

THE GRAMMAR OF OE *HATAN*

RUTA NAGUOKA

The Jagellonian University of Cracow

In the present paper I shall propose a syntactic and semantic analysis of OE *hatan* in order to account for the properties and peculiarities this verb displays in Old English. For the illustrative material I have taken examples from *The Old English version of Bede's Ecclesiastical history of the English people*; the modern English translation (not always literal) is quoted after the editor of the text.

During the last decade lexicological problems and, more specifically, lexical structures have been of considerable interest to transformational grammarians (cf. Gruber 1967, 1976, Fillmore 1970, 1971, Perlmutter 1970, Postal 1971). A historical linguist would like to be in a position to avail himself of their methodological experience and of the results they obtain, but he must be aware of the fact that a number of devices used in the analysis of contemporary languages are inaccessible to him. He cannot expect reasonable answers to such questions as: what an OE speaker knew about the specificity of some individual word, what his linguistic intuition was that enabled him to use the word correctly, what he felt about the conditions which determined the appropriateness of the usage of some lexical structure, what paraphrase or synonymous expression he might suggest for a given word, and so on. In spite of these shortcomings and limitations lexicological problems of historical material can be examined and at least some speculative reflections on them proposed. A linguist engaged in historical research of this type is to a great extent bound to rely upon the immediate and sometimes less immediate textual context in which a given word occurs; he may take into account certain conceptually sound assumptions, as well as his own linguistic intuition, and finally, he may look for support of his argumentation in the behaviour of contemporary words which have a similar lexical meaning.

Evidence for the occurrence of two meanings and uses of *hatan* which seem at first sight to have little in common can be drawn from such sentences as:

(1) *se was haten Amfleaht 90/27* ((in an inlet of the sea) called Ambleteuse)

- (2) Ond he ða heht his geferan toweorpan calne pone herig 7 þa getimbro 7 forbærnan 138/10 (Then he bade his companions pull down all that sanctuary and its buildings, and burn them up with fire)

Working on an assumption that there are two distinct meanings: (1) *call, name* and (2) *order, bid, command* which might be referred to as *hatan*₁ and *hatan*₂, respectively, let us see how each of these verbs behaves with respect to syntax.¹

The verb *hatan*₁ which is illustrated in (1) is a transitive verb. It requires an object and an object complement which is a noun phrase, which is shown indirectly by sentences (3) through (5):

- (3) þe mon hateþ Gallia Bellica 26/2 ((the province) called Gallia Belgica)
 (4) þe mon hateð Ealdseaxan 52/6 ((the people) called Old Saxons)
 (5) ðe Romane heton Uerolamium 40/22 (which the Romans called Verolamium)

Note that in the above three examples *hatan*₁ appears in relative clauses. The unrelativized form of (3), for instance, would be something like:

- (3a) mon hateð þa mægpe Gallia Bellica

(cf. the whole sentence which runs: Hit hafað fram suðdæle þa mægpe ongean, þe mon hateþ Gallia Bellica — It has on the south opposite to it the province called Gallia Belgica). The noun phrases which function as grammatical subjects of *hatan*₁ are typically human (*mon* used here as an indefinite pronoun, *Romane*).

Being a transitive verb, *hatan*₁ can undergo passivization; the deletion of *by someone* is here a regular process dependent on the syntactic construction in which the verb in question appears. Consider some additional passives:

- (6) ðæt wæs iu geara Albion haten 24/29 (formerly called Albion)
 (7) þæt cynn nu geond to dæg Dalreadingas wæron hatene 28/28 (Up to this day the race is called Dalreadings)
 (8) Wyrtegeorn wæs haten 50/12 (Vortigern by name)
 (9) þæs fæder wæs Witta haten, þæs fæder wæs Wihta haten 52/12 (whose father was called Witta, whose father was Wihta)

The passives may undergo a transformation of reduction, i.e. the auxiliary *wesan* can be deleted, resulting in the phrases of modification such as:

- (10) Claudius haten 6/8 (called Claudius)
 (11) Æðelfrið haten 92/4 (named Æthelfrith)

¹ OE *hatan* is also used in the meaning of *giving a promise* or *making a vow*. The syntactic and semantic behaviour of this usage will be discussed in a separate paper.

To see that (10) and (11) have the function of modifying an NP consider the contexts in which they appear in apposition to some NP's:

- (10a) Ðæt se æftera Romwara casere, Claudius haten, þæt ylce ealond gesohte (That the second emperor of the Romans, called Claudius, visited the same island)
 (11a) Ðyssum tidum forewæs Norðanhymbra rice se strongesta cyning 7 se gylpgeornesta, Æðelfrið haten (At this time there ruled over the kingdom of Northumbria a king named Æthelfrith, who was very brave and very ambitious)

The syntactic properties of *hatan*₁ pointed out so far, such as a transitive character of the verb and its liability to enter the process of passivization with its regular accompanying transformations of deletion, seem to be observationally proved. Still this observation raises several questions of an explanatory nature. The most important one concerns the passive and the reduced form of it. On the one hand, in the *haten* sentences (1) and (6) through (9) there are necessary elements to ascribe them to the passive, on the other hand *haten* may be interpreted as a participial adjective on the basis of the inflectional endings it may take. Note that in *hatene* (7) the ending *-e* indicates plurality, masculine gender agreeing in this respect with *Dalreadingas*. Or take another example:

- (12) Ðæt se ylca cyning biddende of Scootta peode biscope onfeng Aidanum on naman gehatene 14/4 (That the same king on his request received a bishop from the Scots named Aidan)

where *gehatene* is marked for masculine, accusative singular. When discussing concord in Old English, Quirk and Wrenn (1968:75) say that "past participles display some variety of usage. With copula verbs...they often agree with the subject...but more usually they are invariable". This is exactly what has been noticed in the above examples. Visser (1966:1223 ff.) is more specific about this point; for him "although the past participle in its adjectival and predicative uses resembles an adjective, it distinguishes itself from an ordinary adjective by its having a clearly manifest verbal force..." The tests commonly applied to establish the categorial status of a given word are useless here, one can only say that a structure of the type: **swiðe gehaten* (*very called) or **(se) gehaten cyning* (*a named king) have not been found in the text (for that matter neither in Modern English would any of the constructions be imaginable). At the moment we may conclude that *(ge)hatan*₁ is participial in form and function — but we shall come back to this problem when semantic notions involved in the syntax of *hatan*₁ are considered.

It is generally agreed that *hatan*₁ is a single verb in Old English which has a passive verbal inflection. One could treat it as an intransitive verb for the

simple reason that it does not take an object. *Hatte*, used both for present and preterite, is found in the following sentences:

- (13) of pære byrig ðe Lepti hatte 32/13 (from the town called Leptis)
 (14) ða wæron cumene of Hibernia Scotta ealonde mid heora heretogan,
 Reada hatte 28/25 (they came from Ireland, the island of the Scots,
 with their leader called Reada)
 (15) Hwæt hatte seo mægð 96/25 (What is the people called)

The structural, surface differences between a periphrastic passive construction, i.e. *wesan + haten*, and the inflectional one, i.e. *hatte*, is too obvious to comment upon. The lexical and notional environmental specifications do not seem to be responsible for the use of one form or the other; but to say that they are in free variation or paraphrase each other may be, perhaps, a premature conclusion.

In all the illustrative examples it is the verb *hatan*₁ by which the syntactic shape of the sentence is conditioned. The meaning of *hatan*₁ — as has been already said — is *name, call*. This is evidenced by semantically parallel sentences in which *nemnan* occurs, for example:

- (16) þe mon gyt nemned Agustinus aac 98/15 (at a place still called the oak of Augustine)
 (17) se wæs genemned Hæpfeld 20/9 ((in the plain) called Bishop's Hatfield)
 (18) þæt heo Dere nemde wæron 96/27 (that they were named Deiri)

It appears that *hatan*₁ and *nemnan* are used interchangeably; the following is the clearest example:

- (9a) pæs fæder wæs Witta haten, pæs fæder wæs Wihta haten 7 pæs
 Wihta fæder wæs Woden nemned 52/12 (whose father was called
 Witta, whose father was Wihta, and the father of Wihta was called
 Woden)²

or take (5), whose context runs as follows:

- (5a) neah ðære ceastre, ðe Romane heton Uerolamium, seo nu fram
 Angelðeode Werlameceaster oppe Wæclingaceaster is nemned 40/22

² See also sentences in which *noma* (noun) is used with *hatan*₁ or *nemnan*, e.g.:
 seo oðre noman wæs Tate haten 120/10 (who was also called Tate) (cf. (12))

or:

Ambrosius, haten oðre noman Aurelianus 54/13 (Ambrosius, also called Aurelianus)
 sum lytel sweltende eniht be naman genemde ða mynsterfæmnan, ðe him æfterfylig-
 ende wes 18/18 (a little child, at his death, named the nun who should follow him)

Gesaga me pinne naman, hwæt ðu haten sie 36/18 (Tell me thy name by which thou
 art called)

(close to the town which the Romans called Verolamium, and is now named by the English Werlameceaster or Wæclingaceaster)

(Note that in the above *fram Angelðeode* has not been deleted.) Besides *hatan*₁ and *nemnan*, (*ge*)*cigan* is occasionally used in the same sense, e.g.:

- (19) Albanus ic eom geciged fram minum yl drum 36/19 (I am called
 Alban by my parents)

The preceding examples all contain verbs which are performative³ in some hypothetical speech acts of the form *I name you so and so*. However, for obvious reasons it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to postulate the circumstances for the speaker performing such a verbal act that would satisfy one of the conditions usually set for these occasions. This might be the case for (19), whose surface syntactic structure indirectly reflects that it was the parents (*fram minum yl drum*) that at some time performed a verbal act of naming their son Alban. We may assume that at that time they had "qualifications" of this sort or just some authority according to common law or procedures accepted by the society. To a certain extent one may say the same about the Romans (5) or the English (5a), but not easily about *mon* (3), (4), (16). Unless additional examples are brought to light, it may be supposed that *hatan*₁ is used in *acts of stipulating* (using one of Fraser's (1975: 192) classificatory terms of performative verbs) which are characterized by "the speaker's desire for the acceptance of the naming convention expressed by the proposition". Still, it must be remembered that what a historical linguist has at his disposal is not a direct speech act; moreover, the putative speaker is in most cases unspecified, and it is unlikely that he ever would be identified. Thus, although *hatan*₁ can be classified as a performative verb, the sentences in which it occurs do not describe the verbal act itself; they seem to convey the literal meaning of a speech act (indirectly), the result and the effect of such an act. In this way *hatan*₁, being a performative verb in some hypothetical direct speech act situations, identified as an agentive verb requiring a human subject, has features of a causative agentive verb.⁴ In surface syntactic structures it appears mainly as passive in form and stative in meaning. *Hatte*, being formally exceptional, could be described as passive, noncausative and stative. Whether the structure is *þe mon hated X* (called notional passive by Quirk and Wrenn), the most commonly met *X wæs haten* (segmental passive), or finally *X hatte* (inflectional passive), the semantic content in all refers to some

³ For detailed discussion on various aspects of speech acts see a collection of papers ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (1975).

⁴ If this observation is correct, Austin's well known example *I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth* could be paraphrased into *I cause this ship to have the name of Queen Elizabeth*.

permanent attribute. The state of having some name is not an inherent property of an object, human or nonhuman, but "can only have been reached after something has been done" (Traugott 1972: 83). Traugott when describing the passive in Old English sees the stative meaning in the adjectival inflection of the participle. She claims that since there are cases which regularly are not inflectionally marked in surface realizations, they are ambiguous with regard to stative and nonstative meaning. This semantic aspect of the passive has been ignored both by Quirk and Wrenn and by Visser.

Now that we have at least demonstrated the possibility of using three different structures of *hatan*₁, let us attempt to show the meaning relationships between them. If the assumption involved here is that *hatan*₁ is a performative verb, which is its primary function, then none of the examples would be a direct manifestation of some verbal act of naming. The active character of the verb in question is indirectly expressed by a formally active but notionally passive construction. In the structures *de Romane heton Uerolamium* (5) or *þe mon hateð X* (3) - (4), the subjects are obligatorily human (*Romane, mon*); in spite of the fact that the structural features, i.e. the inflectional, typically active endings of *hatan*₁ and the presence of the human subject would qualify the above as active sentences, the semantic interpretation of them against a broader context would reveal their passive meaning. We noted earlier that the examples (3) through (5) are relative clauses, and as such their function is to modify some NP. That is, (3) modifies *þa mægþe*, (4) refers to *ðam lande*, and (5) identifies *ðære ceastre*. The province, the people and the town respectively are identified by their names, which is expressed by means of relative constructions whose structurally active shape has to be interpreted in terms of their passive significance. It seems that the relative clauses we are dealing with might be paraphrased into something like *þe wæs X haten*, or *haten X*, the constructions which have been recorded in the text. Note that for the editor all three ways of identifying some object by a proper name are semantically identical, hence the ModE translations he suggests are the same:

- (3) *þe mon hateþ Gallia Bellica* — called Gallia Belgica
- (6) *ðæt wæs iu geara Albion haten* — formerly called Albion
- (10) *Claudius haten* — called Claudius

For these formally active sentences there are corresponding passive transforms which by their nature tend to express the result of the action rather than the action itself. All the more so when *by+someone* (the former agent) is deleted. Further evidence of a stative character rather than strictly passive of such OE sentences is supplied by the possibility of adjectival inflection of the participle (cf. Traugott 1972: 83). This is as expressed in the case of *hatan*₁: the agent is regularly absent, *haten* may be inflected. Although in the meaning of *wesan+haten* sentences there is very little, if at all, of any action the verb

might have had originally, the structural characteristics permit these sentences to be traced back to their corresponding active forms. Still fewer traces are found in the *X haten* phrases, which in their semantic functions are close to *X hatte*. This unique passive inflection, as it is generally accepted, has nothing in common with the passive construction and perhaps in its interpretation would be similar to a ModE usage such as *The book sold quickly* vs. the passive proper *The book was sold quickly* (cf. Visser 1973: 2090).

To sum up, we can discern in the development of the semantic concept of *hatan*₁ the following stages:

- performative, active, causative — not recorded
- active in form, notionally passive or stative
- passive in form (either segmental or inflectional), semantically stative.

Let us now see what is the syntactic behaviour and the semantic interpretation of *hatan*₂ which has so far been left, and whether it is compatible with *hatan*₁ as regards the same aspects. The verb *hatan*₂ is illustrated by the following sentences:

- (20) *Ða het he hraðe his þegnas hine secan 7 acsian 34/25* (Then he quickly ordered his attendants to go and demand him)
- (21) *þa het he hi bidan on þæm ealonde 58/9* (he ordered them to remain on the island)
- (22) *7 het Agustinum mid his geferum þider to his spræce cuman 58/19* (and directed Augustine and his companions to come there to confer with him)
- (23) *þa het se cyning hie sittan 58/27* (Then the king bade them sit down)

The syntax of the above is of a typical pattern: NP *hatan*₂ NP V (infinitive). The NP subject is obligatorily human (*he, se cyning*) and so is here the NP object (*his þegnas, hi, Agustinum, hie*) required by *hatan*₂. The next element which must be used with this verb is the infinitive; the presence of all other structures is optional (*on þæm ealonde, mid his geferum, etc.*), or dependent upon the syntactic characteristics of the infinitival complement (e.g. *secan* being a transitive verb requires an object, i.e. *hine*). The accusative and infinitive construction may be derived from a deep sentence by virtue of the operation of a "complementizer-changing rule" if we accept R. Lakoff's interpretation assumed for similar structures in Latin (1968: 77 ff.). According to this process, the original nominative subject is converted to its accusative form and an infinitive ending is attached to the verb. (Note that R. Lakoff juxtaposes this Latin complementizer with an English one and finds in the derivational histories of both considerable similarities.) Thus, the intermediate stage of (20) would be:

- (20a) *Ða het he hraðe þæt his þegnas hine secen* (then he quickly ordered that his attendants should go to him)

(cf. the following sentence: *7 heton þæt he mid his geferum of heora rice gewile* (subjunctive) 112/25 (and ordered him to depart with his companions from their kingdom)). This is, of course, one of the possible interpretations but not the only one; I shall resume the issue in the subsequent discussion about the semantics of this construction.

Side by side with NP *hatan₂* NP V (infinitive) there occurs its 'truncated' version: NP *hatan₂* V (infinitive), as for example in the following sentences

(24) *Æðelberht se cyning weorðlice cyrcan heht getimbran* 90/20 (king Æthelberht ordered a church to be erected of becoming splendour)

(25) *he het in See Petres mynstre cirican getimbran* 116/16 (he ordered a church to be erected in the monastery of St. Peter)

or even *hatan₂* V (infinitive), e.g.:

(26) *7 het him ute setl gewyrcean* 58/19 (and ordered them to make him a seat in the open air)

(27) *7 heton secgan pysses landes wæstm bærnysse* 50/26 ((messengers, whom they bade to report the fertility of this land)

These NP's, whether in the object or subject functions, or both, are not always easily recoverable from the textual context: the objects of *hatan₂* in (24) through (26) remain unspecified, while in (27) it can be identified only on the basis of the information given in the preceding part of the sentence:

(27a) *þa sendan hi ham ærenddracan 7 heton secgan pysses landes wæstm bærnysse* (Then they sent home messengers, whom they bade to report the fertility of the land)

The NP subjects which have been deleted are as a rule easily extrapolated from the preceding sentences, for example, it is *se cyning* (the king) for (26) or *Seaxan* (the Saxons) in the case of (27).

Most of the uses of *hatan₂* display the characteristics so far described. Occasionally the verb is used in a nonfinite form as in:

(28) *þa wæs he haten from þæm englum, þe hine læddon, þæt he locode in þeosne middangeard* 212/18 (he was ordered by the angels, who led him, to look at this earth)

This is rather a rare example of the passive with *hatan₂*. Leaving aside the points which are not directly concerned with the problem at issue one can trace it back to the same pattern we have had, i.e. NP *hatan₂* NP V (infinitive): *þa englas, þe hine læddon, heton hine in þeosne middangeard locian* — the angels who led him ordered him to look at this earth.

That *hatan₂* is a performative verb is clearly demonstrated by the context, but here again as in the case of *hatan₁* a direct speech act is not reported. What we have is an indirect manifestation of some sort of command which

expresses "the speaker's desire for the hearer to bring about the state of affairs expressed in the proposition" (Fraser 1975:192), in other words, *hatan₂* is used in acts of requesting, following Fraser's taxonomy.⁵ The authority having the power to order, command, bid, etc. is unquestionable: *se biscop* (2) — the bishop, *ealdormann* (20) — the governor, *se cyning* (21) through (26) — the king, *Seaxan* (27) — the Saxons who won the victory, etc. The authoritative character of the subject of *hatan₂*, being obligatorily human, is clearly evident from the context whether immediate or nonimmediate. Once we agree that the speaker in question has the power to give orders owing to his social, legal or some other high rank which he holds, the addressee of the command is his inferior. Thus in (2) it is the bishop who gives orders to his companions, in (20) the governor orders his thanes to do something, in (21) the king commands Augustine and his companions to remain on the island, etc. In some cases the object of *hatan₂* is not specified, e.g. in (24) through (26), especially in the situations when it is irrelevant who will actually perform the task such as building a church or making a seat for the king. The performer of some activity is a person, or a group of people whose identification is of no importance at the moment of giving orders.⁶ Besides, it often happens that the object is presupposed and hence unexpressed. It seems that the sentences with *hatan₂* without its object are permissible in Old English only in cases when the circumstances are not ambiguous or obscure. Contrary to expectation such structures would be considered ungrammatical in Modern English. The verb *order* cannot stand alone without an NP complement, e.g. **The king ordered to build a church*,⁷ and instead its passive form would rather be used: *The king ordered a church to be built*. (See also ModE translations from the Old English given by the editor of the text.)

With the observations that the surface *hatan₂* does not behave regularly with regard to the presence or absence of its NP complement let us consider the verb from the point of view of its underlying meaning. Any performative verb of command, order, request must be followed in its direct application, i.e. in a speech act, by an NP referring to the hearer who is the recipient of the order, which order he is expected to carry out. One cannot give orders without

⁵ Among the verbs listed by Fraser there are: *ask, beg, request* as well as *command, order, prohibit*. That there are considerable semantic differences between requests and orders has been demonstrated on various occasions (see for instance the articles by Stampe, or Green in Cole and Morgan 1975).

⁶ One may come across sentences which show that it need not be a human (or animate, at least) object, e.g.:

and the LORD caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night... (The Bible, Exodus: 14.21)

⁷ Cf. Polish equivalent construction, which is both structurally and semantically correct:

Król rozkazał zbudować kościół.

specifying (no matter in what form) the addressee. That is, *hatan*₂ can perform its function only when there is someone to do something. Since this someone does not always appear on the surface it is either deleted through some transformational process or incorporated by *hatan*₂. It seems that for Old English it is rather the grammatical process of incorporation as seen by Gruber (1976) for whom "incorporation necessitates that the two elements are or may become neighboring"; it "should be reserved for items that are idiosyncratically absent for that other item"; it "reflects the meaning of the word as well as having syntactic effects, since the incorporated elements may themselves determine much of the meaning of the word..." (22). And this is what happens in the case of *hatan*₂, for instance, in (24) *heht* automatically implies that king Æthelberht ordered someone to build a church.

One might make an attempt at considering the relation of the idea of command, order, etc. expressed by *hatan*₂ with the imperatives proper. Truly, they have very much in common; some grammarians would like to be more radical in this respect postulating one hypothetical source for both. The decision, however, about the primary structure is not simple at all and I shall not endeavour to speculate on this point.

Just as for *hatan*₁, it seems reasonable to postulate a putative direct speech act for *hatan*₂, as well, but the sentences in which it appears are only indirect manifestations of this act. What I mean here is that in the text which has been scrutinized I have not encountered a sentence of the type: *I hereby order you X*. There are, however, occasional direct quotations which corroborate its performative function. Take for example the following passage:

- (29) Ond þa hit aræred wæs, þæt he his stefne up ahof 7 cleopode to him eallum þæm weorode 7 cwæð: Uton ealle began usser cneo 7 gemænelice biddan þone ælmihtigan God þone lifendan 7 þone soðan, þæt he us eac from þæm oferhygdigan feonde 7 þæm reðan mid his milt-sunge gescylde: forðon he wat þæt we rihtlice winnað for hælo usse þeode. þa dydon heo ealle swa he heht 154/28 (And when it was set up, he lifted up his voice and called to all that host and said: 'Come let us all bow our knees and together pray to the Almighty, living, and true God, to defend us from this proud and savage foe, with his mercy: for he knows that we justly fight for the safety of our people'. Then they all did as he bade.)

The performative *hatan*₂ is agentive used with a human subject and undoubtedly causative. It occurs regularly with the infinitive which expresses some activity which the speaker wants someone to do. To say that *he quickly ordered his attendants to go and demand him* (20) implies that *he caused (made) the attendants (to) go and demand him, he caused that his attendants went and demanded him*, which they did, as we can read in the following passage. One may

argue that this is not always true and that the *hatan*₂ sentence does not say anything about the obligation fulfilment. The textual context is of much help in this respect, but even this is not necessary if Fraser's suggestive proposals are correct: according to him, "given nothing to suggest the contrary, whenever someone has an obligation to perform some action one can infer that he will perform that action" (1975:194). Since the concept of causativity underlies *hatan*₂, the verb in question is characterized by some specific features: its subject is identified as agent and only as agent (cf. Gruber 1976:158), it is a transitive verb whose object is affected by someone's orders. The obligation or command imposed upon the addressee may be understood as the cause of some action. If we take a sentence such as (29) *þa dydon heo ealle swa he heht* — Then they all did as he bade, the cause-effect relation is clear: they did something (effect) because he ordered them to do so (cause).

It has been shown that both *hatan*₁ and *hatan*₂ are performative, transitive and causative verbs. There is, however, a strikingly evident difference between them which refers to their notional, not formal character. As mentioned earlier, *hatan*₁ has often passive meaning (though active in form), which does not seem to be the case with *hatan*₂. The active meaning of *hatan*₂ is strengthened by the infinitive which is uninflected and cannot be interpreted as a verbal noun (gerund). The latter is not unknown in Old English but has not been found with *hatan*₂. Note the difference between these two sentences:

- (30) he heht deofolgild toweorpan 7 fæstlice forlætan 172/7 ((he) ordered the idols to be overthrown and finally abandoned)
 (31) Swelce eac cyningas 7 rice men sendon heora dohtor þider to læranne 7 to gepeodenne þæm heofonlican brydguman 172/16 (Kings also and rich men sent their daughters there, to be educated and to be espoused to the heavenly bridegroom)

It is my intention now to explain the semantic relationship, if such exists, between *hatan*₁ and *hatan*₂. From the surface manifestations it follows that, in general, each is used in some structurally determined constructions which show distinctions in their ultimate syntactic forms. These are only apparent distinctions, since both appear identical in their prelexical base:

NP₁ V NP₂ NP₃

and it is the NP₃ which may undergo different transformations, and these transformations play a crucial role in differentiating surface *hatan*₁ from *hatan*₂. The process of transforming a prelexical structure into either a *hatan*₁ sentence or a *hatan*₂ sentence seems to be instigated by one of the lexical features of the verb *hatan*. It has been demonstrated that it is a performative verb and that it takes a human subject (NP₁); it is causative and hence it takes an object, human or nonhuman; and finally, it requires an object com-

plement assigning to it either stative or active implications. By saying (1) *se wæs haten Amfleaf* we imply that:

someone (NP₁) cause (V) something (NP₂) stative (NP₃)

while by saying (20) *Da het he hraðe his þegnas hine secan* we imply that:

someone (NP₁) cause (V) someone (NP₂) active (NP₃)

The argumentation presented, if semantically sound, shows that the causative verb *hatan* which demands an object complement imposes upon it either stative or active meaning. Certain restrictions have to be observed, i.e. if active meaning is meant the direct object must be animate, while in the case of stative this restriction is loosened and the direct object may be animate or nonanimate. Thus the verb *hatan* has the sense of ordering, commanding, etc. if active is chosen, but it has the sense of naming if stative is selected.

The causative character of *hatan* which has been mentioned on various occasions still needs some clarification. What is it that can cause someone to do something, someone to have something, someone (something) to be (to become) something, or something to happen? There are two viewpoints: (1) causative verbs take human subjects in the deep structure, the approach most often met in linguistic literature, and (2) causatives take clauses as semantic subjects, the claim made by Jonnie E. Geis (1973). She argues that "only acts or states of affairs, and not persons, cause things" (213). This may be, perhaps, a correct observation for the examples she discusses in which inchoative or causative-inchoative verbs are used; however, it is also postulated for true causative verbs like *cause* or *make*. If we accept this solution for our purposes, the subjects of *hatan* would have to be expanded into subject complements referring to some event that is the cause of "some change of state or the commencement of an activity". A direct speech act might be the very event Geis talks about, but however plausible such an analysis may be, one still must have human subjects in these subject complements. A similar difficulty one encounters when analysing such ModE sentences as: *They elected Brown (to be) chairman*, or *We appointed him treasurer*. For Geis *elect* and *appoint* would most probably be "complex verbs which are inserted for causative predicates" formed by some process and the underlying structures would be something like: *?Their votes elected Brown chairman*, *?Our decree (decision) appointed him treasurer*. It appears that this analysis shows the immediate cause of something, still in most cases the ultimate instigator of the cause is human. Thus her statement that "this subject-embedding analysis of causative verbs is meant to provide a structural representation of the fact that only an act or a state of affairs, and not a person or instrument per se can cause something to happen or someone to do something" (1973: 211-12) seems to be too categorical.⁸

⁸ For a detailed discussion of different aspects of causative verbs see Anderson (1971) and the literature referred to there.

A final remark I should like to make concerns ModE translations of OE *hatan*.⁹ It seems that partially, of course, the meanings of *hatan* are rendered by some uses of ModE *call*: (1) to give a name to; name, (2) to give the order for; to bring into action. It might be interesting to see whether a similar analysis of *call* would prove or disprove the interpretation of OE *hatan* suggested in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. M. 1971. *The grammar of case: towards a localistic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan. (eds). 1975. *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 3: *Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1970. "The grammar of *hitting* and *breaking*". In Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. (eds). 1970. 120-133.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1971. "Verbs of judging: an exercise in semantic description". In Fillmore, C. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1971. 272-289.
- Fillmore, C. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1971. *Studies in linguistic semantics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fraser, B. 1975. "Hedged performatives". In Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan. (eds). 1975. 187-210.
- Geis, J. E. 1973. "Subject complementation with causative verbs". In Kachru, B. B. et al. (eds). 1973. 210-230.
- Gruber, J. S. 1967. "Look and see". *Language* 43. 937-947.
- Gruber, J. S. 1976. *Lexical structures in syntax and semantics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. (eds). 1970. *Readings in English transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn and Company.
- Kachru, B. B. et al. (eds). 1973. *Issues in linguistics: papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. 1968. *Abstract syntax and Latin complementation*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Miller, T. (ed.). 1959, 1963. *The Old English version of Bede's Ecclesiastical history of the English people*. Part I, II. London: EETS OS 95, 96, 110, 111.
- Perlmutter, D. M. 1970. "The two verbs *begin*". In Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. (eds). 1970. 107-119.
- Postal, P. M. 1971. "On the surface verb *remind*". In Fillmore, C. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1971. 180-270.
- Quirk, R. and C. L. Wrenn. 1968. *An Old English grammar*. London: Methuen.
- Traugott, E. C. 1972. *A history of English syntax: a transformational approach to the history of English sentence structure*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Visser, F. T. 1963, 1966, 1969, 1973. *An historical syntax of the English language*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

⁹ Notice that in modern German *heissen* of the same root as OE *hatan* is also used in two meanings.