

# Comparative Studies in Early Germanic Languages

## *Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS)*

This series has been established as a companion series to the periodical *Studies in Language*.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see  
<http://benjamins.com/catalog/slcs>

### **Editors**

Werner Abraham  
University of Vienna /  
University of Munich

Elly van Gelderen  
Arizona State University

### **Editorial Board**

Bernard Comrie  
Max Planck Institute, Leipzig  
and University of California, Santa Barbara

William Croft  
University of New Mexico

Östen Dahl  
University of Stockholm

Gerrit J. Dimmendaal  
University of Cologne

Ekkehard König  
Free University of Berlin

Christian Lehmann  
University of Erfurt

Marianne Mithun  
University of California, Santa Barbara

Heiko Narrog  
Tohoku University

Johanna L. Wood  
University of Aarhus

Debra Ziegeler  
University of Paris III

### **Volume 138**

Comparative Studies in Early Germanic Languages.

With a focus on verbal categories

Edited by Gabriele Diewald, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka and Ilse Wischer

# Comparative Studies in Early Germanic Languages

With a focus on verbal categories

*Edited by*

Gabriele Diewald

Leibniz University Hannover

Leena Kahlas-Tarkka

University of Helsinki

Ilse Wischer

University of Potsdam

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (16th : 2010 : Pécs, Hungary)  
Comparative Studies in Early Germanic Languages : With a focus on verbal categories /

Edited by Gabriele Diewald, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka and Ilse Wischer.

p. cm. (Studies in Language Companion Series, ISSN 0165-7763 ; v. 138)

This publication comprises the papers presented at a workshop on the “Contrastive study of the verbal categories and their grammaticalisation in Old English and Old High German” held at the 16th ICEHL in Pécs, Hungary, in August 2010.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. English language--Grammar, Comparative. 2. English language--Grammar, Historical. 3. Germanic languages--Grammar, Comparative. 4. Germanic languages--Grammar, Historical. 5. Grammar, Comparative and general--Grammaticalization. I. Diewald, Gabriele, editor of compilation. II. Kahlas-Tarkka, Leena, editor of compilation. III. Wischer, Ilse, 1959- editor of compilation. IV. Title.

PE1075.I57 2013

429'.56--dc23

2013020757

ISBN 978 90 272 0605 3 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 7145 7 (Eb)

© 2013 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands  
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

# Table of contents

Introduction	1
<i>Gabriele Diewald, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka &amp; Ilse Wischer</i>	
*HAITAN in Gothic and Old English	17
<i>Robert A. Cloutier</i>	
Incipient Grammaticalisation: Sources of passive constructions in Old High German and Old English	41
<i>Robert Mailhammer &amp; Elena Smirnova</i>	
Passive auxiliaries in English and German: Decline versus grammaticalisation of bounded language use	71
<i>Peter Petré</i>	
Causative <i>habban</i> in Old English: Tracing the Development of a Budding Construction	101
<i>Matti Kilpiö</i>	
Remembering (ge) <i>munan</i> : The rise and decline of a potential modal	127
<i>Matthias Eitelmann</i>	
The emergence of modal meanings from <i>haben</i> with <i>zu</i> -infinitives in Old High German	151
<i>Anne Jäger</i>	
Hearsay and lexical evidentials in Old Germanic languages, with focus on Old English	169
<i>Olga Timofeeva</i>	
Markers of Futurity in Old High German and Old English: A Comparative Corpus-Based Study	195
<i>Gabriele Diewald &amp; Ilse Wischer</i>	
The Verb <i>to be</i> in the <i>West Saxon Gospels</i> and the <i>Lindisfarne Gospels</i>	217
<i>Christine Bolze</i>	
Aspectual properties of the verbal prefix <i>a-</i> in Old English with reference to Gothic	235
<i>Vlatko Broz</i>	

<i>þær wæs</i> vs. <i>thâr was</i> : Old English and Old High German existential constructions with adverbs of place <i>Simone E. Pfenninger</i>	263
On gain and loss of verbal categories in language contact: Old English vs. Old High German <i>Theo Vennemann</i>	289
Index	313

# Introduction

Gabriele Diewald, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka & Ilse Wischer

Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany / University of Helsinki, Finland /  
University of Potsdam, Germany

## 1. Verbal categories and their diachronic development in Old English and Old High German

This publication comprises the papers presented at a workshop on the “Contrastive study of the verbal categories and their grammaticalisation in Old English and Old High German” held at the 16th ICEHL in Pécs, Hungary, in August 2010. To provide a wider view on historical comparative corpus analyses in the field of verbal categories in Early Germanic and on the interrelation between these categories in their development, the volume is expanded by some additional papers on related topics. Although our focus is on the early stages of English and German, other Germanic languages are also examined.

English and German are closely related. Even after their separation in the first centuries AD they have had a long history of contact and interrelated development. Nevertheless they have moved in different directions from a typological perspective. While there are certainly similarities in their increase in analytic forms, there are even more differences in the development of the structure of grammatical categories (particularly the verb).

Thus, while English developed an aspectual system, German did not. Instead German kept and even refined a complicated system of mood marking, whereas in English the grammatical category of mood has been lost. Even the two categories that in both languages showed a trend in the same direction (i.e. tense and voice) contain fundamental disparities as far as the internal structuring of the paradigms and their values are concerned.

In order to indicate the scope of topics brought together in this volume, some introductory notes on the verbal categories and their members in early Germanic are useful. Early Germanic verbs were inflected for person, number, mood and tense. The tense system was reduced to present and past compared to six or seven tenses in Greek and Latin. The two languages under closer examination here, Old English (OE) and Old High German (OHG), had an unmarked non-past tense form and a past tense marked by a dental suffix or by vowel gradation respectively.

Additionally, forms of *have* or *be* could be combined with the past participle of a verb to form perfect-like structures, although their status as periphrastic may be rather called into question. Reference to future events was made by the indicative or subjunctive in the present tense in combination with temporal adverbials or other contextual clues. Additionally, in OE there existed particular uses of the “*be/become-copula*” in constructions with future reference besides combinations of (pre)modal verbs and infinitive to express futures with modal colouring. Thus, the early Germanic languages, having been drastically reduced in their number of tenses, seem to have used their resources in various similar but not identical ways to create new grammatical means of expressing temporal distinctions.

A grammatical category of aspect did not exist in the early Germanic languages, although residues of aspectual markers may be attested. They become obvious in the use of prefixed verb forms. In example (1) *geworhte* ‘made’ is used in a perfective sense, while the same verb without a prefix in example (2) denotes an imperfective meaning.

- (1) *forðam on VI dagum Crist geworhte heofonas & eorðan,*  
 ‘because Christ **made** heaven and earth in VI days,’  
 (ALFRED’S INTRODUCTION TO LAWS, HC,<sup>1</sup> p. 26f.)
- (2) *& sæt þær þa hwile þe mon worhte þa burg æt Tofecestre mid stanwealle,*  
 ‘& was sitting there while they **were building** the fortress at Toucester with a  
 stone wall,’ (CHRONICLE MS A EARLY (O2), HC, p. (102))

A closer comparative look at the use of prefixed verbs with regard to their aspectual function in OE and OHG is presented in Wischer and Habermann (2004). Focusing particularly on *ge-/gi-*verbs in the OE *Orosius* and the OHG *Tatian*, the authors come to the conclusion that “the diverging path of development with regard to aspect seems to begin already in these early stages” (262). Although an aspectual distinction can also be attested in OHG (cf. example (3)) the prefix *gi-* is not used as frequently and systematically as *ge-* is in OE.

- (3) *quando mortui audient uocem filij dei. & qui audierint uiuent. thanne thie toton horent stemma gotes sunes inti thie sia gihorent lebent.*  
 ‘Then the dead (will) **hear** the voice of God’s son, and those who **will have heard** it (will) live.’  
 (Tatian<sup>2</sup> 137, 26–28)

1. HC = Helsinki Corpus.

2. St. Gallen Cod. 56, Masser, ed. (1994, 265–389), cf. also Wischer & Habermann (2004: 277).



A similar aspectual function compared to that of *ge-/gi-* can be signified by the OE verbal prefix *a-*, which is the topic of Broz' article in this volume. Broz expands the study to cognate forms in Gothic and even includes a comparison with Croatian verbs, which are morphologically marked for aspect.

Besides the existence of aspectual residues in the form of verbal prefixes there have emerged analytical constructions with *have* or *be* and past participle in OE and OHG, which can also have a perfective sense, as in example (4).

- (4) *þonne þu þas word gecweden hæbbe genim þone æppel ...*  
 'when you **have spoken** those words, take the apple ...'

(QUADRUPEDIBUS, HC, p. 9)

Again, differences in frequency and use have been observed between OE and OHG. In OE, such periphrastic constructions appear to be more frequent than in OHG. At least in *Tatian* they are extremely random (cf. Wischer & Habermann 2004). In OE, *habban* had even developed an additional causative use, which is the topic of Kilpiö's paper in this volume.

The category of mood, comprising inflectional distinctions between indicative, subjunctive and imperative, interacts with notions of modality and temporality. For OHG, the functional-semantic field of modality with regard to its linguistic expressions has recently been analyzed on the basis of Bible texts in a dissertation by Monika Schönherr (2010). Several papers in this volume deal in depth with specific problems relating to modality, futurity, and evidentiality in OE and/or OHG, often from a comparative perspective.

The shift from Proto-Indo-European active structure to Germanic transitive structure brought about the development of a new active/passive voice system. Modern English and Modern German differ not only in the use of the auxiliary in passive constructions, but also in their syntactic patterns. While in English even indirect objects can become the subject of passive sentences, which is not possible in German, German, on the other hand, possesses an impersonal passive (*Es wird getanzt*) and the so-called dative passive (*Sie bekamen die Betriebserlaubnis entzogen*), both of which do not exist in English. The reasons for such a diverging development may be discovered in a historical comparative analysis. This is what Petré in the present volume attempts at with regard to the different auxiliaries used in English and German.

These differences are all the more remarkable as the source items for each involved construction as well as the general mechanisms of grammaticalisation are very similar. It is assumed that these differences in the pathways and direction of grammaticalisation can be put down to different language contacts to a substantial degree, but also to differences in the original situation in the oldest attestable periods of each language.

The papers in this volume aim to discover the early traces of the distinct developments of both languages by contrastive analyses of central verbal categories in several early Germanic languages, with a focus on OE and OHG. Most papers are based on empirical evidence making use of various corpus data. However, theoretical and philological reflections are included as well.

As the theoretical background of grammaticalisation studies on one hand, and the empirical operational questions concerning diachronic data and their processing on the other, are central to all papers in this volume, some introductory remarks on both topics seem useful before dealing in more detail with the verbal categories investigated in the contributions.

## 2. Grammaticalisation, comparative diachronic linguistics and socio-cultural/philological aspects

As all contributions of the volume are concerned with the diachronic development, the reshaping or the rise of grammatical functions in particular linguistic items that had no or less grammatical functions before, the red thread that unites all investigations is the framework of grammaticalisation studies. Given that the focus is on the evolution of verbal categories, the authors follow Brinton (1988), Bybee et al. (1994), Krug (2000), Heine and Kuteva (2002), Aikhenvald (2004), Diewald (2006), just to mention some of the representative works in this field. In the centre of interest is the evolution of particular verbal categories, structures or constructions, viewed from a comparative perspective of related Germanic languages. There are several issues that have received much attention in grammaticalisation theory in recent years and that also constitute a major topic in several of the papers united here. These are issues like the following ones:

- contrastive investigations of different lexical sources (e.g. Petré on the origin of different auxiliary uses in English and German passive constructions; Diewald and Wischer on source lexemes for future grams in OE and OHG)
- polygrammaticalisation (e.g. Mailhammer and Smirnova arguing that the passive is only one of several possible readings for copula constructions combining *be/become*-verbs with past participles in Old English and Old High German; Kilpiö discussing the conditions and stages for causative and perfect *have*-constructions in Old English)
- constructions in grammaticalisation (e.g. Cloutier with regard to *haitan*-constructions in Gothic and Old English; Kilpiö on the OE causative *have*-construction; Jäger analysing the grammaticalisation path of the modal ‘*haben* + *zu*-infinitive’-construction in Old High German; Timofeeva giving

a survey on auditory evidential constructions in Old English and other Old Germanic languages; Pfenninger studying OE and OHG existential constructions)

- the fuzzy edges between grammatical categories and the intercategoryality of various linguistic forms and constructions (e.g. Bolze examining future and habitual functions of the verb *to be* in two OE dialects)
- interrupted processes of grammaticalisation (e.g. Eitelmann on the rise and decline of OE *(ge)munan* as a potential modal; Broz presenting a study on the aspectual function of the verbal prefix *a-* in OE and its cognate in Gothic)
- the influence of sociolinguistic and/or regional factors or language contact situations on particular developments (e.g. Eitelmann taking into account a combination of language-internal and cultural change (change from an oral to a literal society), as well as the impact of language contact (Old Norse) in the rise and decline of *gemunan* as a modal verb in Old English; Vennemann relating several of the most important structural changes and categorial differences in the verb systems of Proto-Germanic, OE and OHG to the different contact histories of these languages).

This means that in addition to grammaticalisation theory and its typological foundations, ample use is made of the results of diachronic comparative and philological studies and their theoretical and methodological prerequisites.

Due to these broad theoretical foundations that are shared by all authors the individual results concerning particular categories or constructions tie in with each other closely to give a coherent picture of the factors, stages and results of grammaticalising language change in the area of verbal categories in English and German.

Furthermore, the studies are mostly based on detailed corpus investigation in order to enable the authors to identify similarities and differences in linguistic contexts and then ultimately derive some understanding of similar or diverging developments. The use of and access to empirical data in historical comparative studies is, however, still a particular challenge. Thus, the next section is devoted to an evaluation of the conditions and place of corpus studies in diachronic grammaticalisation research.

### 3. Historical comparative corpus studies

Historical study of language has become considerably more approachable during the past few decades. Kytö (2012: 1) claims that “[i]t is probably not an exaggeration to say that corpus linguistics is a methodology that enjoys an ever increasing

popularity world-wide today". Electronic corpora have turned out to be invaluable tools in searching for linguistic items in large amounts of text, quickly and without too much manual intervention. They have also provided us with new methodologies in analysing linguistic data, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Diachronic change and synchronic variation can be approached from many angles, so that it becomes possible to even pinpoint important moments of language change and analyse more easily than ever before synchronic variation across social strata, regions, text types and genres (Tyrkkö et al. 2012).

Corpora are far from being online text archives today. The majority of present-day corpora are still one-language databases, but there seems to be more and more need for comparative corpora consisting of data from different languages and obviously from different periods of time. With regard to the field of corpus development, Stig Johansson pointed out on several occasions that "[w]e need bigger corpora, better corpora, corpora with a wider range of languages, and we need to learn to exploit the corpora in the best possible manner" (quoted in Oksefell et al. 2012). Historical corpus studies still lack electronic databases of the earliest phases of Germanic languages, but work is being done in that area too.

Interdisciplinary corpus work is nothing new today: "Moreover, it is not only linguists that find the approach increasingly attractive: corpus linguistic methodology and language analyses are nowadays applied to fields beyond linguistics proper. Professionals profiting from techniques developed in corpus linguistics include historians, experts in law, literary critics, computer scientists and language teachers" (Kytö 2012: 1).

Corpus annotation creates a particular challenge to corpus compilers at the moment, but new methods for parsing historical texts, as well as for statistical analysis are being developed today. Archer (2012) presents opinions between "too little" and "too much" in terms of annotation, but comes to the conclusion that the primary solution depends on the purpose that annotation is used for. She also calls for a combination of manual and automatic techniques, as well as reliable retrieval tools. Only when all these aspects are taken into account we will achieve reliable results. The volume and diversity of digitized material available for linguists today also creates problems, as for comparative study in particular, it would be ideal to have data that are representative enough and comparable with each other.

Several studies in this volume make use of historical corpora. The majority of these represent the English language and are databases of texts from different periods in the history of English, but annotated corpora have also been utilised. As the constitution of English diachronic corpora is more advanced than that for other Germanic languages including German the following description of available resources is confined to the English language. For many of these corpora, basic information can be retrieved from e.g. the *Corpus Resource Database* (CoRD) as well as the *ICAME Corpus Collection*.

The *opus magnum* within OE studies, the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (DOEC) (Bolze, Kilpiö, Timofeeva), is a complete electronic record of surviving Old English except for some variant manuscripts of individual texts. It comprises at least one copy of each text written in Old English, and sometimes multiple copies if of interest for dialect, date, etc. All in all there are 3,060 texts, more than 3 million running words of Old English and ca. 1 million running words of Latin. The body of surviving OE texts encompasses a rich diversity of records, prose, poetry, glosses to Latin texts and inscriptions. The online *Dictionary of Old English* project makes use of the Corpus compiled for this purpose, and the dictionary is currently available for letters A–G.

Two major electronic sources, partly still in progress, have turned out to be indispensable for any study on Middle English (ME), also witnessed by studies in this volume (Eitelmann, Timofeeva). The electronic version of the *Middle English Dictionary* preserves all the details of the print *MED* (completed in 2001), which is based on a collection of over three million citation slips containing English of 1100–1500, but goes far beyond this, by converting its contents into an enormous database, searchable in ways impossible within any print dictionary. The collection of ME texts in the *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*, still in progress, contains some 60 texts assembled by the Humanities Text Initiative with the intention to develop the corpus into an even more extensive and reliable collection of ME electronic texts for wide use with the help of various search mechanisms.

A well-known fact is that the (online) *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) has been compiled on historical principles and thus serves a great variety of interests among English historical linguists. Eitelmann and Timofeeva have made extensive use of its resources for their comparative studies in the present volume. Another huge electronic resource is the *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, comprising two old authorities within the study of Scots, namely the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (Eitelmann) and the *Scottish National Dictionary*. Online dictionaries have become an indispensable tool for historical linguists.

“The *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (HC) is a structured multi-genre diachronic corpus, which includes periodically organized text samples from Old, Middle and Early Modern English. Each sample is preceded by a list of parameter codes giving information on the text and its author. The Corpus is useful particularly in the study of the change of linguistic features in long diachrony. It can be used as a diagnostic corpus giving general information of the occurrence of forms, structures and lexemes in different periods of English. This information can be supplemented by evidence yielded by more special and focused historical corpora.” (*CoRD*) The HC is relatively small in size, only ca. 1.5 million words, but has indeed been supplemented with several corpora compiled by Helsinki scholars. It has been followed by several annotated corpora, starting with the

*York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE)*. This syntactically annotated corpus of OE prose is based on the Toronto *DOEC* and contains all the major OE prose works. Each word is tagged for part of speech, and the corpus can be searched automatically for syntactic structure, constituent order and lexical items. Corpora of the “Helsinki family” have been utilised in this volume (Broz, Cloutier, Timofeeva, Wischer and Diewald).

For a historical study of other Germanic languages there is a considerably more limited number of corpora available, but there is a clear trend to supplement the resources. In the present volume such online text databases as offered by the *Heimskringla Project*, *Project Wulfila* and *TITUS* have been made use of (Cloutier, Pfenninger, Timofeeva). The first one includes some 4,000 Old Norse titles (some of them in Modern Scandinavian languages), primarily the Eddas, the Icelandic sagas and skaldic poetry. *Project Wulfila* is a small digital library dedicated to the study of the Gothic language and Old Germanic languages in general, and so far it includes the Gothic Bible and minor fragments, but further expansion is being worked on. *TITUS=Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien* consists of an ongoing project that contains even now a variety of early Germanic texts and text fragments (Gothic, Nordic, Old English, Old Frisian, Old Saxon, Middle Low German, Old Dutch, Old High German, etc.).

A synopsis of presently available corpora of diachronic stages of German, including work in progress such as the large project *DDD (Deutsch Diachron Digital)*, is available online via <http://texte.mediaevum.de/textkorpora.htm>. Beyond the resources referred to in that synopsis, there exists a number of small collections for highly specific purposes which can be accessed online. An example is the *kali-korpus* (cf. <http://www.kali.uni-hannover.de>), which has been compiled for selective needs of research and academic teaching. It contains complete glosses of selected texts and is annotated for verbal categories (for details cf. Diewald, Lehmberg & Smirnova 2007). In the present volume, it is used as a database in the contributions by Diewald and Wischer as well as by Mailhammer and Smirnova.

In the past few years, several projects have been launched with the aim of providing online databases containing material for comparative linguistic study. Two of them shall be mentioned in this context, even though they do not form a direct link to any of the studies of this volume: *ISWOC (Information Structure and Word Order Change in Germanic and Romance languages)* aims to map developments of information structure and word order in early Germanic and Romance languages and their modern counterparts; *PROIEL (Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European Languages)* aims to describe and account for the so-called pragmatic resources of these languages, and focuses e.g. on word order or the use of participles to refer to background events.

#### 4. The verbal categories studied in this volume

As has become obvious from Section 1, the verbal categories underwent major restructuring in the early Germanic languages. The studies collected in this volume try to detect these diverging developments looking at the linguistic contexts and sociolinguistic situations. Many of them take a comparative perspective, often contrasting English and German with Latin, but also comparing different Germanic languages. Moreover, the historical perspective, i.e. the comparison of the categorial systems in different diachronic stages of a language, are addressed in all papers, and emphasized in several of them. Table 1 shows a survey of the verbal categories that are studied in the individual papers of this volume:

**Table 1.** Verbal categories and languages studied in this volume

Categories	Languages	Authors
Passive Voice	OE/Gothic	Cloutier
Passive Voice	OE/OHG	Mailhammer & Smirnova
Passive Voice	OE – ME/OHG – MHG	Petré
Passive Voice/Causative	OE	Kilpiö
Modality	OE – ME – EModE	Eitelmann
Modality	OHG	Jäger
Evidentiality	OE/Gothic	Timofeeva
Future Tense	OE/OHG	Diewald & Wischer
Future Tense	OE	Bolze
Aspect	OE/Gothic – ModE, Croatian	Broz
Existential Constructions	OE/OHG	Pfenninger
Verbal Categories	OE/OHG	Vennemann

Though all verbal categories relevant in English and German are dealt with in several papers in the volume, there are some focal points where the research interests of the studies converge and complement each other. Thus, three papers are concerned with passives (Cloutier, Mailhammer & Smirnova and Petré), another one is related to passives, too, while focusing on causative constructions with *have*-verbs (Kilpiö), three papers are concerned with modality and evidentiality (Eitelmann, Jäger, and Timofeeva), and two papers investigate future markers (Bolze, Diewald & Wischer). Further topics treated are aspectual functions in derivational verbal morphology (Broz), the question of the grammaticalisation of constructions with existential meaning (Pfenninger), and the overall development of the verbal grammatical systems in both German and English (Vennemann).



Typically, linguistic items (the verbal source lexemes) undergoing grammaticalisation show affinities to several verbal categories, and their development is characterized by phases of polysemic divergences towards distinct target categories. For example, modal verbs (more exactly their pre-modal ancestors) are possible – and often used – sources for future markers as well as for epistemic and evidential markers. Verbs meaning ‘have’ may develop into causatives, perfectives etc. Thus, beyond the categories each contribution focuses on, there are several cross-cuttings and interrelations among the papers as to the variety of choices individual markers and their cognates in other languages have (e.g. *have*-verbs and their grammaticalisation potential treated as in Kilpiö and Jäger in very different functions).

Thus, the array of contributions presented here gives a coherent (though by no means complete) overview of central aspects of the development of verbal categories in the early stages of German and English, with substantial outlooks to other languages. The commitment to a grammaticalisation approach, which is found in every paper, furthermore ensures a comparable line of argument, uniting empirical-descriptive thoroughness with a common theoretical framework that is explicit enough to make findings comparable, and open enough to allow new aspects of, e.g. historical sociolinguistics and other fields to be integrated.

The following sections present a brief summary of the content, results and theoretical intentions of the papers united in this volume.

The first four papers in this volume address issues related to the passive voice. **Robert Cloutier** in his article “\**HAITAN* in Gothic and Old English”, presents a comparative study of the uses of *haitan* and *hātan* in Gothic and Old English, the only verb that retained a synthetic passive inflection in these languages. On the basis of an analysis of data collected from the Helsinki Corpus (for Old English) and from Gothic *Wulfila* the author aims to shed light on the early functions of *haitan* and *hātan*, and from there to analyze their further development. The Gothic data are compared to the Greek original. Cloutier presents a detailed study of the distribution of this verb in various constructions in the two corpora, taking into account the semantics of its auxiliary-like functions, its lexical vs. copula functions and the syntactic constructions in which it occurred.

The category of passive is also the topic in **Robert Mailhammer & Elena Smirnova’s** paper on “Incipient Grammaticalisation: sources of passive constructions in Old High German and Old English”. The authors present a contrastive study of copula constructions combining verbs denoting ‘be’ and ‘become’ with past participles, which are the sources of later passives. It is shown that in the oldest stages the passive interpretation was only one of several possible readings. All their triggering features are listed, analysed and compared, providing the basis of



a thorough investigation into the different courses of the development of the passives in English and German.

The contribution by **Peter Petré** (“Passive Auxiliaries in English and German: Decline versus grammaticalisation of bounded language use”) relates the diverging paths in the grammaticalisation of passive auxiliaries in English and German (*be-* versus *become-*verb) to a typological distinction at the level of macrostructural planning based on bounded (German) versus unbounded (English) systems (cf. Carroll & Lambert 2003; Roßdeutscher & von Stutterheim 2005). It is argued that English *weorðan* disappeared in passive constructions together with the bounded language use in English. Supported by corpus data, Petré’s study shows how different categories or structures in a language may interact and direct language change in various ways. At the same time it exemplifies how different subdisciplines of linguistics can benefit from each other, as e.g. psycholinguistic findings (bounded versus unbounded language use) and grammaticalisation theory.

**Matti Kilpiö’s** article, “Causative *habban* in Old English: Tracing the Development of a Budding Construction” is concerned with a construction in OE corresponding to the Present-Day English (PDE) type *I had my shoes repaired*. The author draws his data from a complete analysis of the whole *habban* material of the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* (DOEC). It turns out that causative *habban* is very rare in Old English and that all constructions of that kind contain the semantic features of deontic or volitional modality. It is argued that this fact plays a major role in the rise of the causative *habban* construction. Kilpiö’s study does not only present a detailed analysis of the exact contexts and factors of the rise of causative *habban* using central concepts of grammaticalisation theory, it also illustrates how different verbal categories may interact with each other, as in this case passive voice, causativity and modality.

One of the papers addressing the topic of modality is **Matthias Eitelmann’s** “Remembering (*ge*)*munan* – The Rise and Decline of a Potential Modal”. Dealing with modal meanings and modal verbs, this paper focuses on those preterite-presents that did not evolve further to modal functions but got lost. These verbs – in contrast to the surviving ones – have not received very much attention in diachronic linguistics as well as in grammaticalisation studies; this paper takes care of one of them and thus closes a gap in diachronic coverage and provides an extended perspective on processes of grammaticalisation. It takes into account a combination of language-internal (semantic change, auxiliarisation, grammaticalisation) and cultural change (change from an oral to a literal society), as well as the impact of language contact (acceleration of change through contact with Old Norse).

A different aspect of modality is approached by **Anne Jäger** in her paper on “The emergence of modal meanings from *haben* with *zu*-infinitives in Old High German”. Focusing on Notker’s writings and a comparison with Latin, she presents a classical grammaticalisation study dealing with the path from POSSESSION to OBLIGATION in the development of *haben* & *zu*-infinitive to a marker of modality in the OHG period. The background and previous research referred to are – naturally – grammaticalisation studies, in particular Heine and Kuteva (2002), and Haspelmath (1989) for the grammaticalisation channels of infinitives, as well as research into Old High German and Old English. The author presents detailed argumentation for the originality of Notker’s constructions as compared to the Latin texts on the basis of a close-up comparison of Old High German versus Latin. Thus, Jäger’s study complements the discussion on the range of grammaticalisation paths possibly entered by *have*-verbs as outlined by Kilpiö in this volume.

Another category closely related to and subsumable under the broad domain of modality and evidentiality, is the topic of the contribution by **Olga Timofeeva** (“Hearsay and lexical evidentials in Old Germanic languages, with focus on Old English”). It concentrates on perception verbs and verbs with a ‘say’-component, which are known to grammaticalise into morphological evidentials. Like in the previous article by Jäger, not only individual lexical items but whole constructions are under discussion. The qualitative case study of the oldest stages up to Middle English comes to the conclusion that OE and other Germanic languages have very similar patterns of marking direct auditory perception and hearsay evidence, which must have their origin in Proto-Germanic.

Modality is not only closely linked with evidentiality, but also with futurity. The interrelation of futurity and modality is part of **Gabriele Diewald & Ilse Wischer’s** contribution on “Markers of Futurity in Old High German and Old English: A Comparative Corpus-Based Study”. It analyses those constructions in OHG and OE that had the potential of marking future events, i.e. modal constructions and those with *be/become*-verbs. The authors rely on the framework of grammaticalisation, uniting grammaticalisation studies on future markers (e.g. Bybee et al. 1994) with diachronic studies on the development of futures in German and English. The detailed analysis of syntactic and semantic as well as distributional properties of the different constructions reveals remarkable differences with respect to the relevant items even in their earliest attested stages, the reasons for which may be socio-linguistically conditioned. The approach allows theoretical generalizations as to the combination of language-internal factors, universal grammaticalisation paths, and sociolinguistic conditions.

The verbal category of futurity is also the topic of **Christine Bolze’s** paper on “The verb *to be* in the *West Saxon Gospels* and the *Lindisfarne Gospels*”. Old English

is the only Germanic language which contains a double paradigm of the verb *to be* (*b*-forms/*s*-forms) in the present tense, whereby the *b*-forms are used with a future sense or to express habitual events. Bolze analyses the use of *b*- and *s*-forms in two OE dialects, the West Saxon and the Northumbrian one, comparing them to the Latin original, thus providing further insights into their functions in Old English and their dialectal distribution. It closes a gap in English historical dialectology since none of the previous studies has hitherto focused on Northumbrian dialect, relying on such a detailed corpus-based analysis. The paper furthermore underlines the importance of an integrated approach to the study of verbal categories in terms of their mutual interaction, as we are dealing here with an interrelation of modality, futurity and habitual aspect.

While habituais can be considered to be related to imperfective aspect, there were other linguistic means, such as verbal prefixes (*ge*-, *for*-, *a*-, and others), in Old English that had a close affinity to perfective aspect. One of these prefixes is in the focus of interest in Vlatko Broz's paper on "Aspectual properties of the verbal prefix *a*- in Old English with reference to Gothic". It is shown that this item had a range of meanings in Old English, among them the expression of perfective aspect. The paper contrasts Old English with Gothic, and – in the modern stages – it compares the equivalents in Modern English and Croatian. The paper presents a first detailed study of a poorly investigated erstwhile perfective marker; it describes the development from a grammaticalised marker to a fossilised morpheme, and – taking into account that English developed a different way of expressing aspectual distinctions – the renovation of the grammatical category of aspect in English.

Simone E. Pfenninger's article "*Þær wæs* vs. *thâr was*: Old English and Old High German existential constructions with adverbs of place," draws our attention to existential constructions and their degree of grammaticalisation in Old English and Old High German. The paper shows that – notwithstanding the differences in detail – both languages in their modern stages have existential constructions with locative adverbs that have arisen via grammaticalisation. It is assumed that both, OE expletive *þær*- and OHG *thâr*-constructions, had a common origin and common general traits in their development. The study takes up a still neglected area of diachronic research and presents a wealth of qualitative and quantitative data on OE and OHG existential constructions. Drawing on grammaticalisation studies and constructional approaches, the paper puts forward hypotheses on why the two languages developed differently with English acquiring one highly grammaticalised existential construction while German did not, but developed a variety of competing constructions for existential sentences.

The last contribution, which relates several of the most important structural changes and categorial differences in the verbal systems of Old English and

Old High German to the different contact histories of these languages, is **Theo Vennemann's** survey "On gain and loss of verbal categories in language contact: Old English vs. Old High German". After giving an overview of the shared inherited categories, the author discusses the shared innovated categories in English and German, namely periphrastic perfect, future and passive voice. He argues that the grammaticalisation of these categories is well underway in Old English and Old High German, although the new categories had by no means been fully integrated into the verbal systems yet. The main part of the paper, however, is devoted to the divergent developments in English, focussing at some length on the two copulas in Old English, which are also under closer inspection in Bolze's paper in this volume. Vennemann concludes that most of the "differential innovated categories" in Old English as compared to Old High German are due to Celtic influence.

## 5. Summary and outlook

All papers in this volume gain their new insights from a comparative study of language data in related languages or dialects. Generalising the results of the individual studies concerning the verbal categories in English and German, in this concluding section an attempt will be made to widen the perspective and formulate some general principles for studying language change in a comprehensive way.

As language change is a highly complex process, it can only be tackled by combining several perspectives concerning the data, the theoretical approaches, and the methodologies.

1. *Combining data.* The *comparanda*, i.e. the linguistic entities compared, may be related typologically, areally or genealogically. Typologically oriented comparison aims at identifying universal features, cross-linguistic tendencies, and regularities of change. As a consequence, closely related languages in this approach are often treated as mutually exchangeable in cross-linguistic samples so that divergencies of closely related languages tend to get obliterated. However, the categories supplied by typological studies provide a suitable instrument for investigating historical changes and comparing the respective outcomes in any pair of languages, independent of genealogical or areal distance. The comparison of closely related languages, on the other hand, brings to light the differences missed in large-scale typological comparisons, and allows the search for language specific pathways of change.
2. *Combining theoretical approaches.* As language change results from multifaceted situations comprising linguistic and extra-linguistic factors, its investigation has to take into account theoretical models of every structural layer and their interaction as well as of language usage and its socio-historical context.

In this volume, this is achieved by a combination of grammaticalisation theory, constructional approaches, philological as well as sociolinguistic studies. Applying this kind of empirically and theoretically founded approach makes it possible to account for language change in its complexities and thus provides a solid basis even for more formally oriented reflections on linguistic structure.

3. *Combining methodologies.* In the last decades the rise of corpus linguistics in diachronic investigation has proved its merits without however making close-up qualitative and philologically informed studies dispensable. In particular, sociolinguistic research has proved vital for the investigation of language contact and its enormous influence on language change. Thus, methods from sociology and natural sciences must complement the tool box for an integrative investigation of language change.

In short, there is still much to be done. For one thing, the – sufficiently complete – parallel and combined history of the grammatical development of the languages dealt with here has yet to be written; for another, if such a combined linguistic history can be supplied, it may provide valuable new insights for other disciplines concerned with social, historical and cultural development. The present volume is meant to be a step in this direction.

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.
- Archer, Dawn. 2012. Corpus annotation: A welcome *addition* or *an interpretation too far*? In Jukka Tyrkkö et al. (eds).
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1988. *The Development of English Aspectual Systems. Aspectualizers and post-verbal particles* [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 49]. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bybee, Joan, Perkins, Revere & Pagliuca, William. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Carroll, Mary & Lambert, Monique. 2003. Information Structure in narratives and the role of grammaticised knowledge: A study of adult French and German learners of English. In *Information Structure and the Dynamics of Language Acquisition* [Studies in Bilingualism 26], Christine Dimroth & Marianne Starren (eds), 267–287. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CoRD = Corpus Resource Database. (<http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/>)
- Diewald, Gabriele. 2006. Context types in grammaticalization as constructions. In *Constructions. Special Volume 1: Constructions all over – case studies and theoretical implications*, Doris Schönefeld (ed.). (<http://www.constructions-online.de/articles/specvol1/>)
- Diewald, Gabriele, Lehmberg, Timm & Smirnova, Elena. 2007. KALI – A diachronic corpus for the investigation of grammaticalization and semantic change. In *Data Structures for Linguistic Resources and Applications. Proceedings of the Biennial GLDV Conference 2007*, Georg Rehm, Andreas Witt & Lothar Lemnitzer (eds), 103–112. Tübingen: Narr.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 1989. From purposive to infinitive: A universal path of grammaticalisation. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10: 287–310.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalisation*. Cambridge: CUP. ICAME Corpus Collection. (<http://nora.hd.uib.no/corpora.html>)
- ISWOC (Information Structure and Word Order Change in Germanic and Romance languages). (<http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/research/projects/iswoc/index.html>)
- Krug, Manfred. 2000. *Emerging English Modals. A Corpus-Based Study of Grammaticalisation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kytö, Merja (ed.). 2012. *English Corpus Linguistics: Crossing Paths* [Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics 76]. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Oksefell Ebeling, Signe, Ebeling, Jarle & Hasselgård, Hilde (eds). 2012. *Aspects of Corpus Linguistics: Compilation, Annotation, Analysis* [Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English 12]. (<http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/12/introduction.html>)
- PROIEL (Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European Languages). (<http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/research/projects/proiel/index.html>)
- Roßdeutscher, Antje & Stutterheim, Christiane von. 2005. Semantische und pragmatische Prinzipien bei der Positionierung von *dann*. *Linguistische Berichte* 205: 29–60.
- Schönherr, Monika. 2010. *Modalität und Modalitätsausdrücke in althochdeutschen Bibeltexten. Eine korpusgestützte Analyse* [Würzburger elektronischen sprachwissenschaftlichen Arbeiten Nr. 7]. (<http://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/volltexte/2010/4690/pdf/MonikaSchoenherrDissWespa7.pdf>)
- Tyrkkö, Jukka, Kilpiö, Matti, Nevalainen, Terttu & Rissanen, Matti (eds). 2012. *Outposts of Historical Corpus Linguistics: From the Helsinki Corpus to a Proliferation of Resources* [Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English 10]. (<http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/10/introduction.html>)
- Wischer, Ilse & Habermann, Mechthild. 2004. Der Gebrauch von Präfixverben zum Ausdruck von Aspekt/Aktionsart im Altenglischen und Althochdeutschen. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32: 262–285.

# \**HAITAN* in Gothic and Old English\*

Robert A. Cloutier

University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

By collecting data from various corpora, I examine and compare the use of the Gothic and Old English reflexes of \**HAITAN*, a transitive verb that survives as a copula-like verb in the modern Germanic languages. Between the two languages, this verb can occur in five constructions: calling, transitive naming, infinitival commanding, subclause commanding, and copular naming. Both Gothic and Early Old English share the use of this verb in calling constructions whereas the subclause commanding construction is an Old English innovation and the copular naming construction does not appear until Late Old English. Regardless of the language or period, however, when \**HAITAN* occurs in transitive naming constructions, it strongly favours passive voice, which may explain its later use in copular naming constructions. Moreover, an examination of the competitors of Gothic *haitan* shows that it has strong competition from various verbs in each of its functions, though the competition in the transitive naming construction is weakest.

## 1. Introduction

The descendants of the proto-Germanic verb \**HAITAN* have a rather peculiar syntax, behaving in the various modern Germanic languages (with the exception of English where it does not survive) syntactically like a copula in that they connect a subject to a complement, as seen in example (1), and thereby letting the listener know that the complement is an attribute of the subject. In a historical context, we should note that the modern descendants of this verb have this property without any overt marking of passive voice – their inflections are simply that of the active voice. This contrasts with the use of this verb in the older stages of the Germanic languages, which will be discussed later.

- (1) 'I am-called Robert.'
- |    |                          |           |
|----|--------------------------|-----------|
| a. | <i>Ik heet Robert</i>    | Dutch     |
| b. | <i>Ich heisse Robert</i> | German    |
| c. | <i>Ég heitir Róbert</i>  | Icelandic |

---

\* I use \**HAITAN* to represent the Proto-Germanic verb as well as the pan-Germanic lexeme. This is to make a clear distinction between this form and the Gothic verb *haitan*.



Because of this peculiar property, these verbs have been variously analysed in, for instance, Modern Dutch as a copula (Haeseryn et al. 1997), an intransitive verb<sup>1</sup> (Den Boon & Geeraerts 2008), and a raising verb<sup>2</sup> (Matushansky 2008). These modern forms of \**HAITAN* differ from most other copulas, however, in that they encode something more specific: the attribution, for the most part, is not just any attribute of the subject but specifically a *name*, hence the translation of this verb into English as ‘to be called, to be named.’ The ancestor of this verb in Gothic did not have this function without overt marking of passive voice, which could have been applied to any transitive verb, and the shift from a purely transitive verb to the modern descendant has not received any attention in the literature.

Moreover, the etymology of this verb does not help us figure out the possible trajectory of its development because its etymology is not clearly established (Mailhammer 2007). Traditionally, \**HAITAN* has been analysed as an ablauted form of proto-Indo-European \**keih<sub>2</sub>*- meaning ‘to move’ with the addition of a dental suffix (Lotspeich 1933; Pokorny 1951; Seebold 1970; Green 1985; Kluge 2002). However, scholars have pointed out a number of problems with this etymology. There are no direct cognates of this verb in any of the other Indo-European languages (Phillippa et al. 2009). The meanings associated with the reflexes of this root in the other older Indo-European languages do not correspond well to those meanings associated with \**HAITAN* (De Vries 1962). The semantic development from the proto-Indo-European root meaning ‘to move’ to \**HAITAN* ‘to name, to command’ is problematic (De Vries 1962; Boutkan & Siebinga 2005). And the proposed dental suffix reconstructed for this etymology would be isolated to Germanic and absent in the other branches of Indo-European (Seebold 1970;

---

1. Den Boon and Geeraerts’s (2008) analysis is that the modern use of *heten* is as an intransitive verb. Unlike the entries for *zijn* ‘to be’ or *blijken* ‘to seem,’ they do not claim that *heten* can function as a copula.

2. A raising verb has the property of allowing an argument that belongs semantically to a subordinate clause to be realized as a constituent of a higher clause, as shown in the following sentence:

“John continues to shock Steve.”

In this sentence, “John” is semantically the subject of “to shock” but is realized as the subject of “continues.”

Dutch *heten* is analysed in Matushansky (2008) as a subject-raising verb, i.e. the semantic subject of the subordinate small clause is syntactically realized as the subject of *heten*, which is in a higher clause. This analysis, then, assumes that the underlying structure of *heten* is the same as in the older stages of Germanic (where Matushansky would analyse it as an object-raising verb), albeit with the ability to raise the subject of the subordinate small clause. A small clause is a minimal predicate structure in which the copula is omitted.



Boutkan & Siebinga 2005). Addressing a number of these issues, Green (1985) points out that many can be resolved though he does not necessarily conclude that the traditional etymology is correct. Because of the numerous issues surrounding the proposed Indo-European etymology, some scholars suggest that the etymology is unclear (Philippa et al. 2009) or that the word has no Indo-European etymology (Boutkan & Siebinga 2005). What is most important to take into account is that the discussion surrounding the etymology of \**HAITAN* has never posited medio-passive or passive voice as an inherent part of its meaning, though such uses could be encoded through inflection or periphrastic constructions, so we need to account for its shift from a purely transitive verb to its modern use by investigating its use over time in the older Germanic languages.

In this study, I examine and compare the uses of Gothic *haitan* and Old English *hātan*. By examining the behaviour of these verbs in these languages, we will have a firm grasp on the original functions of \**HAITAN* in Germanic, which will later allow us to have a better understanding of how this verb develops over time and then how best to analyse its current structure. The questions addressed in this study are the following: (1) What functions do *haitan* and *hātan* fill in Gothic and Old English, i.e. how and in how many ways can it be used? (2) For each function, is there an indication that certain functions favour either active or passive voice more strongly? An inclination toward passive voice in the naming function might indicate a move toward the current usage. (3) How do the functions filled by *haitan* and *hātan* change over time? Competing functions might show the motivation for \**HAITAN* to develop in the way it does. (4) In Gothic, what other verbs compete with *haitan* in its various functions, and is there any indication that other verbs are preferred to *haitan* in those functions? Strong competitors might indicate pressure on \**HAITAN* to develop into its current copula-like function.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Corpora and data collection

For the first part of the study in both Gothic and Old English, two electronic corpora were used. The Gothic data were collected from the website of *Project Wulfila* (2004) using the search engine available on its website. The corpus includes the Gothic Bible (New Testament) and minor fragments, including Nehemiah, Skeireins, Signatures, and Calendar, totalling around 67,400 tokens. All inflected forms of *haitan* are included, but prefixed forms of *haitan* were avoided because of resultant changes in valency and meaning. The tokens were collected by examining the instances of *haitan* recorded in the concordance available on *Project Wulfila*

and grouping them based on the construction in which they occurred, exemplified in (2) below. Within each construction, the examples were further divided based on the voice in which they occurred.

The Old English data were collected from texts in the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* and were divided into Early Old English (up to 950; OE1 & OE2) and Late Old English (950–1150; OE3 & OE4). Only texts that clearly fit into one of these periods or that were ambiguous between periods within the same grouping were used. In total, the Early Old English corpus used for this study totalled around 82,195 words and the Late Old English corpus around 135,770 words (refer to the appendix for a list of the texts examined). All inflected forms of Old English *hātan* as well as the infinitive and past participle (with or without *ge-*), whether part of a periphrastic construction or a non-finite participial construction, are included in the data. Other prefixed forms of *hātan* are avoided, including the lexeme *gehātan* ‘to promise’, in order to avoid changes in valency and meaning and to maintain comparability with Gothic, where *gahaitan* is clearly a separate lexeme from *haitan*. Additionally, the synthetic passive forms, *hätte* and *hātton*, are included in this study and counted as passive for two reasons: to maintain symmetry with the Gothic data and because *hätte* and *hātton* also appear in alternation with periphrastic passives illustrated below. The Old English tokens were collected using WordSmith, a concordance program, and were grouped based on the construction in which they occurred, exemplified below. Within each construction, the examples were further divided based on the voice in which they occurred.

Instances of either *haitan* or *hātan* were collected and grouped based on the combination of arguments that occurred with the verb in the given context. Among the data were five possible argument configurations as listed in (2) below, with an example of each from either Gothic or Old English:

- (2) a. the calling construction (with a direct object only)  
*ak þan waurkjais dauht, hait unledans, gamaidans, haltans, blindans*  
 ‘But when you have a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind’  
 (Goth, Luke 14: 13)
- b. the transitive naming construction (with a direct object and an object complement)  
*Daweid ina frauþan haitiþ*  
 ‘David calls him Lord’  
 (Goth, Luke 20: 44)
- c. the infinitival commanding construction (with an optional direct object and an infinitive)  
*Gong hræðe to cirican, & hat ure seofon broðor hider to me cuman*  
 ‘Go quickly to church and command our seven brothers to come here to me’  
 (OE2, bede R3.266.1)

- d. the subclause commanding construction (with a subordinate clause)  
*ē heht þæt he biscopphade onfenge ē to Breotone ferde*  
 ‘And commanded that he receive bishophood and go to Britain’  
 (OE2, bede R1.254.5)
- e. the copular naming construction (with a subject complement)  
*Rodbeard het se yldesta*  
 ‘The eldest was called Rodbeard’ (OE4, chroa2 R1086.59)

These examples, with the exception of (2e), were then divided based on whether they were expressed in active voice or passive voice, the latter of which is explicitly marked either synthetically through an inflectional ending or analytically through a periphrastic construction.

Non-finite appositional participial constructions, as in (3a) below, were counted as passive voice.

- (3) a. *In ðæm mynstre wæs in ða tid æfestes lifes ē gemetfæstes liifes*  
*abbud ē mæssepreost æðelwald haten*  
 ‘In this monastery, there was at that time an abbot and priest of pious  
 and modest life called Æthelwald’ (OE2, Bede R 13.434.22)
- b. *Mid þy ða æfter longre tiide cwom to him of Breotone fore neosunge*  
*intingan se halgesta wer ē se forhæfdesta, Hygebald hatte*  
 ‘When after a long time, a most holy and most ascetic man, called  
 Hygebald, came to him from Britain on a visit’ (OE2, Bede R 3.270.16)

This was motivated by the alternation of the past participle and the synthetic passive, as in (3b), in this construction. In both constructions, both the name and verb form constitute a reduced relative clause that is appositional in nature and therefore outside of the main clause, i.e. the construction can be taken out without a major change in the overall structure or meaning of the sentence. For other non-finite participial constructions in Gothic, the morphology on the Greek verb was used as a guide since passive and active participles have distinct inflections.

Instances in Old English containing *mon* ‘one’ are also included and counted as active voice, even though functionally, this construction often serves as an alternative to the passive voice. Counting such instances as active voice is motivated by the verbal morphology of *hātan*, which is always active in such constructions, the appearance of *mon* in the function of subject, and the accusative case of the direct object in instances where the accusative case is distinct from the nominative, as in (4).

- (4) *æfter þæm hiene mon het casere*  
 after that-DAT him-ACC one called Caesar  
 ‘after that, one called him Caesar/he was called Caesar’  
 (OE2, orosiu R10.234.20)

In (4), the direct object is the masculine singular pronoun *hiene* ‘him’, which can only be the accusative case. Unfortunately, most of the direct objects and/or complements are like *casere* ‘Caesar’ in this example; its case is ambiguous between nominative and accusative.

The second part of the study focuses on Gothic and gives a sense of the competition *haitan* had from other verbs. To discover potential competitors for Gothic *haitan* in each of its functions, I first found the Greek verbs *haitan* was used to translate in each of its functions. Using *Biblos.com* to identify other verses in the Bible containing these Greek verbs, I then looked back at the Gothic translation of these Greek verses to see what other Gothic verbs were used to translate the Greek verbs. A comparison of the frequencies of the different verbs in each function gives an indication of the extent to which *haitan* is entrenched in each function as opposed to its competitors, and an examination of the voice preferences helps us to establish whether *haitan* has a stronger preference for passive voice in comparison to its competitors.

3. Results

3.1 Functions of Gothic *haitan* and Old English *hātan*

3.1.1 Gothic

The Gothic data contain 64 instances of the verb *haitan* used in three constructions, the distribution of which is given in Table 1 below: in calling constructions (*haitan*+DO), in transitive naming constructions (*haitan*+DO+Comp), and in infinitival commanding constructions (*haitan*+DO+V).

Table 1. Distribution of Gothic *haitan*

<i>haitan</i> +	Active	Passive	Total
DO	12	5	17 (27%)
DO+Comp	7	33	40 (62%)
DO+V	7	0	7 (11%)
Total	26	38	64 (100%)

As seen in Table 1, *haitan* occurs most frequently in transitive naming constructions (62%) followed by calling constructions (27%) and then infinitival commanding constructions (11%). This shows a preference for Gothic *haitan* to appear in transitive naming constructions.

The instances of *haitan* occurring in calling constructions appear in both the active and passive voices, both of which occur in (5) below.

- (5) *ak þan haitaizau, atgaggands anakumbei ana þamma aftumistin stada,  
ei biþe qimai saei haihait þuk, qipai du þus: frijond, usgagg hauhis*  
'But when you are called, go and sit down in the lowest room so that when  
he who called you comes, he may say to you, Friend, go up higher'  
(Goth, Luke 14: 10)

The second instance of *haitan* in (5), *haihait*, is the third singular preterite indicative active and is representative of the active voice examples. The first instance, *haitaizau*, is the second singular present subjunctive passive; one other example of the calling construction in the inflected passive was found. The next two instances of passive voice in the calling construction were nominalized past participles, as in (6).

- (6) *jah insandida skalk seinana hveilai nahtamatis qipan þaim haitanam:  
gaggiþ, unte ju manwu ist allata*  
'And sent his servant at supper time to say to them who were invited: Come,  
for everything is ready now'  
(Goth, Luke 14: 17)

Such examples were considered passive voice since the participle is describing a property of a group of people, namely those who have been called/invited, and because the Greek verb it translates is κεκλημένοις, the perfect passive participle of καλέω 'to call'.

This leaves one rather peculiar and unexpected instance of the passive voice: Example (7) is an instance of a periphrastic *present* passive with a past participle *haitans* occurring with *ist*, a third singular present indicative of *wesan* 'to be'.

- (7) *saei auk in frauþin haitans ist skalks, fralets frauþins ist; samaleiko saei freis  
haitada, skalks ist Xristaus*  
'For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman:  
likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant'  
(Goth, Corinthians I 7: 22)

When we compare these clauses to the original Greek, we see that both instances of *haitan* in this sentence are translations of κληθεῖς, an aorist passive participle of καλέω 'to call' that is nominative masculine singular. In the Gothic translation, each instance is translated differently: the first with an unexpected periphrastic construction *haitans ist*, the second with the inflected passive *haitada*. Further evidence that the first instance is actually a periphrastic present passive is the fact that each clause in Greek only contains one other verb, namely ἐστίν '(he) is'; the first clause has two instances of *ist*. This example suggests that already in Gothic, the synthetic passive was in the process of breaking down.

All examples of the infinitival commanding construction are in the active voice, as given in (8).

- (8) *gasaihvands þan Iesus managans hiuhmans bi sik, haihait galeiþan siponjans hindar marein*  
 ‘Seeing then great multitudes about him, Jesus commanded his disciples to go beyond the sea.’ (Goth, Matthew 8: 18)

Of the seven instances of this construction, only two have direct objects that represent the people being commanded, like in (8). In this example, *siponjans* ‘disciples’ is in the accusative plural and is the group being commanded to go beyond the sea. In the five other instances, the person or group being commanded is not expressed, as in (9).

- (9) *Iesus haihait ina tiuhan du sis*  
 ‘Jesus commanded him to be brought to him’ (Goth, Luke 18: 40)

In this example, *ina* ‘him’ is the direct object of *tiuhan* ‘to guide/lead’.

In the transitive naming construction, *haitan* occurs in more construction types than either the calling construction or the infinitival commanding construction. Example (10) shows the regularly inflected active (7 instances) and example (11) the passive voices (22 instances).

- (10) *haita þo ni managein meina managein meina*  
 ‘I will call those not my people my people’ (Goth, Romans 9: 25)
- (11) *jah þu, barnilo, praufetus hauhistins haitaza*  
 ‘And you, child, will be called the prophet of the highest’ (Goth, Luke 1: 76)

In addition to these two, we also find five instances of periphrastic preterite passive constructions: one with the preterite of *wairþan* ‘to become’ (see 12) and four with the preterite of *wesan* ‘to be’ (see 13). These are expected as Gothic only has inflectional morphology for the present passive.

- (12) *dupþe haitans warþ akrs jains akrs bloþis und hina dag*  
 ‘For that reason, that field has been called the field of blood up to this day’ (Goth, Matthew 27: 8)
- (13) *jah qinons þozei wesun galeikinodos ahmane ubilaize jah sauhte, jah Marja sei haitana was Magdalene, us þizaiei usiddjedun unhulþons sibun*  
 ‘And certain women, who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary, who was called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils’ (Goth, Luke 8: 2)

Instead of the nominalized past participle construction, we find the past participle functioning as a reduced relative clause, as in (14); this construction occurs in six instances.

(14) *habaidedunuh þan bandjan gatarhidana haitanana Barabban*

‘And they then had a notable prisoner, called Barabbas’

(Goth, Matthew 27: 16)

In considering the distribution of voice in the Gothic data in Table 1 above, we observe that each construction has a clear voice preference: both the calling and infinitival commanding constructions prefer active voice while the transitive naming construction prefers passive voice. These observations are confirmed when these voice preferences are compared against one another using the Fisher-Yates test (a modification of  $\chi$ -square adjusted for smaller amounts) as the voice distributions between the transitive naming construction on the one hand and either the calling or the infinitival commanding construction on the other are statistically significant with p-values of <0.001. Comparing the values for DO versus DO+V, we might assume that the voice distribution is not due to chance, i.e. that it is significant; however, the Fisher Yates test shows that this is not the case, with a p-value of only 0.146.

### 3.1.2 Early Old English

The data collected from the Early Old English period shown in Table 2 below show 125 instances of *hātan* occurring in four constructions: in calling constructions (*hātan*+DO), in transitive naming constructions (*hātan*+DO+Comp), in infinitival commanding constructions (*hātan*+DO+V), and in subclause commanding constructions (*hātan*+SubC).

**Table 2.** Distribution of *hātan* in Early Old English

<i>hātan</i> +	Active	Passive	Total
DO	2	1	3 (2%)
DO+Comp	31	45	76 (61%)
DO+V	41	0	41 (33%)
SubC	5	0	5 (4%)
Total	79	46	125

The transitive naming construction (61%) is the most frequent construction in Early Old English followed by infinitival commanding constructions (33%), subclause commanding constructions (4%), and finally, calling constructions (2%). Even in Early Old English, *hātan* prefers to appear in transitive naming construction by quite a margin.

The calling construction occurs very infrequently in the Early Old English corpus. Of the two instances in the active voice, (15) is a past perfect occurring

with *hæfde* ‘had’ and (16) is an infinitive occurring with *sceal* ‘is obliged’. The one instance of this construction in a periphrastic past passive is given in (17).

- (15) *seoðþan he hine to Cristes þeowdome **gehatenne** hæfde*  
 ‘afterwards he had called him to Christ’s kingdom’ (OE2, bede R8.124.13)
- (16) *ð hine mon **sceal** swiðe hlude **hatan** grædan oððe singan*  
 ‘and one has to call, shout, or sing it so loudly’ (OE2, laece R5.1.1)
- (17) *þa wæs seo fæmne **gehaten** ð æfter fære Eadwine onsended*  
 ‘then the woman was called for and after a while Eadwine sent forth’  
 (OE2, bede R8.120.21)

These examples are noteworthy: in this corpus, (15) is the only example of a perfect construction with *hatan*, (16) is one of only three instances of *hatan* in the infinitive, and (17) is the only example of *hatan* in the passive voice in a construction other than the transitive naming construction.

All instances of the infinitival and subclause commanding constructions are in the active voice (see 18 and 19 for the former and 20 for the latter).

- (18) *Gong hræðe to cirican, ð **hat** ure seofon broðor **hider to me cuman***  
 ‘Go quickly to church and command our seven brothers to come here to me’  
 (OE2, bede R 3.266.1)
- (19) *Seo cwen **het** þa ðæm cyninge **þæt heafod of aceorfan***  
 ‘The queen then commanded the king’s head to be cut off’  
 (OE2, orosiu R4.76.31)
- (20) *...se papa...**heht** þæt he biscopphade onfenge ð to Breotone ferde*  
 ‘...the pope... commanded that he receive bishophood and go to Britain’  
 (OE2, bede R1.254.5)

The only variation in the infinitival commanding construction is the presence or absence of a direct object, exemplified in (18) (repetition of 2c above), which is in the third singular present tense, and (19), which is in the third singular preterite, respectively. The subclause commanding construction remains the same in all instances; the subject of the subordinate clause is always the entity being commanded (see 20), and the verb is in the subjunctive. Examples (19) and (20) demonstrate the two different preterite forms of *hatan*: *hēht* is a vestige of the reduplicating preterite and *hēt* is a newer form that rises in Old English.

The transitive naming construction is not only the most frequent use of *hatan*, but it also has the most variation. In the active voice, *hatan* occurs both in the regular active voice (18 instances, see 21) and the *mon* construction (13 instances, see 22).



- (21) *ðeofas we hatað oð VII men*  
 ‘we call (a group of) up to seven men thieves’ (OE2, lawine R13)
- (22) *se steorra þe mon on boclaeden hæť cometa*  
 ‘the star that is called (one calls) “cometa” in book Latin’ (OE2, chroa2 R892.1)

In the passive voice, we find the expected split between the periphrastic passive (30 instances, see 23) and the synthetic passive (15 instances, see 24).

- (23) *Se æresta cyning wæs Ninus haten*  
 ‘The first king was called Ninus’ (OE2, orosiu R1.60.11)
- (24) *Minutia hatte an wifmon*  
 ‘a woman who is called Minutia’ (OE2, orosiu R6.108.15)

Within each type of passive construction are instances of the reduced appositional relative clauses discussed and exemplified above in (3): three of the past participles are used in this way and four instances of *hätte*.

Except for the calling construction, which has far too few tokens for any accurate discussion, each of the remaining constructions with *hātan* in Early Old English has a clear preference for voice. The transitive naming construction (*hātan*+DO+Comp) prefers the passive voice whereas the infinitival and subclause commanding constructions only occur in the active voice. Using the Fisher-Yates test to compare the ratio of active and passive voice between each pair of constructions, we find that, like Gothic, the voice ratio in the transitive naming construction in Early Old English differs significantly from the infinitival and subclause commanding constructions, as shown by p-values of <0.001 and 0.015, respectively. The ratio between the two types of commanding constructions is not statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.20. These data support the hypothesis that *hātan* favours passive voice when it is in transitive naming constructions.

### 3.1.3 Late Old English

The Late Old English data contain 199 instances of *hātan*, shown in Table 3, occurring in four constructions: the transitive naming construction (*hātan*+DO+Comp), the infinitival commanding construction (*hātan*+DO+V), the subclause commanding construction (*hātan*+SubC), and the inherent passive naming construction (*hātan*+Comp). The Late Old English data are quite different from the distributions we observed in both Gothic and Early Old English. While the transitive naming and the infinitival commanding constructions remain the two most frequent uses of *hātan* and both at roughly the same frequencies as the Early Old English period, the calling construction is completely lost and the inherent passive naming construction makes an appearance at the same frequency as the calling construction it seems to replace.