The Naxos Papers, Volume I

The Naxos Papers, Volume I:

On the Diachrony of English

Edited by

Nikolaos Lavidas, Alexander Bergs and Elly van Gelderen

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

NIKOLAOS LAVIDAS

This volume collects ten studies on various characteristics of the historical development of English, and mainly Old and Middle English, first presented in workshops at the "Old and Middle English" and "Language Variation and Change in Ancient and Medieval Europe" summer schools, organized in Naxos, Cyclades, Greece. The first volume of "The Naxos Papers" includes studies derived from the first four workshops: "New Approaches to the History of Early English(es)" I, II and III and "Language Change in Indo-European" I (July 23, 2016; July 26, 2017; July 21, 2018; and July 31, 2019, respectively). The aim of the Naxos workshops was to discuss the ongoing research or the results of the research of young scholars as well as those of established linguists and philologists on a variety of topics, including language change in the diachrony of English, historical morphology and syntax, historical phonology, historical sociolinguistics, linguistic theory and historical data, language teaching and dialectology (diatopic aspects) and language teaching and diachrony (diachronic aspects).

This volume is divided into two parts that both focus on characteristics of Old English: the first part emphasizes the synchronic description of syntactic, morphological and semantic features of Old English, and the second part emphasizes explanations of the development of various features of English, starting with Old English. Sweet's (1874) study established the tradition of the tripartite division of the history of English: Old – Middle – Modern English, with subperiods within each period. However, it is well-known that there is no consensus among linguists regarding the question of exactly when one period begins and another ends (among many others, Bergs & Brinton 2012, Fisiak 1994, van Gelderen 2014, Lavidas & Bergs 2020). Sweet (1892) also proposed the following chronological division of the diachrony of English, which is still considered a plausible way of examining English:

Early Old English (English of Alfred)	700-900
Late Old English (English of Ælfric)	900-1100
Transition Old English (English of Layamon)	1100-1200
Early Middle English (English of the Ancren Riwle)	1200-1300
Late Middle English (English of Chaucer)	1300-1400
Transition Middle English (Caxton)	1400-1500
Early Modern English (Tudor English, English of Shakespeare)	1500-1650
Late Modern English	1650-...

For Sweet (1888: 154-155), the inflection of English nouns and the development of unstressed vowels were the main linguistic criteria for the tripartite division:

> If we take Sth E [Southern English] as the standard, we may define OE as the period of full endings (*mona, sunna, sunu, stanas*), ME as the period of levelled endings (*mone, sunne, sune, stones*) – weak vowels being reduced to a uniform *e ...*, MnE as the period of lost endings (*moon, sun, son*).

Sweet's division became part of the long tradition of diachronic studies of English. For scholars before Sweet (e.g., Latham 1858: 156-160 and Koch 1863 I: 9-10), the diachrony of English includes only two main periods and five subperiods: Anglo-Saxon (Anglo-Saxon: 7th century-1150; Half-(Semi-)Saxon 1150-1250) and English (Old English 1250-1350; Middle English 1350-1500; Modern English 1500-...). However, since Sweet's proposal, we may find only very few cases of strong criticism against the chronological division of English. For instance, Hockett (1957: 61-66) and Jones (1972: 2) have followed a different perspective and even have questioned the necessity of recognizing periods and stages.

This volume synthesizes recent approaches to the study of historical English and long-established philological scholarship. Using this synthesis, this volume doubts the old antagonisms between modern linguistics and traditional approaches and makes the historical study of English accessible to scholars and students of both backgrounds (Smith 2009). The first part of the volume concentrates on questions concerning the analysis of the Old English language and the development of some Old English features.

The chapter "Semantic and morphological features of causative *hatan* in Old English" by Lorenzo Moretti argues that the Old English data support the integration of the verb *hatan* into the causative verbal system even though different uses of *hatan* are also well attested in Old English. Moretti shows that *hatan* could be used as an ordering verb and as a causative verb in Old English and that the difference between the two meanings was determined by the morphology of

the infinitive that *hatan* took as a complement: the infinitive was prefixed, and the meaning of the construction was causative, whereas bare infinitives were found in ordering constructions. The development of *hatan* and its disappearance as a causative verb in the Middle English period are other important aims of Moretti's study.

The second chapter, "Worðenne ł Worðianne: verbal morphology simplification in the Lindisfarne Gospels and the case of weak verbs class II" by Elisa Ramírez Pérez, examines the weak verbs class II in the late Northumbrian dialect of Old English. Ramírez Pérez analyzes the 10th century interlinear, word-by-word Northumbrian glosses added to the Lindisfarne Gospels in contrast to the data collected from the Rushworth Gospels. The study presents the level of variation in the distribution of the -i- formative of the weak verbs class II and investigates the development of the -i- formative. The disappearance of the -i- formative led to the merger of the inflectional endings of the second class of weak verbs with those of the first class. The chapter concludes that Lindisfarne displays a higher degree of deletion and variation of distribution of the -i- formative than Rushworth, which maintains most of the examples of the -i- formative.

In the third chapter, "How 'rusty' were the Anglo-Saxons? *Ōman* and *ōmiht* in Bald's *Leechbook*," Felix Hausleitner argues that the noun *ōman* (Sg. *ōme*), with the literal meaning *rust*, and the adjective *ōmiht* or *ōmig* are polysemous in a medical context and may refer to a number of different concepts. Hausleitner's study shows that the above noun and adjectives can refer to skin conditions with a rust-like appearance but also to internal conditions. Hausleitner investigates the meanings of Old English *ōman* and *ōmiht* in Bald's *Leechbook* on the basis of internal evidence, relevant Latin sources and other Old English medical texts. The noun *ōman* refers to skin conditions which involve reddening of the skin in *Leechbook I*, whereas it refers to unhealthy fluids in the stomach in *Leechbook II*.

The chapter "Old English verbs denoting locomotion; meaning components and grammatical behavior" by Sara Domínguez Barragán analyzes the consistency of the grammatical behavior of verbs of motion in Old English and identifies the morphosyntactic alternations in which they participate. Domínguez Barragán argues that the meaning of the three verb classes in Old English (verbs of neutral motion, verbs of manner of motion and verbs of path of motion) corresponds to different realizations of arguments and, more specifically, to two different morphosyntactic alternations: the reflexive alternation and the verb/satellite alternation. The study concludes that the polysemic verbs of motion of Old English are usually atelic, whereas telicity coincides with path of motion.

Yosra Hamdoun Bghiyel's chapter "A pilot study on Old English superlative adverbs lemmatization" discusses the challenges of the lemmatization process of Old English adverbs in the superlative degree. The study follows the *Nerthus Project* (Martín Arista et al. 2016) on the lemmatization of the nonverbal categories of the Old English lexicon. The main aim of the lemmatization is the identification of a lemma for all of the superlative adverbial forms of Old English extracted from the York Corpus of Old English (YCOE). Hamdoun Bghiyel defines a methodology for the lemmatization of adverbs and shows how 1,267 adverbs in the superlative degree have been lemmatized into 80 lemmas provided by the Nerthus database through an automatic (extraction) and a manual (lemma assignment) procedure.

The second part of the volume focuses on questions that relate the development of English to the main approaches to linguistic theory.

The chapter "Language history in six texts of spousal controversy from *Beowulf* to *Macbeth*" by Eugene Green presents a sociolinguistic and pragmatic history of features that occur in six depictions of spousal controversy from Old to Renaissance English. The study concentrates on lexical and grammatical features that help characterize antipathetic husbands and wives in each text and attempts to determine whether the identified features embody recognized or new attitudes toward gender. The study concludes that the predominant trend in all texts evidences a preference for linguistic features that can strike audiences as entirely current.

Martha Lampropoulou's chapter, "Semantic remarks on the placement of adjectives in Middle English based on a case study on *King Horn* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*" discusses the development of adjectives in Middle English and semantic factors that might have motivated the shift from postposed adjectives in Old English to preposed adjectives in Middle English. The study examines the occurrence of prenominal and postnominal adjectives in two Middle English romances, *King Horn* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and argues that semantic factors interact with the most and least dominant positions of adjectives in the two romances. Lampropoulou shows that honorary expressions or titles (Name + adjective) constitute a common type of construction that is found in the two romances, whereas adjectival constructions with *ful* (noun + *ful* + adjective) and *so* (noun + *so* + adjective) are quite frequent only in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.

Gerardo Fernández-Salgueiro, in the chapter "*For to infinitives* in Middle English: on the position of PRO," examines the syntax of infinitival clauses, particularly *for to* infinitives in Middle English with respect to the position of their implicit null subject (PRO). The chapter argues that the position of PRO has changed in the history of English: PRO remains in the VP in Middle English but moves to Spec, TP in later stages. Fernández-Salgueiro relates this analysis to the hypothesis that Middle English learners did not necessarily acquire obligatory A-movement as a feature of their grammar. The study also discusses the consequences of this approach for the understanding of the properties of *for to infinitives* and their decline after the Middle English period, the rise of *for infinitives* and other constructions and the presence of *for to* infinitives in Belfast English.

The chapter "Remarks on the diachrony of English and Dutch complementizers" by Isabella Greisinger provides a syntactic explanation for the development of complementizers that present similar characteristics in at least two West Germanic languages, namely English and Dutch. Greisinger argues that there is always a periphrastic construction including the complementizer *that* (Dutch *dat*) in the first stage of change, whereas the last stage consists of the substitution of *that/dat* with a new complementizer, for example English *for* or Dutch *met*, in the head of the CP. Moreover, the study demonstrates that two subtypes of this change exist: the deletion of an item of periphrastic

construction or the univerbation of words of periphrastic construction.

The final chapter in the volume, "Linguistic complexity in grammaticalization: a case study in the 'be going to' construction" by Vassileios Symeonidis, argues that both systemic structural complexity and cognitive processing difficulty associated with the emergence of new grammatical items should be taken into consideration because they provide a good picture of the development of complexity in a dynamic system. It appears that when both types of complexity are taken into account, the results are different than when only one type is examined. The chapter falsifies the hypothesis that grammar necessarily gets simplified over time or complexified when naturally acquired. Symeonidis suggests an equicomplexity mechanism and proposes that the two types of complexity – structural and processing difficulty – balance out grammatical difficulty in the diachrony of a language.

We hope that this volume will find its position among other valuable studies on Early English and the development of English, similar to the way that the summer school managed to attract the interest of students and young as well as established scholars from its first version (July 2016). The Naxos summer school offered us the opportunity to discuss historical linguistic topics, following the methodology of modern linguistics, in an environment that combined historical tradition and modern culture. This volume also combines philological study with the analysis of significant questions through a modern perspective. We could not have a better chance than here, in the introduction to the first volume derived from the Naxos summer school on historical linguistics (Old and Middle English, and Language Variation and Change in Ancient and Medieval Europe), to express our gratitude to all of the institutions and people who made and still make the Naxos workshops and summer schools possible: the Municipality of Naxos and Small Cyclades; the Legal Entity of Culture, Sports, Environment, Education, Welfare and Solidarity (ΝΟΠΠΑΠΠΠΑ) of the Municipality of Naxos and Small Cyclades; the Onassis Foundation (for the support of the 2018 Workshop and Conference); the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens; the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (for the 2016 and 2017 workshops); Arizona State University and the University of Osnabrück.

References

Bergs, Alexander & Laurel J. Brinton (eds). 2012. *English Historical Linguistics: An International Handbook*. 2 Volumes. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Fisiak, Jacek 1994. Linguistic reality of Middle English. In Francisco Fernandez, Miguel Fuster & Juan José Calvo (eds), *English Historical Linguistics 1992*, 47-61. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gelderen, Elly. van. 2014. *A History of the English Language*. Revised edition. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hockett, Charles F. 1957. The terminology of historical linguistics. *Studies in Linguistics* 12.57-73.

Jones, Charles. 1972. *An Introduction to Middle English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Koch, Carl Friedrich. 1863. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. Vol. 1. Weimar: Böhlau.

Latham, Robert Gordon, 1858. *A Handbook of the English Language.* London: Walton & Maberly.

Lavidas, Nikolaos & Alexander Bergs. 2020. *On historical language contact in English and its types: state of the art and new directions*. Linguistics Vanguard, 6(s2), 20200010. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2020-0010.

Smith, Jeremy J. 2009. *Old English. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweet, Henry. 1874. *A History of English Sounds from the Earliest Period, Including an Investigation of the General Laws of Sound Change, and Full Word-lists*. London, Pub. for the English Dialect Society by Trübner & Co.

Sweet, Henry. 1888. *A History of English Sounds from the Earliest Period, with Full Word-lists*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sweet, Henry. 1892. *A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

PART I:

ON OLD ENGLISH AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH

CHAPTER TWO

SEMANTIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL FEATURES IF CAUSATIVE *HATAN*
IN OLD ENGLISH

LORENZO MORETTI

Abstract

This paper investigates semantic and morphological features of causative *hatan* in Old English. *Hatan* could be used as an ordering verb and as a causative verb; both constructions share the same syntactic structure and it is generally assumed that it is the surrounding context that makes clear whether the construction expresses causation or an order. The aim of this paper is to show that the difference between the two meanings is determined by the morphology of the infinitive that *hatan* takes as a complement. In fact, it is argued here that when the infinitive has a prefix, the meaning of the construction is causative, whereas bare infinitives are found in ordering constructions.

This study also examines the position of *hatan* in the Old English causative system and analyses the circumstances that led to its sudden disappearance in Middle English.

1. Introduction

Old English verb *hatan* has received much attention in the past years for its syntactic behavior and for the possibility to be found in several contexts (Royster 1918; Nagucka 1980; Timofeeva 2010; Cloutier 2013; Lowrey 2013). The first scholar to point out that *hatan* could be interpreted as a causative verb has been Royster (1918), who made the distinction between "perfective" and "imperfective" uses of *hatan*. Royster noticed that in some contexts *hatan* not only expressed the idea that "will or power residing in one person or thing is exercised upon another person or thing toward the accomplishment of an act" (1918: 83), but also that the act evoked by the causative verb has actually been accomplished. The difference between the two uses of *hatan* has been analysed also by Nagucka (1980) and Lowrey (2013): in the attempt of unifying the "calling/naming" and the "ordering/commanding" meanings, Nagucka observes that *hatan* is "used with a human subject and undoubtedly causative" (1980: 36), while Lowrey took back the differentiation made by Royster using the terms "implicative" and "non-implicative" (Lowrey 2013: 24-26). In his account, implicative use of *hatan* is found when the order was performed, while non-implicative use does not make explicit whether the order has been carried out.

This study is part of a larger project whose aim is to analyse in terms of morphology, syntax and semantics the causative verbal system in Old English. This paper focuses on the causative use of *hatan* and its grammatical features. *Hatan* is a versatile verb, as from the earliest Old English texts it shows multiple meanings. The causative use developed probably from its use as an ordering verb: it became frequent in contexts in which the order was given and then performed, causing "someone to do something". What is challenging, however, is how it is possible to distinguish ordering *hatan* from causative *hatan*, given the fact that they show the same syntactic structure.

This paper intends to show that there were grammatical features that characterised the use of *hatan* as a causative verb. The analysis carried out in this study shows that in the two constructions the infinitive complement is morphologically different when the meaning of *hatan* is causative.

2. Methodology

This study is based on data extracted from the YCOE, the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose.[1] The software used to retrieve the data is *CorpusSearch*: the research query entered included all the inflected forms of *hatan*[2] that take both infinitive and clausal complement. The instances in which *hatan* takes an infinitive have been grouped for syntactic characteristics and translated; then, the infinitives have been analysed in terms of morphological features, valency of the infinitive verb and type of action expressed (agentive vs non-agentive). In finite clause complements, special attention has been paid to the mood of the verb, whether it was indicative or subjunctive, and cases in which a modal was present have been noted.

The periodisation used in the Helsinki Corpus has been retained:

---

[1] http://corpussearch.humanities.manchester.ac.uk.
[2] All the forms have been taken from the Oxford English Dictionary.

OE1	- 850
OE2	850 – 950
OE3	950 – 1050
OE4	1050 – 1150

Table 1: Helsinki Corpus periodisation

3. The Old English verb *hatan*

Old English verb *hatan* derives from the proto-Germanic verb **haitan* and it is regularly attested in all the other Germanic languages for the development from proto-Indo-European to Early Germanic (Cloutier 2010). In Modern English it survives in the form *hight*, now of archaic use, while in Modern German and Dutch it is much more productive and is commonly found in the forms *heißen* and *heten* with the meaning "to call, to name" and "to be called". As in other cognate languages, *hatan* was used in more than one context (Coutier 2010; Lowrey 2013): in Old English, it could occur in calling constructions taking a direct object (1), in naming constructions both in active (2) and in passive voice (3), in ordering constructions taking an infinitival complement (4) and in causative constructions taking both an infinitival complement (5) and a finite clause introduced by *þæt* (6).

(1)
Seoðþan   he hine to Cristes þeowdome gehatenne hæfde
Afterwards   he him to Christ kingdom   called   had
"Afterwards he had called him to Christ's kingdom"
(OE2 Bede: 8. 124. 13)

(2)
Se leofode six hund   geara, and his sunu hatte   Arfaxað
He lived   six hundred years, and his son named Arphaxad
"He lived six hundred years, and he called his son Arphaxad"
(OE3 ÆCHom I, 1: 186.222.236)

(3)
And sum wif   hatte Uenus seo wæs Ioues dohtor
And some women called Venus she was Jove daughter
"And some women called Jove's daughter Venus"
(OE3 Whom 12: 77.1205)

(4)
þa   het   se gerefa hi swingan þæt þæt blod fleow
then ordered the prefect her scourge that the blood flow
"then the prefect ordered to scourge her so that the blood flow"
(OE3 Mart 5: Jy7,B.17.1102)

(5)
Se Hælend þa   het   þa þenincmenn afyllan six stænene fatu   mid hluttrum   wætere
The saint   then bade   the servicemen fill   six stone   vessels with pure   water
"The saint then bade the servicemen to fill six stones of vessel with pure water"
(OE3 ÆCHom I, 4:206.10.647)

(6)
het   se æðela cyning þæt Florus hine gespræce
bade the noble king   that Florus him spoke
"the noble king bade Florus to speak to him"
 (OE3 ÆLS: 244.1640)

Active voice naming construction is the most frequent construction in the whole Old English period, followed by ordering and causative constructions (Cloutier 2010). Calling constructions were already not frequent at the beginning of Old English and disappeared in late Old English, while the passive voice naming constructions became more frequent and seems to have replaced the calling constructions.

A causative meaning did not develop in the other cognate languages: it is interesting to note in fact that while an ordering meaning is available also for Gothic *haitan*, a causative use it is not (Coutier 2010). This means that causative *hatan* represents an innovation which took place only in Old English and probably in an early period (Cloutier 2010).

The frequency of infinitival and clausal complementation with both causative and ordering *hatan* is extremely diverse: the data show that an infinitive complement was much more frequent than clausal complements, as it is illustrated in Table 2.

hatan + Infinitive	1217/1296	93.8%
hatan + *þæt*-clause	79/1296	6.2%
Total	1296/1296	100%

Table 2: Frequency of complementation of the causative *hatan*

4. Causative *hatan*

The construction in which *hatan* is found as a causative verb is an analytic structure in which there are two predicates, the first expressing causation and the other the effect of the causation (Kemmer 1994). Morphologically, *hatan* appears in the finite form and is marked by tense and aspect, while the second verb is an infinitive. Syntactically, the construction is biclausal as the two verbs involved are semantically and conceptually very specific and independent one from the other. This happens because *hatan* is not the typical causative verb which Song (1996) and Kemmer & Verhagen (1994: 117) have defined as "all that is expressed by the predicate representing the causing event [...] is the pure notion of cause [...] without more specific lexical content". Semantically, *hatan* is still very marked and its lexical content has not been bleached: this implies that *hatan* preserves a specific syntactic structure which determines the semantic roles involved in the causative construction.

Terasawa (1985) suggested that there are two types of analytic causative verbs, "pure causative" and "agentive causative". Pure causatives refer to the definition of causative verb given by Song and Kemmer & Verhagen. Agentive causatives, on the other hand, are those verbs which express "direct and coercive causation" (1985:133). Semantically, they are formed by a three-argument structure and require an agentive causer and an agentive causee. By contrast, pure causatives display a two-argument structure and have less semantic restrictions, as they may also take a non-agentive causer and a non-agentive causee. In terms of syntax, Terasawa argues that agentive causatives take a direct object, whereas pure causatives do not.

The syntactic structure displayed by causative *hatan* with an infinitival complement is a typical pattern: NP1 + *hatan* + NP2 + INF. *Hatan* requires three arguments: NP1, the causer, is the subject of the causative verb and is a human, agentive entity; NP2, the causee, is an agentive entity which plays both the role of the object of *hatan* and the subject of the infinitive; the verb, which is in the infinitive form and expresses the type of action that has to be carried out.

NP1 is necessarily a human agentive entity, as the lexical context of *hatan* demands that the order is issued by a human being. NP2 is also agentive because the order issued by *hatan* has to be accomplished by an agent. The infinitive represents the action that the causee has to perform in order to execute the request made by the causer.

This structure can of course vary: the causer can be left implicit in cases in which it is easily recoverable from the context. Also, under certain circumstances, the causee can be omitted and left implicit: this is more likely to happen when the focus of the structure is on the action expressed by the infinitive rather than on who made the action (Denison 1985; Goldberg 2001).

Examples (7)-(10) illustrate the different syntactic structure found with causative *hatan* (causer is in italics, causee is underlined, verbs in bold):

-        NP1 + *hatan* + NP2 + INF

(7)
þa   gelihte   *se Cuma* [...] mid his halwendum handum and **het**   hine **geniman** hwietene smedenian
Then relieved the guest […] with his healing   hands   and bade him take   wheat   flour
"Then the guest was relieved […] with his healing hands and bade him to take wheat flour"
 (OE3 ÆCHom II,10: 82.39.1638)

-        þa + *hatan* + NP1 + NP2 + INF

(8)
þa   **het** *Valerianus* se refa   hi   forþon **acwellan**
then   bade Valerianus the judge them for   kill
"then Valerianus bade the judge to kill them"
(OE3 Mart 5: A.15.1413)

-        *hatan* + INF

(9)
& **het**   **gewyrcan** ane burg þær on neaweste,
and bade build   a   city there in nearness,
"and bade to build a new city nearby"
 (OE2 ChronA: 924.4.1345)

- NP1 + *hatan* + INF

(10)
ond *he* **het   gebindan** þæm mægdene stan on swiran
and   he bade bind   to   girl   stone on neck
"and he bade to bind a stone on the neck of the girl"
 (OE3 Mart 5: Jy19,A.12.1196)

In (7), the subject *se Cuma* "the guest", who turns out to be an angel a few lines afterwards, orders that some flour was taken in order to cure Cuthberth's knee, who had suffered a serious injury; the causee *hine* refers to Cuthberth. The angel ordered and caused him to perform the action of taking the flour. Cuthberth plays both the role of the object of the causative verb, being directly affected by the order made by the angel, and the subject of the action caused by *hatan*.

Similarly, in (8) Valerianus is the subject which orders that some people were killed as a result of a mistake they had made. The causee is the executor of the order and is syntactically the object of *hatan* and the subject of the verb *acwellan* "to kill".

In (9) and (10) there is no causee intervening between *hatan* and the infinitive: nonetheless, both the actions of "building a city" and "binding a stone" have to be performed by an agent, which is unspecified. Who executed the action is irrelevant, as the focus of (8) is on the action of building and in (9) on the action of binding. However, since *hatan*, *gewyrcan* "to build" and *gebindan* "to bind" are verbs that necessarily require an agent in order to be meaningful, there is very little doubt that an agent performed the action expressed in the caused situation.

The high degree of agentivity that *hatan* expresses affects the type of the infinitives that it can take: they are generally transitive, agentive verbs as in (7)-(10). Transitive verbs fit perfectly with causative *hatan* both syntactically, as the object of *hatan* can play the role of the subject of the infinitive verb, and semantically, as they require an agentive performer to initiate the action. Intransitive verbs can also be taken by *hatan* but are less likely to occur and most importantly they have to be unergative, as *arisan* "to arise" in (11):

(11)
Benedictus hine het   arisan, ac   he ne dorse ætforan þam halgan   on his fotum gestandan.
Benedictus him made arise,   but he not dared before   the holy man on his feet   stand.
"Benedictus bade him to arise, but he did not dare before the holy man stood on his feet"
(OE3 ÆCHom II, 11: 99.250.2076)

Unaccusative intransitive verbs as *feallan* "to fall", *brecan* "to break" are not selected by *hatan* due to the lack of agentivity of the subject, but are found together with other causative verbs, specifically don.

With respect to Terasawa's classification, *hatan* shows all the features of agentive causatives. The semantic structure is formed by three arguments (causer, causee and infinitive verb) with the causer and the causee that have to be agents. Further, it appears that the type of causation expressed by *hatan* is direct, following the definition given in Dixon (2000), who argues that direct causation refers to causative situations in which the causer acts directly on the causee.

In light of the explanation given above, the small number of finite complements (see Table 1) is not surprising but it is rather expected; finite complementation, in fact, is supposed to express weaker causation, as the integration of the events works differently (Timofeeva 2010).

Causative *hatan*, as it has been shown, expresses strong and direct causation, triggering a command chain "order given – execution of the order – situation caused".

Turning to finite complementation, the mood of the verb in the finite clause may vary, since it could be either indicative or subjunctive. The choice of the mood seems to follow some general principles (Traugott 1992), and it is usually assumed that indicative is correlated with the expression of a perfect/resultative actions, while subjunctive is used in unreal, potential situations and to express exhortations, wishes and desire. The distribution of the mood in finite clauses governed by *hatan* seems to confirm these assumptions; see Table 3:

Indicative	15/79	19%
Subjunctive	29/79	36.7%
Pre-Modal verb	14/79	17.7%
Ambiguous	21/79	26.6%
Total	79/79	100%

Table 3: Distribution of the mood of the verb in the *þæt*-clause

Despite the number of ambiguous cases in which indicative and subjunctive share the same forms, the data provides a strong indication of the contexts where this construction was used. In fact, subjunctive is present in 37% of the examples and a modal verb is found in 18%, while indicative is found only in 19% of the occurrences. This seems to indicate that finite complementation was used when the causation was less direct (12) or when it failed (13) (example taken from

Timofeeva 2010: 117):

(12)
and he hine gesette   to heah-gerefan ofer alexandrian and ægyfto lande and het
And he him appointed as governor   over Alexandria and Egypt   land and bade
þæt he heolde   þa romaniscan gesætnysse. ðæs   ðægn philippus næs na
that he observed the Roman   law.   The   official Philip   was not
gefullod on   gode. forþan þe cristendom næs   þagyt geond eall cuð
baptised unto God. because the Christianity was not yet   among all known
"And he appointed him as governor over Alexandria and Egypt and bade him to observe the Roman law. The official Philip was not
baptised into God because Christianity was not widespread yet."
(OE3 ÆLS: 9.200)

(13)
þa   het Dioclitianus se kasere   þære ceastre gerefa þæt he gename on   þam
Then bade Diocletian   the emperor the town   reeve that he took   from the
biscope ealle Godes bec   ond forbærnde. ða   nolde   se bisceop þa bec syllan,
bishop all   God   books and burned.   Then did not want the bishop the books give
"Then the emperor Diocetian bade the reeve of the town to take all the books of God from the bishop in order to burn them. But the
bishop did not want to give the books"
(OE3 Mart 5: Au,A.3.1602)

In (12), Philip is sent by emperor Commodus to Alexandria to be the supervisor of Egypt. Then, the emperor orders
Philip to govern following the principles of the Roman law: there is little doubt that Philip carried out the order, but
there is no situation caused, no consequence to the execution of the order. The accomplishment of the order has no
further impact, it is only a piece of information which reinforces and, to a certain extent, justifies the key statement,
which is "Philip was not baptised". Crucial, however, is that his unbaptised status is not a direct result of the causative
action, as this is caused by the fact that the Christianity was not yet completely spread. Lacking a piece in the command
chain, the causative force of *hatan* is less direct and weaker.

In (13) the ordered commanded to the reeve has not been executed because of the action of the bishop, who turned
against the reeve. The mood used in subjunctive, indicating that the causative was only potential and failed due to
external factors.

The high number of modals involved in the finite clause is another indication of the nature of this construction. In
some circumstances, as in (14), *hatan* fluctuates between being a causative or an ordering verb: while in the first
construction there is no doubt that the girl has been imprisoned and that *hatan* is a causative verb, in the second
construction the finite clause does not make explicit whether the action has been actually carried out. This is shown by
the presence of the modal *sceolde* "should" in the *þæt*-clause.

(14)
þa   cwehte se dema his deoflice heafod and **het**   hi   **gebringan** on anum blindum
Then shook   the judge his fiendish head   and bade her bring   into a   dark
cweartene and **het**   þæt heo **sceolde** hi sylfe beþencan hu   heo mihte ætwindan þam   wælhreowum tintregum
prison   and ordered that she should her self think   how she might escape   those cruel   tortures
"Then the judge shook his fiendish head and bade to bring her into a dark prison and ordered that she would think herself how she
might escape those terrible tortures"
(OE3 ÆLS: 91.2064)

Causative *hatan* is also found in translations from Latin sources. It is generally used to render the Latin verbs *iubeo* "to
order, to command" and *praecipio* "to tell, to command" (see also Timofeeva 2010). The syntactic structure does not
change, so where the original Latin text has NP1 + *hatan* + NP2 + INF this is preserved by Old English writers.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that sometimes *hatan* is used to translate *facere* "to do, to make" + (NP2) +
INF. The closest counterpart of *facere* in terms of meaning in Old English is *(ge)don*, or alternatively *wyrcan* "to work",
"to do" or *fremman* "to make", "to perform". While *wyrcan* and *fremman* are sporadically found as causative verbs
(Ogura 1996), *(ge)don* is commonly found in causative constructions. However, *(ge)don* seems to prefer clausal
complementation more than infinitival and therefore is substituted by *hatan*, which on the other hand takes an infinitive
complement in the vast majority of the cases (see Table 2).

5. Ordering *hatan*

Hatan used in ordering contexts presents the same syntactic structure as when it is used as a causative verb. It takes an
infinitive verb and the presence of the causee follows the principles illustrated in Section 4: it is expressed when it is
significant or left implicit when the stress is on the action ordered by the causer. The causer can be left unexpressed
when it is easily retrievable from the contexts. Both the causer and the causee are agents, as the first has the role to give
the order and the second to receive it. The accomplishment of the action is what distinguishes ordering *(ge)don* use from
causative *hatan*: when it is used as an ordering verb, the order is given but there is no further indication if it has been
carried out (15) or its accomplishment has failed due to external circumstances (16).

(15)
ac Crist hi   het   sittan 11ePa þære eorðan. Forðan ðe us is beboden ðurh   gewrite ðære ealdan æ
but Christ them ordered sit   on   the   earth. For that –   us is ordered through writing the old   law
"but Christ bade them to sit on the earth. This is what is ordered us through the writing of the old law"
(OE3 ÆCHom II, 29: 232.72.5165)

(16)
þa   heo þæt nolde, þa   het   he bindan hire stan to þam swuran, and worpan
then she that resisted, then ordered he bind her stone to the neck,   and throw
on Tifre flod. þa   tobærs se stan, and heo fleat   ofer þæt wæter to lande.
in Tiber river. Then broke the stone, and she floated over the water to land.
"then she resisted to that and then he ordered to bind a stone to her neck and throw her in the Tiber. Then the stone got broken, and she floated over the water to the land."
(OE3 Mart 1: De25,C.23.55)

In (15), the order, which is to sit on the earth, is given by Christ, but whether the order has been carried out and the people actually sat down it is not specified. Even the context doesn't make it clear:

(17)
ofsittan and fortredan ða gewilnigendlican lustas;   and on ðære Niwan
sit   and tread   the desirable   pleasures; and in the   New
Gecyðnysse us is beboden   þæt we sceolon forlætan þas eorðan and ða hwilwendlican æhta,   gif we   willað fulfremede beon.
Testament us is commanded that we should forsake the earth and the transitory   possessions, if we   wish   perfect   be.
"sit and treat the desirable pleasures; and in the New Testament is ordered to us to forsake the earth and the transitory possessions if we want to be perfect."
 (OE3 ÆCHom II, 29: 233.72.5165)

The order in (15) is part of a series of injunctions present in the New Testament: there is no "order – accomplishment of the order – situation caused" chain as it is visible when *hatan* is found in causative contexts.

    In (16), the order, which is to bind a stone to the neck of the girl, has been given but it is not carried out as an external force interferes and the stone suddenly broke down.
    Essential is that the expression of the order has no consequence in what happens afterwards: it has no influence on other actions, while the accomplishment of the order affects the events that follow.

6. The accomplishment of the order:
causative vs ordering meaning

In the previous sections several examples have been presented to show that the difference between ordering and causative use *hatan* lies in the accomplishment of the action ordered. Other scholars have put forward that whether the order has been carried out is expressed by the context: Royster (1918) pointed out that in an age in which there was a great respect for authority, giving an order was equivalent to its realisation. This statement has been taken up by Fischer (1989) and Lowrey (2013), arguing that both social authority of the causer and what happens later in the narration are indicators for the actual carrying out of the order. Lowrey (2013: 27) provides this example:

(18)
ða   ne mihte Iudas meteleas þær abidan, ac het   abrecan þone weall, þeah
then not could Judas longer there wait, but bade break   the   wall, although
þe he brad   wære. Eodon ða   ealle inn, ofslogon ealle ða hæðenan and aweston   ða burh.
- he broad was. Went then all   in, destroyed all   the heathens and demolished the town.
"then Judas could not long wait there. But he bade to break the wall, although it was broad. Then everyone went in, destroyed all the heathens and demolished the town."
 (OE3 ÆLS: 447.5141)

The order of "breaking the wall" is considered to be performed as it is shown by the following actions of entering into the city and then destroying it. Context, however, can also provide no further information regarding the consequences of the order, indicating that action may have not been performed:

(19)
and het   hi   faran geonde ealne middangeard, bodigende fulluht and soðne
and ordered them go   through all   earth,   preaching baptism and true
geleafan Drihten ða   on ðam feowerteogoðan dæge his æristes   to heofenum, ætforan heora ealra […]
faith.   Lord   then on the fortieth   day his resurrection to heaven,   before them all   […]
"and ordered them to go all over the earth preaching baptism and true faith. Lord then on the fortieth day of his resurrection to heaven, before them […]
 (OE3 ÆCHom I, 1: 188.281.299)

The order of going all over the earth has been expressed by God but whether his followers have actually performed it is not specified. The analysis of the examples suggests also that social hierarchy is not a strong indication of the accomplishment of the act. In (7) – (10), where *hatan* has a causative meaning and in (15) – (16), in which *hatan* is used only to give an order, who gives the order is a hierarchically and socially high figure. It seems that the role of the causer has no further implication in the accomplishment of the order. Context is clearly very important in pinpointing causative *hatan* from ordering *hatan* in some cases, but the examples provided show another crucial feature.

The infinitive verbs found in causative constructions, in fact, have the prefix, while when they are used in ordering constructions, they present the bare form of the infinitive. In (7) – (10) *hatan* used as a causative takes *geniman* "to take", *acwellan* "to kill", *gewyrcan* "to build", *gebindan* "to bind" and *gestandan* "to stand", while in (15) and (16) when is used in ordering contexts takes *sittan* "to sit" and *bindan* "to bind".

Old English verbal prefixes have been the focus of several studies and many theories have been put forward on their function and their productivity (a.o Streitberg 1891, Bloomfield 1929, Lindemann 1970, De la Cruz 1975, Brinton 1985, Ogura 1995, Broz 2014).

Recent studies have shown that prefixes are still prolific as aspect markers in Old English, despite each prefix shows a different degree of productivity. Broz (2014) has demonstrated that in Old English *a-* still had a perfective/resultative meaning in the vast majority of the cases, while *ge-* is an empty marker in half of the occurrences.

Therefore, morphology seems to provide a strong indication which allows to differentiate between causative and ordering *hatan*. Theoretically, the equation "prefixed infinitive : order accomplished = bare infinitive : order given" would make sense and would also provide evidence that, at least in (some) contexts, (some) prefixes were still productive. In (20) and (21) two examples are presented in which *hatan* takes the same verb *beran* `to carry': in (20) it is preceded by the prefix *a-*, while in (21) the infinitive has no prefix.

(20)
ða **heton** ða apostoli hi **aberan** to heora inne. And hi ðrim dagum ne
then bade the apostles them carry to their house. And they three days not
onbirigdon ætes ne   wætes, ac symle   hrymdon and grimetedon forðam ormætum tintregum.
tasted   food neither water, but continuously cried   and roared   for   immense torments.
"then bade the apostles to carry them to their house. And they did not taste food and water for three days, but cried and roared continuously for immense torments"
(OE3 ÆCHom II, 38: 284.142.6402)

(21)
þa **het**   Benedictus **beran** þa tocwysedan lima on anum hwitle into his gebedhuse.
then ordered Benedict   carry the crushed   limbs on one   mantel into his oratory.
And beclysedre dura anrædlice on his gebedum læg, oð þæt tocwysede cild, þurh   Godes mihte, geedcunode: wunderlic ðing.
And closed   door resolutely on his prayers lay, until that crushed   child, through God   might, recovered: wonderful thing.
"Benedictus then ordered to carry the crushed limbs into one mantel into his oratory. And closed the door resolutely and prayed until that child recovered, through God's might: wonderful thing." (OE3 ÆCHom II, 11: 98.212.2045)

In (20) the apostles order that some people would be carried in their house and, as a result, these people did not eat and drink suffering terrible agony: the construction is causative as the command chain "order given – execution of the order – situation caused" is satisfied and the verb has the prefix *a-*.

In (21), on the other hand, Benedict orders to carry the crushed limbs inside his oratory and then he starts praying: only then the child recovers as a result of Benedict's prayers. Here, what happens afterwards is not due to the execution of the order but to another action performed by Benedict. The requirements of the command chain are not entirely met and the order may have been executed or it may not, it is not explicitly stated: the construction cannot be considered causative and the infinitive has the bare form without the prefix.

The same verbal morphology is found in other texts too: in (22) and (23) tare taken from *Bede's Ecclesiastical history of the English People*:

(22)
Æðelberht se cyning weorðlice cyrcan heht getimbran þara eadigra apostola Petri
Æthelberht the king beautiful church bade build   the blessed apostle Peter
and Pauli and mid missenlecum geofum welgade. [...] þa cirican hwæðre nales he
and Paul and with different   gifts   endowed. […] that church however not
Agustinus, ac Laurentius biscop his æfterfylgend heo gehalgode.
Augustine, but Laurentius bishop his successor   she consecrated.
"Æthelberht the king bade to build a beautiful church to the blessed Peter and Peter and endowed it with different gifts. […] that church however was not consecrated by Augustine but by his successor, bishop Laurentius."
(Bede 1: 17.90.18.827)

(23)
ð a wæs se dema [...] and het þa sona blinnan fram ehtnysse cristenra
then was the judge […] and ordered the son stop from persecution christian
manna, and ongan arweorþian ð a þrowunge þara haligra martyra,
people, and start honour the passion the saint martyrs,
"then the judge was […] and he ordered the son to stop to persecute Christian people, and start honoring the passion of the saint martyrs,"
(OE2 Bede 1: 7.40.16.336)

(22) introduces a causative situation in which the king ordered to build a church and the order has been performed, as also the following context shows. The infinitive verb, *getimbran* "to build", has the prefix *ge-*. In (23) the order is given but there is no indication whether it has been carried out, therefore the verb presents bare infinitival form which is correlated with an imperfective, incomplete action.

It is noticeable that the syntactic structure is not a factor in the distinction between ordering use and causative use of *hatan*. Besides finite complementation, differences between constructions in which the causee is present and constructions in which it is left implicit are not found in terms of causation and realisation of the caused action.[3] This seems to be expressed by a different morphology of the infinitival verb, where accomplished actions are marked by the prefix and imperfective actions present the bare infinitive.

7. *Hatan* among other causatives

The agentive nature of *hatan* allowed it to become very frequent in the entire Old English period. It was used when the caused situation required a human agent to be performed and in some context it is used "almost as a pure causative" (Fischer 1992: 56). The only context in which its use is not permitted is when the caused situation is non-agentive and the verb is unaccusative: the verb used in non-agentive causative constructions is *(ge)don*. Therefore, it seems that the semantic space left by *hatan* is filled by *(ge)don*, which is found more frequently with a finite complement than with an infinitive: this suggests that the type of causation coded by *(ge)don* was rather weak and that its role was to introduce impersonal situations in which the causee is not directly affected by the causative.[4]

Other verbs could be used as causatives in Old English: *macian* "to make", *biegan* "to persuade", *berenian* "to arrange", "to cause", *bringan* "to bring", *niedan* "to compel", *wyrcan* "to work", "to do". Their use is, however, very sporadic and limited to certain contexts. *Lætan* is particularly interesting because it was used as a causative verb in some contexts but is mainly found as a verb of allowing: its rise as causative verb started at the beginning of the Middle English period, and its increase in frequency may be correlated to the sudden drop of causative *hatan* Lowrey affirms that "lexical rivalry with *lætan* remains the probable primary cause of the disappearance of causative *hatan*" (2013: 39).

8. Further development: *hatan* in Middle English

The fall of *hatan* in Middle English is rather unexpected, considering the usage frequency in Old English and the key role played in the causative system. The reasons why it fell out of use are still to be properly understood: what can be done is listing a series of factors that may have caused it to decline. First, *hatan* has never only been a causative verb; the frequency with which it is found as an ordering verb and as a verb of naming was very high. In Table 4 it is illustrated the frequency of these three forms of *hatan* in the S*econd Series of the Catholic Homilies* written by Ælfric:

Ordering verb	66/158	41.8%
Naming verb	49/158	31%
Causative verb	43/158	27.2%
Total	158/158	100%

Table 4: Frequency of *hatan* in Ælfric's S*econd Series of the Catholic Homilies*

The Table above shows that the causative meaning was not the primary context in which *hatan* was used. Despite a small preference for ordering contexts, *hatan* is almost evenly distributed in these three different constructions. This competition between different uses of the same verb may be referred to as an "internal competition".

Also, in Middle English the old causative system underwent considerable changes: new verbs entered the system and others extended their meaning and started to be used as causatives. In the North, the most frequent causative verb

---

[3] These two constructions are commonly called VOSI (Verb - Object/Subject - Infinitive) V+I (Verb + Infinitive), see also Denison (1993) and Lowrey (2013).
[4] In the following example *Se ð e deð his sunnan scinan ofer ð a yfelan* "he who made his sun shine over the evil", *deð* does not directly affect the causee *his sunnan*, which can be considered only an argument of the infinitive verb *scinan*. *(Ge)don* creates the situation of "the sun to shine", which is formed by two arguments, the causer and the infinitive, with the non-agentive causee being part of the semantic structure of the infinitive only.

was *gar* "to make", "to cause", a loanword from Old Norse. In the rest of the country, *lætan* and *make* are the most used causative verbs in Middle English. What triggered the increase of causative *lætan* is still not clear, but the simultaneous fall of *hatan* is significant: it is possible that *lætan* replaced *hatan* as the agentive causative verb, since *hatan* never grammaticalised as an exclusively causative verb (Lowrey 2013). The rise of *make*, on the other hand, may be correlated to the drop of causative *(ge)don*, which lost its light causative meaning and possibly developed into auxiliary *do*. This factor may be called as "external competition".

9. Conclusions

The integration of *hatan* in the causative verbal system seems to be well supported by Old English data. However, this was not the only use of *hatan* and different uses in other semantic contexts are well attested in the data. This may have been one of the causes that determined its fall as a causative verb during the Middle English period: *hatan* never grammaticalised as a causative verb, but was just one of the uses of this verb.

Hatan requires a specific type of complementation when it appears as a causative in which the construction is formed by an agentive causee that performs the action issued by the causer. The presence of the causee, however, is not mandatory; when the stress of the entire construction is on the caused action rather than on the performer of the action, the causee may be left implicit. This is possible because *hatan* takes as complement only transitive and intransitive unergative verbs. Unaccusative verbs, by contrast, do not appear in combination with *hatan* as they lack an agentive subject.

The syntactic structure of causative *hatan* is the typical configuration found with other causatives: NP1 – V – NP2 – INF. This construction is also displayed when *hatan* is used in ordering contexts. It seems that syntax gives no indications in order to distinguish between causative and ordering *hatan*. In previous analysis it has been argued that the difference between causative and ordering meaning was expressed by the high hierarchical role of the causer (Royster 1918), as it is assumed that if an order is given by an authority it is also assumed that it was carried out. However, this situation is also found when *hatan* is used in ordering contexts, where the subject that gives the order is an important authoritarian figure.

It has been proposed that the meaning of *hatan* is retrievable from the context (Fischer 1989, Lowrey 2013). This is plausible, as the results of non-performed orders and accomplished orders are very much different: an accomplished order triggers a command chain "order given – execution of the order – situation caused" in which the situation caused is directly affected by the execution of the order. In ordering constructions, the order is given but what happens next is not influenced by the order. The data, however, show that this distinction is captured by the morphological configuration of the infinitive verb. The causative construction implies a certain degree of perfectivity/completion, which is expressed by the prefixed form of the infinitive complement. The ordering construction expresses an imperfective meaning, as the order has only been given; in these cases, the infinitive has the bare form, which is assumed to code imperfectivity. This is consistently found in different texts, showing that prefixes were still productive, at least in this context.

List of abbreviations

ÆCHom I	*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies I*. Ed. Clemoes, P. 1997. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series.* EETS s.s. 17. Oxford: OUP.
ÆCHom II	*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies II*. Ed. Godden, M. 1979. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series.* EETS s.s. 5. London: OUP.
ÆLS	*Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. Ed. Skeat, Walter William. 1966 (1881-1900). *Ælfric's Lives of Saints.* EETS 76, 82, 94, 114. London: OUP.
Bede	*The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Ed. Miller, Thomas. 1959-1963 (1890-1898). *The Old English Version of "Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People".* EETS 95, 96, 110, 111. London: OUP.
ChronA	*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle A*. Ed. Plummer, Charles. 1965 (1892-1899). *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reissued D. Whitelock, Oxford 1952.
Mart 1	*Martyrology, 1*. Ed. Herzfeld, George. 1973 (1900). *An Old English Martyrology.* EETS 116: 2-10. London: Trübner. Corrected by Kotzor, G. 1981. *Das Alternglische Martyrologium, vol. II.* Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Abhandlunge, Neue Folge, Heft 88/2. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Mart 5	*Martyrology, 5*. Ed. Herzfeld, George. 1973 (1900). *An Old English Martyrology.* EETS 116: 2-10. London: Trübner. Corrected by Kotzor, G. 1981. *Das Alternglische Martyrologium, vol. II.* Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Abhandlunge, Neue Folge, Heft 88/2. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Whom	*The Homilies of Wulfstan*. Ed. Bethurum, Dorothy. 1957. *The Homilies of Wulfstan.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

References

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1929. Notes on the preverb *ge-* in Alfredian English. In K. Malone & M.B. Ruud eds., *Studies in English Typology: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press. 18-37.

Brinton, Laurel J. 1985. Iconicity and semantic change: Old English verbal prefixes. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 23:55.

Broz, Vlatko. 2014. *Aspectual Prefixes in Early English*. Peter Lang Edition.

Cloutier, Robert A. 2013. **haitan* in Gothic and Old English. *Studies in Language Companion Series*, 138, pages 17-40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

De la Cruz, Juan M. 1975. Old English pure prefixes: Structure and function. *Linguistics*, 13(145): 47–82.

Denison, David. 1993. *English historical syntax*. London and New York: Longman Linguistics Library.

Dixon, Robert M.W 2000. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In R.M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds., *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*, pages 30-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fischer, Olga. 1992. Syntactic change and borrowing: The case of the accusative-and-infinitive construction in English. *Internal and external factors in syntactic change*, 17–88.

Hogg, Richard. and Denison, Denison. 2008. *A history of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Implicative verbs. *Language, 47*(2), 340–358.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1991. *Historical English Syntax*, volume 2. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kemmer, Suzanne and Verhagen, Arie. 1994. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5(2),115-156.

Lindemann, John W. R. 1970. *Old English preverbal ge-: its meaning*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Lowrey, Brian. 2013. The Old English causative *hatan* and its demise. *Token 2*, 23–43.

Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax: Concord, the parts of speech, and the sentence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nagucka, Ruta. 1980. The grammar of OE hatan. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 11:27–39.

Ogura, Michiko. 1995. The interchangeability of Old English verbal prefixes. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 24:67–93.

Ogura, Michiko. 1996. *Verbs in Medieval English: Differences in verb choice in verse and prose*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Royster, James. F. 1918. The causative use of hātan. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 17(1):82–93.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1891. Perfective und imperfective actionsart im germanischen. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (PBB)*, (15):70–177.

Terasawa, Jun. 1985. The historical development of the causative use of make with an infinitive. *Studia Neophilologica* 57. 133-143.

Timofeeva, Olga. 2010. *Non-finite constructions in Old English with special reference to syntactic borrowing from Latin*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki LXXX.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1992. Syntax. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 168–229.

CHAPTER THREE

WORÐENNE Ł WORÐIANNE:
VERBAL MORPHOLOGY SIMPLIFICATION
IN THE *LINDISFARNE GOSPELS* AND THE CASE OF WEAK VERBS CLASS II

ELISA RAMÍREZ PÉREZ

Abstract

This paper aims to provide a preliminary study on the state of weak verbs class II in the late Northumbrian dialect of Old English.[1] As will become evident in section 2, the Northumbrian dialect was a rather innovative and linguistically advanced dialect in terms of its morphological expression. The verbal data analysed for this study, and which will be presented in section 3, has been manually collected from the 10th century interlinear, word-by-word Northumbrian glosses added to the Lindisfarne Gospels, specifically from Matthew's Gospel. For comparative purposes, the data collected from the Lindisfarne gloss will be contrasted to the data manually extracted from another copy of Matthew's Gospel, that is, the Rushworth Gospels. The Rushworth Gospels were also given interlinear, word-by-word glosses around the 10th century, however the dialect the Rushworth glosses to Matthew's Gospel were written in was Old Mercian. In stark contrast with the late Northumbrian dialect, the Mercian dialect tended to be linguistically much more regular and conservative. Thus, with these dialectal and theoretical premises in mind, the present study expects to find a more innovative and linguistically simplified paradigm for weak verbs class II in the Lindisfarne gloss than in the Rushworth gloss. As the results in section 3 will illustrate, this is precisely the state of affairs suggested by the morphology of this class of verbs. Following these findings, section 4 will comment on them and provide some preliminary explanations in an attempt to account for such dialectal discrepancies.

1. Old English: dialects and verbal paradigms

Old English (OE henceforth) is the name given to the earliest form of English which was spoken in Britain from the 7th century approximately to the 1100s (Campbell, 1959: 1; Hogg, 2011a: 1). There were four distinct OE dialects, namely West-Saxon, Mercian, Kentish and Northumbrian (Campbell, 1959: 4), of which West-Saxon is the most widely attested since it is the language of the majority of extant Anglo-Saxon texts (Hogg, 2011a: 7).

With regard to verbs in OE, there used to be two main types, namely strong and weak verbs. Strong verbs formed their past and past participle forms with ablaut, or vowel variation (e.g. *beran*, *bær/bæron* and *boren* > Present-Day English (PDE) 'bear, bore, born'), and there used to be seven classes, according to the phonological structure of the root (classes I to V) and to the vowels involved in ablaut (for class VI). Class VII verbs presented reduplication of the root, hence why they are also called reduplicating verbs. Each of these seven classes of strong verbs had a different vowel series in their principal parts, namely infinitive, 1st and 3rd person singular preterite indicative, plural preterite indicative and past participle (Campbell, 1959: 295-318). For the gradation series of OE strong verbs, their conjugation and examples, see Hogg (2011b: 227-251).

Weak verbs, on the other hand, formed their past and past participle forms by adding a dental suffix (OE *hieran*, *hierde* > PDE 'to hear, heard'), and there used to be three main classes. For reference, below are the paradigms for the three classes of weak verbs (after Hogg, 2011b: 260-290):

OE *fremman* > PDE 'to perform, to do'			
Present	**Indicative**	**Subjunctive**	**Imperative**
Sg. 1	fremme		
Sg. 2	fremm(e)st	fremme	freme
Sg. 3	fremm(e)ð		
Pl.	fremmað	fremmen	fremmað
Preterite	**Indicative**	**Subjunctive**	
Sg. 1	fremede	fremede	
Sg. 2	fremedon		
Sg. 3	fremede		
Pl.	fremedon	fremeden	
Infinitive	fremman		
Inflected infinitive	to fremmenne		
Present participle	fremmende		
Past participle	fremed		

Figure 1: Class I conjugation

OE *lofi(g)an* > PDE 'to praise'			
Present	**Indicative**	**Subjunctive**	**Imperative**
Sg. 1	lofige		
Sg. 2	lofast	lofige	lofa
Sg. 3	lofað		
Pl.	lofiað	lofigen	lofiað
Preterite	**Indicative**	**Subjunctive**	
Sg. 1	lofode	lofode	
Sg. 2	lofodest		
Sg. 3	lofode		
Pl.	lofodon	lofoden	
Infinitive	lofian		
Inflected infinitive	to lofianne		
Present participle	lofiende		
Past participle	lofod		

Figure 2: Class II conjugation

OE *secg(e)an* > PDE 'to say'[2]			
Present	**Indicative**	**Subjunctive**	**Imperative**
Sg. 1	secge		
Sg. 2	sægst	secge	sæge
Sg. 3	sægð		
Pl.	secgað	secgen	secgað
Preterite	**Indicative**	**Subjunctive**	
Sg. 1	sægde	sægde	
Sg. 2	sægdest		
Sg. 3	sægde		
Pl.	sægdon	sægden	
Infinitive	secg(e)an		
Inflected infinitive	to secganne		
Present participle	secgende		
Past participle	sægd		

Figure 3: Class III conjugation

The focus of this paper is on the morphological simplification of weak verbs class II. As can be seen on the paradigm for weak verbs class II above, these verbs were characterized by having a medial vowel <i> between the root and the ending (cf. *lofi(g)an* vs *secgan*) and an <a> as the inflectional vowel in the 2nd and 3rd person singular. The medial <i> element in weak verbs class II is known as -i- formative and was expected in the following environments: infinitive,

---

[2] By the OE period, there seemed to be four verbs only whose conjugation followed that of weak verbs class III, namely *secg(e)an* (PDE 'to say'), *habban* (PDE 'to have'), *libban* (PDE 'to live') and *hycg(e)an* (PDE 'to think'). While originally more verbs used to belong to this class, they were eventually re-formed following the paradigm of either weak verbs class I or, most commonly, class II (Hogg, 2011b: 295). The data presented in section 3 do include instances of original class III weak verbs which were transferred to the second declension.

inflected infinitives, 1st person singular and plural present indicative, singular and plural present subjunctive, present participle and imperative plural. However, throughout the course of the history of the English language, the -i- formative was lost, thus rendering the second class of weak verbs virtually undistinguishable from the first declension. While the simplification process whereby the -i- formative started to disappear has traditionally been classified as a Middle English innovation, being first attested in Northern dialects (Lass, 2006: 127-128), the data presented in this paper will point towards an earlier and dialect-specific start to the loss of the formative, namely 10th century Northumbrian dialect.[3]

The Northumbrian dialect was spoken in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria, covering most of the Northern part of Britain. Early Northumbrian is attested in texts such as *Cædmon's Hymn, Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, Liber Vitae Dunelmensis, Bede's Death Song*, *the Leiden Riddle* and some runic inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross and Franks Casket (Sweet, 1876: 543; Campbell: 1959: §6 and Hogg, 2011a: 4-5). The later variant of the Northumbrian dialect, namely late Northumbrian, is attested in the 10th century interlinear glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Rushworth Gospels (latter section of the Gospels only, see section 2 for details) and the Durham Ritual (Campbell: 1959: §6 and Hogg, 2011a: 5). Since the data presented in this paper have been manually collected from the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and Rushworth Gospels (Matthew's section only), the following section will introduce these texts before moving on to the presentation of the data.

2. The Lindisfarne Gospels and the Rushworth Gospels

The Lindisfarne Gospels or Book of Lindisfarne is thought to have been made around AD 715-720 in the monastery of Lindisfarne in Holy Island on the north-east coast of England, a territory which used to belong to the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria. The main text of the codex containing the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John was written in vulgar Latin and it seems to be based on the version written by biblical scholar St Jerome. According to Brown (2011: 35) a copy of this vulgar Latin version of the Gospels produced in Naples arrived in Anglo-Saxon England and was kept at the library found at the twin monasteries of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow in Northumbria. It has been speculated that it was with the assistance of the Venerable Bede that a copy of the Gospels was sent to Eadfrith, Bishop of Lindisfarne, during the early seven hundreds and which was kept at the Shrine of St Cuthbert in Holy Island (Brown, 2011: 36).

Based on palaeographical and colophonic evidence, it is generally believed that a monk and scribe by the name of Aldred added interlinear, word-by-word glosses to the original Latin text during the middle of the 10th century at Chester-le-Street (current County Durham). The Lindisfarne codex is thought to have arrived in Chester-le-Street along with the monks fleeing Lindisfarne in Holy Island due to Vikings' raids (Brown 2011: 63).[4] The glosses to Lindisfarne were written in the late Northumbrian dialect and constitute the oldest surviving translation of the Gospels into the English language (Brown, 2011: 36).

When it comes to the Rushworth Gospels, scholarship has established that the codex containing the four Gospels was created in the ninth century (800 AD) at Birr, Ireland. The scribe responsible for the Latin text has been identified as Macregol, probably the Abbot of Birr, hence the secondary name these Gospels receive: the Macregol Gospels (Tamoto, 2013: xxv). With regard to the OE glosses, it is believed that they were added in the late tenth century at *Harawuda*, 'Harewood', either in Yorkshire or Herefordshire, and it seems to be the work of two separate scribes, namely Farman and Owun.[5] Farman, writing in the Old Mercian dialect, seems to be responsible for the glosses to the whole of Matthew, the first two chapters of Mark (2. 15) and a very small section of John (18. 1-3) (Tamoto, 2013: xcv). The part glossed by Farman is usually referred to as Rushworth[1], which constitutes the source of the comparative data for the present paper. On the other hand, the scribe Owun is credited with having glossed the remaining of the Gospels in the late Northumbrian dialect, that is, the remaining chapters from Mark and John, as well as the whole of Luke (Tamoto, 2013: xcv). The Northumbrian section is generally referred to as Rushworth[2].

2.1. The language of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth glosses

The OE dialect Lindisfarne is written in, that is, late Northumbrian, is highly interesting from a linguistic viewpoint because, compared to other contemporary OE dialects, it is morphologically rather simplified and displays a number of features which are more commonly associated with Middle English grammar.[6] One of the linguistic peculiarities of Lindisfarne is that it bears witness to the beginning of the collapse of the Germanic-inherited gender system, as noted by Jones (1939: 21): "Their data [the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual] are extensive and

---

[3]The term simplification has been chosen in this paper in order to frame the loss of the -i- formative in weak verbs class II because due to the loss of the iconic formative, the morphology of weak verbs classes I and II became virtually identical. As a consequence, by the early Middle English period, the weak verbal system no longer presented three distinct classes but two (Lass 2006: 127), hence having undergone simplification.

[4] According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, it was in the year 787 that the kingdom of Northumbria was first raided by the Vikings. Annal 793, however, records the first time Lindisfarne in Holy Island was under attack (Whitelock et al., 1961)

[5] The exact location of *Harawuda* has never been identified. For discussions on the possible candidate cities, see Skeat (1871: xii), Bibire & Ross (1981) and Coates (1997).

[6] From this point onwards, Lindisfarne and Rushworth[2] will refer to the Northumbrian glosses to these texts while Rushworth[1] will refer to the Old Mercian glosses only. Please refer to the end of the previous section for details on which gospels constitute Rushworth[1] and Rushworth[2].

complex and show a great many innovations in both syntactical and morphological expression when compared with those of "classical" West Saxon models." Jones' work focused on the study of gender agreement between determiners and their following nouns, and how this process of gender assignment underwent neutralisation, that is, lexical forms started to reflect human gender and animacy distinctions (Jones, 1939: 34). Building on Jones' general study on the collapse of gender, McColl Millar (2016) examined in detail the reduced inflectional morphology of the noun phrase as evidenced in Lindisfarne and compared it to the forms one would expect to find in the West-Saxon dialect. As the examples below will illustrate (found in McColl Millar, 2016: 154), the scribe Aldred can be seen not to follow the West-Saxon expected forms, but rather he provides historically unjustified and linguistically innovative inflectional endings to the demonstrative pronouns:

(1) Mark 16.8[7]   *At illae exeuntes fugerunt **de monumento***
MkGl (Li) 16.8:   *Soð ða ilco ðona foerdo flugon of **ðæm byrgen***
                         True the same then departed fled of the sepulchre
                         'But they going out, fled from the sepulchre'.

(2) Matthew 9.22   *et salua facta est mulier **ex illa hora***
MtGl (Li) 9.22:   *7 hal geworden wæs wif of **ðæm ł ðær tið***
                         And whole made was woman of that ł that hour
                         'And the woman was made whole from that hour'.

As can be seen in these examples, the distinction in terms of grammatical gender agreement in the noun phrase was clearly starting to disappear in Lindisfarne. Note how example (1) shows the demonstrative *ðæm* in the dative singular despite the fact that it is followed by a feminine noun, namely *byrgen* 'sepulchre'. Given the inflectional system as was the norm in the West-Saxon dialect, this determiner would only have preceded masculine and neuter nouns in the dative singular. Example (2) interestingly displays a mixture of forms highly indicative of a gender system on the brink of collapse, since both the historically expected form for the feminine dative singular of the demonstrative pronoun, that is, *ðær*, and the innovative form, *ðæm* (historically a masculine/neuter form), appear side by side preceding the feminine noun *tid* 'time'.

In terms of verbal morphology, the focus of this paper, the Northumbrian dialect also seems to be at the forefront of linguistic innovation and simplification. Characteristic features include high levels of early deletion of final -n in unstressed syllables (Campbell, 1959: §472; Fernández Cuesta, 2008: 138) in environments such as infinitives, present plural subjunctives or indicative preterite plurals. Examples from the data collected for the present study include infinitives such as *gefulwia* 'to baptise' and *gedeigla* 'to hide' (in MtGl (Li) 3.14 and MtGl (Li) 5.14, respectively) or the indicative plural preterite forms *leornade* 'read' and *heafegde* 'lamented'(in MtGl (Li) 12.3, 12.5 and MtGl (Li) 11.17). The loss of this final consonant has been considered to have enhanced the phonological weakening of final vowels in the unstressed inflectional endings, hence contributing to their ultimate disappearance (Sweet, 1876: 555). It is important to notice that this process does not seem to happen in any other dialects of OE as early as it does in late Northumbrian, hence reinforcing the picture of advanced linguistic simplification in this dialect. Another notable Northumbrian characteristic as attested in Lindisfarne is the early incidence of innovative -s endings in environments such as 3rd person singular present indicative, plural present indicative and imperative plural, where -s appears alongside -ð. According to Cole (2014: 215), the distribution of -s/-ð endings in the Lindisfarne gloss is conditioned by the morphological constraints of the Northern-Subject Rule, whereby pronominal subjects directly adjacent to the verb triggered -s endings (*hia niomas* 'they shall take up' in MkGl (Li) 16.18), as opposed to non-pronominal subjects and non-adjacent pronominal subjects which triggered -ð: *ðine uut(edlice) ðegnas na fæstað* 'But your disciples do not fast' in MkGl (Li) 2.18. Yet again, while the constraints behind the Northern-Subject Rule tend to be more commonly associated with Northern Middle English texts, it can be argued that, in so far as written records allows one to see, this phenomenon is first attested in the late Northumbrian dialect. Finally, another interesting development within the verbal system first attested in Lindisfarne includes early instances of strong verbs following the weak verbal declension when forming their preterite forms, for example strong verb class I *gehrinadon* 'they touched' in MtGl (Li) 14.36 and strong verb class VII *slepde* 'he slept' in Lk (Li) 8.23. This phenomenon is vastly attested later in Middle English texts (Roseborough 1970: 74; Barber 2000: 165).

At this point it is worth noting that the analysis of weak verbs as attested in Lindisfarne has not received much scholarly attention. The most extensive study in English to date is that underwent by Ross (1937) who based his analysis, in turn, from Kolbe's (1912) study on the verbal conjugation of Lindisfarne. Ross' focus was mainly on the first and second class of weak verbs. With regard to the first class, he focused on developments relating to the preterite paradigm and, particularly, on the number of instances which could have been transferred to the second class of weak verbs as indicated by their conjugation (Ross, 1937: 139-142). Regarding the distribution of the -i- formative in the second class of weak verbs, the main area of interest of the present paper, Ross provides an overview (Ross, 1937: 144-146) of the environments where the extended – retaining the -i- formative – or unextended – not retaining the -i- formative – inflectional ending is the norm, followed by a reassessment (Ross, 1937: 146-148) of the number of exceptions to this pattern found by Kolbe (1912). Some of these peculiar forms found by Kolbe (1912) Ross accounts for by means of

---

[7] Quotations and textual references follow the editions given on the Old English Dictionary Corpus. Biblical translations follow the Douay-Rheims Bible.

analogy, for instance, the unexpected appearance of extended inflectional endings in the second and third person singular present indicative environment, -iað, -ias on analogy with the plural present indicative inflection -iað (Ross, 1937: 148-149). Similarly, many other exceptions Ross takes to be cases of verbs which had been mistakenly regarded as original second class weak verbs, hence the reason behind their unextended endings. For instance, he suggests that the present subjunctive form *geembehta* is not a form of the weak verb class II *embehtian* 'to minster, to serve' but rather a form representing a weak verb class I (1937: 147). It is important to note, however, that while the Dictionary of Old English records entries for both *embehtan* and *embehtian*, (DOE 2007-: s. vv. *(ge)embihtan, (ge)embihtian*, v.), the majority of attestations are instances of weak verbs class II as per their conjugation (8 instances out of 13). At this stage and without further research, this evidence could well suggest that spellings for this particular verb tended to follow the weak class II verbal declension. Indeed, this phenomenon was far from unusual in late OE, since most of the weak verbs class I ending in *-ian* – such as *nerian* 'to save' or *werian* 'to clothe' – went over to the second declension during the OE period due to many of the inflections being identical in both classes (Hogg, 2011: 269). All in all, Ross' study of the language of Lindisfarne provides a rather superficial coverage of the loss of the -i- formative in the second class of weak verbs. Hence, the present paper attempts to remedy this situation by providing an in-depth analysis of the state of the formative as evidenced in the glosses to Mathew in the Lindisfarne Gospels.

Because doing so will reveal interesting and linguistically significant differences, the language of Rushworth[1] will also be analysed in section 3 and compared to Lindisfarne. Regarding the dialect Rushworth[1] was written in, namely Old Mercian, it has long been noted that, despite also being an Anglian or Northern dialect just like Northumbrian, Old Mercian was much more conservative, in many aspects following West-Saxon declensional patterns, most likely because it was influenced by it. Thus, Sweet (1876: 556) claimed: "[t]he Mercian dialect is, in short, much more conservative and stable than the Northumbrian, and in this respect stands half-way between it and Kentish and [West] Saxon". The paradigmatic stability proper to Rushworth[1] can be seen in the fact that, unlike Lindisfarne, this text seems to preserve the inherited OE gender system in full (Ross 1976: 493). For example, returning to example (2) above, (3) incorporates the exact same verse in Matthew from Rushworth[1]:

(3) Matthew 9.22	*et salua facta est mulier ex illa hora*
MtGl (Li) 9.22:	*7 hal geworden wæs wif of **ðæm** ⱡ **ðær** tið*
	And whole made was woman of that ⱡ that hour
MtGl (Ru) 9.22:	*7 warð ða hal þ wif of **þære hwile** ⱡ **tiðe***
	And becomes then whole the woman of that time ⱡ hour
	'And the woman was made whole from that hour'.

It can be seen in (3) that, while Lindisfarne introduces the innovative *ðæm* preceding the feminine noun *tid* 'time' in the dative singular, Rushworth[1] presents the etymologically expected form for the determiner, namely *ðær*.

The expression of verbal morphology in Rushworth[1] is also considerably more conservative than that of Lindisfarne. It was mentioned above that Lindisfarne attested innovative forms of -s endings alongside the expected -ð in the 3rd person singular and plural present indicative, as well as imperative plural environments. In Rushworth[1] however, -ð endings dominate throughout and -s forms are virtually non-existent, hence *ariseþ* in MtGl (Ru) 24.7, *bindaþ* in MtGl (Ru) 23. 4 and *gefyllaþ* in MtGl (Ru) 23.32, respectively (Ross 1976: 502). Given these dialectal differences where Old Mercian tends to present a much more regular and conservative nature, the study on which this paper is based on expects to find a higher number of weak verbs class II retaining the -i- formative in Rushworth[1] than in Lindisfarne. The results obtained by this study, which will be presented in section 3, confirm these expectations.

2.2. Authorship debate and editorial practices

Before moving on to the presentation of the data, two issues must be addressed first, as they have implications for the study. The first issue concerns the authorship of Lindisfarne and the second has to do with the editorial practices of the edition of the Gospels used by this study, that is, Skeat's 1871-1887 edition.

Recent scholarship on the language of Lindisfarne has spurred a lively debate regarding the authorship of the Northumbrian gloss. The standard view ascribes its authorship solely to the scribe Aldred (Brown, 2011: 36), a view which seems to be fully supported by palaeographical evidence. Ross et al. (1960) carried out an extensive analysis of the palaeography of the gloss and identified two main parts dividing the text on the basis of orthography and discrepancies in the letter forms of the glosses. The first part consisted of the first three Gospels and the last section covered John. This division apparently tallied with that provided in the colophon at the end of John (f.259r) by Aldred himself where, besides providing information regarding the general making of the book and asserting his authorship (Brown, 2011: 66), Aldred seems to suggest that the glossing of John was a separate operation from the glossing of the other three Gospels.[8] However, despite the marked differences identified, Ross et al. (1960) concluded that the manual

---

[8] The translation of the colophon reads (from Brown, 2011: 66-67): "Eadfrith, Bishop of the Lindisfarne church, originally wrote this book, for God and for St Cuthbert and – jointly – for all the saints whose relics are in the island. And Ethiluald, bishop of the Lindisfarne islanders, impressed it on the outside and covered it – as he well knew how to do. And Billfrith, the anchorite, forged the ornaments which are on it on the outside and adorned it with gold and with gems and also with gilded-over silver – pure metal. And Aldred, unworthy and most miserable priest? [He] glossed it in English between the lines with the help of God and St Cuthbert. And, by means of the three sections, he made a home for himself – the section of Matthew was for God and St Cuthbert, the section of

production of the letters was so consistent throughout the Gospels that only the existence of one single hand glossing the text should be entertained.

Despite the palaeographical uniformity, there are certain scholars who are sceptical about the notion of single authorship in Lindisfarne and tend to base their arguments on the remarkable linguistic variation that can be seen in the text. For instance, Brunner's (1947-1948) analysis of the distribution of variant forms in Lindisfarne – for example, *ðy* and *ðyu* versus *ðio* and *ðiu* for the feminine nominative/accusative singular form of the demonstrative pronoun or the stems *cueð-* versus *cuoeð-* for the strong verb *cweþan* 'to say' – revealed that some of these variants, for example the use of *ðy* and *ðyu*, were more dominant throughout the whole of Matthew and the first five chapters of Mark (demarcation at MkGl (Li) 5.40). This division led Brunner to believe that either the glosses had been written by two or more scribes, or that one scribe had glossed all the Gospels but relying on different exemplars, now lost (1947-1948: 52). Similarly, Cole's (2016) findings regarding the varied distribution of -s /-ð in the 3rd person singular and plural present indicative forms also support the belief that the glossing of Matthew and the first five chapters of Mark are strikingly similar, given the higher incidence of -s endings (Cole, 2016: 184-185). Cole also identifies an increase in the appearance of -s endings for pretty much the whole of John, a break which highlights the linguistic uniqueness of this gospel and which seems to indicate that the glossing of it might indeed have been a separate exercise, as Aldred himself asserts in the colophon at the end of John. All this linguistic variation Cole interprets as being indicative of Aldred relying on pre-existing exemplars of the Gospels which are now lost (Cole, 2016: 187).

Finally, it is also important to mention that Van Bergen (2008), examining the variation in frequency regarding the occurrence of uncontracted (*ne wolde*, *ne wallas* '(do) not wish') versus contracted (*nolde*, *nallas*) negative forms in the glosses, also supports the belief that Aldred's translation was informed by more than one single source. The division she encountered in terms of linguistic features, that is, higher rates of uncontracted forms from MkGl (Li) 5.40 to the end of Luke as opposed to higher rates of contracted forms in John, tallies with the division made by Ross (1960) based on palaeographical evidence, presented above.

It is important to mention at this stage that all the aforementioned studies on the language of Lindisfarne, as well as the present study, have been based on Skeat's (1871-1887) standard edition of the Gospels. Despite Skeat's explicit statement to respect the peculiarities of the scribe while editing the Gospels (Skeat, 1871-1887: viii), recent detailed and comparative analysis between Skeat's edition and the Lindisfarne manuscript (British Library, Cotton MS Nero D.iv) has shown that Skeat adopted a somewhat idiosyncratic position when editing the text. Thus, Fernández Cuesta (2016) establishes that Skeat's edition is not fully reliable for purely linguistic and analytical purposes, since it includes numerous emendations, additions, and alterations of the original manuscript which often leads to the loss of valuable material for the analysis of the language of Lindisfarne and the dialect it represents. In any case, irrespective of the many controversies surrounding the text, what it is clear is that the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels have attracted the attention of numerous linguists interested in the language represented, that is, the late Northumbrian dialect, due to its remarkable variation in comparison to other contemporary, 10th century OE dialects.

3. Weak verbs class II in the late Northumbrian dialect

This section will present the instances of weak verbs class II found in Lindisfarne. As mentioned earlier, for comparative purposes, the data collected from Rushworth[1] will also be presented in order to illustrate that the development of weak verbs class II in so far as the loss of the -i- formative is concerned differed from dialect to dialect. The data will be presented in tables according to verbal paradigms.

Infinitives	Inflected infinitives[9]
Lindisfarne: *adustriga* 'to curse', *agnege* 'to possess', *bodage* 'to preach', *geclænsige* 'to clean, purify', *druncnia* 'to drown, sink', *gedeigla* 'to hide', *gefulwia* 'to baptise', *gelecnia* 'to cure', *gelecnige* 'to cure', *gelosiga* 'to lose', *losige* (x2) 'to lose', *milsa* 'to take pity on', *unrotsiga* 'to be sorrowful', *gesomnia* 'to gather', *gesyngege* 'to commit adultery', *synngiga* 'to commit adultery', *geðolega* 'to suffer', *ðerhwunia* 'to endure', *giwiga* 'to ask for', *ofsceomage* 'to reproach, shame', *sueria* 'to swear', *sueriga* 'to swear', *suerige* 'to swear', *suoeriga* 'to swear', *wifegæ* 'to marry, wed' and *geworpe* 'to cast out'	**Lindisfarne**: *embehtane* 'to minister, serve', *forlosanne* 'to destroy, kill', *bæd* 'to pray, worship', *nytanne* 'to enjoy, desire', *pinene* 'to torment, torture', *worðianne* (x3) 'to worship', *worðenne* 'to worship'and *wilnanne* 'to covet, desire'

Mark for the bishop(s), the section of Luke for the members of the community (in addition, eight ores of silver for his induction) and the section of St John was for himself (in addition, four ores of silver for God and St Cuthbert) so that, through the grace of God, he may gain acceptance into heaven; happiness and peace, and through the merits of St Cuthbert, advancement and honour, wisdom and sagacity on earth."

[9] Some of the class II verbs in Table 1 used to belong to the other two weak verbal classes prior to being transferred to the second declension. Examples include weak I verbs *ā-dustrian* 'to curse' and *swerian* 'to swear' and class III verbs *forlosian* 'to destroy, kill', *losian* 'to lose, perish', *þolian* 'to suffer' and *(ge)wunian* 'to dwell, live'. x2, x3, etc., indicate the number of instances (twice, thrice, etc.) a particular form has been encountered in the texts.

| **Rushworth**[1]: *andustriga* 'to curse', *agan* 'to possess', *geclænsige* 'to clean, purify', *fretwan* 'to trim', *iarwan* 'to make ready', *gesomnian* 'to gather', *gesomnige* 'to gather', *lufige* 'to love', swerige 'to swear', *tinterga* 'to torment, torture', *geþrowigan* 'to suffer' and *þrowigan* 'to suffer' | **Rushworth**[1]: *gebædd* 'to pray', *gebiddanne* 'to pray' and *gitsanne* 'to covet, desire' |

Table 1: Infinitive and inflected infinitive forms

Table 1 shows that, out of the twenty-seven infinitival forms found in Lindisfarne, seventeen of them retain the <i> in their verbal ending (62,9%), whereas ten of them do not (37%). Regarding the inflected infinitives, out of the ten forms identified, seven forms (70%) show no -i- formative. When it comes to Rushworth[1], while eight out of the twelve infinitival forms found retain the formative (66,6%), all of the inflected infinitive forms seem to have lost it.

First person singular present indicative	Plural present indicative[10]
Lindisfarne: *gefroefre* 'I console', *fulwa* 'I baptise', *halsa* 'I adjure', *somnigo* 'I gather', *sædi* 'I sow, plant', *ðrouiga* 'I suffer', *ðrowa* 'I suffer' and *worpe* 'I cast out'	**Lindisfarne**: *agnegað* 3PL 'they posses', *(ge)-behofes* 2PL 'you need', *boddages* 3PL 'they evangelise', *clænsas* 2PL 'you clean', *geduellas* 2PL 'you err', *eardegas* 3PL 'they dwell, lodge', *eðmodas* 3PL 'they obey', *forhogas* 2PL 'you neglect', *oferhogas* 3PL 'they transgress', *ondsuerigað* 3PL 'they answer', *ondueardas* 3PL (x2) 'they answer', *byes* 3PL 'they dwell, lodge', *forcunnas* 2PL 'you tempt', *geadrias* 2PL 'you gather', *geadriges* 3PL 'they gather', *gearuiga* 1PL 'we have ready', *giuigas* 2PL 'you ask for', giwas 2PL 'you ask for', *losas* 3PL (x2) 'they perish', *losiga* 3PL 'they perish, faint', *miclas* 3PL 'they enlarge, magnify', *eft-gemynas* 2PL 'you remember', *geniðras* 3PL 'they condemn', *niðria,* 2PL 'you humiliate, despise', *somnigas* 3PL (x2) 'they gather', *(efne-)geðeaehtas* 2PL 'you agree, consent', *geðolas* 3PL 'they suffer', *ðerhuunas* 3PL 'they remain, continue', *wunias* 3PL 'they remain, worship', *lufias,* 2PL 'you love', *lufyað* 2PL 'you love', *ePaol* 3PL 'they love', *ricsað* 3PL 'they rule', *tanages* 2PL 'you tithe', *getegðeges* 2PL 'you tithe', *ðrowiga* 3PL 'they suffer', *ðrowiges* 2PL 'you suffer', *worðias* 2PL 'you strain out' and *widlas* 3PL (x2) 'they profane'
Rushworth[1]: *halsio* 'I adjure', *somnige* 'I gather', *ðrowa* 'I suffer' and *þrowe* 'I suffer'	**Rushworth**[1]: *clænsigaþ* 2PL 'you clean', *dwaligað* 2PL 'you err', *eardigaþ* 3PL 'they dwell, lodge', *eardigað* 3PL 'they live', *frætwæþ* 2PL 'you decorate', *andswarigað* 3PL 'they answer', *andswærigaþ* 3PL 'they answer', *costigað* 2PL 'you tempt', *micclaþ* 3PL 'they enlarge, magnify', *myngað* 2PL 'you remember', *niðrigað* 3PL 'they condemn', *asomnigaþ* 3PL 'they gather', *gesomnaþ* 3PL 'they gather', *somniaþ* 3PL 'they gather', *somnigað* 3PL 'they gather', *geþafigaþ* 2PL 'you agree, consent', *lufigaþ* 2PL 'you love', *lufigaþ* 3PL 'they love', *tægþigaþ* 2PL 'you tithe', *þrowiaþ* 3PL 'they suffer' and *þrowigaþ* 2PL 'you suffer'

Table 2: First person singular and plural present indicative forms

For Lindisfarne, Table 2 shows a total of eight forms for the first person singular present indicative environment, where five instances seem to have lost the -i- formative (62,5%). For the plural present indicative environment, forty-three instances were found, out of which twenty-eight do not display the <i> (65,1%). The data from Rushworth[1], on the other hand, show that two out of the four first person singular forms identified have lost the -i- formative (50%). In terms of the plural present indicative environment, only 19% of the forms found, that is, four instances out of twenty-one, have lost the <i>.

---

[10] Table 2 also records verbs which originally belonged to the first and third weak declensions, for instance *(ge)frēfrian* 'to comfort', *(ge)andswarian* (x2) 'to answer', *(ge)gaderian* (x2) 'to gather', *(ge)-niðerian* (x2) 'to condemn' *and (ge)bȳa* 'to dwell, inhabit', *(ge)ðolian* 'to suffer', *(ge)losian* 'to lose, perish', *(ge)wunian* 'to dwell, live', respectively.

Singular present subjunctive	Plural present subjunctive[11]
Lindisfarne: *deadege* 2SG 'you lost', *geduologia* 3SG 'it wandered', *gefriega* 3SG 'he saved', *synngiga* 3SG 'he sinned', *gehongiga* 3PS 'it hanged', *lifige* 3SG 'she may live' and *suindria* 3SG 'he may separate'	**Lindisfarne**: *gearuiga* 2PL 'you may wear'
Rushworth[1]: *gedwalige* 3SG 'it wandered', *firnige* 3SG 'he sinned', *gefreoge* 3SG 'he saved' and *syngige* 3SG 'he sinned'	**Rushworth**[1]: *gearwige* 2PL 'you may wear', *geteorige* 3PL 'they fainted' and *prowige* 3PL 'they suffer'

Table 3: Singular and plural present subjunctive forms

Data in Table 3 show how three out of the total seven singular present subjunctive forms found in Lindisfarne have dropped the -i- formative (42,85%). In contrast, Rushworth[1] only records one form displaying loss of the formative, namely *gefreoge* 'he saved', although it should be noted that *(ge)frēog€an* was originally a class III weak verb, where the formative would not have been expected. With regard to the plural present subjunctive paradigm, all forms in Table 3 retain the formative, both in Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1].

Present participle	Imperative plural[12]
Lindisfarne: *bifigende* 'shaking', *cliopende* (x2) 'calling', *clioppende* (x2) 'calling', *clioppendo* 'calling', *cuacende* 'shaking', *frohtende* 'scaring', *geondsuarende* 'answering', *cunnende* 'trying, testing', *fulwuande* 'baptising', *geadrigende* 'gathering, catching', *gearwende* 'wearing, stripping off', *mercande* 'securing, sealing', *milsande* (x5) 'feeling compassion', *unrōtsande* 'grieving', *somnende* 'gathering, catching', *wungiende* 'remaining, dwelling', *hyngrende* 'feeling hunger', *hlifgiende* 'living', *hlifigende* 'living', *styrende* 'shaking, stirring', *ðreatende* 'wishing, urging', *geðrowend* 'suffering', *ðrowende* 'suffering', *worpende* 'throwing' and *wundrigendo* 'admiring, wondering at'	**Lindisfarne**: *agneges* 'inherit, possess', *behaues* 'observe, behold', *bodages* 'preach', *forebodages* 'preach', *clænsas* 'cleanse', *unclænsias* 'root up', *byes* 'inherit, possess', *geadriges* 'gather', *gradrias* (x2) 'gather', *gearuas* 'make ready', *giwias* 'ask', *leornas* (x2) 'learn', *leornes* 'learn', *somnias* 'collect', *somniges* 'collect', *wunas* 'live, reside', *locas* (x2) 'look, behold', *lufas* 'love', *lufaþ* 'love', *sceauiges* 'observe, behold', *sceawgias* 'observe, watch out', *suerige* 'swear', *unwyrtrumias* 'root up', *wuldriað* 'glorify' and *wynnsumiað* 'rejoice'
Rushworth[1]: *apenende* (x3) 'stretching', *boensendu* 'demanding', *bifgende* 'shaking', *bismerende* 'mocking', *bodende* (x2) 'preaching', *clipende* 'calling', *clipigende* 'calling', *ondswarande* 'answering', *ondswarende* 'answering', *swarande* 'answering', *costænde* 'trying, testing', *gærwende* 'wearing, stripping off', *miltsende* (x2) 'feeling compassion', *gesomnende* 'gathering', *hyngrende* 'feeling hunger', *lifgende* 'living', *locande* 'looking', *lokende* 'looking', *prowende* 'suffering' and *wundriende* 'admiring, wondering at'	**Rushworth**[1]: *bodigað* (x2) 'preach', *clænsigæþ* 'cleanse', *ahsiað* 'enquire, ask', *ahsigaþ* 'enquire, ask', *geblissiað* 'rejoice', *gearwigað* 'make ready', *geleornigaþ* 'learn', *leornaþ* 'learn', *leorniað* 'learn', *gesomnigaþ* 'gather', *gesomnigæþ* 'gather', *wynigaþ* 'live, reside', *lufigaþ* (x2) 'love', *sceawigaþ* 'observe, behold', *swerge* 'swear' and *wuldrigæ* 'to glorify'

Table 4: Present participle and imperative plural forms

Finally, Table 4 records all the present participle and imperative plural forms found in both Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1]. With regard to the present participle environment, Lindisfarne shows a total of thirty-one instances, out of which twenty-five have lost the -i- formative (80%). Similarly, the majority of the forms collected from Rushworth[1], that is, twenty-two in twenty-four total instances (91%) have also lost the formative in this environment. In terms of the imperative plural, the results are less similar. Lindisfarne shows a total of twenty-eight instances where fifteen have lost the <i> (53%), while Rushworth[1], on the other hand, records a total of eighteen forms, of which only two (11%) do not display the formative.

Following the presentation of all the instances of weak verbs class II as attested in both Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1], two conclusions can be drawn from Tables 1 to 4. First of all, there is a clear preference in Lindisfarne for unextended endings in this class of verbs, that is, verbs where the -i- formative has been dropped and, therefore, the inflectional endings are not preceded by it any more. This is indeed the case for the inflected infinitive and the singular present indicative environments, but, most notably, for the plural present indicative and the present participle. This phenomenon

---

[11] Instances of verbs in Table 3 originally belonging to weak class I and III include *syndrian* 'to sunder, separate', *(ge)teorian* 'to faint' and *(ge)frēog(e)an* 'to (make) free, *lifian* 'to live', respectively.

[12] Original class I weak verbs in Table 4 include *(ge)andswarian* (x3) 'to answer', *(ge)gaderian* (x3) 'to gather', *hyngrian* 'to feel hunger', *styrian* 'to shake', *swerian* 'to swear', *wuldrian* 'to glorify', *wundrian* 'to admire, wonder at' and class III verbs *bifian* 'to tremble, shake', *bismerian* 'to mock', *(ge)bȳe* 'to dwell, inhabit', *cwacian* 'to shake', *(ge)leornian* (x5) 'to learn, read' and *lifian* (x2) 'to live'.

whereby the -i- formative was lost contributed to and further triggered paradigmatic simplification in the late Northumbrian dialect, because, by dropping the formative, these verbs became morphologically indistinguishable from weak verbs class I in most of the environments (see section 1 for the verbal paradigms). It is precisely these simplificatory trends which rendered the Northumbrian dialect much more similar to Middle English than any other contemporary, OE dialect. Secondly, the Rushworth[1] data show that the -i-formative seems to be present in the majority of the expected environments and forms, with the notable and interesting exception of the present participle paradigm. The distribution of the -i- formative in Rushworth[1], therefore, confirms the prediction previously mentioned which anticipated a more conservative distribution of the formative in Rushworth[1] due to the fact that the dialect in which the glosses were written, namely Old Mercian, displayed a lower level of morphological simplification. However, it is worth mentioning at this point that there are noticeably less instances of class II weak verbs in Rushworth[1] than there are in Lindisfarne, since, in many cases, one single Latin lemma is given multiple glosses in Lindisfarne but only one in Rushworth[1].

4. Discussion

The previous section presented in detail the state of weak verbs class II in Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1]'s Matthew's Gospel in terms of the distribution of the -i- formative. The aim was to ascertain whether these verbs showed any preference for either extended or unextended endings, that is, endings with or without the formative, respectively. The data demonstrated that, by and large, Lindisfarne displayed a tendency for unextended endings, since many of the weak verbs class II attested in this text had already lost the -i- formative in most of the environments where the formative was historically expected. The two environments where the loss of the formative is felt the most in Lindisfarne are the plural present indicative and the present participle. Additionally, the data also demonstrate that the loss of the formative was nowhere nearly as advanced in Rusworth[1] as it was in Lindisfarne. This is true for all the expected environments except for the present participle, where 91% of the forms in Rushworth[1] had dropped the <i>. Thus, this is the only verbal environment where both Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1] coincide in terms of the distribution of the formative.

An explanation to this unexpected coincidence could be sought on the fact that the present participial forms had a peculiar phonetic makeup, as they not only bore stress on the root syllable, as all other verbal forms, but they also bore secondary stress on the participial ending, namely -ende (Campbell 1959: §757).[13] Under these conditions, that is, positioned between the verbal root and the participial ending (as in *wungiende* 'remaining'), both elements bearing stress, the -i- formative would then be more prone to phonological weakening, eventually resulting in its ultimate deletion.[14] It is worth mentioning that, in theory, the formative should have been maintained under these conditions when preceded by light syllables only (Campbell, 1959: §757), that is, syllables formed by one short vowel followed by one single consonant. However, the data collected from Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1] do not always abide by this law, as there are many instances where either the formative is lost when being preceded by a light or short syllable, and maintained when preceded by a heavy or long syllable (the latter being made up by either a long vowel or diphthong followed by one consonant, or a short vowel followed by more than one consonant). Note for example *apenende* (x3) 'stretching', *bodende* (x2) 'preaching', *styrende* 'shaking, stirring' or *ðrowende* 'suffering', where the formative is lost when following light syllables, and *geadrigende* 'gathering, catching', *hlifgiende* 'living' or *wundriende* 'admiring, wondering at', where the formative is retained despite being preceded by a heavy syllable.

In spite of the fact that the distribution of the formative seems to be rather uniform in the present participle environment, Tables 1 to 4 illustrate that this uniformity is not commonplace in the other verbal environments under consideration. The remaining of this section will be, therefore, devoted to accounting for both the paradigmatic and dialectal variation encountered throughout the course of the present study by resorting to the phonological process of lexical diffusion, and by acknowledging the socio-linguistic scenario surrounding the glossing of Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1] and considering if language contact could have had any impact on the morphological simplification of weak verbs class II.

The phenomenon of lexical diffusion was first put forward by Wang (1969), who aimed to readdress the main questions in historical phonology, namely, how sounds change (implementation) and why (actuation). In order to give answers to these questions, he posited the notion of lexical diffusion, that is, the hypothesis that a phonological abrupt change could propagate itself gradually across the lexicon or in individual morphemes. Interestingly, this process of implementation of sound change tends to require long spans of time (Wang 1969: 10). The main two aspects of this theory had to do with the temporal and lexical dimensions of the phonological change per se, in other words, its focus was in the interplay between the chronology of a sound change and its manifestation in the lexicon.[15] In terms of the lexical dimension, it was proposed that the manifestation of sound change in the lexicon took place as follows: "a phonological rule gradually extends its scope of operation to a larger and larger portion of the lexicon, until all relevant items have been transformed by the process. A phonological innovation may turn out to be ultimately regular, i.e. to

---

[13] It should be noted that this rule also applied for the inflective infinitive ending, namely -ianne (Campbell 1959: §757), an environment where 70% of the forms in Lindisfarne where formativeless.

[14] And this is despite the fact that the -i- formative itself had a light stress (Campbell 1959: §89). However, positioned between two more prominent stressed syllables, it is conceivable that the formative was likely outweighed by them.

[15] By chronology, it is meant the internal time dimension or '*chronological profile*' of a given sound change; in other words, "the gradual development, expansion or regression of a single phonological process" (Chen and Wang, 1975: 256).