editor. In a broad sense, Esteban-Segura’s chapter contributes to the understanding of medical texts in fifteenth-century England and adds to a compilation in progress of Middle English scientific prose (as mostly kept in the Hunterian source) carried out at the Universities of Málaga, Glasgow, Murcia, Oviedo and Jaén.
The history of Old and Middle English provides ground for exploration in the field of lexical semantics. Ayumi Miura’s chapter sheds light on singular aspects of the semantic scope of impersonal constructions in Middle English. Her study provides thorough lexicographical evidence for a group of verbs which have apparently not been recorded in impersonal constructions during those periods, although they retained the necessary semantic potential to have done so. The linguist conducts meticulous research into the likely reasons that led some verbs to be used in impersonal constructions at the time, while other closely related ones did not. Specifically, the chapter tackles the analysis of the Middle English verbs of fear and anger, a visibly less frequented group in the comprehensive literature that, for more than a century, has analysed the morphosyntactic and semantic nature of impersonal verbs at that time. To make an exhaustive examination, the study resorts to the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*, thus presenting a wealth of lexicographical data. The resulting considerations challenge old notions about the impossibility of drawing general conclusions regarding these fields and open the way to feasible generalizations in the domains of lexical semantics and impersonal constructions in the Old and Middle English periods.

The last chapter in this section addresses another favourite concern of Middle English scholarship, namely linguistic contact and the French influence on the English language, at the level of both text and translation. With that aim, Lyubov Zholudeva carries out a comparative analysis of Chaucer’s translation of Boethius’ *The Consolation of Philosophy* and Jean de Meun’s Old French version of the same Latin work, *Li Livres de Confort de Philosophie*. This topic, which has been a source of critical attention since the early 19th century, takes on a novel slant. Alongside considering the already ascertained influence of French borrowings on the English translation, it encompasses an innovative analysis of structural French calques on the lexical and syntactic layers of the English text. The word-by-word comparison evidences a recurring use of prepositional phrases in the *Boece* (to the constraint of alternative coetaneous uses, like compounding and epithets) that reflects the profound influence of the French source on the late 14th century English author. Additionally, the study reveals the adequacy of structural linguistics to expound the techniques of translation used in the second half of the 14th century, at the aftermath of French dominance and the germination of English as full-fledged literary tongue. On closer scrutiny, the analysis not only clarifies the still French potential over Middle English textualities, but also delights
in enhancing the remarkable Chaucerian canon as stylistically measured, strikingly cadential and genuinely indigenous.

Chaucer becomes a suitable connection with Part III of the book, which turns to mediaeval literature. Carolina Taboada tackles a systematic investigation of symbols in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, conducted through the novel perspective of the literary workshop, revealing crucial ways in which literature can act as a powerful means of self-exploration. Theoretically based on Jungian analysis and the decisive link between the individual’s conscious and unconscious, the study displays a comprehensive battery of exercises, with the poetic symbols as kernel. The methodology is meant to provoke diverse reflections upon the readers’ intuitive interpretation, to ostensibly trigger personal meanings and open a doorway to self-knowledge and personal development. The critical examination of the Arthurian poem is divided into two parts. The first one, entitled *The Symbolic Journey Towards Wild Nature*, is intended as an inquiry into the symbols in the text which, not coincidentally, has the *journey* as nucleus. The second one focuses specifically on the reading praxis, and deals with the likely *Applications for a Writing Workshop* that the literary text can offer. Overall, the scholar’s original endeavour foregrounds the symbolic interpretation that a mediaeval text like *Sir Gawain* can provide for a Present-day reader, as a real tool for life, and as a projection of individual psychology in action.

Laura Torrado’s chapter deals with the multifaceted cultural juncture that existed in Anglo-Saxon England during the 10th century and the interpretation of a significant hybrid poem like *Judith*, which she explores from an all-inclusive angle. The study reviews previous critical readings of the poem, including the patristic (which has signaled inspirational sources like Ælfric’s *Homily on the Book of Judith*), the pedagogical (which has seen in Judith an example of Ecclesia, in Holofernes an allegory of the Devil), and the political (which has ennobled the piece as a patriotic call to battle, on parallel grounds of the Danish invasion of England). Not disregarding the scholarly input of previous exegesis, Torrado’s analysis suggests that any line of research may fall short that does not take into consideration the essentially hybrid quality of the poem, at a time in English history when Roman echoes still abide, and the intermingling of heathenism and Christianity prevailed. The desire for an all-embracing analysis leads to a syncretic reading of *Judith* as herald of *sapientia et fortitudo*. The heroine unites the Christian virtues of the saintly life (*soðne geleafan to ôam Ælmíhtigan Ælmihtigan* / “her true faith in the Almighty”), with her Germanic leadership (she is depicted as *ellenpriste* / “courageous” and *collenferhð* / “brave”). As a consequence, this chapter
presents a cross-sectional analysis of *Judith*, at the same time as it reflects on the suitability of integral hermeneutics to acknowledge the Old English poem as vivid literary artifact, within convulsed late Anglo-Saxon England.

Part IV comprises the teaching of mediaeval language and literature. In those terms, Andrés Canga envisions crucial analogues of language teaching in mediaeval England and Present-day teaching as regards the influential instruction of *Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CLIL). The chapter explores bilingual education dating back as early as 3,000 BC, to eventually focus on the British Isles during the Middle Ages (where Latin, French and English coexisted in language instruction), until the present (with the expansion of bilingualism and language immersion programmes in the European and American teaching contexts). The chapter then moves into the domain of teaching content through the medium of a second language and reveals that this is by no means an invention of our era but rather a development of the instructional modes already existing in England during the Middle Ages. The analysis evinces some similarities and differences between teaching in mediaeval England and CLIL instruction today, and scopes both methodologies in their distinctive frameworks. Amongst other parallels, the study indicates the value of mono/bilingual glossaries in the learning of vocabulary and the classification of words in differentiated semantic fields. Regarding differences, the essay points out a lower degree of class interaction in the monastic schools, lesser degrees of dialogic instruction and less cognitively engaged environments,—which CLIL classroom settings have exponentially enhanced on the basis of social-constructivist models and the integration of feedback—. For all this, the contribution becomes a synoptic compendium of essential maneuvers in the mediaeval curriculum of language teaching and the current resources that CLIL is implementing nowadays to qualitatively foster the student’s performance along the learning process.

Directly concerned with contemporary modes of effective learning is the next chapter, by Ana Sáez-Hidalgo and Laura Filardo-Llamas. The authors explore the recent teaching models that have ensued from the new European Space of Higher Education, under the auspices of the Bologna process and the new Degrees in English Studies. Both scholars envisage the tangible potential of innovative transparency tools in virtual learning environments, like Moodle. With student-centered learning as target, the study offers a reflection on e-learning and higher education from a thoroughly theoretical perspective. It also proceeds to ponder the impact that the process of modernization under the Bologna system has had on the
factual praxis of university teaching, and conceives a model course on the History of the English Language (HEL). A further advantage of the research is that it explores the suitability of blended learning modes, which promote the affiliation of online environments and classroom settings (acknowledging the teaching figure, without whom human contact would be lacking, much as other essential foundations in learning, like peer support and in-class feedback). On the whole, the chapter tackles aspects of imminent relevance to contemporary English teaching and learning contexts.

Part V addresses the translation and interpretation of mediaeval texts. Among the alluring gaps in the Old English semantics of translation, stand those traditionally concerned with a central poem like Beowulf. One such controversial node deals with the interpretation of the “ond lófgeornost” at its close (3182b), which Jorge Luis Bueno Alonso discloses in full detail in his chapter. He proposes an all-encompassing evaluation that covers authoritative editions of the Old English text, translations into English (academic much as poetic), and translations into some languages of the Iberian context (Spanish, Catalan and Galician). The analysis reveals that the interpretive possibilities behind the “ond lófgeornost” can only get full semantic resolve by considering the threefold editorial, translation, and poetic cruxes. For one thing, the editorial becomes the first step in any translating approach to get the syntactic and lexical findings contextualized. The aspect of translation itself should provide accessible versions, academic and informative likewise, to the non-specialized reader. The poetic comes as the sequential furthering of the second, and is quintessential in a text like Beowulf whose medium is inextricably, poetry. That is why one claim of the resulting critical discussion accentuates the need for a formal poetic philosophy behind any verse translation that wants to be deemed effective.

Chaucer’s translation of the Consolation of Philosophy has also become a source of interest to Present-day erudition, adding to the revival of Boethian studies and more strictly, the Consolation. José María Gutiérrez Arranz tackles the matter of sources and surpasses the original scepticism of some revered scholarship, to trace new faithful and likely sources of the Boece that add to already extant ones. The exhaustive tracking, which the author takes from the 6th century to Chaucer’s time, offers a copious survey of sources from the ancient tradition to the numerous vernacular writings that emerged in Old and Middle English, and which linked the goal of interpretation to textual enarratio, transcending former notions of translation as mere imitation. Chaucer’s Boece will be regarded in this light, and from an extensive tracing of historical influences. Hence, from behind the O qui perpetua to Allas! I
wepynge, there emerge new connections and documental encounters that enrich the simmering background of this major Middle English text.

The closing chapter of the book is written by María Ángeles Ruiz Moneva, who undertakes an analytical study in structural thematics in translation, from Old English to Present-day English. Rooted in the works of influential scholars like Hatim and Mason, the author assesses the true impact of diachronic evolution on the thematic progress of discourse (the former being a preeminently synthetic language with a versatile syntax, the latter a visibly more analytic one). The examination focuses on a selected corpus of Old English textual types and genres and puts forward a number of partial and substantial conclusions. For one thing, it disavows the shift from a synthetic to an analytic language as main factor befalling the progression of the thematic structure in English. In addition, the study envisions other constituents as decidedly more important than the structure of language itself or its characteristic synthetic and analytic patterning. Among the diversely conceived grounds, the analysis stands out the nature of information, the specific textual types and the primary underlying communicative functions. The chapter advances subsequent critical research that will further develop this already telling account on the kernels of theme and structure along the English diachrony.

3. Final Remarks

A brief glance at the book’s contents evinces the manifestly plural ways in which the English Middle Ages, the mesmerising media tempestas, are being addressed in current critical debate, from the diverse areas of linguistics, literature, teaching methodology and translation. Not obliterating the imposing scholarship along history, the recent paths of learning consolidate the betwixt-and-between edges of tradition and innovation: the onset of the 21st century has naturally given way to new cultural demands and new university models; departments are fostering specialized projects designed to promote these privileged areas of medievalism; universities worldwide are as ever strengthening the collaborative expertise among scholars, research groups, and interdisciplines; the scholarly debate is buoyed up by vibrant international conferences, such as SELIM; traditional mediaeval disciplines are being accessed through new advances in technology, digital thesauri, and lexical databases. This volume becomes exceptional witness to all these developments. In view of them, it is not foolhardy to predict that the dark old ages may provide solid foundations for new stimulating highlights.
PART I:

OLD ENGLISH
1. Introduction

This book chapter intends to explore the role of stem alternations in the domain of verbal derivation in Old English. For reasons that will be explained below, I will focus on the morphology of deverbal jan-verbs, which have the expression of causativity as their prototypical function; see e.g. lǣdan ‘lead, take, carry, bring, produce’ vs. līþan ‘go, sail’ or swencan ‘cause a person to labour, harass, afflict’ vs. swincan ‘toil, labour, work with effort’.1

Dieter Kastovsky has written extensively on the status of morphophonemic alternations in Old English morphology (Kastovsky 1988, 1992, 1994, 2006).2 In his contribution to the Cambridge History of the English Language, among other works, he points out their “pervasiveness” in the inflectional and derivational patterns of Old English (1992: 297). More recently (2006: 173) he again emphasizes the importance of morphophonemic alternations, and laments that they “have so far been sorely neglected in the existing handbooks.” This contribution intends to mitigate this deficit.

As suggested by Pilch (1970: 88ff.) and Kastovsky (1988, 2006), stem alternations in Old English have a twofold origin: the ablaut alternations inherited from Indo-European, on the one hand, and, on the other, a number of Germanic sound changes, such as i-mutation (in e.g. fyllan ‘to

---

1 This research has been funded through the projects FFI2008-04448/FILO and FFI2011-29532. I thank Christopher Langmuir for his revision of the manuscript.
2 On terminology see below; in the present paper the term “stem alternations” is preferred since it does not prejudice the kind of conditioning involved.
fill’ < full ‘full’), palatalization/assibilation (in e.g. swencan (< swincan) above, where the velar consonant /k/ has become /ʃ/), gemination (wreccan ‘raise, take up, torment’ < wrecan ‘drive, expel’) or Verner’s voicing (in e.g. nerian ‘save’ < nesan ‘be saved from’). These sound changes result in automatic or allophonic alternations, which are phonemized with time, then become morphophonemic by association with a certain morphological environment and finally allomorphic when the phonological motivation is lost (see Haspelmath 2002: 195-199 for the diachrony of stem alternations; specifically on Old English see Kastovsky 1988, 2006).

According to Kastovsky, stem alternations “by the end of the Old English period ended up as morphologically conditioned unpredictable alternations” (2006: 171). That alternations in causative pairs in particular were subject to morphological conditioning during the Old English period is implied by Brinton and Traugott (2005: 153), when they mention specifically causative pairs such as lay/lie, drink/drench as “representatives of a major and productive word formation strategy [i.e., stem alternations], which was coming to be obsolete by the end of the Old English period.”

The present chapter takes up precisely that issue and analyzes the status of the stem alternations present in Old English deverbal jan-verbs, or jan-causatives for short. They constitute an ideal corpus to study the status of sound alternations in Old English derivation, since they are the most numerous group of deverbal verbs, and they are suffixless, solely characterized by stem alternations. 3 Although many of the jan-verbs are still clearly causative in Old English, in a substantial number of them the causative component is either only residual or non-existent. This functional demise goes hand in hand with growing formal opacity. As we will see, Old English jan-verbs are characterized by extensive allomorphy and display a wide array of stem alternations with respect to the strong verbs that form their derivational bases. This chapter addresses whether these sound alternations constitute the locus of morphological restructuring within Old English jan-formations, or rather are lexicalized relics of unproductive phonological and morphological rules, ripe for elimination by analogical restructuring. I will verify this by means of two procedures. The first follows a standard definition of morphology as “the

---

3 Whether this is zero-derivation or not is an issue that might well be worth further investigation. Kastovsky (2006: 153) identifies zero-derivation with conversion, but causatives are clearly not a case of conversion, though their derivational process does not involve suffixation from a synchronic point of view, and are hence a case of zero-derivation.
study of systematic covariation in the form and meaning of words” (Haspelmath 2002: 2). It therefore requires ascertaining whether specific alternations are attached to a particular kind of development within deverbal jan-verbs, such as to the preservation of causative meaning or its opposite. In the second place, I have searched for analogical changes in the alternations that can be ascribed to the operation of morphological rules.

In a more general frame, this chapter may contribute to the understanding of the massive morphophonemic restructuring occurring in Early English, which has been receiving some attention since Kastovsky (1992: 298 and again in 1996: 101) remarked on the need for detailed systematic investigation (see e.g. the works by Martin Arista 2008, 2011; Pesquera Fernández forthcoming; Torre Alonso 2009). The term “Early English” above has been deliberately chosen in order to avoid the more specific “Old English”, “early Old English” or “late Old English”, since as will become apparent below, the findings of the present study seem to contradict estimations that date the turning point in late Old English and early Middle English (Kastovsky 1988, 1992, 2006; Brinton and Traugott 2005: 153). Such morphophonemic restructuring entails, as Kastovsky has repeatedly pointed out (1992, 1994, 2006), the loss of stem variability and its replacement by stem invariancy as a morphological principle. Hence, defining the status of stem alternations, which are at the core of stem variability, is crucial to understanding morphophonemic changes in early English.

The chapter has the following sections: after a brief note on the terminology used, the historical morphology of jan-verbs is described in section 2. Section 3 presents the sound alternations found in Old English deverbal jan-verbs. Next, the syntactic and semantic developments shown by Old English jan-verbs are briefly described in section 4. Section 5 examines whether specific alternations are associated with a particular pattern of development within deverbal jan-verbs. In section 6, cases of analogical restructuring are tackled as further indicators of morphological conditioning. The main conclusions of the study are summarized in section 7.

Note on terminology: Haspelmath (2002: 181ff.) uses “sound alternation” as a cover term for all stem alternation types. He further distinguishes between “automatic” and “morphophonological alternations.” The former are purely phonetic, the latter are at least in part morphologically or lexically conditioned. Kastovsky’s “morphophonemic” alternations involve morphological as well as phonemic conditioning, whereas “allomorphic” alternations are governed by morphological factors only (see e.g. 1988, 2006). In this he follows Dressler’s classification of morphophonemic
rules (1985: 57ff.). The findings of the present study call for a further distinction to be drawn between allomorphic and lexical alternations, which go one step further along the lexicalization path and do not respond to any morphological pattern.

2. Diachronic description of the morphology of Old English deverbal jan-verbs

Old English jan-verbs are the reflexes of a major Germanic word-formation type, deployed mainly to derive verbs which added a causer and a sense of causation to a non-causative verbal base (see some examples below). A very limited number of jan-verbs show hints of an intensive or iterative nuance in Germanic.

In Present-day English there are only a few remnants of the causative jan-formation, the most obvious ones being set/sit, lay/lie, drench/drink and fell/fall. The relationship between the members of each pair and the pairs with one another is not straightforward, either in formal or in semantic terms. In fact, if questioned about these verbs, few speakers would identify set, lay, drench and fell as related to sit, lie, drink and fall by any causative nexus.

In common Germanic, on the contrary, the jan-formation was a predictable and very productive derivational strategy. Thus, 30% of all Germanic strong verbs as listed by Seebold (1970) have a jan-causative attested in one Germanic language or another. In Old English, one hundred and six deverbal jan-verbs are attested—almost a third of strong verbs having a jan-verb by their side; fifty-seven of them have a causative nuance (further details in García García forthcoming).

The form of jan-verbs was readily analyzable in Germanic. The suffix *-(i)ja- was generally added to the root of a strong verb in the Germanic a-grade (Indo-European o-grade), as shown under (1):

---

4 This section follows standard descriptions, such as Krahe and Meid (1969: 244ff.) and Ringe (2006: 230ff.) and my own conclusions, explained in more detail in García García (1997 and 2005: 17ff.).

5 Estimations of the number of Old English strong verbs obviously vary: Seebold (1970) lists ca. 370. Pesquera Fernández (forthcoming) retrieved 407 strong verbs from the lexical database of Old English Nerthus, in which each meaning of polysemous verbs receives a separate entry. According to Pesquera, 304 Old English strong verbs have any derivative at all.