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ABSTRACT

It is well known that many strong verbs became weak verbs in the history of the English language. A reverse process, whereby weak verbs became strong verbs, is also known. In this article, I will examine the important role synonymous verb forms played in driving these changes. The analogical extension of a form from one type to another is most likely influenced by the form’s co-occurrence with other phonetically or semantically related forms (Bloomfield 1933: 409). Considering the central role that semantic similarity plays in driving analogical change, I present a series of detailed case studies on individual verbs and argue that synonymous verb forms were a primary factor in the transfer of verbs from the strong to the weak conjugation and vice-versa.

1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to investigate the influence of synonyms on the transition of English verbs as related to analogy: “a process whereby one form of a language becomes more like another with which it has some association” (Arlotto 1972: 130). Old English (OE) verbs are traditionally divided into two main types, weak and strong. Weak verbs employ dental consonants in the final position to mark the past tense and the past participle; strong verbs, on the other hand, express tense distinctions by means of vowel gradation without the presence of a dental marker. The most common type of change, i.e., the transformation of strong verbs into weak verbs, sees a significant increase from the 13th to 15th centuries, the peak of which was reached in
the 14th century, according to the data from the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* and Krygier’s work (1994: 247). As the past tense was easier to form with weak verbs than with strong verbs, it is likely that the strong-to-weak transfer is related to the simplicity of the verbal system. The opposite development – the transfer of weak verbs to strong verbs – is less frequent and has received but scant attention from most scholars, with the exception of Welna (1997). In this paper, I will consider the influence of synonyms on both directions of change.

Before entering into the main discussion, let me briefly review some of the previous literature on these issues. Ever since the idea that languages change as a result of borrowing, analogy, and sound change was formulated by Paul (1898) in his *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, most scholars (e.g., Brook 1958; Myers 1966; Bambas 1980; Welna 1991, 1997, etc.) have claimed that analogy is involved in the transformation of English verbs. Although these scholars tend to treat analogy as if it were the only relevant intrasystemic factor, there is little explanation as to how exactly this mechanism functioned. Other scholars (e.g., Wright – Wright 1928; Fries 1940; Mossé 1952; Bloomfield – Newmark 1963, etc.) focused on either the listing of new analogical forms or the chronology of the transformations without attempting to reveal their causes. For this reason, I decided to investigate in more detail the role analogy may have played in the change of some English verbs.

Some scholars (Kaluza 1900-01 [1906-07]; Michelau 1910; Long 1944; Brunner 1951; Newfield 1983; Welna 1991, 1997; Krygier 1994) analyzed other factors which may have been responsible for such verb shifts. Especially worth mentioning in this area is Krygier’s comprehensive study on the English strong verb system. Kaluza began research into some of the phonological processes in the Middle English (ME) period as factors in this change. Michelau, on the other hand, proposed several parameters: the influence of a coexisting etymologically-related weak verb on its strong counterpart, the shift to the weak conjugation for dental-final verbs (with reference to Bülbrinng’s (1889) study), the relation between ablaut and the shift, as well as Old Norse (ON) and Norman French (NF) influences. Most scholars cited above followed many of Michelau’s ideas. Exceptions include Long, Brunner, and Krygier, who presented other factors such as the effect of a related ON verb, the irregularity of ablaut patterns, and the disintegration of certain ablaut series. Since every linguistic change involves at least some degree of choice, the probability of multiple conditioning must constantly be borne in mind (Samuels 1972: 3). In this light, it is likely that, depending on the period, different combinations of factors may have contributed to
the transfer of verbs. As a whole, further research into causes of the transfer other than analogy will be necessary in the future.

The reason why I draw attention to synonyms in this study is that, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the role of synonyms has rarely been examined by historical linguists. For example, Brunner (1951: 183) suggests that the coexistence of etymologically related strong and weak verbs with different but similar meanings (e.g., pairs of intransitive strong verbs and transitive weak verbs) gave rise to a blurring of this distinction in meaning, which then led to their forms being mixed up as well. This was not included in the main body of Brunner’s discussion, but as a side-comment as to how other factors might be linked to the transfer of verbs. Krygier also mentions the impact of weak congeners on the shift, but their full effect could not be assessed because of many uncertainties accompanying the issue, such as the number of strong verbs, the number of their weak counterparts, and the degree of relationship necessary to trigger the shift (1994: 252). Therefore, this study will seek to shed some light upon on this issue.

2. The role of form and meaning in analogical change

Analogical change involves a relation of similarity (Anttila 1989: 88) which can be represented in an equation of the form \( A : B = C : X \), i.e., \( A \) is to \( B \) as \( C \) is to \( X \). Through this formula one can solve for ‘\( X \)’, but only in those cases which fit the pattern. It is important to note that the sets on both sides of the equation are not limited to two members. Traditionally, two subtypes of analogical change are distinguished: levelling and extension. Levelling is a process which causes paradigms to become more uniform by eliminating alternations in forms. Some strong verbs have been levelled to the weak verb pattern, such as, *help*, a strong verb, whose past tense (PT) form *healp* and past participle (PP) *holpen* were replaced by *helped*. Extension, the opposite of levelling, is a process which increases irregularity in a paradigm by replacing a regular pattern with an irregular pattern due to its similarity to an existing pattern, as is the case with *dive*, a weak verb, whose PT form *dived* was superseded by *dove* on analogy with strong verb patterns like *drive / drove*, *ride / rode*, *write / wrote*, and so on.

Let me turn now to the role of meaning and form in analogy. Paul (1898: 96) remarked that individual words may attract each other due to a partial correspondence of meaning between them. Different words with a similarity in meaning can cluster into groups, and then a new form may be
created on the basis of these groups. Thus a word is subject to the influence of analogy with other semantically similar words. In addition to semantics, phonetic similarity may also play an important role in analogical change. Bloomfield suggested that “the extension of a form into a new combination with a new accompanying form is probably favoured by its earlier occurrence with phonetically or semantically related forms” (Bloomfield 1933: 409). For example, in *kine* and *cows*, the former is an obsolete plural form of *cow* and the latter is an analogically-created form. *Cows* can be represented by the following proportions: *sow : sows = cow : X; sow : sows, heifer : heifers, ewe : ewes = cow : X*, where in both examples *X* is solved with *cows*. The former equation illustrates analogy based on phonetic similarity, the latter on semantic similarity.

As for phonetic relations, in a previous paper (Yoneda 2010), I showed that rhyme in poetry can be associated with analogy through a closer look at syllable structure in English. As similarity of sound played an important part in analogy which contributed to the transfer of verbs, it is natural to think that a word with a similar meaning could have an impact as well. Hence it is necessary to test this hypothesis through a series of detailed case studies on individual verbs.

### 3. The effect of synonymous words on the conjugation type of verbs

The Bible in English is as old as the recorded history of the English language. Many biblical passages came to be associated with a gloss in connection with primarily the Latin Bible, the Vulgate (Vg). Biblical texts are useful sources for understanding language change because they allow us to trace a language's continual change in written records.

Here I will briefly touch on the practice of glossing and translation. Glosses are explanations, usually brief, of difficult words or expressions in a text, typically written in the margin or between the lines of the text; glossaries are collections of glosses, drawn together for easier reference (Szarmach et al. 1998: 316). The purpose of producing English glosses of the Latin Bible was to teach the Christian faith especially to young oblates or novices whose understanding of Latin was inadequate. As Greenfield – Calder (1986: 6) state, “[...], the beginner would first have committed the Latin psalter to memory. His teacher would have aided memorization by means of literal explanations: hence, presumably, the complete OE interlinear glosses of Latin texts in many Anglo-Saxon psalters”.

© 2013 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.
In producing the English texts, the scribes were faced with a task familiar from the production of Bible translations. Ælfric, who is believed to have been a monk in Dorset and Oxfordshire and who did many translations of Greek and Latin texts, states his policy for translation in *Grammar* as follows (Zupitza 1880: 1 [trans. Wilcox 1994: 130]): “I know it is possible to translate words in many ways but I follow a simple translation for the sake of avoiding putting off the reader”. Clemoes (1966: 187) also notes: “Always he [Ælfric] omitted, transposed or added to his original to suit the audience for which his work was intended. […] In general, as he states in his prefaces, he condensed. Whenever he could he simplified and explained difficult material […]”. It seems likely that the translators’ lexical selection underwent changes in the wake of the semantic changes of the times. Thus, it is worth examining how OE equivalents of Latin words differ among various manuscripts or versions in order to discuss the transfer of verbs.

3.1 The verbs *slæpan* and *hnappian* in OE

To address the question of why the strong verb *slæpan* became weak in OE, the following case study will focus on OE, ME, and EME translations of the Latin verbs *dormīre* ‘to sleep, to rest, to be at ease, inactive’, *ob-dormīre* ‘to fall asleep’ and *dormitāre* ‘to be sleepy, drowsy, to begin to sleep, to fall asleep’, referring to the OE Gospels (Li, Ru1, Ru2, WSCp), Psalter manuscripts with OE Glosses (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, P, PPs), and English versions of the entire Bible (WycE, WycL, Ty, Cov, GB, Mat, BB, Gen, AV). The *Douay-Rheims* Bible (D-R) is used as an EME reference for comparison.

*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: BT* (Bosworth & Toller 1989) shows that these Latin words are typically rendered as -*slæpan*, *swefan*, *hnappian*. -*slæpan* ‘to sleep’ belongs to the OE strong verb class VII, and has a number of

---

1 Li: Lindisfarne Gospels, 10th c., Northumbrian; Ru1: Rushworth Gospels (all of Mt, Mk 1-2.15, In 18.1-3), c. 7th c., Mercian; Ru2: Rushworth Gospels (remainder), 8th c. Northumbrian; WSCp: The Corpus Gospels, West-Saxon.


3 WycE: Wycliffe Bible, earlier version, 1382; WycL: Wycliffe Bible, later version, 1395; Ty: Tyndale Bible, 1534; Cov: Coverdale Bible, 1535; GB: The Great Bible, 1540; Mat: Matthew’s Bible, 1549; BB: The Bishops’ Bible, 1568; Gen: The Geneva Bible, 1587; D-R: Douay-Rheims Bible, 1609-10; AV: Authorized Version, 1611.
slightly different forms and meanings: *a-slæpan* from *slæpan* ‘to be sleepy, to begin to sleep, to fall asleep’; *on-slæpan* ‘to sleep, to fall asleep’; *be-slæpan* ‘to sleep’; *be-slæpan* ‘to slip, lay, place, put’; *slæpian* ‘to cause to sleep’. *Swefan* ‘to sleep, to slumber, to rest’ belongs to the OE strong verb class V and is related to the weak verb *ge-swefian* ‘to cause to sleep, to cast to asleep, to lull, to appease’. *Hnappian* ‘to slumber, to sleep, to doze’ belongs to the weak verb class II, and its present meanings ‘to sleep lightly or for a short time, to get drowsy’ only appear later. It appears that *hnappian* had a meaning similar to *slæpan* in the OE period. The *OED* describes *hnappian* as “formerly in more dignified use than at present, being frequently employed in renderings of Biblical passages” (*OED*, cf. NAP). Biblical texts are useful sources for the study of how such words are used. The English noun ‘sleep’ is commonly used for ‘natural sleep’, and also the figurative sense of ‘eternal sleep’, that is, ‘death’. It should be possible to see whether the OE equivalents of these Latin words are distinguished in their literal and figurative usages.

In the Gospels, there are 24 instances of the Latin words *dormière* (22 times: *Mt* 8.24; 9.24; 13.25; 25.5; 26.40; 26.43; 26.45; 27.52; 28.13; *Mk* 4.27; 4.38; 5.39; 13.36; 14.37; 14.40; 14.41; *Lk* 8.52; 22.45; 22.46; *Jn* 11.12; 11.12), *ob-dormière* (once: *Lk* 8.23) and *dormitāre* (once: *Mt* 25.5), and all instances of *dormière* and *ob-dormière* are rendered as *slæpan*, whereas only *dormitāre* is glossed either as *slæpan* or *hnappian*. As a gloss for *dormière* used in the figurative sense, *slæpan* is found five times: *Mt* 9.24; 27.52; *Mk* 5.39; *Lk* 8.52, and *Jn* 11.11. There is no distinction in the choice of OE equivalents of Latin words as far as literal or figurative usage is concerned.

As shown in (1), the gloss or translation for the Latin *dormitāre* is inconsistent among the numerous versions: *slæpan* in *Li* and *Ru1*, but *hnappian* in *WSCp*, *WycE*, and *WycL*, and *slumber* in the rest of the versions from *Ty* to *AV*. This new expression appears in *Ty*, and as this is mostly followed by the rest of the versions, it seems natural to conclude that *Ty* had a great impact on following translations. Therefore, in this paper I only cite the example from *Ty*. The Latin *dormière* is glossed as *slæpan* in all versions with the exception of *Ru1*. Let me point out some other things: most of the versions seem to avoid the combined use of same glosses, weak forms of *slæpan* appear in Anglian (i.e. Mercian and Northumbrian) texts while strong forms remain in *WSCp*, weak forms of *slæpan* are observed in *WycE* and *WycL* the new expression *slumber* appears from *Ty* onwards. Some of these features can be observed in (2).

(1)  

*Mt* 25.5  …*dormitaverunt* omnes et *dormierunt*.  
[D-R: They all slumbered and slept.]
Li: geslepedon alle & geslepdon.
Ru1: slepade ealle & slep ofereode.
WSCp: hnappudon hig ealle & slepun.
WycE: alle nappiden and slepten.
WycL: alle thei nappiden and slepten.
Ty: all slombred and slepte.

(2) Lk 8.23 Navigantibus autem illis obdormiit…
[D-R: When they were sailing, he slept]
Li: hrowundum vel miððy gehrowun donne δας slepde.
WSCp: ṭa hig reowun, ṭa slep he.
WycE: Sothli, hem rowynge, he slepte.
WycL: And while thei rowiden, he slepte.
Ty: And as they sayled he fell a slepe.

Thirteen surviving OE glossed Psalters were examined, as shown in Tab. 1. The Latin verbs (dormīre, ob-dormīre, dormitāre) corresponding to hnappian are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>dormīre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>dormīre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>dormīre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67.14</td>
<td>dormīre</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>dormīre</td>
<td>○ ●</td>
<td>○ ○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>ob-dormīre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>ob-dormīre</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.23</td>
<td>ob-dormīre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td>ob-dormīre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>ob-dormīre</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>dormitāre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>118.28</td>
<td>dormitāre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>dormitāre</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

●: hnappian; ○: slæpan; ▲: ge-swefian; parts that do not correspond are left blank; instances where both hnappian and slæpan appear are shaded in grey.
marked with ●, to släpan with ○, and to ge-swefian with ▲. Parts that do not correspond are left blank, and instances where both hnappian and släpan appear are shaded in grey. The OE equivalents of Latin words differ greatly in the various Psalters. Either hnappian or släpan is given as a gloss for the Latin dormīre, ob-dormīre, and dormitāre. Only dormīre in Psalms 67.14 and ob-dormīre in 12.4 and 120.4 are consistently translated with släpan, with the exception of the PPs. Ge-swefian appears only once as an equivalent of the Latin ob-dormīre.

These Psalters can be divided into two groups according to the Latin texts they are based on: one is the Roman Psalter (A to D and L), and the other is the Gallican Psalter (E to K and P). With some exceptions, when compared to the Roman type, the Gallican type seems to use hnappian for dormitāre and släpan for dormīre and ob-dormīre. However, although A and D are of the same type, the opposite distribution is observed in D. Both hnappian and släpan coexisted in the OE period, but from the latter half of OE to ME and later, släpan outnumbers hnappian more markedly. This appears to confirm the idea that släpan gradually became more common as compared to hnappian.

The thirteen instances shown in Tab. 1 can be spilt into three groups based on their meanings: 1) the figurative use of ‘sleep’, 2) ‘to lie’, 3) ‘to slumber, to sleep’. The figurative use is found in 3.6, 4.9, 12.4, 40.9, 43.23, and 120.4 with the Latin verbs dormīre, ob-dormīre, and dormitāre. Both släpan and hnappian appear as glosses of these Latin words. As is the case with the Gospels, there is no distinction between the literal and figurative usages. A difference in glosses can be found in 3.6, 4.9, 40.9, and 43.23 in the various Psalters. This contrasts with what was found in other places; for example, in 12.4 and 120.4, the Latin ob-dormīre is rendered as släpan in all versions, with the exception of PPs ge-swefian in 120.4. Referring to 3.6, 4.9, 40.9, and 43.23 in Tab. 1, one can see that hnappian is preferably used in A and B, släpan in D, E, G, H, J, K, and P, and both of the verbs in C, F, and I. These instances show that hnappian and släpan may have been interchangeable. For instance, in 3.6 the Latin verb dormivi, which is the first person singular perfect active indicative form of dormīre ‘to sleep’, corresponds to hnappian in A, B, and F, whereas släpan is found in the others; and in 4.9 dormiām, the first person singular future indicative form of dormīre ‘to sleep’, is equivalent to hnappian in A, B, C, and F. Conversely, släpan is found in the rest. Another thing to point out is that the verbal type of släpan differs among OE glosses as in 3.6 and 4.9, where its weak form can be observed in G and J and the original form in the rest.
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(3) Psalms 3.6  Ego dormivi et somnum coepi...

[D-R: I have slept and taken my rest.]
A: Ic hneappade & slepan ongon.
B: Ic hnappade & slapan ongon.
C: Ic slep & hnappunge ic onfeng.
D: Slep ic aras forðon anfeng.
E: Ic slep & swefne ic onfeng.
F: Ic hnæppode & ic swodrode.
G: Ic slepte & slæp ic ongan.
H: ic slep onfeng me.
I: Ic slep & ic eom geswefod.
J: Ic slaæpte & slæpingan ic eom.
K: Ic slep & swefnode.
P: þa ongan ic slapan and slep.

(4) Psalms 4.9 In pace in idipsum dormiam...

[D-R: In peace in the selfsame I will sleep.]
A: In sibbe in ða ilcan ic neapiu.
B: In sibbe in þa ilcan ic hnappige.
C: On sybbe in þa ilcan ic hnappige.
D: On sybbe on þæt selfe ic slape.
E: On sibbe on þæt selfe ic slaæpe.
F: On sibbe on þæt sylfe ic hnæppie.
G: In sibbe on þære ilcan ic slepte.
H: on sibbe on þæt sylfe ic slaæpe.
I: On sibbe on him sylfum ic slaæpe.
J: On sibbe on þære ilcan ic slaæpte.
K: On sibbe on þæt sylfe ic slaæpe.
P: on þære sibbe slapan.

The Latin dormīre glossed ‘to lie’ can be found in 56.5 and 67.14. In 56.5, dormīre is glossed as hnappian in A and C, whereas it is slæpan in the others. On the other hand, slæpan only appears in 67.14 as an equivalent of the Latin dormīre in the various Psalters. Hence, it seems clear that both hnappian and slæpan overlapped in meaning in OE.

In 75.6, 75.7, 118.28, and 120.3, four examples of Latin words for ‘to slumber, to sleep’ are found. The OE equivalents of the Latin words vary among the various Psalters, especially in 118.28 and 120.3. In 118.28 the Latin dormītāre is glossed as hnappian in A, B, C, I, and L while slæpan is used in the others. Here, no weak verbs are observable. In 120.3 the gloss for the Latin
obdormire is hnappian in A, B, and C whereas it is slæpan in the others with the exception of I and L, where both hnappian and slæpan appear.

In general, the verb hnappian in OE and early ME denoted ‘to sleep, to slumber, to fall asleep, to lie’ as well as the figurative use of ‘sleep’; however, the meaning of hnappian was gradually circumscribed, and it came to be used in the more specific sense of, for example, ‘to sleep lightly or for a short time, to get drowsy’. Therefore, I conclude that the weak verb hnappian was a synonym of slæpan in the OE period.

(5) Psalms 118.28  Dormitavit anima mea prae taedio...
[D-R: My soul hath slumbered through heaviness.]
A: Hneapade sawul min fore longunge.
B: Hnappode sawl min for langunge.
C: Hnappode sawl min fore longunge.
D: Slep sawl min for æþrote.
E: Slep sæwle mine for unluste.
F: Slæpð sawle min for gælnysse.
G: Slep sawl min.
I: Hneppade sawle min for ðrece vel for æmelnysse.
J: Slæpþ sawle min for gælnesse.
K: Slep sawl min for æþrote.
L: Hnappode sawl min for langunge & utrotnesse.
PPs: Min sawl aslep, þa me sorh begeat for langunga.

(6) Psalms 120.3  …neque obdormiet qui custodit te.
[D-R: Neither let him slumber that keepeth thee.]
A: ne hneappað se ðe haldeð ðec.
B: ne hnappað se ðe healdeð ðe.
C: ne ne hnappað se ðe healdeð þe.
D: & na slape þe heald þe.
E: nemne sleþ þæ gehielt ðe.
F: & ne ne hnæppie se ðe healde þe.
G: & slapað se þe heald þe.
I: ne ne slæpeð vel ne ne hnappap se þe gehealt þe.
J: & na slape se þe healdeþ þe.
K: & na sleþ þe healdeþ þe.
L: ne ne hnappad & slæpeð se þe healdþ þe.
PPs: ne hycge to slæþ þe ðe healdþ þe.

The combined use of different lexical items which have the same or a similar meaning is sometimes effective in helping to convey a strong impression of
a scene. One finds an alternation between *hnappian* and *slēpan* in the texts, it is likely that there is a close semantic relation between these words. I found six examples of the combined use of *hnappian* and *slēpan* in glossing the Latin words *dormīre*, *ob-dormīre*, or *dormitāre*, which are shaded in grey in Tab. 1 and shown in (6)-(9). Here I noticed that the combined use of words with a similar meaning can be seen not just in a single manuscript, but in several. Furthermore, a noteworthy example is shown below in (8), which indicates how *slēpan* may have become a weak verb in analogy to *hnappian*. *Hnappian* occurs with a weak form of *slēpan* in A, whereas it appears with a strong form of *slēpan* in C.

(7) Psalms 43.23  Exurge quare *obdormis* Domine exurge.
[D-R: Arise, why sleepest thou, O Lord? arise.]
I: Uparis forhwi *hnappas* þu vel hwi *slæpst* þu aris.

(8) Psalms 75.6  …*dormierunt* somnum suum…
[D-R: They have slept their sleep.]
A: *hneapedun* [vel *slypton*]¹ slep heara.
C: *slepun* vel *hnappudon* slee þyra.

(9) Psalms 75.7  …*dormitaverunt* qui ascenderunt equos.
[D-R: They have all slumbered that mounted on horseback.]
E: *slepon* *hnappodon* þa æstigen hors.

All available evidence thus suggests that both *hnappian* and *slēpan* were essentially synonymous in OE. I also noted that both *hnappian* and *slēpan* are used as glosses for the Latin words *dormīre*, *ob-dormīre*, and *dormitāre* in the same verse. This allows us to conclude that the strong verb *slēpan* began to employ the weak conjugation in OE due to the analogical influence of the synonymous *hnappian*.

### 3.2 OE words for ‘to spit’

The typical terms for ‘to spit’ in OE are as follows. *Spātan* and *spīwan* (= *spew*) were strong verbs which had related meanings such as ‘to spew up’, ‘to vomit’, and ‘to spit up’. Weak verbs include *spētan*, *spēowan* / *spīowan*, *-spittan* (= *spit*), *spittian*, *spatilian* and *spigettan*. Derived words (weak verbs)

---

¹ []: a mark for insertion.
are -spi(o)wian from the PT spiowede of spēowan /spīowan ‘to spew, to spit up’ (see BT). As for the Latin words which correspond to these words, they are as follows: -spuere ‘to spit (out/upon), to spew’, sputāre ‘to spit, to spit out’, screāre ‘to hawk, to clear the throat noisily’, -vomere ‘to vomit, to vomit up, to vomit forth, to throw up, to spew out’ (see ALD). Glosses corresponding to the Latin -spuere are mostly spā/æ¯tan or -spittan, but spā/æ¯tan seems to be predominant, and the Latin -vomere is chiefly glossed with spīwan according to the examination according to a survey of OE texts: Saint Gregory’s Pastoral Care (CP) (MSS, C and H)⁵, Ælfric’s Grammar (ÆGram) and Ælfric’s translation of the Heptateuch (ÆHept), WScp, etc.

First, I will consider why spīwan (= spew), which belongs to the strong verb class I, changed to the weak class. In the Book of Leviticus (Lev.) 18.28; 20.22 and the Book of the Apocalypse of St. John 3.16 of WycE and WycL, -vomere corresponds to the weak verb cast, a verb which was borrowed from ON kasta. However, spew with weak forms is found from Ty to AV, except for D-R which uses vomit instead.

(10) Lev 18.28  Cavete ergo ne et vos similiter evomat cum paria feceritis sicut evomuit gentem quae fuit ante vos.
[D-R: Beware then, lest in like manner, it vomit you also out, if you do the like things, as it vomited out the nation that was before you.]
WycE: Shoneth therfor, lest and also3ow it caste out, whanne the same things 3e doon, as it keste out folk that was before 30w.
WycL: Therfor be ye war, lest it caste out viliche also you in lijk manere, whanne ye han do lijk synnes, as it castide out vileche the folk, that was bifor you.
Ty: lest that the lande spewe you out when ye haue defiled it, as it spewed out the nacions that where there before you.

(11) Lev 20.22  ...ne et vos evomat terra equam intaraturi estis et habitaturi.
[D-R: Lest the land into which you are to enter to dwell therein, vomit you also out.]
WycL: lest the lond, in to which ye schulen entre and dwelle, caste out viliche also you.
Ty: that the londe whether I brynge you to dwell therein, spewe you not oute.

⁵ MS.C: Cotton Tiberius B. xi., in the British Museum (C. i.); MS. H: Hatton 20 (formerly 88) in the Bodleian (H.).
(12) *Apocalypse of St. John* 3.16  
...incipiam te *evomere* ex ore meo.

[D-R: I will begin to *vomit* thee out of my mouth.]

*WycE*: I shal bigynne for to *caste* thee out of my mouth.

*WycL*: I schal bigynne to *caste* thee out of my mouth.

*Ty*: I will *spew* ye oute of my mouth.

According to the *OED*, weak forms for *spew* are first attested in the 14th century. In addition, the weak verb *vomit*, which was borrowed from Latin, appears after the 14th century. Although the strong verb *spīwan* was used in OE as a gloss for Latin -*vomere*, the existence in later glosses of two synonymous weak verbs, i.e., *cast* and *vomit*, suggests that these verbs may have had an analogical influence on *spīwan*, causing it to become a weak verb.

Now let me turn to the problem of why -spittan (= spit), a weak verb, changed to a strong verb. Previous studies like Jespersen (1942: 48), Brunner (1962: 233), and Esser (1988: 31) claimed that the new strong forms of -spittan came about from the past form of -spæ ¯tan, a weak verb, while others like Bülbring (1889: 113-114), Wright (1924: 177), and Price (1970: 136) argued that the two originally distinct verbs -spittan and spæ ¯tan were mixed up due partly to the operation of analogy that occurred after these forms became phonetically similar to *sit*. What seems to be lacking are any convincing examples which show the relation between these two verbs. Let me carefully examine the effects of synonyms in the OE period, and then demonstrate that the effects are diachronic.

As mentioned above, spā/æ ¯tan and -spittan were used interchangeably as an equivalent of the Latin -spuere, but spā/æ ¯tan was quite dominant in OE. As a result of their semantic relatedness, their forms were gradually combined in the OE period. For my analysis, I will take a look at the diachronic change of the OE equivalents of the Latin -spuere in the Gospels. The third person plural future active indicative form of -spuere in *Mk* 10.34 and the present infinitive active form of -spuere in *Mk* 14.65 correspond to -spittan in *Li*, *Ru2*, and from *Ty* onward, whereas -spæ ¯tan is used in *WSCp* and *WycL*, and either -spæ ¯tan or -spittan in *WycE*. What is to be noted here is that -spittan occurs in infinitive and present forms in Northumbrian, but -spæ ¯tan occurs only in West-Saxon (WS).

(13) *Mk* 10.34  
et inludent ei et conspuent eum et flagellabunt eum...

[D-R: And they shall mock him, and *spit* on him, and scourge him, and kill him.]

*Li*: & bismerageð him & hia *spittes* hine & hia suingeð hine hia acuoellað hine.
Ru2: & bismergas hine & spittas & hiae swingas hine & hiae cwellað hine.
WSCp: & hi hine bysmirað & hi him on spætan & hine swingað & ofsleað hine.
WycE: And thei schulen scorne him, and byspeete him.
WycL: and bispete hym, and bete him; and thei schulen sle hym.
Ty: and they shall mocke hym and scourge him and spit vpo hym and kyll him.

(14) Mk 14.65 Et coeperunt quidam conspuere eum…
[D-R: And some began to spit on him.]
Li: & ongunnun summe efne gespitta vel gehorogae hine.
Ru2: & ongunnun sume efne gispita vel hyra on hine.
WSCp: And sume agunnon him on spætan.
WycE: And summe bigunnen for to bispitte him.
WycL: And summe bigunnen to bispete hym.
Ty: And some begane to spit at him.

With regard to the OE equivalents of the Latin -spuere in the past tense or as a past participle, -spātan is observed in most cases with a few occurrences of -spittan to be found in OE. For example, in Jn 9.6, the Latin ex-puit, the third singular perfect indicative active form of -spuere, is rendered as aspeaft\(^6\) in Li, aspeoft in Ru2, and spætte in WSCp; in Lk 18.32, the Latin con-spuetur, the third singular future indicative of the passive form of -spuere, is translated as gespeoftad\(^7\) in Li, gispitted in Ru2, and onspæt in WSCp. In short, the new weak form and the original strong form of -spātan occur in Li and the forms of a weak verb spittan and a strong verb -spātan appear in Ru2. In contrast, the weak verb -spātan remains in WSCp. These observations imply that in Northumbrian -spittan was more likely to be used for infinitive and present forms for the term ‘to spit’, while -spātan was used for its past and past participle forms, but the situation differed in WS where the weak verb -spātan was commonly used.

Tab. 2 shows the distribution of OE equivalents for the Latin -spuere in the numerous versions of the Gospels. A further important point is that the PT/PP forms for -spittan are variable, such as spit with the dental suffix, spit


\(^7\) According to Krygier, gespeoftad is the PP form of *speoftian which is derived from the PT speoft of -spātan, but BT has taken an uncertain stance on it. Campbell (1959 [2003]: 320) claims that it is formed from PT speoft.
Table 2. Distribution of OE equivalents for the Latin *spuere* in the numerous versions of the Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>Ru1</th>
<th>Ru2</th>
<th>WScP</th>
<th>WycE</th>
<th>WycL</th>
<th>Ty</th>
<th>Cov</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>Mat</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>D-R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 26.67</td>
<td>expuerunt</td>
<td>speafton</td>
<td>spittadun</td>
<td>spætton</td>
<td>spitten</td>
<td>speten</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spytted</td>
<td>did spytt</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>did spyt</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>did spit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 27.30</td>
<td>expuentes</td>
<td>spatende vel</td>
<td>spittende</td>
<td>spætton</td>
<td>spittynge</td>
<td>speten</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>spytted</td>
<td>had spytt</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>had spyt</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>spitting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 7.33</td>
<td>expuens</td>
<td>gebleuua</td>
<td>gibleow</td>
<td>spætende</td>
<td>spetinge</td>
<td>spetide</td>
<td>dyd spyt</td>
<td>dyd spyt</td>
<td>dyd spyt</td>
<td>did spitte</td>
<td>dyd spyt</td>
<td>did spit</td>
<td>spitting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 8.23</td>
<td>expuens</td>
<td>speaft</td>
<td>speoft</td>
<td>spætte</td>
<td>spetynge</td>
<td>spete</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>had spyt</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>had spyt</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spitting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10.34</td>
<td>conspuent</td>
<td>spittes</td>
<td>spittas</td>
<td>spætað</td>
<td>byspeete</td>
<td>bispete</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spyt</td>
<td>spyt</td>
<td>spyte</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14.65</td>
<td>conspuere</td>
<td>gespitta</td>
<td>gispita</td>
<td>spætan</td>
<td>bispitte</td>
<td>bispete</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spyt</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spyt</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 15.19</td>
<td>conspuerun</td>
<td>speofteron</td>
<td>speofterun</td>
<td>spættun</td>
<td>bispatten</td>
<td>bispatten</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spytted</td>
<td>dyd spitt</td>
<td>spatte</td>
<td>did spit</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>did spit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 18.32</td>
<td>conspuetur</td>
<td>gespeofterad</td>
<td>gispitted</td>
<td>onspæt</td>
<td>bispet</td>
<td>bispat</td>
<td>spetter</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>spytted</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>spitted</td>
<td>spitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 9.6</td>
<td>expuit</td>
<td>aspeaft</td>
<td>aspeofter</td>
<td>spætte</td>
<td>spette</td>
<td>spette</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td>spat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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with *do*-periphrasis, and *spat* with or without the dental suffix. These forms can be seen in various versions. However, *spat* with *do*-periphrasis never occurs, as shown in (15). This implies that the weak form *spat* functions well by itself as a past tense form for *-spittan*.

(15)  

\[ Mt\, 26.67 \]  
\textbf{Tunc expuerunt in faciem eius.} 
\[ [D-R: \text{Then} \, \text{did} \, \text{they} \, \text{spit} \, \text{in} \, \text{his} \, \text{face}.] \]  
\textbf{Li: ða speafton on his onsonc his.}  
\textbf{Ru1: þa spittadun on his ondwliotu.}  
\textbf{WSCp: þa spætton hig on hys ansyne.}  
\textbf{WycE: Thanne thei spitten in to his face.}  
\textbf{WycL: Thanne thei speten in his face.}  
\textbf{Cov: Then spytted they in his face.}  
\textbf{GB: Then dyd they spytt in his face.}  
\textbf{Mat: Then spat they in hys face.}  
\textbf{BB: Then dyd they spyt in his face.}  
\textbf{Gen: Then spet they in his face.}  
\textbf{Ty: Then spat they in his face.}  
\textbf{AV: Then did they spit in his face.}  

According to Elleågrd’s (1953: 161-2) research on the use of *do*-periphrasis in various types of sentences, the second half of the 16 century was the peak of the usage of *do*-periphrasis in affirmative statements. Thus it is probably no coincidence that the use of *do*-periphrasis as a past marker for *-spittan* appeared around that time. One of the likely causes for inserting *do*-periphrasis is to differentiate the form of the preterit from that of the present of such verbs as *cast*, *put*, *set*, *spit*, *beat* and *eat* (Grainger 1907; Trinka 1930: 44; Rissanen 1999: 240). If there were a similarity between present and past, one would desire to avoid ambiguity. Then the historical competitor *-spætan* or *do*-periphrasis may be used for resolving the issue.

4. Concluding remarks

Through a series of detailed case studies on several individual verbs, I have argued that the transformation of verbs from strong to weak or vice-versa occurred as a result of analogy based on semantic relatedness. For instance, the strong verb *slæpan* became a weak verb by analogy to the synonymous weak verb *hnappian*. The strong verb *spīwan* became weak under the
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influence of the loanwords *cast* and *vomit*. The original weak verb *spittan* became strong under the influence of the strong verb *spātan* and its weak form *spætan*. I also noted that the simplification of final inflectional endings led to formal ambiguity between the present and past. In this case, the historical competitor -*spætan* or *do-*periphrasis were used for disambiguating the form. As a result, the original weak verb *spittan* obtained the PT form of -*spætan*. Furthermore, it was shown that the transfer of English verbs is often fostered by the verb type of co-occurring synonymous words. It is hoped that this study will contribute to elucidating the history of the English verb, despite the fact that it documents only a small number of cases. More comprehensive studies are necessary in the future.
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