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Abstract

This dissertation investigates evidence of multiple authorship in the Old English Hexateuch translation of Genesis and in the Old English Gospels by examining how the translations render the Latin present participle into Old English. These are two of the longest extant Old English texts, and there is growing scholarly recognition that both may be products of multiple authorship; however, the translators, except one in Genesis, are anonymous, and the number and locations of shifts in authorship are widely disputed. Past scholarship has employed qualitative, philological evidence, counted features possibly indicating shifts in authorship, and variously proposed breaks between and within texts, but qualitative studies have not fully exploited the present participle as a marker, and quantitative results have not been verified with statistical tests. This dissertation addresses these gaps by conducting a full inventory of Latin present participles in the Old English Genesis and the Old English Gospels, identifying how they are rendered into Old English, and then categorizing them by case and position. The dissertation then applies a statistical “proportion test” to search for the locations of statistically significant shifts in the rate of translating the Latin present participle with its OE counterpart, both overall and in several subcategories. Last, the study engages in qualitative syntactic and philological analysis to evaluate breaks indicated by the proportion test. The results independently corroborate
previously asserted textual breaks in Genesis and the Old English Gospels with new syntactic 
and statistical evidence, revise an existing theory of intra-textual shift in the OE Matthew, and 
detect evidence of other intra-textual shifts not previously asserted in scholarship. These results 
also suggest Old English biblical translators engaged in interpretation and authorship, not merely 
mechanical translation. The study’s approaches further explore how traditional and non-
traditional methods of authorship attribution can investigate a wide variety of authorship 
problems.
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Introduction: Biblical Translation, Authorship-Attribution, and the Present Participle

Modern perceptions of translation are sharply different from what at least some Anglo-Saxon translators thought and did when they engaged in translation. Scholars of translation theory and studies today lament a view of translation as a mechanical process, and present a picture of translation quite different from the notion of an individual who simply substitutes one lexicon for another and reproduces a copy in a different language. An extremely generous scholar recommended George Steiner’s book, which illuminated for me the potential for all actions of communication to include translation, and therefore interpretation; thus, “a human being performs an act of translation, in the full sense of the word, when receiving a speech-message from any other human being” (48). As I began to explore the translation of the Latin gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John) into the resulting Old English version of the Gospels, I began to wonder how the translators, who remain anonymous, perceived the act of translation.

---

1 Lawrence Venuti has written prolifically on the topic of translation and the sometimes contradictory imperatives that coalesce around the perception of what a translator does. In his book *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti argues that publishers want translations to be “transparent”, even invisible, but Venuti complains that a translation is only a product of the translator’s intervention, and that invisibility is an illusion: “What is so remarkable here is that this illusory effect conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translator’s crucial intervention in the foreign text. The more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and, presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text” (1-2).

2 Steiner’s book, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* is an excellent overview of the issues of authorship and interpretation that surround emerging theories of translation. Steiner argues, “Any model of communication is at the same time a model of translation, of a vertical or horizontal transfer of significance. No two historical epochs, no two social classes, no two localities use words and syntax to signify exactly the same things, to send identical signals of valuation and difference. Neither do two human beings. Each living person draws, deliberately or in immediate habit, on two sources of linguistic supply: the current vulgate corresponding to his level of literacy, and a private thesaurus” (47).

3 In this dissertation, I refer to this translation as the “Old English version of the Gospels” first, and as the “Old English Gospels” thereafter. Some scholarly works have referred to the translation as the “West-Saxon Gospels”, but Roy Liuzza explains in his 1994 edition, *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, that “one early and two late MSS are strongly southeastern in character, and none of the other MSS can be said to be purely representative of the West-Saxon dialect” (xiii). Liuzza’s choice of title has been adopted by scholars including Kazuhisa Horiguchi, Michiko Ogura, Richard Marsden, Javier Calle-Martín and Antonio Miranda-García.
since their rendering of the Latin was not merely a gloss, but appeared to arrange the resulting English translation with variety from the Latin.

The assertion that medieval biblical translators engaged with source texts in a dynamic, interpretive fashion, and not merely in a mechanical fashion, has not been without a few detractors. There remains some critical belief among a minority of scholars that biblical translation is particularly mechanical, overly literal, and unrepresentative of modern scholarly perceptions of translation. Douglas Robinson, for example, argues in his 1991 book that Western translation theory is derived “from Christian theology and the dogmatic demands placed on Bible translating”, and so Robinson considers much of Western translation theory different “from what translators actually do when they translate.” Robinson’s exhortation that translators should “shrug off the role of secularized priests, and the exclusive priestly rules and restrictions” (xvi) suggests that scholars perceive biblical translations as mechanical, uninterpretive, and unrepresentative of “real” translation. In an example firmly situated within the realm of medieval biblical translation, scholars studying Ælfric’s translations of the Latin Genesis, for example, have at times charged that he was excessively literal, even to the point of barely intelligible translations. In 1976, Harvey Minkoff argued that there are in Ælfric’s translation of Genesis, “places where his literalness results in meaningless phrases” (30). Minkoff argues that Ælfric borrowed Jerome’s approach to translating the Bible, which Minkoff describes as so literal that the “ordo verborum” (the order of the words) “had to be retained” (31), although Minkoff does acknowledge that the “ordo verborum” may not literally indicate the syntax of the text. Nonetheless, Minkoff’s conclusion is that Ælfric engaged in the kind of mechanical translation that Douglas Robinson would argue characterizes medieval translation as a whole.
The debate over Ælfric’s translation of Genesis

Minkoff’s conclusions became the foundation on which other scholars have based the critical view of Ælfric as a literal translator of the Bible, at least in histories of Old English literature. Stanley Greenfield and Daniel Calder in 1986 directly accepted Minkoff’s assessment and described Ælfric as “so conservative on this point [of the ordo verborum] that he was willing to translate an occasionally incomprehensible passage from Jerome’s Latin (itself based on an impenetrable Hebrew) into a ‘nonsense’ Old English” (85, Marsden 320). R. D. Fulk and Christopher Cain in 2003 also accepted Minkoff’s assessment and described the Hexateuch overall as a “direct, literal translation of Jerome’s Vulgate” (108). Fulk and Cain also cite Greenfield and Calder’s assessment (Fulk and Cain 249, note 9), in turn based on Minkoff’s, although Fulk and Cain do briefly acknowledge Richard Marsden’s 1991 counter-argument in a note (249, note 9).

As the foundation upon which the view of Ælfric as a mechanical translator is built, Minkoff’s argument is, however, inconclusive for several reasons. Minkoff situates his thesis within a line in inquiry begun by Charles Davis, who in his 1946 dissertation “Biblical translations in Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies and Lives of the Saints” argued that “over one-third of the total verses used have been exactly translated” (Minkoff 29, Davis 26). However, Minkoff relies on this context without any consideration of what “one-third” means, or why this number necessarily supports Minkoff’s contention that Ælfric’s Old English translation is at times “nonsense.” This kind of loose implication that an apparently large number self-evidently indicates a phenomenon, without any context or statistical test to articulate the significance of such a number, partly motivated my own exploration of statistics in this dissertation.
Minkoff’s own study focuses on two translation cruces in Jerome’s version: Genesis 2.3 and 17.4, which present challenging Latin. Genesis 2.3 explains God’s blessing of the seventh day: “et benedixit diei septimo et sanctificavit illum quia in ipso cessaverat ab omni opere suo quod creavit Deus ut faceret” (And he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, since on that day he had ceased from all his work, which God created so that he might make). Much of the Latin is transparent, but the relative clause “quod creavit Deus ut faceret” presents difficulties in interpretation. The Latin literally reads “that God created so that he might make,” but the Douay-Rheims Bible translates this as “which God created and made”: “And he blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” Ælfric renders the verse and captures the literal meaning of the Latin with an infinitive of purpose: “Ond God gebletsode ðone seofoðan dæg ond hine gehalgode, for ðan ðe he on ðone dæg geswac his weorces, ðe he gesceop to wyrcenne” (And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, since he on that day finished his works, which he shaped to make). Genesis 17.4 occurs in the middle of God’s promise of a covenant with Abraham to multiply his people: “dixitque ei Deus ego sum et pactum meum tecum erisque pater multarum gentium” (And God said to him, “I am, and my pact with you, and you will be the father of many peoples). Translators struggle with the apparent ellipsis of a verb in the clause “et pactum meum tecum”. The Douay-Rheims does little to add to the Latin except to add the verb “to be” between “my pact” and “with you”: “And God said to him: I AM, and my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.” Ælfric’s only significant deficiency from the much later Douay-Rheims translation is that Ælfric does not add the unattested verb “is”: “Ic eom 7 min wed mid ðe, 7 þu byst manegra þeoda fæder” (I am, and my pledge with you, and you will be many
people’s’ father). In both cases, the differences between Ælfric’s rendering and that of later translations are present but minor.

From these two examples, Minkoff concludes that “it is hard to avoid the conclusion that these two strange phrases are the result of the pervasive literalness of their contexts” (34). Indeed, Ælfric follows the Latin rather closely in both cases, but Minkoff appears to overlook his own admission that in each case “the sense of the passage cannot be deduced” (32). Minkoff recognizes that in Genesis 2.3, the Latin “creavit Deus ut faceret” is a phrase that “to this day baffles Bible translators” (32-3), since “no known meanings can make sense of creavit ut faceret” (31). Similarly, Minkoff acknowledges that the difficulty in Genesis 17.4, which reads, “Ego sum, et pactum meum tecum,” arises from Jerome’s erroneous interpretation of the Hebrew, yet Minkoff faults Ælfric for producing a close translation when it “is difficult to imagine what he thought the verse meant” (34). Minkoff promises that these two cases are “not aberrations; rather, they are the almost inevitable consequence of Ælfric’s practice,” a practice that Minkoff characterizes as “extreme literalness” (34). However, Minkoff does not provide further examples of this kind, and his criticism of Ælfric appears to fall on exceptional cases in which Ælfric could hardly have been expected to interpret phrases that remain unresolved.

Minkoff does compare Ælfric’s treatment of these two passages in Genesis to his versions in the Homilies. However, in the Homilies (I.14.31-2) Ælfric does not interpret “creavit ut faceret” from Genesis 2.3, but rather simply excises the phrase from the translation: “and gehal gode þone seofðan dæg, forðan þe he on þam dægæ his weorc geendode” (Minkoff 35), which explains, “and sanctified the seventh day, since he on that day ended his work.” Again, Minkoff argues that Ælfric is more interpretative in his treatment of Genesis 17.4 in the Homilies (I.90.21-4), yet Minkoff does not appear to see Ælfric’s “interpretation” for what it is: simple
excision of the difficult part. An examination of the whole of Ælfric’s sentence, which conflates Genesis 17.1, 17.2, and 17.4, shows that the translation of the Latin “ego sum et pactum meum tecum” (which Ælfric renders as “Ic eom 7 min wed mid ðe” in Genesis) is missing in the Homilies: “Ic eom Ælmihtig Drihten, gang beforan me, and beo fulfremed. And ic sette mid wed betwux me and þe, and ic þe þearle gemenigfylde, and þu bist manegra þeoda fæder” (Minkoff 36). This excision seems hardly like interpretation in the Homilies, but rather simplification. Ælfric’s goal in Genesis is to make the text accessible to an English reader, not to avoid difficult passages; as the first part of this dissertation will discuss, Ælfric generally only ellipts clearly redundant information, and even then only rarely. The rarity of these two passages and Ælfric’s decision simply to excise the puzzling Latin phrases in his Homilies cannot support such a broad characterization of Ælfric as generally extremely literal in his translation of Genesis, an assertion with which Richard Marsden in fact took issue in his 1991 article “Ælfric as Translator: The Old English Prose Genesis.”

Considering Minkoff’s characterization of Ælfric’s translations unwarranted (321), Marsden suggests several passages of Genesis in which Ælfric engages in interpretation and paraphrase rather than literal rendering. Marsden notes several differences between the Latin of Genesis 1.16 and Ælfric’s translation (334); in 2.19 and 3.24, Marsden suggests extensive syntactic changes beyond what is necessary for idiomatic word order (336); and in 3.24 Marsden finds variations including inversions, a pronoun substituted for “Adam”, and an omission (337). Marsden roundly counters Minkoff, arguing that “if Ælfric had wanted a version nearer the Latin, he could have made one that was still consistent with the needs of clear and idiomatic Old English” (337), and that these changes “seem to have been made for stylistic reasons” (338). In 3.20, Ælfric interpolates the name “Eua” as “þæt is lif”, as “vita” in this position was common in
patristic sources (339). Marsden find many other variations in Genesis 1-3, including explanatory phrases, expansion of pronouns to nouns, and “simplifications and omissions” (340).

Marsden also responds specifically to Minkoff’s analyses of Ælfric’s rendering of Genesis 2.3 and 17.4. Treating Genesis 17.4 first, Marsden acknowledges that there appears to be a missing copular verb in “ego sum et pactum meum [est] tecum”, that Ælfric understood this, and that the omitted copula in the OE is unusual (345). However, Marsden qualifies these critical problems with Visser’s claim that copula-omission was rather common in OE (346). Marsden argues that the “context of divine rhetoric is surely crucial,” and may allow the carrying-forward of the verb from first to third person for ellipsis (347), creating a “divine present tense” (348) with a “numinous significance”. In Marsden’s view, the meaning of the ellipted second “to be” verb should be clear, not muddled as Minkoff suggests (348). In Genesis 2.3, Marsden sees a completely different sort of translation from that proposed by Minkoff. A variety of translations from Augustine to Tyndale reveals the difficulty of Ælfric’s task here, yet Marsden argues that Ælfric clearly engaged in “useful simplification, amplification, and syntactical alteration, and even arbitrary omission” (354). For such a passage still opaque to biblical scholars, Ælfric “was able to provide a translation which largely kept faith with the form of the Vulgate original and yet was ‘meaningful’ and, importantly, offered no contradiction to the exegesis of the patristic whom he knew and used” (358). The painstaking specifics of these arguments about Ælfric’s translation of Genesis reflect how the impression of highly literal approaches by medieval translations do not generally stand up to close scrutiny.
Scholarly re-examinations of the complexities of medieval translation

Several scholars have in fact taken issue with such a general perception of medieval, even biblical translation, as mechanical. Many twentieth-century translation theorists speaking generally about the history of translation generally do not view such medieval practice as exceedingly literal, despite the arguments of Robinson and Minkoff. George Steiner more generally considers Jerome, Luther, Jonson and Dryden as translators who observed “Cicero’s famous precept not to translate verbum pro verbo” (248). Walter Benjamin much earlier had recognized in 1923 that “the task of the translator consists in finding that intended effect upon the language into which he is translating which produces in it the echo of the original” (77), and considers this in light of biblical translation. Alastair Minnis’ 1984 book, Medieval Theory of Authorship, re-examined the problem that modern scholars analyzing medieval literature had become “inclined to adopt concepts from modern literary theory, concepts which have no historical validity as far as medieval literature is concerned” (1). Minnis finds medieval scholarship on literature was “provided by the glosses and commentaries on the authoritative Latin writers, or “auctores”, studied in the schools and universities of the later Middle Ages” (1). Minnis’ work suggests that there was a great deal more introspection about authorship than has been recognized in scholarship until recently, and that a medieval theory of authorship “was not homogenous in the sense of being uncomplicated and narrowly monolithic” (2). Minnis does not treat medieval practices of translation in much detail, as his work focuses on critical commentaries, but in his analysis of these commentaries, Minnis argues that “theologians and Bible-scholars were elaborating a comprehensive and flexible interpretive model for the diverse literary styles and structure supposed to be present in sacred Scripture” (3). Biblical scholars also were deeply invested in issues of authorship, as Anselm and other authors of the Glossa
*Ordinaria* demonstrate in an interpretation of the authorship of the Psalter (45). However, as Rita Copeland’s key work would later recognize, there were also some limitations to medieval perceptions of the role of the author in biblical text: “twelfth-century exegetes were interested in the *auctor* mainly as a source of *auctoritas*” (72), but still this was an effort to find “the vast pattern of meaning supposed to lie behind the literal sense of Scripture” (72) and not merely a regurgitation and expansion of literal meanings in biblical writings. Much of Minnis’ study focuses on twelfth-century and later exegesis, but his work has had significant implications for further scholarly work more specifically on translation, and it suggests that a sophisticated sensitivity to notions of authorship was emerging in the Middle Ages.

A far more focused examination of medieval perceptions of translation emerged in 1991, when Rita Copeland, in her book *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* articulated the complex problem of medieval translation, which is “necessarily bound up with the deepest questions of interpretation, significance, and reception” (37). For Romans such as Cicero and Quintilian, “translation serves the target text and target language in a project of displacement and appropriation which foregrounds cultural difference through linguistic difference” (43). By contrast, patristic translation attempts “to generate a theory of translation directed almost entirely at meaning and at signification outside the claims of either source or target language.” The patristic approach to translation “thus rejects the motives of contestation, displacement, and appropriation” and “addresses particular textual conditions only in so far as these aid or impede access to supra-textual meaning” (43). Whereas Cicero’s approach “actually leads to a rhetorical contest in which the re-creative and interpretive powers of discourse play an important role” (46), Jerome theorizes “language as an impediment to fidelity rather than as a facilitator of difference” (47). Jerome “seems to equate a word-for-word translation with sheer clumsiness”
but he seeks “dynamic equivalence, not dynamic difference” (48), an attempt to preserve transcendent meaning rather than appropriate the source and author a new text. Therefore, medieval translators did inherit a mode of translation that was apparently less interpretive than that of their Roman predecessors. Copeland concedes that through “Jerome the Middle Ages inherits the formula “non verbum pro verbo” as a model of textual fidelity rather than of difference” (51). However, by no means does Copeland suggest that medieval modes of translation were strictly literal; rather, the medieval exegetical tradition “does develop a norm of translation whose hermeneutical motive is directed at textual appropriation” (55) in the form of grammar. Medieval exegesis engaged with the hermeneutic impulses of translation in ways that “overtake and displace” (221) studied texts. By synthesizing exegetical work with the medieval practice of translation, Copeland re-contextualizes medieval translation within a broader framework of hermeneutic thought and authorship in which “primary translation, which identifies itself with exegetical claims of service to the source, can be just as ‘loose’ or ‘re-creative’ as anything that Cicero could have desired in a rhetorical translation” (223). Copeland’s work sharply questions lingering assumptions about medieval modes of translation and demonstrates persuasively that medieval perceptions of translation did value appropriation and displacement, although this was more often done in exegesis than in standalone translation, which rather tended to present access that could then be expanded upon and addressed in exegesis. Thus, translation in the Middle Ages became a medium of “access to academic discourse” (229).

Medieval approaches to translation were, however, by no means uniform, nor were they consistent throughout the Middle Ages, a time period perhaps too broad for such a discussion of translation without some recognition that distinct trends opposed, subverted, and supplanted one
another. While twelfth-century exegetes began to explore a sophisticated approach to literary criticism in their commentaries on literary and biblical texts, other intellectual and political forces later worked to reign in the vernacular and impose limits on biblical interpretation in the early fifteenth century. As Nicholas Watson explains in his 1995 article, “Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel’s Constitutions of 1409,” the issues of vernacularity and biblical authority conflicted as church officials worried that vernacular translation was a threat not only to the Church itself, but to the authority of biblical texts. There were two sides to the argument: “a conservative one, which held that, because vernacular religious writings were accessible (at least potentially) to everyone, their circulation and content needed to be carefully restricted; and an evangelical one, which held that the Gospel was too important to be ‘claspid vp, ne closid in no cloister,’ and that truth should be available to all” (Watson 839). William Butler articulated the conservative position with his bold claim that “making the Bible available to illiterati is a foolish disruption of the order of things,” since “in practice the laity cannot overcome the problems presented by the Bible, which include textual deficiencies only scholars can assess as well as the interpretive problems of ambiguity and obscurity – which lead to confusions … and more serious errors or heresies” (Watson 841-2). This sort of distrust of translation led to the 1409 Constitutions of Archbishop Thomas Arundel of Canterbury, which did not forbid clerics to engage in ad hoc translation to a congregation, but “article 7 forbids anybody to make any written translation of a text of Scripture into English or even to own a copy, without diocesan permission, of any such translation made since Wycliffe’s time” (Watson 828). These strictures on translation and interpretation in the late fourteenth and fifteenth century represent in many ways a backward step from the more hermeneutic approach of earlier exegetes and translators,
who had inherited from Jerome and Roman models a more versatile engagement with questions of authorship and translation. As such, the Wycliffite controversy and Arundel’s dispute with the Lollards over biblical translation do not represent anything resembling a uniformly literal and mechanical approach to translation, or even biblical translation, in the Middle Ages, and certainly not in the period of late-Old English biblical translations such as those of Ælfric, who indeed struggled with some of the same concerns as did fifteenth-century thinkers, but who negotiated these tensions in translations more clearly engaged with Jerome’s own directives on translation.

In fact, Robert Stanton argues in his 2002 book that English biblical translation, despite the view of Robinson (106), was an act of interpretation in which translations only “masquerade as replicas” (103). Stanton recognizes that glosses such as the Lindisfarne and Rushworth were highly literal, probably meant to aid in the reading of the Latin (118) and were as such “pragmatic educational texts” (120). However, Stanton also argues that even Alfred’s translation of the first 50 psalms, while conservative, was by no means “slavish” (121), that the Old English Gospels were written in continuous prose and were a “step up from a gloss” (130), and that Ælfric’s concerns about the dangers of translation, explained in his Preface to Genesis, reveal Ælfric’s awareness that interpretation is inevitable in his work (134-5).

**Patristic approaches to translation**

The writings of Jerome on his practice of translation, and those of Augustine, Jerome’s friend and fellow biblical exegete, illuminate some of the patristic approaches to biblical translation and interpretation that question notions that biblical translation was highly mechanical. In Copeland’s view, Jerome was a translator who seeks “dynamic equivalence”
rather than “dynamic difference” (48), but Jerome also views himself as an original author. In the preface to the Book on the Sites and Names of Hebrew Places, Jerome explains, “I might be called at once a translator and the composer of a new work” (Nicene 486). In his preface to his translation of Job, Jerome recognizes the tensions he must negotiate between linking the words and interpreting the larger sense of the translation: “Haec autem translatio nullum de veteribus sequitur interpretem, sed ex ipso hebraico arabicoque sermone et interdum syro, nunc verba, nunc sensus, nunc simul utrumque resonabit” (Biblia Sacra 731) (However, this translation follows no translator from the ancients, but will resound now the words, now the sense, and now both together from the Hebrew and the Arabic language and sometimes the Syriac). Although Augustine was at first resistant to Jerome’s new translation, Augustine eventually accepted Jerome’s version: “As to your translation, you have now convinced me of the benefits to be secured by your proposal to translate the Scriptures from the original Hebrew, in order that you may bring to light those things which have been either omitted or perverted” (Worth 39). Augustine accepted the importance of reading beyond the literal and interpreting between source and target, between texts, and between their cultural contexts. In Book III of De Doctrina Christiana, Augustine gives directives to interpret passages that highlight cultural tensions between the biblical culture and the target culture. Augustine explains that it is culturally appropriate for Romans to be naked in public baths even if it is biblically inappropriate to be naked at drunken parties (Green 151). Book III concerns Augustine’s sociologically forward thinking, in which he cautions readers not to interpret the culture of the Jews by the readers’ own cultural context, and vice-versa. Augustine warns, “When those who are unfamiliar with different social practices come up against such actions in their reading, they think them wicked unless restrained by some explicit authority. They are incapable of realizing that their own sort of
behavior patterns, whether in matters of marriage, or diet, or dress, or any other aspect of human life and culture, would seem wicked to other races or other ages” (Green 155). Lawrence Venuti echoes these perceptions of translation as a medium through which cultural difference must be recognized and interpreted. According to Venuti, “This would involve examining the place and practice of translation in specific cultures, addressing such questions as which foreign texts are selected for translation and which discursive strategies are used to translate them, which texts, strategies, and translations are canonized or marginalized, and which social groups are served by them” (11). The patristic tradition of interpretation of the underlying sense of the original, and not just a focus on literal reception, reveals a far more sophisticated patristic approach to biblical translation than some scholars recognize.

That very sophisticated patristic approach appears to inform Old English biblical translation, particularly visible in Ælfric’s writings on translation. Like Augustine, Ælfric had concerns that literal translation could allow a reader to interpret the practices described in the Old Testament as appropriate in the reader’s time: “gif sum dysig man ðas boc ræt oððe rædan gehyrþ, þæt he wille wenan, þæt he mote lybban nu on þære niwan æ, swa swa ða ealdan fædoras leofodon þa on þære tide, ær ðan þe seo ealde æ gesett wære, oppe swa swa men leofodon under Moyses æ” (76) (if some ignorant man reads this book or hears it read, that he will think that he might live now in the new law, just as the old fathers lived then in that time, before the old law was set down, or just as men lived under Moses’s law). For such reasons, Ælfric implores his patron Æðelweard, “Ic cweðe nu ðæt ic ne dearr ne ic nelle nane boc after ðisre of Ledene on Englisc awendan; 7 ic bidde ðe, leof ealdormann, ðæt ðu me ðæs na leng na bidde” (80) (I say now that I do not dare, and I will not, translate any book after this from Latin into English, and I pray you, dear alderman, that you no longer ask me this). Jonathan Wilcox
notes that Ælfric makes similar vows in his *Lives of the Saints* and at the end of the *Catholic Homilies II* (Wilcox 1-2). Despite his fears, however, Ælfric also recognizes the inevitable difference between Latin and English, explaining “ðæt Leden 7 ðæt Englisc nabbað na ane wisan on ðære spræce fandunge” (79) (that Latin and English do not share one custom in their speech arrangement), and that a translator “sceal gefadian hit swa ðæt ðæt Englisc hæbbe his agene wisan” (79) (should arrange it so that the English has its own custom). As much pressure as the inviolability of the biblical text exerted on Ælfric, he understood that some interpretation was necessary. Whereas Minkoff and then Greenfield and Calder have argued that Ælfric was a highly literal translator, later scholarship has interrogated these characterizations and suggested that Ælfric engaged in considerable interpretation in his translations. In his 1991 article “Ælfric as Translator: The Old English Prose Genesis”, Richard Marsden argues that, although the beginning of Genesis is “undoubtedly the most fully and faithfully translated part of the whole Old English Heptateuch” (333), Ælfric also “did not hesitate to amplify or explain by addition or rearrangement, or even alteration, where he thought it appropriate” (340). Two years later in his 1993 article “A Reluctant Translator in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Maccabees”, Jonathan Wilcox argues that Ælfric clearly engages in interpretation in his practice of translation. Wilcox explains that Ælfric “translates approximately and inserts comments into the text in order to guide his reader” (6) and thus addresses his concerns that a reader might interpret details of the Old Testament as applicable to Ælfric’s period. Ælfric does not mechanically transport the Latin texts into English, but rather pre-figures Venuti’s assessment that a “translated text should be the site where a different culture emerges, where a reader gets a glimpse of the cultural other” (*Translator’s Invisibility* 306). To Anglo-Saxon scholars, translation was incredibly important and fraught with complexity. The size of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth glosses attest to the
importance of biblical translation. The variation between the Latin source and the Old English Gospels suggests that Anglo-Saxon translators negotiated linguistic difference dynamically. To Ælfric, the translations of Genesis, of Maccabees, and of the homilies attest to the capacity of Anglo-Saxon translators to engage in interpretation and authorship. Such translation was much more than a mechanical process.

This emerging scholarly opinion that medieval perceptions of translation, including biblical translation, were dynamically hermeneutic motivated me to consider how authorial interpretation could have affected the translation of the Old English Gospels, especially since we still know almost nothing about who might have executed these translations, or how many there were. A significant critical history on the topic of the authorship of the Old English Gospels has examined this authorship several times, but with some highly contrasting results, although the most recent scholarship has begun to show some consensus that the Old English Gospels are likely the product of multiple authorship. Roy Liuzza’s 2000 companion volume to his critical edition of The Old English Version of the Gospels was special, however, since Liuzza appears to be the first scholar to argue that the translations are not only different from each other (that is, that the OE Mark and Luke appear to be different from the OE Matthew and John), but also that the OE Matthew appears to show evidence of internal shifts in practice, and therefore authorship. Liuzza’s observations alerted me to the need for further research into the potential of multiple authorship, a feat I believed both possible and worthy of exploration since Old English biblical translation is a dynamic interaction between author/translator and meaning.

---

4 This is an issue that I will address in detail in the literature review of my second study, which examines evidence of authorship of the Old English Gospels.

Traditional authorship attribution and non-traditional developments

Authorship attribution, however, while not a new discipline, is still an emerging discipline that has undergone many phases of practice, comprising a very wide variety of potential techniques, and presenting many unresolved complications and limitations. Authorship-attribution studies of the Old English Gospels began around 1894 when Allison Drake’s lexical study of the translation motivated Drake to argue that at least two authors worked on the translation (18), an argument with which both James Bright in 1904 and Arthur Abel in 1962 took issue, both relying on traditional philological analysis of parallel passages and concluding that there was more evidence of unity than difference. However, a year later in 1963 emerged Frederick Mosteller and David Wallace’s ground-breaking study “Inference in an authorship problem: A comparative study of discrimination methods applied to the authorship of the disputed Federalist papers,” which tackled the disputed authorship of the Federalist papers from a methodical and deeply statistical perspective. Mosteller and Wallace, two statisticians, applied Thomas Bayes’ statistical theorem since “problems of discrimination are widespread” (277). Mosteller and Wallace searched the known writings of Alexander Hamilton and James Madison to find words whose usages discriminated between the two authors, subjected papers of disputed authorship to a set of standard blocks of texts, and then executed a number of tests including binomial and Poisson probability (279) to evaluate how well each word signified one author or the other. Mosteller and Wallace concluded that Madison had written most of the disputed papers, with one exception probably written by Hamilton, two more of shared authorship by

---

6 I discuss Bright’s and Abel’s arguments in more detail in the literature review of my study on the Old English Gospels; however, their arguments help illustrate the scholarly context of traditional authorship attribution while non-traditional, statistical methods like those of Mosteller and Wallace were beginning to find their footing. Statisticians and those conversant in emerging statistical and later computational techniques were beginning to contribute to authorship-attribution studies in ways that helped re-define the field of authorship attribution. At the same time, Mosteller and Wallace’s paper also signified a kind of split in the field, in which traditional studies would engage in descriptive, philological research that often entailed very close readings of texts, while statistical methods would focus on finding discriminating features and then developing statistical tests to explore hypotheses.
Madison and Hamilton, and one more paper requiring further analysis (306). Mosteller and Wallace concluded about authorship-attribution studies that function words were potent discriminators, an assertion still applied by some of the most recent authorship-attribution studies, including Antonio Miranda-García and Javier Calle-Martín’s 2007 study “Function Words in Authorship Attribution Studies,” which examines the authorship of the Old English Gospels. Mosteller and Wallace demonstrated that statistical theory afforded largely unexplored but extremely diverse possibilities to explore questions of authorship.

Despite this potential, the field of non-traditional authorship-attribution studies, which focus on statistical approaches, has by no means achieved widespread scholarly acceptance by outsiders or even much consensus by those in the field. In his 2003 published lecture “Questions of Authorship Attribution and Beyond: A Lecture Delivered on the Occasion of the Roberto Busa Award ACH-ALLC 2001, New York”, John Burrows recounts a story in which a session chairman fell asleep during the presentation of his first paper of “hand counts”. Nonetheless, Burrows’ experience taught him that “the task became so onerous that hand-counting would not do”, so Burrows and his colleagues “began making machine-readable versions of Jane Austen’s novels” (6) for analysis. Burrows reviews some of the major advances in the field, including the incorporation of statistical approaches by G. Udny Yule. Burrows describes how statistical techniques can assist in authorship attribution studies, but admits that statistical results do not always neatly confirm patterns of authorship; rather, “We do ourselves no justice when we forget

---

7 “Non-traditional authorship attribution” is Joseph Rudman’s term, which refers to those authorship-attribution studies that incorporate statistical tests and computing to examine authorship attribution. The term stands in contrast to what Rudman considers “traditional” authorship-attribution studies, which rely heavily on philological and parallel-passage analysis to explore and assert authorship. Rudman explains in footnote 35 of his 2012 review article, “I prefer non-traditional authorship attribution because it gives deference to the long tradition of authorship attribution done before the use of the computer and sophisticated statistics” (263). Therefore, “non-traditional” in this discussion refers to very statistical studies, whereas “traditional” refers to philological studies that generally do not incorporate statistical tests.

8 On pages 7-10 of his published lecture, Burrows concisely reviews the key accomplishments of many scholars, principally those who use computer-assisted analysis to execute “Principal Component Analysis”.

---
that the quantifiable features we deal in are but the shadow of a shadow” (30). Joseph Rudman broadly and thoroughly reviewed the field of statistical authorship-attribution studies in 1998 and re-visited his analysis in 2012, and further cautions that the field has achieved neither external acceptance nor internal consensus. Rudman reports that, in his field of eighteenth-century literature, “most scholars feel that there is a long way to go before they accept the results. Many respected linguists remain sceptical” (261). Rudman also acknowledges a number of problems, errors, and inconsistencies among well-publicized authorship-attribution studies, vigorous disagreements between scholars including one between Burrows and Rudman, and even Donald Foster’s “mis-attribution of the Jon Benét Ramsay ransom note” (261-2), a debacle that undermined confidence in statistical authorship-attribution studies. Rudman even argues that the Mosteller and Wallace study is flawed: “I have pointed out many flaws and listed many flaws pointed out by others in the seminal work by Frederick Mosteller and David L. Wallace…. What ramifications is this going to have?” (263). Rudman laments that the field of non-traditional authorship-attribution studies lacks much consensus about its approaches or even its name (264). Rudman confesses that the entire field is based on key assumptions, perhaps most significant of which is the unproven theory that “every author has a verifiably unique style” (265). Further deepening the lack of consensus in the field, the number of style markers that could be used to investigate authorship is practically infinite (268); as such, Rudman cautions that still there “is

---

9 The entire issue of six-year-old Jon Benét Ramsay’s disappearance, ransom note, and murder could entail a large discussion all on its own. However, it has some key implications that deserve a brief discussion here. The case, which remains unsolved, presented little evidence except a ransom note. In his 2002 book *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*, Gerald McMenamin heavily criticizes Donald Foster and “Literary Forensics”, a “hybrid form of what is generally known as text linguistics” (85). Foster’s little errors in grammar cause McMenamin to dismiss Foster’s work as proof of “the dangers posed by a little bit of linguistic knowledge” (85). It provides “no clear methodology for authorship identification” with “no coherent system for finding and using identifiers presented” (87). McMenamin devotes an entire chapter (chapter 10, p. 181-205) to the Jon Benét Ramsay case, in which he participated as a forensic linguist. McMenamin subjected the two-page hand-written letter to a number of qualitative and quantitative analyses, and he concluded that Mrs. Ramsey, the child’s mother and prime subject of the prosecution’s attention, was not the author of the letter (204). As Joseph Rudman also notes, a discussion of Foster’s involvement with the case, and his change of authorship attribution, is available in Lawrence Solan and Peter Tiersma’s book *Speaking of Crime*, p. 159.
no one set of style markers that is correct for every study” (268). In its current state, non-traditional authorship-attribution remains an unsettled field that must address central, theoretical questions before it can stand alone as a discipline of authorship attribution.

In spite of the limitations of statistical and computer-assisted authorship-attribution studies, several traditional authorship-attribution studies in the twentieth century have recognized the limitations of traditional methods and suggested that statistical methods could help scholars explore unanswered questions about authorship problems. In 1949, long before Mosteller and Wallace’s key statistical study, A. C. Partridge investigated whether William Shakespeare may have collaborated with John Fletcher on Henry VIII. Much of Partridge’s assessment of the text is stylistic and generally descriptive. Partridge argues that Shakespeare’s syntax is complex and makes for opaque text, different from Fletcher’s clarity: “On the track of the telling and indelible image, he may leave behind anacoluthons and hanging relative clauses in the most inconsequent fashion; he compresses his meaning and tortures his syntax, so that while the effect of it may be poetically grand, the meaning is wrung from it with great difficulty” (16). However, Partridge attempts to assess the text at a statistical level: he considers the numbers of “periphrastic auxiliary verb do” in Shakespeare’s attributed portion and Fletcher’s, and argues that an assessment of Fletcher’s known works generally showed that “expletive do” was “uncommon with him” (18). Partridge also considers that Shakespeare uses “them” 23 times but five of “’em”, while Fletcher uses seven of “them” and 59 of “’em” (20). Partridge even notes, “Equally unstudied in Shakespeare’s time was the habit of making participial phrases do duty for temporal and conditional clauses. They tend to clog the meaning, and modern syntax avoids them in complicated sentence structures” (30). Partridge’s interest in apparently telling numbers suggests
that his philological approach to this authorship- attribution problem was in many ways statistical in nature, but perhaps lacking a developed scholarly framework within which to test his statistics.

Seventeen years later in 1966, David Erdman and Ephim Fogel edited Evidence of Authorship: Essays on Problems of Attribution, in which many traditional authorship- attribution studies contend with rates and numbers, and assert the potential importance of statistical evidence. In his essay “The Uses and Abuses of Internal Evidence,” Arthur Sherbo recalls a study of one nine- word sentence and one six- word coordinate verb phrase debated as Samuel Johnson’s, and suggests that some debates in authorship attribution focus on too little evidence, in other words, an unrepresentative sample (6). In “The Signature of Style,” David Erdman explains that he attempted a very basic kind of quantitative test, “a ‘concordance test’ applied to several newspaper sonnets probably written by Coleridge. The sonnets that failed the test were more probably not his” (51). However, Erdman’s methodology does not define a statistical boundary or method to facilitate his conclusion. Erdman still gives credence to the belief that “strong parallels give objective and independent support to the reader’s impression that he recognizes unique marks of style; the recognition of such marks lifts the parallelism out of the realm of pure coincidence. Both of these are double- edged tools; properly sharpened and employed together, they are the best we have” (53). Ephim Vogel, however, addresses the potential importance of mathematical probability as a likely line of inquiry in such internal- external analysis: “Suppose, however, that the contemporary allusions in two works are genuinely parallel. Whether that coincidence is probative of common authorship depends on the relative frequency of such allusions” (81). Fogel concedes that literary analysis “can yield valid results from a passage of moderate length” (84), but argues that “statistical analysis of internal evidence can also be an effective method of attribution in its own right. It aims to give precise
mathematical indications of such features as prosody, sentence structure, vocabulary, and linguistic usage, and it has the advantage of being applicable to works most notably distinctive in technique and style” (95). Fogel notes the work of G. Udny Yule (96) and urges that “properly used, statistical analysis holds great promise for canonical studies” (99). These traditional authorship-attribution scholars perceived the need for reliable methods by which to consider statistical issues and explore how they can reflect on authorship-attribution.

The intersection of traditional and non-traditional approaches to the Old English Gospels

As scholars exploring the style and authorship of the Old English Gospels reconsidered the work of Drake, Bright, and Abel, they began to supplement philological analysis and the analysis of parallels with the counting of features and frequencies of renderings, a very statistical thrust in such traditional authorship-attribution scholarship. Lea Olsan perceived the potential for the Latin participle to serve as a particular marker of style, one that occurs in large numbers in the Latin gospels, and one whose rendering could indicate the approach of an Old English translator to the Latin original (125). Olsan focuses on the analysis of parallel passages, as do Abel and Drake. Scholarly studies on the Old English Gospels in the late-twentieth and twenty-first centuries, however, showed a sharply increased interest in particular lexical and syntactic markers of style, and the frequencies of their use in the translation. Taejin Kim’s 1992 dissertation, *The Particle þa in the West-Saxon Gospels: A Discourse-Level Analysis*, counts all incidences of “þa”, divides them according to various types of discourse shifts, and presents the resulting percentages of the total incidence. Roy Liuzza’s expansive 2000 study counts incidents of Latin absolute constructions, infinitives, Latin “ut” and the subjunctive, Latin “quia” and the declarative, periphrastic imperatives, and present participles (*Old English Version of the Gospels*,
Vol. 2, 113-18). Liuzza enumerates many hundreds of renderings and presents the frequencies at which these features are rendered with different Old English (OE) constructions. Kazuhisa Horiguchi in 2004 compared the rates of preserving the OE present participle in the “expanded form” (the copular verb *beon/wesan* and the OE present participle). Michiko Ogura in 2008 examined the use of OE present participles in the Lindisfarne and the Rushworth glosses and compared their frequencies to those in the Old English Gospels. Such a focus on counting specific markers and comparing frequencies resembles Elizabeth Canon’s 2010 work, *The Use of Modal Expression Preference as a Marker of Style and Attribution: The Case of William Tyndale and the 1533 English Enchiridion Militis Christiani*. In her study of Tyndale as the author of the English *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, Canon examines the inflected subjunctive in three of Tyndale’s polemical texts “as a marker of style and authorship” (1). Canon uses the Wordsmith Tools 4.0 concordancer software to mark subjunctive forms of “be” and “were” and categorize according to usage, and to search for “if” or “yf” and categorize them as “unmarked form, modal preterite, modal auxiliary, inflected subjunctive” (2). Canon’s data suggest that the *Enchiridion’s* use of the subjunctive closely matches that of the comparison corpus, quite in contrast to the known works of Tyndale. Canon agrees with earlier scholars, then, that “Tyndale was not the author” (77). Although Horiguchi, Ogura, and Canon do not apply statistical tests or principles beyond such counting and rates of incidence, Antonio Miranda-García, Javier Calle-Martín, and Teresa Marqués-Aguado in 2007 published two studies that applied basic statistical tests to evaluate inter-textual difference among the four Old English translations of the Latin Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These works have demonstrated a trend among traditional authorship-attribution studies that show a convergence, in which philological analysis can be combined with statistical analysis to reflect more comprehensively on problems of authorship and attribution.
A hybrid traditional and non-traditional approach to a new research question

That lack of consensus led me back to Roy Liuzza’s study, very specifically an observation he makes about the way the Old English Gospels inconsistently render the Latin present participle with the OE present participle. Liuzza suggests that a change in the practice of translation appears around chapter 21 (*Old English Version*, Vol. 2, 119), and that the rendering of appositive participles also shows evidence of a change between the practice in chapters 8-13 and in chapters 14-18. It was Liuzza’s observation here that gave birth to my project, since it appears that Liuzza focuses on a large sample of present participles in the texts, but not all. This was the moment when I perceived a confluence of possibilities that could lead to a research question, the investigation of which could potentially shed light on the authorship of the Old English Gospels: are the Old English Gospels a product of multiple authorship, and can we assume that split authorship would naturally happen between gospel translations? My journey to this question suggested a method of inquiry: the possibility that the rendering of the Latin present participle with the OE present participle could be a robust-enough marker of authorial style to reflect on that question. Such a question would have implications not only for the emerging scholarly understanding of the Old English Gospels, but also for potential approaches to other authorship-attribution questions in Anglo-Saxon literature. If the present participle could be a

---

10 I take these issues up in more detail in the literature review of my study of the Old English Gospels. At this point, these studies place my interest in the authorship of the Old English Gospels in a larger context of scholarly debate in a field undergoing paradigm shifts. They inform the development of my research interest and the eventual formation of my final research question.
useful marker of authorial style and possible shift, such an approach would have further implications for authorship-attribution studies of texts in languages that use a syntactically discrete present participle as an option for connecting ideas. Such a question could also allow this study to reflect on the debate among historians of the English language, who are uncertain of how and when the English present participle and, later, the progressive became grammaticalized. Such a question would be especially exciting, since it would require a kind of detective work, searching through evidence to look for clues about a text whose author or authors are indeed unknown: it is a kind of philological mystery, in which syntax and, later, statistics would be tools that I would wield in experiments and interrogations, tools that would eventually complement and facilitate each other in illuminating ways. That investigation, painstaking, complex and sometimes potentially contradictory as it may be at times, is the subject of this dissertation, but the results have been worth the effort. The results show not only that the present participle can illuminate patterns of authorship, but that the analysis of its use in the Old English Gospels adds new evidence to support the scholarly consensus that more than one author worked on the translation, even though we have no idea who those authors even were.

This dissertation divides this work into two separate studies of two comparable texts: the Old English translation of Genesis in the Old English Hexateuch, and the Old English translation in the Old English Gospels. The first study functions as a sort of “control” experiment, in which I apply my method to a text of generally accepted divided authorship in order to evaluate whether

---

11 The question of the development and grammaticalization of the English present participle and the English progressive aspect is a particularly fascinating one, since English stands apart from many of its European cousins in its use of the progressive “be” + present participle (-ing) as a stable and idiomatic verbal construction. As the studies contained in this dissertation will reveal, there is considerable variety in how different texts, and even different portions of texts, render the Latin present participle in Old English. This includes the category of Latin present participles that appear as complements after the Latin verb “esse” (to be), similar to an English “be” + “-ing” construction. At the end of this dissertation, I will reflect on this question again by considering some of the larger scholarly debate about these issues, and discuss how the data from this study can add to our understanding of these issues.
the rendering of the Latin present participle in the Vulgate version into Old English can reflect significant changes in authorship style. The translation of Genesis in the Heptateuch is uniquely suited to this control experiment because it is the only book of the Heptateuch in which divided authorship has been clearly established. Scholars generally accept that the Old English translation of Genesis is divided around chapter 24. In his preface to Genesis, Ælfric writes that he only translated up to the end of the story of Isaac, as he was instructed to do so by Æðelweard, at which point Ælfric’s work would be added to another unnamed translator’s work. Boundaries in the manuscripts also strongly indicate a clear break in the work of translation in the middle of chapter 24, where the translation ends at Genesis 24.22 and resumes at 24.61. This study, which functions as Part 1, begins by reviewing the scholarly consensus that Ælfric is the translator of Genesis 1-24.22, and that an anonymous translator is the author of Genesis 24.61 to the end at 50.25. Part 1 then discusses many of the statistical considerations of testing whether the rate of rendering the Latin present participle with the OE present participle in Genesis 1-24.22 is statistically different from the rendering starting at 24.61. The methodology explains why the study uses standardized blocks of Latin text, the statistical software program known as “R”, and that program’s “proportion test” to assess these rates. The results demonstrate clear qualitative and quantitative evidence that the rendering of the Latin present participle into Old English dramatically reflects the known break in authorship in the Old English Genesis. The quantitative results show that there is statistically a very significant difference in these renderings, and that some cases and positions of present participles are rendered at rates statistically different from the overall rate and other rates. The qualitative analysis then explores how Latin present participles in various cases and positions are rendered differently in each of the two portions.

Together, the results demonstrate that, as far as the rendering of the Latin present participle in the Old English Genesis goes, the texts are of different authorship. This finding, which agrees with both internal and external evidence of this break, suggests that the rendering of the Latin present participle into Old English is a significant and potentially effective marker of style for use in the subsequent authorship-attribution study of the Old English Gospels.

The second study in this dissertation, which functions as Part 2, applies the methods tested in the study of the Old English Genesis to the practice of translation in the Old English Gospels. This study begins by addressing some methodological concerns that arise from the fact that there is little indication in current scholarship, other than in Roy Liuzza’s observations, where differences in the practice of translation may occur. As such, the methodology explains the development of a “sliding proportion test” that helps seek the greatest point or points of difference in the text, and proceeds with a number of secondary quantitative studies to attempt to localize what kinds of shifts occur, where they occur, and where parts of the Old English Gospels may be statistically similar to others. The quantitative findings indicate statistically significant evidence of both inter-textual (between gospel translations) and intra-textual (within gospel translations) shifts in the practice of translating the Latin present participle. The study then follows up with a number of qualitative studies of participles in various cases and positions, in parallel passages, and in conjunction with phenomena such as omission and lexical shifts to evaluate the quantitative findings. Several, although not all, qualitative studies give support to the quantitative findings, which together support the emerging scholarly consensus that the Old English Gospels are a product of multiple authorship, and more specifically support Roy Liuzza’s assertion that there is evidence of intra-textual shift. In both studies, I consider the limitations of my findings, my choice of style marker (the present participle), my statistical
method and, as Joseph Rudman concedes, the larger issue that scholars still cannot say how much an individual author can vary his or her style.

In conclusion, I re-visit and synthesize the major findings of my studies: what they have shown about the utility of the method as demonstrated with the analysis of the Old English Genesis, the variance in the practice of translation in the Old English Gospels, and the implications that these findings have for recent scholarly assertions that the Old English Gospels are a product of multiple authorship. I reconsider some of the limitations of my studies in order to recommend a variety of future research projects that will add support to my findings, and that will expand our scholarly understanding of how to combine traditional and non-traditional methods of authorship attribution to generate more persuasive results with a preponderance of evidence. I also address how the results of this study could contribute to future work on the development of the English present participle and the progressive aspect. The specific findings in these two studies hold a great deal of potential for adaptation to a number of applications within translation studies, medieval studies, authorship attribution, the history of the English language, and even forensic applications, in which patterns of authorship can have surprisingly dramatic consequences on people’s livelihoods and lives.
Part One:

Unravelling the Unity of Genesis: Ælfric, the Old English Genesis, and Corporate Translation

1.1. Introduction: Unravelling the unity of authorship of the Hexateuch

The Old English Hexateuch, “together with Ælfric’s summaries of other Old Testament books – Judges, Kings, Esther, Judith and Maccabees -, represents the only attempt to render the text of the Old Testament into English prose on any scale before the Wycliffite Bible in the fourteenth century” (Cleoes 42). One of the very largest works by word count in the Old English corpus, the Hexateuch is a key component in a scholarly understanding of the Old English language and of textual production, because scholars such as Jost, Cleoes and Marsden have established that this translation is not the product of one especially talented and prodigious translator, Ælfric, but almost certainly a joint effort by two or more translators dividing up the work and creating potentially very different translations within the overall translation. Scholars are unravelling the unity of authorship of the Hexateuch and attempting to unravel the text itself.

How many translators worked on the project, and how did they divide up the work? Whereas translations today are often contracted out to individuals¹, how did Old English translators perceive and tackle translation? Perhaps most importantly, scholars are asking, “How would we even ascertain multiple authorship, without clear records?” This is, indeed, the fundamental question of authorship attribution, a relatively new field that is still evolving in different ways without a consensus on how to approach the problem.

¹ Lawrence Venuti’s discussion of the current state of contracted translations suggests a very restricted approach to translation, in which publishers assign translations to individuals and strive to retain ownership of the product. See Venuti page 10. However, whether this model applied to Anglo-Saxon translators is one of the questions that this study will indirectly illuminate.
Although the current scholarly consensus asserts confidently that the Hexateuch is very likely a product of multiple authorship, most clearly in Chapter 24 of the Old English Genesis, some scholars have suggested that general views of the Hexateuch perceive the text as a single product of Ælfric. In fact, the notion that Ælfric has been considered the single author of the Hexateuch appears to be more of an assumption than a representation of scholarly argument. William Craigie, in his 1940 chapter “The English Versions (to Wyclif)”, recognizes Ælfric’s explanation that he was instructed to translate as far as the story of Isaac in Genesis, but Craigie argues that Ælfric also claims in his Libellus de ueteri testament et novo to have translated “the remaining four books of the Pentateuch, as well as that of Joshua” (132). Craigie does not, however, further delve into the text of the Libellus or explore the body of textual evidence surrounding this authorship to justify the attribution of the other books to Ælfric. Greenfield and Calder in their book, A New Critical History of Old English Literature, assume this view when they argue that “Ælfric had once been attributed the entire work, but his contributions now seem more limited” (84). However, Greenfield and Calder do not refer to any specific argument of this kind advanced by a particular scholar. Whether this notion was at one time commonly held or not, scholars now generally accept that Ælfric did not translate the entire Hexateuch, but rather that he translated the first twenty-four chapters of Genesis, at which point another translator performed the work, perhaps even before Ælfric completed his translation.

Several scholars in the last hundred years have explored the shifts in the practice of translation evident in the Old English Hexateuch. Jost, Clemoes and Marsden’s studies have all yielded findings that have done much to unravel the loosely assumed unity of authorship of the Hexateuch and contextualize Ælfric’s own comments in his preface to Genesis. Since the divided authorship of the Old English Hexateuch Genesis has been essentially established, this study will
examine the Genesis text as a sort of “control” experiment in which to assess how the translation of the Latin present participle into Old English can reflect shifts in the authorship of a translation. If an analysis of the present participle in Genesis can reflect a known shift in authorship, a similar study could further reveal shifts in authorship in the Old English Gospels, a text whose authorship is still widely debated. Genesis is a suitable text to use in such a study because it is of the similar genre of late-Old English biblical translation, it is similar in length to the texts of the Old English Gospels, and it was produced in the same time period as the Old English Gospels. The study of Genesis will also contribute to a scholarly understanding of the divided authorship of Genesis by addressing some limitations to earlier scholars’ findings that would benefit from further attention. The primary issue is that these studies are lexical in nature, focusing on the choices of individual words and how often they occur. This is indeed the most common approach in traditional and non-traditional authorship-attribution studies. Although lexical approaches yield very significant results, they overlook the potential for syntactic features to illustrate potential shifts in authorship when lexical data are ambiguous. Joseph Rudman cautions that studies of particular words or types of words “may not in themselves be an indicator of a unique style, but when used in conjunction with all of the other quantifiable indicators that make up style, they become important” (360). A secondary issue, however, is that these studies offer quantitative data in ways that appear significant, yet these studies do not perform statistical tests of the significance of the reported frequencies. This begs the question, “Do these numbers really show significant difference, or do they really indicate similarity with variation, and how can we tell?”

The objective of this study is to build upon the work of Jost, Clemoes, and Marsden by evaluating the translation of the Latin present participle in the Old English Genesis as a control
experiment for a method to be applied to the study of the authorship of the Old English Gospels. Specifically, I have analyzed the ways in which the Old English Genesis renders the Latin present participle, which affords the opportunity to assess stylistic difference with the complex syntax of participial phrases rather than just single words. Using participles as markers of style and authorship is relatively unexplored in authorship-attribution studies, but it appears robust enough to produce hundreds of instances per text and reflect in detail on subtle shifts in the practice of authorship and translation. I have then subjected my qualitative analysis of the renderings of present participles to some basic statistical tests, which allow this study to draw an independent conclusion that there is a difference in translation practice between Genesis 1-24.22 and 24.61-50, where scholars generally agree a break in translation is visible. This study also breaks ground in the inquiry into the authorship of Genesis by mobilizing some of the rigorous tests from statistical science to validate that a perceived difference is, in fact, a significant difference. By applying this method to a text of generally accepted divided authorship, this study seeks to advance the ways in which traditional authorship-attribution studies across the field can synthesize basic quantitative results, such as frequencies of translation, with complex and robust theoretical models that can distinguish simple variation from real difference. This study also functions as the first baseline or control experiment of its kind, by which to assess the capacity of
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2 Varelo, Justino and Oliveira in 2011 recognize that participles, although somewhat neglected in authorship-attribution studies, offer significant potential to help discriminate texts and authorship. The authors therefore included participles with other verbal forms in Brazilian Portuguese to create a more sophisticated approach to authorship attribution. Their method increased their correct recognition rate of short articles by 15%. J.W. Dyk in 1994 performed a computer-assisted study of Old Testament Hebrew and defined many of the problems inherent in using computers to examine participles. Dyk notes that programs that automatically analyze texts produce “less satisfactory results” when they search for participles than when they search for noun or verb phrases (3). Dyk explains that past projects found that “the participle caused grave difficulties for syntactic analyzing programs designed to automatically recognize the phrase and clause boundaries” (28). Dyk discusses the need for tagging and the potential for human decisions about tagging to influence the result of automated searches (201). Dyk’s work shows that, in Hebrew, using computers to detect and enumerate participles automatically would require a very significant set of search and proximity rules, and that this methodology is far from complete (205). All of this informed my decision to combine my own close reading with computer search functions to detect and then personally tag participles in this study, as I explain in the methodology.
present participles to reflect on potential shifts in the practice of translation. Because there is
general consensus that the Old English Genesis is the product of divided authorship, the capacity
for this approach to yield significantly confirming results will demonstrate the suitability of this
approach to my study of the authorship of the Old English Gospels.

This chapter proceeds in Section 2 by surveying in greater detail the history of analysis of
the practice of translation in the Old English Hexateuch, specifically focusing on Genesis, which
is the focus of this particular study. Section 3 describes the methodology of my approach and
discusses some of the assumptions I have made in order to facilitate the analysis of the text.
Section 4 reports the results of the quantitative analysis and discusses the significance and
implications of these results. Section 5 presents the results of the qualitative analysis and creates
connections between quantitative and qualitative analyses. Section 6 considers the outcomes of
this study in the context of Ælfric’s writings about biblical matters in his Libellus de ueteri
testamento et novo, using these texts as natural points of comparison to discuss the Old English
present participle in original, not translated, texts. Section 7 concludes by conceding lingering
limitations of this work, affirming and summarizing the contributions that the work has
nonetheless made, suggesting new studies and directions in need of scholarly attention, and
contextualizing how the work’s methods can be extended to other authorship-attribution
questions.

1.2. Literature review: the question of authorship in Genesis

The first inquiry into the divided authorship of Genesis appears to have emerged in 1855,
when Dietrich questioned notions that Ælfric had authored the entire Hexateuch. Dietrich
suggested that scholars had overlooked Ælfric’s own claim in his preface to Genesis that he had
only translated up to Isaac, a claim that supported Dietrich’s perception of difference in the practice of the translation of Genesis, starting at 25.18, and Dietrich’s perception that Ælfric’s attested writings differed in style from Genesis after 25.18 (Clemoes 43). Karl Jost in 1927 performed an extensive lexical analysis of the Hexateuch and argued that differences in linguistic usage differentiate Genesis MS C 1-24.22, which Jost attributed to Ælfric, not only from the rest of Genesis, but also from variants in Genesis MS B at chapters 4, 5, 10, 11, as well as Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers 1-12 and Deuteronomy (Clemoes 44).

Agreeing with Jost, Peter Clemoes in 1974 applied four sets of lexical tokens to the Hexateuch and found significant differences in the rates of translation between Genesis 1-24 and the rest of the text, and found variations in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy that supported Jost’s proposed divisions in authorship (45, 48). Melinda Menzer’s comment in her 2000 article “The Preface as Admonition: Ælfric’s Preface to Genesis” succinctly surveys the current critical view of the authorship of Genesis that Ælfric was probably the author of the first half of Genesis, but that an anonymous translator was likely responsible for the rest (16).

Richard Marsden in 2000, largely accepting Jost and Clemoes’ suggested divisions, analyzed the translations of key conjunctions and adverbs, and found some significant variations in the rates of translating Latin words with specific Old English words in the Hexateuch texts. Marsden concluded that the data, although not entirely consistent in some cases, suggested the likelihood of at least triple authorship, and perhaps quadruple authorship of the Hexateuch (82-3). Marsden related his results in Exodus to a study of the anonymous part of Genesis, and found that the anonymous parts of Genesis “are nearer in translation style to the earlier than the later parts of Exodus. However, only three fifths of the Latin words are translated (118 out of 196), compared with more than four fifths (107 out of 128) in the earlier Exodus” (77). The question
remains whether there is a reliable method by which to determine whether “three fifths” is sufficiently similar to “more than four-fifths” to support Marsden’s proposal of shared authorship between the second half of Genesis and the first half of Exodus (83). This is not by any means to argue that Marsden’s inference is incorrect, but rather that scholars need reliable tests by which to ascertain whether numbers that appear different are statistically likely to be actually different. In his introduction to his edition of the Old English Heptateuch, Marsden argued that the Heptateuch is likely “a composite work”, and that Genesis 1-24.26 and the second half of Numbers are the product of Ælfric (lxx), and he refers to Clemoes’ work here as support. The critical consensus that the Hexateuch is likely the product of multiple authorship, most clearly in Chapter 24 of the Old English Genesis demonstrates the suitability of Genesis as the control experiment for the subsequent study of the translation of the present participle in the Old English Gospels. However, this consensus would also benefit directly from the work of this study, which confirms the lexical work of earlier scholars with syntactic analyses and statistical tests to bolster the perceptions of difference in these two portions of the translation.

1.3. Methodology

Although the divided authorship of Genesis had been accepted by earlier scholars, I felt it was important to avoid potential bias in my investigation of the translation of participles as a marker of authorship shift. Since no previous study had enumerated the incidence of present participles or how they related to the break in authorship, I needed to translate the original Vulgate text\(^3\) myself and analyze the presence and types of Latin present participles\(^4\). During this

---

4 The purpose of my translation was not to produce a literary translation, but to render the Latin into a Present-Day English structure that would allow close analysis of how the Latin participles fit into the structure of the Latin.
translation, I marked Latin present participles and subdivided them into eight categories: pre- and post-positive nominatives, pre- and post-positive accusatives, substantives, predicatives, ablative absolutes, and present participles in oblique cases: genitive, dative, and non-absolute ablative. To ensure that my close reading of the Latin was accurate, I created and used an electronic version of the Latin text, and then subjected that text to text searches to ensure that I had not missed any Latin present participles in my close reading. Specifically, I used the “Find” and “Highlight” functions in Microsoft Word to locate strings including “-ens”, “-ent”, “-ans”, “-ant”, and all four in combination with all case endings and the suffixes “-ne” and “-que”. This method allowed me to detect 28 Latin present participles overlooked in the close-reading phase. I excluded all case versions of Latin vehemens (adjective), serpens (noun), frumentum (noun), adulescens (noun), and sementis (noun) because these forms do not appear to derive from a verb acting as a participle. Classifying the participles into the selected sub-categories was a painstaking process that required a great deal of close reading and analysis, particularly to determine whether a Latin nominative present participle pre-modifies a noun or pronoun, which it frequently does to clause subjects, or post-modifies one. In many cases, the difference is relatively clear upon close examination, as the lack of other clauses in parallel structure defines the purpose of a participial phrase. However, some parallel structures required detailed examination to ascertain whether a participial phrase was post-modifying an earlier subject, or pre-modifying the subject of the next verb. When the syntax of a Latin sentence presented clauses in parallel, rather than just parallel verb phrases, and when the structure of an ambiguous participial phrase reflected proximity to the next clause subject similar to the proximity that clearly pre-modifying participial phrases

---

exhibited, I took such a participial phrase to be a pre-modifying phrase. As I will explain further in my study of the Old English Gospels, Roy Liuzza cautions that differentiating among various “appositive participles” can be difficult (Vol II. 117).

The next phase of my approach was to read the Old English Genesis text and compare, word for word\(^6\), the translation with the Latin, although my focus was chiefly upon the rendering of the Latin present participle in the OE\(^7\). Crawford’s edition, used in this study, draws on the B\(^8\) and L manuscripts, partly because Crawford considers B “the earliest complete MS. of Ælfric’s version of the Old Testament” and because he also considers L “an almost equally reliable text of the standard translation” (12). Crawford views MS C as “radically different in both dialect and version, giving us a ‘contaminated’ text of the earlier part of Genesis, which follows in part the standard Ælfrician translation” (12). However, later scholarship by Jost, Clemoes and Marsden explains the emerging belief that MS C is more likely the closest manuscript to Ælfric’s original work (Clemoes 44, Marsden 43). In his 2008 edition, Marsden proceeds from his manuscript study to argue that, although MS C is a “late copy”, it also “seems to bear witness, at some remove, to the oldest extant text associated with the OEH” (lxxii). Crawford’s edition does include those passages in which B differs from C; although B omits verses and even considerable swathes of text that C does not omit, the effect on the rendering of the present participle is minor.

Where the two MSS differ on this feature, I took the rendering in C to reflect the text’s original

---

\(^6\) See footnote 2 for a brief explanation of Dyk’s study, which demonstrated the difficulty of using computers to find participles in Hebrew automatically. Both Latin and Old English present participles contain strings of letters found in non-participial forms. This may at least partly explain why many computational studies have not employed the present participle in authorship-attribution studies.

\(^7\) All Latin participles were cross-checked against Richard Marsden’s 2008 edition of *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric’s Libellus de Veteri Testamento et Novo*. Three discrepancies exist between the versions, at 1.30 and 22.5, which present OE participles unattested in the Latin, and at 44.26, where a participle missing in an omitted line in Crawford’s edition is simply an omitted participle in Marsden’s edition. The analysis relies on Marsden’s data in each case, but the discrepancies do not affect the statistical tests performed.

\(^8\) MS B is MS. British Library, Cotton, Claudius B. iv (Ker 142); MS L is MS. Bodleian, Laud Misc. 509 (Ker 344); and MS C is MS. Cambridge University Library, I i. 33 (Ker 18) (Crawford 1; Marsden, *The Old English Heptateuch*, xxxiv – liv).
rendering most closely. This indeed relies on the assumption that C is closest to Ælfric’s work, but I believe it was a wise one under the circumstances. In any event, B and C only differ on whether to render a Latin participle with an OE one or not in very few places, except in those areas where B omits text. Relying on MS C until chapter 24.22, where C ends, and then B/L in Crawford’s edition after this point, I compared the Old English translation with the Vulgate Genesis, and examined how the translation renders the Latin present participle. In each case, I observed whether the OE uses a present participle and, if so, whether the translation changes the position (whether the participle pre- or post-modifies its referent) or function (whether the translation paraphrases the Latin to the extent that the OE participle is rendered in a morphological case different from the Latin). If the OE translation renders the Latin participle with a structure other than a present participle, I observed whether the resulting rendering uses a verb, past participle, infinitive, noun, prepositional phrase, adjective, determiner, or omission.

To collect these findings into useful data for analysis, I searched for methods by which to report and examine the types and frequencies of translation, a feature of this study that began with traditional methods but that ended with more statistical methods. The extant literature on the authorship of the both the Old English Gospels and the Heptateuch in traditional Anglo-Saxon studies has tended to rely on chapter-by-chapter analysis: how many Latin features are translated with how many OE features in each chapter, collated usually into percentages that shape an understanding of trends in the text. Roy Liuzza uses this approach in his extensive study of the Old English Gospels, and both Clemoes and Marsden use this approach in their studies of the Old English Hexateuch. This chapter-based approach affords the obvious
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9 The use of Crawford’s edition for this study, when Marsden’s is available, requires some explanation: I intended to use the resources of the Dictionary of Old English online search tool to scan the text for certain words and structures. I used Crawford’s edition because it was the same as that used by the Dictionary of Old English; however, as I explain in the discussion, I checked every participle to ensure that the OE renderings of Latin present participles matched Marsden’s updated edition.
convenience of ready-made and widely understood divisions of the texts. Certainly, all of these authors have made very illuminating observations about the texts by means of this method, and my concern here is not meant to undermine or weaken their tremendous work, which has broken open the field and revolutionized scholarly understanding of these two massive texts in the Old English corpus. However, as I also will describe in detail in my analysis of the Old English Gospels, the chapter-by-chapter approach suffers from an inconsistency of size. This is certainly true as well in Genesis: chapter 16 contains only 16 verses and 272 words, while chapter 24 contains 67 verses and 1193 words. Can the frequency of the translation of Latin participles be as significant in chapter 16 as it is in chapter 24, which is 4.39 times the size?

Recognizing the potential for the chapter-based approach to skew the results and overstate (or understate) the pattern of translation, I attempted to divide the text into quarters and then into eighths. This approach heightened my confidence that the resulting analysis would capture the practice of translation over the course of the text, but the Latin texts themselves are so different in size that the relative quarters and eighths in one text were vastly different from their counterparts in other texts. In search of a system that could maximize consistency not only within but between texts, I explored how statistical authorship-attribution studies attack the problem. In their seminal work on the authorship of the Federalist papers of Hamilton and Madison, Mosteller and Wallace broke texts into regular blocks of words in order to evaluate the frequency at which targeted words appear in the text (279). The most current statistical investigations of authorship attribution use this block method to improve the direct comparability of frequencies within and among texts. In their 2012 paper, “The ‘Fundamental Problem’ of Authorship Attribution,” Koppel et al. use blocks of 500 and 2000 words to perform their “unmasking” technique (286, 288). David Hoover’s 2012 authorship attribution of Charles
Kingsley’s “The Tutor’s Story”, which is generally known to be of mixed authorship of Charles Kingsley and his daughter Mary, uses blocks of varying sizes to elicit useful frequencies of target words (328-9).

Taking this cue from statistical authorship-attribution studies, I broke the Vulgate Genesis into blocks of 500 words, a decision that requires some justification. As in other authorship studies, the block size in this study needed to be small enough to allow comparison across each text with a large number of available blocks to examine, but large enough to capture a significant number of instances of the Latin present participle to make the blocks useful. A block size that produces zero-value segments, in which there is no Latin present participle to examine, defeats the purpose of the method. Mosteller and Wallace confronted this issue when they found that some of their target words “often have zero frequencies and therefore zero rates in the papers” (282). Therefore, I calculated the general ratio of each Latin text’s number of words to the number of present participles and sought a minimum number likely to produce at least more than two Latin present participles per block. The Latin Matthew, Mark, and Luke presented similar ratios of present participles to words: approximately 1:39 in Matthew, 1:33 in Mark, and 1:40 in Luke. The Vulgate John, however, had far fewer at 1:114, and the Latin Genesis 1:65. This suggested that large blocks would ensure that each block would contain the feature targeted in this study; however, that suggestion was tempered by the need to produce a large enough number of samples to facilitate a detailed analysis of trends and changes over the course of the resulting translation. Large numbers of samples are generally more desirable than small numbers of samples, and statisticians generally distinguish between large and small sample sizes at 30 (McClave and Sincich 335, Kenny 125). Because there is no way for this study to take a larger sample of a text than the complete text itself, I had to contend with the problem that the
Vulgate Mark is only 10,311 words long, while Genesis is 25,239 words long. Therefore, I settled on the size of 500 words to balance these analytical requirements. With any arbitrary block size, there is the inherent risk that the resulting analysis will suggest different patterns and information than would another block size. This is a larger issue that future work in the field of authorship attribution will need to address, but I proceeded with this technique on the assumption that it was generally consistent with the most current practices in the field. However, I also divided the texts into 600-word and 800 word blocks to mitigate the potential for one block size to bias the evaluation of potential breaks. I selected the values of 600 and 800 in order to keep them small enough to reveal trends, but not to be divisible into or by 500, to reduce further the potential for block-size bias.

Once I had created the 500-, 600- and 800-word blocks and calculated the incidence of Latin present participles, the types of Old English translations present, and the frequency at which the translation uses the OE present participle to render its Latin counterpart in each block, statistical practice required me to evaluate whether the resulting data was even suitable for the most common types of statistical tests, or whether the data required advanced and specialized analysis, and therefore further consultation with a statistician. In order to use normal probability, hypothesis-testing, and the tests applied to those methods, I had to establish that the data fit normal distribution, which I tested by means of applying the empirical rule. This requires two steps: first, it is necessary to establish the standard deviation of each sample. The standard deviation is the overall average value of how far the data in the sample tend to be different from the average value. McClave and Sincich explain that a measure of quantitative data is “incomplete without a measure of the variability, or spread” (67) of the data. The standard deviation is the overall average value of how far the data in the sample tend to be different from the average value. McClave and Sincich explain that a measure of quantitative data is “incomplete without a measure of the variability, or spread” (67) of the data. The standard deviation is

---

10 The segmenting process of the Latin Genesis produced (50) 500-word segments and (1) remaining segment of 239 words, (42) 600-word segments and (1) remaining segment of 50 words, and (31) 800-word segments and (1) remaining segment of 442 words.
deviation allows a researcher to differentiate between two sets of data that may have identical means (averages): translator one may render a feature as little as 45% of the time, and as high as 55% of the time, with a mean of 50%, while translator two may render a feature as little as 10% of the time, and as much as 90% of the time, with the same mean of 50%. However, these two phenomena are different because of how far the rates of translation lie from the average of 50%: translator one varies little, but translator two varies considerably. Therefore, simply describing their respective practices as both an average of 50% translation does not capture the difference in their variation. Standard deviation is a number that allows us to create a standard measurement to describe how far the data generally disperse from the mean in the sample (how widely each translator varies the practice of translating – a lot or a little), using a standard method: the larger the standard deviation number, the more the data are spread out, and the more widely the practice of translation varies.

The second step in applying the empirical rule is to survey how far from the average each individual value is, using the standard deviation as the unit of measurement. Therefore, for each segment, we must ask, “How many standard deviations is this segment’s value from the average value of the whole sample?” This required me to calculate the standard deviation of each sample, which I computed by using Microsoft Excel to produce descriptive statistics for all the segment values in each sample. Using this outcome for the standard deviation, I then computed “bins”, a list of categories for each number of standard deviations from the average. The bins allowed me to define categories to sort how many segments are how many standard deviations away from the mean, or average. Then, I used Microsoft Excel’s Data Analysis component to produce a frequency distribution to reveal how many segment values fell within each bin, and computed
the percentages. All results from that command are given, although this discussion will only address mean and standard deviation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics on the OE Genesis</th>
<th>Frequency distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genesis General Stats OE %</strong></td>
<td><strong>bins</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.08114663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>19.38752179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>84.61538462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>84.61538462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions for 500-word segment values of the OE Genesis. Because the average (mean) is 11.08 and the standard deviation (one unit of distance from the mean) is 19.39, all values lower than the mean of 11.08 will fall within 1 standard deviation of the mean. Therefore, the mean defines Bin 1, which contains all those values lower than the mean and within one standard deviation (equal to or lower than 11.08 but within 19.39). Bin 2, whose boundary is 30.4687, contains all values higher than the mean of 11.08 but that lie within one standard deviation (19.39) of the mean. Bin 3, 49.8562, contains values higher than one standard deviation from the mean but within two standard deviations. Bin 4, 69.2437, contains those values higher than two but within three standard deviations higher than the mean. Bin 5, 88.6312, contains values higher than three but within four standard deviations. Bin 6, 100, contains values higher than four standard deviations from the mean but within the maximum possible value of 100.

These bins and the number of blocks that fall within each bin allowed me to use a basic rule in statistics, the empirical rule, to decide whether the data fit “normal distribution”, which essentially determines whether the data are “normal” enough to be subjected to basic statistical tests. The empirical rule requires that approximately 68% of the data in a set fall within 1 standard deviation of the mean, 95% within two standard deviations, and 99.7% within three standard deviations (McClave and Sincich 75). The Old English Genesis generally satisfies these criteria: 84% of its data fall within one standard deviation, 94% within two, and 98% within three. Genesis differs from the Old English Gospel translations, which all tend to satisfy the first criterion very closely. However, as the following analysis reveals, Genesis as a whole text presents massive variation, which creates a very large value of standard deviation, and which
therefore explains why more of its results fall within one standard deviation than are expected. It is also necessary to note that significantly more of the results fall within one standard deviation than the empirical rule predicts: 84% vs. 68%. This may indicate that the data do not fit normal distribution, possibly because there is more than one translator at work, but such a statistical question exceeds the scope of the work\textsuperscript{11}. Later work, perhaps further informed by statistical theory, will allow me to re-visit this phenomenon. The empirical rule and normal distribution, once established, can allow basic analysis of samples by the number of standard deviations by which they vary from the average, a technique that Macdonald P. Jackson applied in his study of attribution to Middleton in 1979 (84-5).

With normal distribution in the OE Genesis approximately, but not entirely, established, this study began by applying two established statistical tests to evaluate whether there is a statistically significant break in authorship around chapter 24, as argued in previous scholarship. First, this study used the Student’s t-test, a basic statistical test used in a wide variety of applications in which there are fewer than 30 samples, to compare the text of Genesis before chapter 24.22, where scholars believe Ælfric finished his translation, and after 24.61, where Clemoes and Marsden argue that an anonymous translator started work. The idea was to use each block as a sample of the translation, then combine the blocks occurring before Genesis 24.22 to those blocks occurring after Genesis 24.61, and use the results of the test to ascertain whether there is statistical evidence of difference between the two portions of Genesis. The t-test is a mainstay of normal probability, necessary in experiments in which there are fewer than 30 samples. Both the Vulgate John and Mark produced fewer than thirty 500-word samples. It was

\textsuperscript{11} The difference between the expected value of 68% and the detected value of 84% may potentially represent a complication for those tests that rely on normal distribution. However, as I explain subsequently, this difference does not appear to affect this study because this study finally opted for the proportion test rather than the kind of hypothesis tests that rely on normal distribution, such as t-tests and z-tests.
also my intention not to invent a new statistical test, but to draw upon well-established, basic
tests to help put the rates of translation into perspective, and help discern whether different rates
really suggested different authorship, or just one author’s personal variation. In his 2012 revision
Problems and Solutions,” Paul Rudman warns that a “troubling trend to note is that the main
purpose of too many studies (well into the hundreds) is to present a new, novel method that
always is better or almost as good as the old one” (268). Therefore, the t-test appeared to be an
excellent choice: Hoover uses the “venerable” t-test in his study of “The Tutor’s Story” (268)
and Kenny’s book recommends the t-test and z-test (for samples larger than 30) as the methods
of choice to compare means in authorship attribution (121-6). For these various reasons, I
applied the t-test to this analysis and considered the results illuminating.

However, attempts to break new ground often reveal unsuccessful methods before they
reveal successful ones, and I think it is in the interests of medievalists and traditional authorship-
attributionists to see my process, and the lessons I learned before I produced helpful results. I
learned that the t-test is not an appropriate test for this study, because this study measures the
relative rates of translation in each segment; in other words, it compares the percentage of
translation with the Old English participle against the percentage of non-participial translations.
Working with percentages within blocks is a problem for the t-test. As set up in this study, the
block segments contained information about the percentage of Latin present participles translated
with Old English participles. A t-test of the blocks would measure the variation among the
percentages in Genesis 1-24.22, and compare that variation to the variation in Genesis 24.61-50.
If the t-test found that the variation in the first portion is significantly different from the variation
in the second portion, the result would suggest a likely difference in authorship. However, such a
test is unrepresentative of what is happening in the actual translation. Comparing percentages of Latin participles rendered with OE participles would not consider how many participles even occur in each segment; one segment could contain 24 Latin participles, while the other could contain four; a t-test would weigh three OE participles out of four (75%) as if they were the same as 18 of 24 (also 75%). Even if the 75% rate may be consistent, the use of participles would not. In this way, performing a t-test of percentages segment-by-segment could suggest similarity where the phenomenon itself does not occur consistently: it is unrepresentative of the translation to count the first segment containing only four participles as equivalent to the second segment containing 24. The t-test applied in this case can only measure the rate of translation, but not how many participles there are, and how many are translated with OE present participles: there could be three of four, or three-hundred of four-hundred. These would appear identical as 75%, even though their ability to represent the text would be dramatically different. Therefore, I opted\textsuperscript{12} to employ the proportion test in R, a statistical software package widely used in statistical sciences and linguistics\textsuperscript{13}. Stefan Gries explains that R is both fully functional and responsive to user development as an open-source software (2), for which reasons it is a widely accepted choice of researchers performing statistical analyses.

The proportion test is a much better test for this type of study because it allows the user to compare the overall rate of translation in one portion to the overall rate of translation in the other portion. The proportion test is actually a variation of the chi-square test, a basic statistical test that Kenny recommends as “the significance test of the widest of most general application”\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} I arrived at this decision after a great deal of helpful advice about how to examine these data from Daphna Heller, Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto. I would like to acknowledge her extremely helpful contribution at this key juncture of the methodology. Daphna Heller explained the flaws with the t-test and pointed me toward the proportion test as a better option.

\textsuperscript{13} The software package called simply “R” is not the only platform on which researchers who analyze quantitative data run their tests; however, it is quickly emerging as a very popular and powerful platform in a variety of disciplines. See Gries pp. 2-4 for a brief discussion of why R is a popular choice with quantitative linguists.
A chi-square test works by comparing the squared values of the differences between proportions (or rates) and the overall average, and then comparing the results to a threshold value set by the experimenter to determine whether the proportions are statistically similar or different. These tests offer the potential for this study to argue that the qualitative analysis and general frequencies of translation not only appear different, but they also clearly are different, according to statistical models and tests. The proportion test is specifically suitable to this study because it compares two relatively simple numbers: the number of a result out of a total number of opportunities in the first group, and another number of the result out of a total number of opportunities in the second group. In other words, if portion one presents 44 Old English present participles out of a total of 100 Latin present participles, and if portion two presents 61 present participles out of 107 Latin present participles, the proportion test compares these rates and produces a result that suggests whether these rates are different or similar within a threshold of probability set by the user. The proportion test can in fact test many groups in this way at the same time, although this study almost always uses the test of only two rates, called “proportions”. Specifically, the proportion test uses “groups with finite numbers of successes and failures”; the data include the numbers of all OE participial translations of Latin present participles compared to the total number of Latin present participles in the Vulgate translation. The objective was to determine whether the number of OE participial translations in one sample was statistically different from the number of OE participial translations in another sample from the same translation, in order to detect difference. Therefore, the proportion test tested a “two-sided” hypothesis, which determines whether two proportions are similar; a one-sided hypothesis

---

14 The R software package includes an extensive help-query apparatus that contains definitions of the tests, their purposes, and the scholarly sources that inform their use. The help query “prop?help” rendered the definition given above.
would only measure whether one proportion was statistically higher or lower than another\textsuperscript{15}. The proportion test in R addresses recent scholarship in statistics, particularly that of Robert Newcombe, who discusses the need for statistical software to offer appropriate tests to facilitate the “comparison of two independent binomial proportions” (873). A binomial experiment deals with any outcome that has only two discrete, or mutually exclusive options, such as a coin flip, or in this study whether a Latin participle is rendered with an OE participle, or some other non-participial form. Since the study examines only these two outcomes, the proportion test is suitable to this aspect of rendering the Latin into OE.

This study then proceeded by applying the proportion test to the subcategories of present participles analyzed, and revealed that these subcategories do not appear to behave consistently with each other, suggesting that the translation of the Latin present participle is not a single phenomenon, but rather an aggregate of different treatments. These sub-categorical studies yielded patterns that support the hypothesis that the general pattern of translation of the Latin present participle changes over the text. They also demonstrate that the treatment of subcategories of Latin present participles can significantly vary among texts and among practices of translation within a text.

### 1.4. Quantitative results and discussion

The quantitative portion of this study will present several findings that demonstrate the capacity of the rendering of the Latin present participle in Genesis to reflect the widely accepted

\textsuperscript{15} Section 1.4.c. does explain the two-sided hypothesis in more detail as the study prepares to use it in the quantitative study. Figure 1.5 and its accompanying discussion illustrate why the two-sided hypothesis is necessary. However, let me preview that discussion with this explanation. If we are to compare whether A is similar to B, there is a chance that A will be higher than B, and a chance that A will be lower than B. Therefore, 50% of the chance that they are different will occur above the value of B, and 50% of the risk that they are different will occur lower than the value of B. A two-tailed hypothesis is simply a parameter in a statistics test that acknowledges the two sides of that risk, and adjusts the threshold accordingly.
shift in authorship occurring in chapter 24 of the text. These findings are divided into four parts that first reveal that the Latin present participle does not diminish in use over the course of the text, but second reveal that the use of the OE present participle very much does diminish. Third, these results reveal that the proportion test can characterize this difference in ways that helpfully demonstrate the extent of that difference, a method that would be particularly useful in situations in which a visual look at a bar graph may not show clear signs of difference. Last, these results also provide evidence that the rendering of the Latin present participle in Genesis is not a single phenomenon, but a collection of sub-phenomena in which the case and position of a participle has a statistically significant correlation with whether the participle is rendered with an OE participle.

1.4a. The incidence of the Latin: does it decline, too?

The analysis of the Old English Genesis as a whole reveals that the text translates Latin present participles with Old English participles at slightly over 11% of the time. A chapter-by-chapter analysis already suggests that the rendering of Latin present participles is far from even over the course of the translation. The incidence of Latin present participles varies widely among the 500-word clusters, but a comparison of portions of equal size shows that the Latin present participle actually increases slightly in the first half of the text and remains even in the second half: segments 1-24 contain 181 Latin participles, and segments 25-48 contain 204 Latin participles. The Latin present participle increases and then remains even, quite a contrast to the OE participle, which all but disappears in the second half of the Genesis translation.
1.4b. 500-word, 600-word, and 800-word segments vs. chapter analyses: a more standardized image of OE participles in the OE Genesis.

Since the purpose of this overall study of Genesis is to ascertain whether the translation of the Latin present participle into English can reflect a shift in practice across a known break in authorship, a brief review of the evidence for a break in authorship at Genesis 24.22 is helpful to give some critical context to the results of the various segment analyses. First, Ælfric claims in his preface to Genesis that he only “translated Genesis as far as Isaac” (Marsden 43). Specifically, Ælfric notes that he was instructed by his patron Æðelweard to go only as far as Isaac: “… þu cwæde þa þæt ic ne þorftæ na mare awendan þære bec buton to Isaace, Abrahames suna, for þam þe sum oðer man þe hæfde awend fram Isaace þa boc ðe ende” (you said then that I should no further translate the book except to Isaac, Abraham’s son, on account of some other man who had translated the book from Isaac until the end). This statement, however, does not preclude the possibility that Ælfric changed his mind for some reason and went on to translate the rest of the text, that the order of division changed, or that the other translation for some reason was lost, incomplete, or unsatisfactory. Therefore, supporting stylometric analysis could inform the veracity of Ælfric’s claim. Second, omissions and terminations in the manuscripts themselves suggest a significant disruption in chapter 24 of Genesis. MS C, which Richard Marsden has argued is probably Ælfric’s original translation (“Translation by Committee” 42-3), ends at Chapter 24.22. MS B, which does omit a small number of lines in Chapters 1-23, displays a major break at Chapter 24.15, where it summarizes verses 15-20 in one sentence. In verse 15, the text directs the reader to read further in the Latin text for more information: “… swa hyt on þære Leden-bec awritten ys, ræde se þe wylle þær” (as it is written in the Latin-book; let him who wishes read it there). At the end of this summary in 24.15-20, MS B. ceases the
translation and does not restart until 24.61. Third, Clemoes and Jost found that the stylistic differences unique to MS B are consistent with Genesis 24.61 to the end of the text (Marsden 43).

With a scholarly context established that there is very likely a break in the translation of the Old English Genesis in chapter 24, I plotted the block-size results in order to examine whether any change was also visible in the rendering of Latin present participles. If the present participle is a representative marker of authorship style, a significant shift in the rendering of the present participle should be visible in the Genesis translation. Indeed, the block-size analysis reveals that this appears to be the case: the frequency with which the translation renders the Latin present participle with the OE participle drops dramatically over the course of the Old English Genesis, as the 500-word segments graphs show:

Figure 1.1: Percentages of Latin present participles rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 500-word blocks. The data here represent rates of translation, not the numbers of participles.
Figure 1.2: Numbers of Latin present participles rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 500-word blocks. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.

In both cases, the Old English present participle virtually disappears after segment 27. However, the proposed break in authorship, where MS C ends at 24.22 occurs in Segment 21, and MS B and L do not resume until late in Segment 23. This graph suggests that the Genesis chapters 1-24 (segments 1-20) vary in the use of the Old English present participle to render Latin participles, but that the practice is substantially less frequent in Genesis 24.61 to the end.

The 600-word segment-size analysis yields a similar result, showing a strong contrast between segments 1-19 and 22-42:

Figure 1.3: Numbers of Latin present participles rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 600-word blocks. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.

The 600-word analysis also demonstrates that a different block size can yield different results. In the 600-word segment-size analysis, the manuscript break between MS C 24.22 and MS B/L
24.62 occurs in segments 17 and 18. The 600-word block size appears to reflect this in the translation of Latin present participles.

The 800-word analysis further demonstrates that the results are consistent with 500- and 600-word segment analysis but that different block size can produce slightly different results:

![Figure 1.4](image-url)

*Figure 1.4:* Numbers of Latin present participles rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 800-word blocks. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.

The break in manuscripts in Genesis 24.22-61 occurs in 800-word segments 13 and 14. When MS B and L resume at 24.62, they engage in a short spate of participial translations, which all but disappear for the rest of the text. The three block sizes reflect a common pattern showing that Genesis 1-24.22 translates the Latin present participle with the Old English participle more than does Genesis 24.61-end. These block-size analyses do not pinpoint an exact location of a shift, but rather suggest a visible difference around the location of the textual break. The change in block size has produced slightly varied results, but all three analyses produce persuasive evidence that the rendering of the present participle does reflect the largely accepted shift in authorship. Such dramatic results do not appear to require a further statistical analysis to decide whether difference is visible. However, the point of this study is to assess how the proportion test of rates of translation of the present participle can assist in authorship-attribution investigations. As such, it is necessary here to apply the test and examine how the results characterize dramatic
results such as these, in order to provide some context for situations in which bar graphs alone do not easily reveal differences in the practice of translation. The results demonstrate that the proportion test can and does reflect useful evidence of difference in authorship-attribution studies that rely on the kinds of counting results reported in this section.

1.4c. The 2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction: these two texts are not the same, statistically.

Therefore, in order to observe how the proportion test reflects on the dramatic results visible in the rendering of the Latin present participle in Genesis, this study proceeded by breaking the text into samples that observe the proposed boundary. Sample 1 consists of 500-word segments 1-8 and 10-20 (Genesis chapters 1 – 24.14); segment 9 is excluded because it contains no Latin present participles for the text to render. Sample 2 consists of segments 22-50 (24.44 to 50.13); segment 51 is excluded because it is a fragment of only 239 words. This study excludes segment 21 because MS C ends in the middle of this segment, which could cross-contaminate the results across the proposed break, and because MS B does not translate most of it.

To explore the potential of difference more precisely and reliably, I performed a test called a “2-sample test of two proportions with continuity correction” in the software program called “R”, which allows us to examine whether the mean of a sample is probably similar to or different from the mean of another sample. This technique addresses the problem that real phenomena are not entirely uniform, and so the mean frequency of a sample (rate of translation in one portion) of the phenomenon may not exactly resemble the frequency of the entire phenomenon (in the entire text). In other words, it is not only possible, but also likely, that any
author will vary his or her style to some degree according to chance, just as flipping the same
coin should theoretically result in 50% heads and 50% tails, but real coins rarely produce these
results exactly, and often require hundreds of repetitions before they begin to regress to the
expected mean. Three questions then remain: are sample 1’s and sample 2’s means really just
random variations of the same process, or is the probability that they would coincide so low that
it is statistically unlikely? Is sample 1’s mean (25% average) roughly twelve-fold higher than the
mean of sample 2 (2% average), indicating substantial difference, or only 23% (25%-2%)
higher? Could one author or translator have been in a different mood for each part of the text, or
is this likely a strong indicator of split authorship?

The proportion test cannot guarantee one conclusion or the other; only by directly
observing the creation of these translations could scholars confirm authorship absolutely.
However, the proportion test can demonstrate the probability of similarity or difference. Of
course, tests of probability also contain an inherent risk of error, stemming from the potential
that the test might cause us to reject a finding of similarity when the samples are in fact similar,
or reject difference when the samples are really different. The proportion test incorporates a
function to adjust the parameters of the test to accept a certain level of error, called the alpha.
The alpha value describes the potential that the result does not in fact represent the population,
and therefore represents the chance of error. Anthony Kenny recommends that in “most literary
studies an alpha of 0.05 or 0.01” is the standard (108), with 0.01 as the stricter and less error-

16 This study has had to address the statistical concept of probability, in which even what appear to be fairly
predictable processes can demonstrate more variation than one might expect. Several texts have discussed how
experiments with coin-flipping, which one would generally expect to produce roughly even rates of heads and tails,
odependent produce rates of heads and tails far different from those expected. The relevance to this study is that, if an
unmodified coin can produce considerably different numbers of heads and tails in a flipping experiment, we must
consider that a translator could produce considerably different treatments of the otherwise same process of
translation. The question is how to tell the difference statistically between this kind of variation, and the variation
that results either from using a “rigged” coin or from two different translators. A helpful introduction to coin-
flipping as an example of probability is available in Innumeracy by John Allen Paulos, pp. 27-28 and 57-60. A more
mathematical examination is available in McClave and Sincich pp. 121-124.
prone of the two. For the sake of accuracy and caution, I have conducted all studies with an alpha value of 0.01.

It is at this point where the term “alpha” can be confusing, because there are two ways to describe the chance of error; these differing ways to describe the chance of error affect how to establish a threshold at which to determine difference, and so further clarification is necessary. The alpha is often called the “confidence interval”, which reports the probability that the result represents the population; an alpha of 0.01 corresponds to a confidence interval of 99%. In simple terms, the confidence interval represents the probability of accuracy, while the alpha represents the probability of error. In a simple equation, if all probability = 100% (1), then 1 – the confidence interval (the probability of accuracy) = the alpha (the probability of error). To give my choice of alpha at 0.01 or confidence interval of 99% some context, I note that McClave and Sincich advise that confidence intervals “used in practice usually range from .90 to .99” (325). Indeed, a confidence of 95% is common and accepted in current medical research. For example, Woods et al. in their 2005 report “Adverse Events and Preventable Adverse Events in Children” use only 95% confidence intervals to assess rates of preventable harm-causing events to children in US hospitals (156). However, in the type of proportion test I perform in this study, the confidence interval of 99% produces an alpha of 0.005, and it is necessary to explain this threshold before this study applies it to the data. Because my objective is to determine whether the rates of translation in two samples of text are similar or not, I must employ a “two-tailed hypothesis”. A two-tailed hypothesis test creates a range within which one sample would

---

17 As my discussion will explain in greater detail, my choice of alpha is stricter than that generally applied in most quantitative fields, including linguistics. Professor Heller has suggested that only an alpha of .025, which increases the chances that I will conclude that there is significant difference, is appropriate. I consider this problem by showing how test results differ when I apply an alpha of .025.
be considered the same as the other. Outside that range, on both the lower and high ends of the range, lie two small regions of probability that the samples are different.

![Diagram of two-tailed hypothesis, confidence interval, and two rejection regions.](image)

**Figure 1.5**: A schematic diagram of the two-tailed hypothesis, confidence interval, and two rejection regions. The region in white is the region of acceptance. Regions shown in grey contain results that support rejection of similarity of two samples.

As the figure above illustrates, this kind of test contains a region of probability in which the rate of translation in one sample could be much higher than the rate in the other, and another region of probability in which one sample’s rate could be much lower than the other’s rate. These two regions share the probability that one sample lies outside the range of similarity for the other. As a result, a two-tailed hypothesis requires the experimenter to divide the alpha in half (McClave and Sincich 378-9, 384), one half for each of the two regions of difference. Because this test deals with real numbers, one sample of Genesis cannot be both higher and lower than the other. The result of a test would only apply either to the higher threshold of difference or to the lower threshold. As such, my selection of a 99% confidence interval, which suggests an alpha of 0.01,
requires the alpha to be divided by two, producing an alpha of 0.005, 0.005 for whichever side of the other sample the result of the proportion test falls.

The proportion test contains two important numbers. The first is the confidence level, set to 99% . The confidence interval in the proportion test can also be expressed as the alpha. As I explain above, the alpha in my tests is \( \alpha = 0.005 \) \( ((1 - .99) / 2) \). The second important number in the proportion test is the “p-value”, which defines “the probability (assuming that \( H_0 \) is true)\(^{19}\) of observing a value of the test statistic that is at least as contradictory to the null hypothesis, and supportive of the alternative hypothesis, as the actual one computed from the sample data” (McClave and Sincich 383). In simpler terms, the p-value is the result of the specific test; it quantifies how likely the specific result of the test is. When the p-value of a test of two proportions is smaller than the alpha value (the threshold of difference, above which the two samples are statistically the same), the two proportions are statistically unlikely to be similar. I compared Genesis 1-24.22, which translates 39 of 154 Latin present participles with Old English present participles, with Genesis 24.61-end, which translates 7 of 277 Latin present participles with Old English present participles. If the result of the proportion test produces a p-value smaller than the threshold alpha value of 0.005, it is probable that these two samples of the Old English Genesis are statistically different.

To execute the test in R, I used the following command line\(^{20}\) to analyze the rates of translation with a 99% confidence interval and a two-sided test in order to determine whether the two samples were similar or different:

\[
> \text{prop.test(x=c(39,7), n=c(154,277), conf.level=0.99)}
\]

\(^{19}\) “\( H_0 \)” is the hypothesis that the two samples are in fact statistically similar. The p-value then expresses the likelihood that the two samples are the same. An extremely low p-value in a test indicates that the probability is extremely low that the two samples are really the same, statistically.

\(^{20}\) Before presenting the results here, I confirmed with Professor Heller that this command line was, in fact, correct.
The proportion test in R produced the following results:

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction

data: c(39, 7) out of c(154, 277)
X-squared = 51.591, df = 1, p-value = 6.836e-13
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
 0.1294485 0.3265034
sample estimates:
  prop 1  prop 2
0.25324675 0.02527076

The proportion test returned a p-value of 6.836e-13, which can be expressed in standard notation as 6.836 \times 10^{-13}. In effect, this result suggests that, if the two samples indeed came from the same whole, the chances that they would both have their respective rates of translation would be 0.00000000006386%, or one in roughly sixty billion. Although such a probability is not absolutely impossible, it is extremely unlikely, and it is also far below the 0.005 threshold of statistical significance. As a result, this statistical difference strongly supports the hypothesis that the rate of translation of the present participle in the first 24 chapters of the text, which are attributed to Ælfric, is statistically very different from the rate of translation attributed to the anonymous translator(s) of Genesis 24.61 to the end of the text, and thus the translation of the Latin present participle very strongly reflects a shift in authorship.

**The Problem of Line-Omission in OE Genesis**

There is, however, a significant complication with the analysis of Genesis that deserves further study to ensure that these results are accurate, and they require further examination beyond that generally required for the OE Gospels texts. The problem is that MSS B and L, on
which Crawford based Chapter 24.61 and forward, omit the translation of many Latin verses that contain Latin present participles. The translation of an entire verse but the omission of a present participle in that verse reflects a decision specific to the translation of the Latin participle. Also, the paraphrase of more than one verse into a combined verse paraphrase also reflects a decision to render the text, and therefore to consider whether and how to render a Latin participle in the paraphrased text. However, the omission of an entire verse containing a Latin participle, with no apparent attempt to paraphrase it elsewhere, largely removes the relevance of the present participle. Therefore, a more precise examination of the Genesis translation requires the study to remove omitted verses from the analysis, in order to ascertain how the translator did handle Latin present participles when the translator attempted to render the text immediately surrounding that participle. However, it is also significant that many of the omitted lines after the proposed break in authorship include Latin present participles. How much do these omissions of whole lines change the results of the translation of present participles? Although the text to Genesis 24.22 only omits one whole verse containing a Latin present participle at 8.19, might we find that the rate of the translation of Latin present participles with OE participles after 24.61 falls more in line with the part of the text attributed to Ælfric, if we analyse the renderings of only those Latin present participles in rendered or at least paraphrased verses?

In order to evaluate and resolve this complication, this study examined all of the OE Genesis, enumerated all Latin present participles contained in omitted verses, and then calculated a new total of Latin participles in verses that the OE Genesis attempts to translate either directly or in paraphrase. The objective was to reflect more accurately how the translation renders Latin participles. However, an additional complication came to light: Chapter 34 of the OE Genesis is almost entirely paraphrased in a brief text at the end of Chapter 33. It is difficult in this case to
separate verse omission from paraphrase; however, this study matched the material in the paraphrase to the original Latin text, and noted those lines that are not specifically addressed in the OE paraphrase. Verses 4, 5, 12, 13, and 19 in segment 34 contain Latin present participles omitted in the paraphrase, and verses 22, 23, 26, 28 in segment 35 are also omitted in the paraphrase. For this reason, this study counted these omissions as omissions of whole verses, because the paraphrase does not appear to make a significant attempt to translate the Latin text surrounding these participles. In total, 92 Latin present participles are contained within omitted verses in the Old English Genesis: 1 at 8.19 in the section attributed to Ælfric, 12 in the untranslated portion between 24.23-24.60, and 79 in the text starting at 24.61. This process of excluding omitted verses reduced the overall number of Latin present participles in the OE Genesis considered for translation from 443 to 351 participles, a reduction that could significantly affect the impact of the proportion test performed above.

It is in a situation such as this in which the 500-word segmenting technique used by statisticians and computer scientists rewards the painstaking work required to perform the technique. As the data show (see Appendix A for the data), the omissions of verses containing Latin present participles have surprisingly little effect on the rate of translation into Old English. Keeping in mind that this study proceeds from the well-supported hypothesis that a break occurs in segment 21, and that segments 1-20 deserve comparison with segments 22-50, we observe a clear pattern emerging in the raw data: line omission has a very slight effect on the rates of translation in the text attributed to Ælfric, because MS C (the manuscript that Marsden suggests is closest to Ælfric’s original translation) engages in very little omission of this kind. Ælfric omits only one line containing a participle at 8.19, in segment 7, which causes the rate of translation with OE participles to rise less than 2% from 21.43% to 23.08%. The situation in the
anonymous text starting at 24.61 is very much different, however. Here, the translation frequently omits verses containing Latin present participles, and this practice of omission tends to coincide with a practice of rendering Latin present participles without any OE present participles whatsoever, as is evident in segments 23-25, 28-36, and 39-51. Of the remaining five 500-word segments in which the translation uses at least one OE present participle to render a Latin one, verse omission has no effect on segment 38, negligible effects on segments 27 (14.29% to 15.38%) and 37 (6.66667 to 7.69%), and a minor effect on segment 26 (6.67% to 11.12%). The only dramatic change out of the 28 segments in this sample occurs in segment 22, the first segment in the anonymous translation, which drops from eleven to four eligible participles, causing a rate of two out of 11 (18.18%) to change to two out of four (50%). This highly anomalous finding suggests that either the effect of verse omission caused a bias in the result, or at least that segment 22 is remarkably different from the general practice of translating the Latin present participle with OE present participles after the end of MS C.

The question remains, however, whether the loss of 92 of 443 Latin present participles through verse-omission in the OE translation, more than 20%, in this analysis has a significant statistical impact on the practice of translation. With the problem of verse omission addressed, this study performed a 2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction:

```
2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction
data:  c(39, 7) out of c(153, 198)
X-squared = 34.629, df = 1, p-value = 3.989e-09
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
 0.1169097 0.3221871
sample estimates:
  prop 1  prop 2
0.25490196 0.03535354
```

**Figure 1.7:** R results for 2-sample hypothesis test of overall rendering of Latin present participles with OE participles in the Old English Genesis, excluding participles in omitted verses. The p-value, which is the key statistic in this test, is given in bold text.
This second proportion test returned a p-value of 3.989e-09, which can be expressed in standard notation as 3.989⁻⁹. Even after factoring in the problem of line omission, this study finds that the probability that Genesis 1-24.22 and Genesis 24.61-50.25 take the same approach to rendering Latin present participles is only 0.0000003989%, or one in roughly four million. These statistical results very strongly support the critical consensus that the Old English Genesis is the result of two very different approaches to the translation of the Latin present participle, and therefore that the rendering of the Latin present participle in such biblical translations is a reflective marker of stylistic and authorial variation.

1.4d. Proportion testing of sub-categories of present participles to determine relationship to the general feature.

The critical assumption that the previous argument makes is that the present participle is a single phenomenon, the translation of which can signify trends and difference in authorship. However, the methodology of this study included tracking how participles in several syntactic sub-categories are rendered in the Old English translation; the renderings of the sub-categories are significantly divergent and suggest very different practices of translation. To assess this possibility with the same style of test used to suggest overall difference in the translation, I applied the proportion test to compare the frequencies of translation of the sub-categories of present participles to examine whether these deserve further analysis. My objective was to use a reliable statistical test to investigate a simple question: are all Latin present participles the same in the translator’s eyes, or are nominative participles different from accusatives, or predicatives, or substantives? Are these subcategories of Latin present participles rendered at similar rates, or at statistically different rates?
Using the same technique employed to assess the difference in the overall translation of Latin present participles between the two portions of the text, I applied the proportion test to evaluate whether the translation of the sub-categories follows a generally unified practice, or the translation of at least one sub-category is significantly different from the translation of the whole and from that of other subcategories. The underlying assumption is that, if the translations of pre- and post-positive nominative present participles, accusative participles, ablative-absolutes, predicatives, substantives, and oblique-case participles are really just functions of the translator’s overall treatment of the Latin present participle, their rates of translation should lie within the probable limits of the test. However, if these proportions lie outside the probable limits of this test, they are likely not parts of the same process or approach, and therefore deserve individual analysis. Just as in the proportion test above, I used a confidence interval of 99% to minimize the chance of error.\(^{21}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Comparison</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OE Latin</td>
<td>OE Latin</td>
<td>p-value 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ælfric pre-nom vs. Ælfric all</td>
<td>0 24</td>
<td>39 153</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ælfric post-nom vs. Ælfric all</td>
<td>17 56</td>
<td>39 153</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ælfric post-acc vs. Ælfric all</td>
<td>13 18</td>
<td>39 153</td>
<td>0.0001413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ælfric pre-nom vs. Ælfric post-nom</td>
<td>0 24</td>
<td>17 56</td>
<td>0.000608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ælfric post-nom vs. Ælfric post-acc</td>
<td>17 56</td>
<td>13 18</td>
<td>0.00409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ælfric post-nom vs. Anon post-nom</td>
<td>17 56</td>
<td>1 117</td>
<td>1.343e-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ælfric post-acc vs. Anon post-acc</td>
<td>13 18</td>
<td>3 21?</td>
<td>0.0008364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: A table of p-values for proportion tests in the Old English Genesis. “Category 1” refers to the first category in the comparison, while “Category 2” refers to the second. For example, in the first comparison “Ælfric pre-nom vs. Ælfric all,” the test compares the rendering of pre-positive nominative participles in Genesis 1-24.22, attributed to Ælfric, to the rendering of all Latin present participles in Genesis 1-24.22. The column “p-value 99” denotes results of tests to which a 99% confidence interval was applied; the threshold of difference (the alpha) is 0.005. Numbers smaller than 0.005 are considered statistically different. The column “p-value 95” denotes results of tests to which a 95% confidence interval was applied; the threshold of difference (the alpha) is 0.025. Numbers smaller than 0.025 are considered statistically different.

\(^{21}\) However, to respond to Professor Heller’s reservation that only a 95% confidence interval is necessary in most quantitative studies, I have also provided the results of the test using a 95% confidence interval.
The 99% confidence interval created fairly liberal upper and lower limits that reduce the chance of a false finding of difference more than the standard confidence interval of 95% applied in most disciplines. Results within these limits are probably statistically similar to the overall frequency of translation of the Latin present participle in each text, with a low margin of error of suggesting difference where there is none. However, four of these seven values lie outside the threshold for similarity, and two that lie within barely do so, statistically. First, the proportion test of Ælfric’s rendering of pre-positive nominative participles versus Ælfric’s general rate of rendering Latin present participles presents a p-value of 0.0112, just above the threshold alpha value of 0.005 to be considered statistically the same. In other words, there is roughly a 1.12% percent chance that Ælfric’s rendering of Latin pre-positive nominative present participles, which he does 0 out of 24 times (0%), reflects Ælfric’s overall practice of rendering of Latin present participles, which he does 39 times out of 153 (25.5%). While this passes the threshold of the proportion test at the much-more conservative confidence interval of 99%, it would not do so at the more widely used standard of a 95% confidence level. Second, the proportion test of Ælfric’s rendering of Latin pre-positive nominative participles, which Ælfric renders with an OE participle 0 out of 24 times, versus post-positive nominative participles, which Ælfric renders with an OE participle 17 out of 56 times (30.4%), presents a p-value of 0.00608, or a roughly 0.6% chance that Ælfric’s renderings of Latin pre- and post-positive nominative are statistically the same. Like the result of the proportion test of Ælfric’s rendering of pre-positive nominatives versus all types of participles, the result of this test would lie outside the threshold of similarity at a 95% confidence interval. Even with a 99% confidence interval, however, both results stand in stark contrast to the result of the proportion test that compares Ælfric’s rendering of Latin post-positive nominative present participles, which he does 17 out of 56 times (30.4%), with Ælfric’s
overall practice of rendering of Latin present participles, which he does 39 times out of 153 (25.5%). For this comparison, the proportion test produced a p-value of 0.598, or roughly a 60% chance that these are statistically the same. These various findings of statistical difference, produced with the same proportion test that suggests difference between the two portions of Genesis, suggest that not only does the rendering of Latin present participles with OE participles differ between the two portions, but also differs among the specific sub-categories of Latin participles. The rendering of the Latin present participle is a complex process that strongly appears to differ according to the syntax of the particular participle.

These results, however, beg the question of how they can even be correct: how can the test be valid if some rates of translation lie outside the range of similarity with the overall mean, when the same participles and their renderings were used to compute these statistics? I believe the answer is a combination of range and variation. Collated into one phenomenon, the renderings of these participles in each text produce a result that is very different from the renderings of individual sub-categories, suggesting that different translators handled each subcategory quite differently from other sub-categories. In many cases, the translators of the Old English Genesis and the Old English Gospels treated the subcategories of present participles so differently that the various sub-categories of participles simply do not appear to be parts of the same process. In other words, they do not appear to be products of the same single phenomenon. These findings strongly indicate the need for a closer analysis of what happens with how the translations render these features, which this study undertakes in the qualitative analysis of translation.

Overall, the quantitative analysis has established that the Latin present participle in Genesis does not diminish over the course of the text, but the segment analyses have
demonstrated that the use of the Old English present participle to translate the Latin participle sharply diminishes and almost disappears in Genesis 24.61-50. The proportion test has demonstrated that these differences would indeed count as very different by statistical standards, and that this difference extends even into the ways in which individual sub-categories of participles are rendered in the translation. Taken together, these results demonstrate that the rendering of the Latin present participle in Genesis can reflect known shifts in authorship, and that the proportion test can characterize these differences in ways that helpfully illuminate the extent of that difference where a simple bar graph alone could not. In this way, these quantitative analyses also demonstrate how scholars can raise the standard of proof in authorship-attribution studies to make better-supported assertions about shifts in authorship.

1.5 Qualitative results and discussion

The qualitative portion of this study of the Old English Genesis engages in a close syntactical analysis of how Ælfric and the anonymous translator of Genesis render the Latin present participle into Old English. Here, I find that Ælfric and the anonymous translator take entirely different approaches to the rendering of post-positive nominative participles, and that Ælfric himself distinguishes between pre-positive and post-positive nominative participles in his translation. The study of accusative present participles also reveals considerable variation between Ælfric, who preserves the participles in the translation and usually renders them with OE present participles, and the anonymous translator, who sometimes omits these participles entirely and rarely renders them with the OE present participle. Neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translator renders present participles in ablative-absolute constructions, but Ælfric shows a greater tendency to render substantive participles with OE participles than does the
anonymous translator. Predicative participles are too rare to inform the practice of translation, but oblique-case participles do indicate that Ælfric tends to render these with the participle more than does the anonymous translator. I also report on differences between Ælfric’s and the anonymous translator’s own uses of OE present participles where the Latin does not use a present participle, and show that Ælfric’s use of his own OE present participles in Genesis is generally consistent with his use of present participles in his *Libellus de veteri testamento et novo*. These analyses demonstrate that the rendering of these various subcategorie of Latin present participles reflect considerable division between Ælfric’s practice of translation and that of the anonymous translator; thus, these results also demonstrate the suitability of the present participle as a marker of authorship shift for use in other studies such as that of the Old English Gospels.

1.5a *The pre-positive and post-positive nominative participle*

So far, much of this study has addressed the rendering of the Latin present participle at the whole-text level, and treated the Latin present participle itself as a single phenomenon, whose rendering can characterize trends in a larger text. However, as the study above suggests, and my subsequent study of the Old English Gospels will also indicate, the rendering of the Latin present participle is not a single process, but rather an umbrella term for what appears to be a number of different practices of translation that vary from text to text. A close analysis of how the OE Genesis translates the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle demonstrates telling features of comparison with the Old English Gospels. The Old English Genesis simply does not translate the pre-positive nominative present participle with a single OE participle, a practice of conspicuous uniformity in a text so completely divergent in the overall practice of translating
present participles. It also suggests a significant difference from the practice of translation in the Old English Gospels, which also show variations in their treatment of these features:

![Pre-positive Nominatives](image1)

*Figure 1.8:* Rates of translation of Latin pre-positive nominative present participles with Old English present participles in the four Old English Gospels and in the Genesis text from the Old English Hexaetuch.

However, just as separating pre-positive from post-positive nominative participles in the OE Gospels will reveal striking similarities among these texts, so does it reveal another striking difference within the OE Genesis:

![Post-positive Nominatives](image2)
Figure 1.9: Rates of translation of Latin post-positive nominative present participles with Old English present participles in the four Old English Gospels and in the Genesis text from the Old English Hexaetuch. As the study of the OE Gospels will show, the Old English John translates some Latin present participles with OE participles up to chapter 12, then no more.

As discussed in the later study of the OE Gospels, the three synoptic gospels render the Latin post-positive nominative present participle at nearly an identical rate. In the portion of the OE John chapters 1-12, which does render these Latin participles with OE participles, it also does so at a rate nearly identical to those of the other texts. The text of MS C of the OE Genesis, chapter 1-24.22, also does so at nearly the same rate. However, despite the surprisingly even frequencies of translation of post-positive nominative present participles with OE participles in these texts, the translation of chapters 24.61 to the end of the OE Genesis in MS B/L translates only one of 117 (0.85%) Latin present participles in this category, at 37.35, with an Old English present participle. This should come as no surprise in light of the previous analysis of overall translation, which showed very few OE participial translations of any kind in the second portion of the translation. Still, the fact that Ælfric and the anonymous translator render the post-positive nominative participle at such different rates shows a stark contrast to the fact that neither translates the pre-positive nominative participle in the OE Genesis. Why are they so different in one category, and so similar in another? Discrepancies such as these motivate this study to consider sub-categories as independent processes, and not part of one unified process of translating Latin present participles. Ælfric shows a strong similarity to the translators of the Old English Gospels in his rendering of the post-positive nominative, a characteristic drastically different in the anonymous translation of Genesis 24.61 to the end.
i. The pre-positive and post-positive nominative present participle

Why does the OE Genesis render the post-positive nominative present participle so differently from the pre-positive nominative participle, and how does this practice change over the course of the text? The study sought first to evaluate whether the difference is purely syntactic or the two categories of participles contain remarkably different words or sentence structures. Second, the study sought to assess whether the Latin of Genesis 1–24.22 is significantly different from that of Genesis 24.61 to the end, to ascertain whether the translators of the two sections even had a chance to render similar words and structures containing Latin present participles.

Because the OE Genesis does not render a single pre-positive nominative present participle with an OE participle, there is no way to assess a difference in practice between the first and second sections of Genesis. Also, because the second section of the OE Genesis only renders one of 117 post-positive nominative participles with OE participles, it is not feasible to suggest a significant difference between the anonymous translator’s practice of rendering pre- vs. post-positive participles. However, two comparisons of nominative participles produce fruitful results: a comparison of pre- vs. post-positive nominatives in the first portion of Genesis, and a comparison of post-positive nominatives in the first and second portions. In both cases, there is a
significant difference in the frequency of rendering Latin present participles with OE present participles.

The first comparison addresses the question of why Ælfric might have elected to translate post-positive nominative participles with OE participles 30% of the time in 56 opportunities, but 0% of pre-positives in 21 opportunities. The answer may be that the Latin uses different verbs in these positions. Ælfric translates the post-positive nominative present participles “dicen-”, “inrigan-”, “scien-”, “redeun-”, “dissipan-”, “fuman-”, “transien-”, “stans/t-”, and “ducen-” with OE present participles. However, not a single one of these appears as a pre-positive participle in Genesis 1-24.22. Of these participles, only “dicen-” appears more than twice. When the Latin uses a dialogue verb in pre-positive position, it is “responden-” at 15.9, 16.6, and 18.27, and “expostulan-” at 20.10, and these two participles never change position in Genesis 1-24.22: “responden-” is a pre-positive structure, while “dicen-” is a post-positive structure. Two exceptions to this distribution occur in the second portion of Genesis, with “dicen-” as a pre-positive in 31.32 and “responden-” as a post-positive in 25.23, but these have no bearing on the first section of Genesis. This dramatic difference in the Latin itself suggests that a translator could very easily have developed a sensitivity for the position of the Latin present participle, when the Latin source developed and worded these two types of participles differently.

This distribution of “respondere” and “dicere” as present participles appears to have had an effect on Ælfric’s rendering of “dicere” in post-position. Ælfric renders “dicen-” with an OE participle eight of 21 times (38%), only a little higher than that of post-positive nominatives in general (30.35%). An inspection of Ælfric’s rendering of “dicen-” as a participle or otherwise reveals that there are key differences between contexts that lead to participial translations or otherwise. Ælfric tends to render Latin “dicen-” as OE “cwedende” (or “secgende” in one case)
after dative structures, speech-verb structures, naming structures, and intransitive structures.

Ælfric does not translate dative or intransitive structures involving “dicen-” other than with OE present participles, even though it is necessary also to recognize that these structures are fairly rare:

Dative structures:
1.22 benedixitque eis dicens (Post Nom) crescite et multiplicamini et replete aquas maris avesque multiplicentur super terram
(DR) And he blessed them, saying: Increase and multiply, and fill the waters of the sea: and let the birds be multiplied upon the earth.
(OEGEN) Ond bletsode hi, ðus cweðende, "Weaxað ond beoð gemænifylde, ond gefyllað ðære sæ wæteru, ond ða fugelas beon gemænifylde ofer eorðan.

2.16 praecepitque ei dicens (Post Nom) ex omni ligno paradisi comede
(DR) And he commanded him, saying: Of every tree of paradise thou shalt eat:
(OEGEN) Ond bebæd him, ðus cweðende, "Of ælcum treowe ðises orcerdes ðu most etan.

Intransitive structures:
17.17 cececidit Abraham in faciem et risit dicens (Post-Pos Nom) in corde suo putasne centenario nascetur filius et Sarra nonagenaria pariet
(DR) Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, saying in his heart: Shall a son, thinkest thou, be born to him that is a hundred years old? and shall Sara that is ninety years old bring forth?
(OEGEN) Pa feol Abraham on cneowum 7 hlæh, cweðende on ys heortan: Wenst þu la ðæt sunu beo acenned hundwintrum men? Sarra hundnygontigwintre nu acenne?

---

22 To analyze the translation, I devised and used a series of “tags”, additional codes that I inserted into the translation to allow me to mark and track the incidence of participles, as I define in my methodology. In all quoted portions of the Genesis translation, which are drawn from Crawford’s edition, but checked for accuracy of participles against Marsden’s edition, Latin present participles are given in bold, underlined text. Old English present participles are highlighted in bold, for ease of discovery. Latin present participles are additionally coded as follows, which I give here for ease of reference as the reader encounters the quoted examples: pre-positive nominative (Pre-Nom), post-positive nominative (Post-Nom), pre-positive accusative (Pre-Acc), post-positive accusative (Post-Acc), ablative absolute (Abl Abs), substantive and the case of the participle as it applies (Sub), predicative (Pred), and oblique-case (genitive, dative, non-absolute ablative) (Ob). Old English present participles that occur without a Latin cognate are “unattested” participles, and marked “(unatt)”.

23 As I explain in the methodology, I have used Crawford’s edition as the source text from the Old English Genesis, checked against Marsden’s 2008 edition. Crawford does not distinguish between MS B/L and C where they are the same. Whenever C is different from B/L, I mark the quoted text with “B” and “C”, accordingly.

24 I have provided the Douay-Rheims translation of the Latin Vulgate, in order to provide a more readable version of the text, on the advice of Professor A. diPaolo Healey. Because my own translation was deliberately meant to illustrate the structure of the Latin rather than produce a translation that engages with the vernacular of English, the use of the Douay-Rheims allows the reader to refer to an excellent translation, which should illuminate the analysis even further. The Douay-Rheims translation is marked with “(DR)”.

25 Where I insert the text from the Old English Genesis, I add the code “(OEGEN)”. 
18.12 quae risit occulte dicens (Post-Pos Nom) postquam consensui et dominus meus vetulus est voluptati operam dabo
(DR) And she laughed secretly, saying: After I am grown old and my lord is an old man, shall I give myself to pleasure?
(OEGEN) Hloh digelice ḏus cweðende : Syððan ic ealdode 7 min hlaford geripod ys, sceal ic nu æniges lūstes gyman?

Ælfric does, however, vary in his translation of naming structures, rendering 4.25 with a participle in MS. C but 5.29 with a verb:  

4.25 cognovit quoque adhuc Adam uxorem suam et peperit filium vocavitque nomen eius Seth dicens (Post Nom) posuit mihi Deus semen aliud pro Abel quem occidit Cain
(DR) Adam also knew his wife again: and she brought forth a son, and called his name Seth, saying: God hath given me another seed, for Abel whom Cain slew.
(OEGEN) B: Eft Adam gestrynde sunu ḏone he nemde Seth, ḏus cweð : Drihten me sealde ðisne sunu for Abel, ḏe Cain ofsloh.
(OEGEN) C: Adam soðlice briac his wiues, heo acende sunu 7 gecigde hine Seth, ḏus cweðende : God forgeaf me oþerne offspring for Abel, þone Cain ofsloh.

5.29 vocavitque nomen eius Noe dicens (Post Nom) iste consolabitur nos ab operibus et laboribus manuum nostrarum in terra cui maledixit Dominus
(DR) And he called his name Noe, saying: This same shall comfort us from the works and labours of our hands on the earth, which the Lord hath cursed.
(OEGEN) Gecigde hine Noe, & cweð (V), þes gefrefrað us fram weordum & geswincum ure handan ofer eorþan, þe God awirigde

Ælfric also renders “double-speech” structures with OE participles, which tend to present two words that indicate the same speech act, either two verbs or a noun combined with a verb:

8.15 locutus est autem Deus ad Noe dicens (Post-Nom)
(DR) And God spoke to Noe, saying:
(OEGEN) God ḏa spræc to Noe, ḏus cweðende:

15.1 his itaque transactis factus est sermo Domini ad Abram per visionem dicens (Post-Nom) noli timere Abram ego protector tuus sum et merces tua magna nimis
(DR) Now when these things were done, the word of the Lord came to Abram by a vision, saying: Fear not, Abram, I am thy protector, and thy reward exceeding great.
(OEGEN) Đa ðis gedon wæs, ḏa wearð Godes spræc to Abrame ðurh gesyhðe him secgende: Ne ondræd þu ðe Abram; ic eom ðin wergend (uantly), 7 þin med byð swyðe mycel.

---

26 When the translation uses non-present-participial forms to render a Latin participle, I tagged them as follows: verb (V), past participle (Past part), infinitive (Inf), prepositional phrase (PP or prep phrase), noun (N), adjective (Adj), determiner (Det), omitted participle (omitted), and participle in an entirely omitted line [Line Omitted Participle].
15.4 statimque sermo Domini factus est ad eum **dicens (Post-Nom)** non erit hic heres tuus sed qui egredietur de utero tuo ipsum habebis heredem

(DR) And immediately the word of the Lord came to him, saying: He shall not be thy heir: but he that shall come out of thy bowels, him shalt thou have for thy heir.

(OEGEN) Ðær rihte wearð Godes spræc to Abrame, þus **cwæðende**: Ne byð ðes þin yrſenuma, þe ðu embe spæce, ac ðone þu hæfst to yrſenuman, þe of ðe sylfum cymð.

However, Ælfric does change his approach after the first three of these, preferring to conflate double-speech structures into translations with a single main verb:

19.15 cumque esset mane cogebant eum angeli **dicentes (Post- Nom)** surge et tolle uxorem tuam et duas filias quas habes ne et tu pariter pereas in scelere civitatis

(DR) And when it was morning, the angels pressed him, saying: Arise, take thy wife, and the two daughters which thou hast: lest thou also perish in the wickedness of the city.

(OEGEN) Þa englas ða on ærne mergen **cwædon (V)** to Loðe : Aris 7 nym ðin wife 7 þine dohra 7 fár ðe heonon, ðy lës þe ðu losige samod mid þissere forsyclidgan burhware.

20.11 respondit Abraham cogitavi mecum **dicens (Post-Nom)** forsitan non est timor Dei in loco isto et intericient me propter uxorem meam

(DR) Abraham answered: I thought with myself, saying: Perhaps there is not the fear of God in this place: and they will kill me for the sake of my wife:

(OEGEN) Abraham him **cwæð (V)** to : Ic cwæð on minum geðance : Ic wene þæt Godes ege ne sy on þisre stowe 7 þæt hi wyllað me ofslean for mines wifes ðingon.

22.11 et ecce angelus Domini de caelo clamavit **dicens (Post-Nom)** Abraham Abraham qui respondit adsum

(DR) And behold an angel of the Lord from heaven called to him, saying: Abraham, Abraham. And he answered: Here I am.

(OEGEN) Mid ðam ðe he wolde þæt weorc begynnæ, ða clypode Godes engel ardlice of heofonum, (Omitted) Abraham! He andwyrdre sona.

22.15 vocavit autem angelus Domini Abraham secundo de caelo **dicens (Post-Nom)** Abraham Abraham qui respondit adsum

(DR) And the angel of the Lord called to Abraham a second time from heaven, saying:

(OEGEN) Eft clypode se engel Abraham, 7 **cwæð (V)** :

23.3 cumque surrexisset ab officio funeris locutus est ad filios Heth **dicens (Post-Nom)**

(DR) And after he rose up from the funeral obsequies, he spoke to the children of Heth, saying:

(OEGEN) MS.B. (Line Omitted)

(OEGEN) MS.C siððan wolde bicgan heore byrgene. Þa spræc he to þam mannum, þe he mid wunedun (þæt wærôn Hethes sunu) 7 hi þises bæd, 7 ** cwæð (V)** :
Overall, these results demonstrate that Ælfric varied his practice of translating certain post-positive nominative participles with either participles, verbs or omission. However, it is also significant that the remaining seven cases in which Ælfric does not use the OE participle to render “dicen-” present complex syntax that the translation resolves with the verb. The following are representative examples. In 18.13, the Latin strictly relies on the participle to post-modify Sarra\textsuperscript{27}, who asks the following question. Although a reader alert to the feminine gender of the future participle “paritura” would not attribute it to “Dominus,” Ælfric elects to rearrange word order and use clear verbal parallelism to signify that Sarra both laughs and speaks:

18.13 dixit autem Dominus ad Abraham quare risit Sarra \textit{dicens (Post-Nom)} num vere paritura sum anus

(DR) And the Lord said to Abraham: Why did Sara laugh, saying: Shall I who am an old woman bear a child indeed?

(OEGEN) Þa cwæð God to Abrahame : Hwi hloh Sarra ðin wif 7 cwæð (V) “Sceil ic nu eald wif cennan?”

In 21.17, Ælfric again changes the word order and uses a verb, possibly to contend with the difficulty presented by “Agar”, which does not take an ending, to indicate that the messenger of God is speaking to Agar, a syntactic situation that presents unusual difficulties since other Hebrew names in the text do at times take endings. Ælfric uses a finite verb for “dicens” and makes this relationship clear:

21.17 exaudivit autem Deus vocem pueri vocavitque angelus Domini Agar de caelo \textit{dicens (Post-Nom)} quid agis Agar noli timere exaudivit enim Deus vocem pueri de loco in quo est

(DR) And God heard the voice of the boy: and an angel of God called to Agar from heaven, saying: What art thou doing, Agar? fear not: for God hath heard the voice of the boy, from the place wherein he is.


\textsuperscript{27} I use the spelling “Sarra” here, even though I believe we might spell it “Sara” in Present-Day English, only because both the Latin and the Old English use this spelling. I attempt here to facilitate reading the discussion and the quoted texts.
The second comparison of post-positive nominatives addresses the question of whether the translator of the second portion of Genesis chooses not to use OE present participles to translate Latin participles, even when the Latin is similar to the first portion of Genesis. Once again, a comparison of the translation of the Latin present participle “dicen-” reveals that the anonymous translator avoids the OE present participle even in specific syntactic and semantic contexts in which Ælfric chooses to use the OE participle. Perhaps the most interesting question is what might be so special in Genesis 37.35 that the anonymous translator renders the post-positive nominative present participle with an OE participle, but does so in no other case in the 117 such participles from Genesis 24.61 to the end. The answer may be that this particular verse’s syntax was rather challenging. The present participle in question is embedded in the predicate of the verb “descendam”, which is followed by an ablative-absolute containing its own embedded present participle:

37.35 congregatis autem cunctis liberis eius ut lenirent dolorem patris noluit consolationem recipere et ait descendam ad filium meum _lugens_ (Post-Pos Nom) in infernum et illo _perseverante_ (Abl Abs) in fletu.

(DR) And all his children being gathered together to comfort their father in his sorrow, he would not receive comfort, but said: I will go down to my son into hell, mourning. And whilst he continued weeping,

(OEGEN) Soðlice hys bearn hi gesamnodon to þam þæt hi heora fæder gefrefrodon : he nolde nane frefrunge underfon, ac cwæð _wepende_ : (Omitted) Ic fare to minum suna to helle.

The anonymous translator considerably re-arranges the Latin and excises material to render this passage. The translation shifts Latin “lugens”, which post-modifies the pronominal subject “ego” (I) of “descendam” (will go down) to post-modify the subject “he”. The translator then simplifies the action of “going down” to “going”, and eliminates the subsequent ablative-absolute construction “et illo perseverante in fletu” completely. This one participial rendering by the anonymous translator appears to be a response to rare complexity, but the translator’s response,
which is to omit material and re-arrange for simplicity, is consistent with the overall practice of rendering present participles after Genesis 24.61. Five other verses in all of Genesis contain post-positive nominatives and ablative-absolutes. When these components are clearly separated, the anonymous translator renders them in some way, although not with present participles:

38.27 *instante (Abl Abs)* autem partu apparuerunt gemini in utero atque in ipsa effusione infantum unus protulit manum in qua obsetrix ligavit coccinum *dicens (Post- Nom)*

(DR) And when she was ready to be brought to bed, there appeared twins in her womb: and in the very delivery of the infants, one put forth a hand, whereon the midwife tied a scarlet thread, saying:

(OEGEN) On þære *cnenningtide (PP-N)* æteowdon twegen getwisan on hire innoþe: 7 on þæra cilda forðcyne, se oþer ræhte forð his hand, 7 seo byrþerpínenu wraþ wyrmreadne þrad þæron, 7 *cwæð (V):*

41.55 *qua esuriente (Abl Abs)* clamavit populus ad Pharaonem alimenta *petens (Post- Nom)* quibus ille respondit ite ad Ioseph et quicquid vobis dixerit facite

(DR) And when there also they began to be famished, the people cried to Pharao for food. And he said to them: Go to Joseph: and do all that he shall say to you.

(OEGEN) Þa þæt folc hingrode (V), þa clipodon hi to Pharaone, 7 *bædon (V)* him metes. He andswarode 7 *cwæð*: Gaþ to Iosepe 7 dop swa hwæt swa he eow secge.

When, however, these Latin participles become more closely mingled in complex participial syntax, the translation tends to omit them completely:

31.34 *illa festinans (Post- Nom)* abscondit idola subter stramen cameli et sedit desuper *scruatantique (Abl Abs)* omne tentorium et nihil *inveniunt (Abl Abs)*

(DR) She in haste hid the idols under the camel' s furniture, and sat upon them: and when he had searched all the tent, and found nothing,

(OEGEN) Rachel *(Omitted)* hi hæfde gehydd under anes olfendes seame. *(Omitted)* and *(Omitted).*

33.11 *et suscipe benedictionem quam adtuli tibi et quam donavit mihi Deus tribuens (Post-Nom)* omnia vix fratre *compellente (Abl Abs)* susciptiens *(Pre- Nom)*

(DR) And take the blessing, which I have brought thee, and which God hath given me, who giveth all things. He took it with much ado at his brother’ s earnest pressing him,

(OEGEN) Ða *(Omitted) (Omitted)* *underfeng (V)* he hi uneaþe.

For the rest of this portion of the text, the translator never uses an OE present participle to render a Latin post-positive nominative. Unfortunately, the only occurrence of post-positive and ablative-absolute participles in the same verse in the first portion of Genesis receives an
uncharacteristically reductive treatment, which limits the opportunity to compare how Ælfric might have rendered such structures:

23.10 habitabat autem Ephron in medio filiorum Heth responditque ad Abraham cunctis auidentibus (Abl Abs) qui ingrediebantur portam civitatis illius dicens (Post- Nom) (DR) Now Ephron dwelt in the midst of the children of Heth. And Ephron made answer to Abraham in the hearing of all that went in at the gate of the city, saying:

(OEGEN) MS.B Pa cwæð (V) Effron (Omitted).
(OEGEN) MS.C Effron þa andwirde (Omitted) Abraham, 7 cwæð (V):

Ælfric, however, whether he uses OE participles or not, appears to have little difficulty rendering heavily participial syntax. Only in 12.8 does Ælfric omit the Latin “habens”, which Ælfric makes redundant with his parallel structure with his translation “to þam munte be eastan Bethel, be westan Hai” (to the mountain east of Bethel and west of Hai). Otherwise, Ælfric renders all present participles in some way:

1.11 et ait germinet terra herbam virentem (Post Acc) et facientem (Pre Acc) semen et lignum pomiferum faciens (Post Acc) fructum
(DR) And he said: Let the earth bring forth the green herb, and such as may seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind
(OEGEN) Ond he cwæð, “Sprytte seo eorðe growende gaers ond sæd wyrcende (Pos) ond æppelbære treow wæstm wyrcende

1.12 et protulit terra herbam virentem (Post Acc) et adferentem (Pre Acc) semen iuxta genus suum lignumque faciens (Post Acc) fructum
(DR) And the earth brought forth the green herb, and such as yieldeth seed according to its kind, and the tree that beareth fruit,
(OEGEN) Ond seo eorðe forðteah growende (Pos) wyrta ond sæd berende be hyre cynne ond treow wæstm wyrcende

8.11 at illa venit ad eum ad vesperam portans (Post-Nom) ramum olivae virentibus (Ob Abl) foliis in ore suo intellexit ergo Noe quod cessassent aquae super terram
(DR) And she came to him in the evening, carrying a bough of an olive tree, with green leaves, in her mouth. Noe therefore understood that the waters were ceased upon the earth.
(OEGEN) Heo com ða on æfnunge eft to Noe, & brohte (V) an twig of anum elebeame mid grenum (Adj) leafum on hyre muðe. Ða undergeat Noe ðæt ða wætera wæron adruwode ofer eorðan.

12.8 et inde transgrediens (Pre-Nom) ad montem qui erat contra orientem (Sub Acc OP) Bethel tetendit ibi tabernaculum suum ab occidente (Sub Dat OP)
And passing on from thence to a mountain, that was on the east side of Bethel, he there pitched his tent,

(OEGEN) 7 ferde (V) syððan to þam munte be eastan (Adj) Bethel, be westan (Adj) Hai, 7 þær gesloh hys geteld 7 aræde þær an weofod Gode, 7 ys naman þær clypode.

**habens (Post-Nom)** Bethel et ab oriente Ai aedificavit quoque ibi altare Domino et invocavit nomen eius

(DR) having Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east; he built there also an altar to the Lord, and called upon his name.

(OEGEN) (Omitted above)

15.17 cum ergo occubuisset sol facta est caligo tenebrosa et apparuit clibanus *fumans* (Post-Nom) et lampas ignis *transiens (Post-Nom)* inter divisiones illas

(DR) And when the sun was set, there arose a dark mist, and there appeared a smoking furnace and a lamp of fire passing between those divisions.

(OEGEN) Ða ða sunne eode to setle, ða sloh þær swylc eal mycel mist, 7 ferde swylce an often eal smociende, 7 leochtberende fyr ofer ða lac.

21.16 et abiit seditque e regione procul quantum potest arcus iacere dixit enim non videbo *morientem* (Pre-Acc) puerum et *sedens* (Pre-Nom) contra levavit vocem suam et flevit

(DR) And she went her way, and sat over against him a great way off as far as a bow can carry, for she said: I will not see the boy die: and sitting over against, she lifted up her voice and wept.

(OEGEN) 7 set (V) hyre ferran *wepende* (unatt), cwæð þæ heo nolde geseon hu þær cild *swulte* (V).

22.3 igitur Abraham de nocte *consurgens* (Post-Nom) stravit asinum suum *ducens* (Post-Nom) secum duos iuvenes et Isaac filium suum cumque concidisset ligna in holocaustum abiit ad locum quem praeceperat ei Deus

(DR) So Abraham rising up in the night, saddled his ass: and took with him two young men, and Isaac his son: and when he had cut wood for the holocaust he went his way to the place which God had commanded him.

(OEGEN) Abraham ða *aras* (V) on ðære ylcan nihtæ 7 ferde mid twam cnapum to þam fyrlenum lande, 7 Isaac samod, on assum *ridende* (paraphrase).

22.13 levavit Abraham oculos viditque post tergum arietem inter vepres *herentem* (Post-Acc) cornibus quem *adsumens* (Pre-Nom) obtulit holocaustum pro filio

(DR) Abraham lifted up his eyes, and saw behind his back a ram amongst the briers sticking fast by the horns, which he took and offered for a holocaust instead of his son.

(OEGEN) Ða beseah Abraham sona underbæc, 7 geseah þær ænne ram betwux þam bremelum be þam hornum *gehaeft* (Past Participle), 7 he *ahefde* (V) ðone ram to ðære offrunge 7 hyne þær ofsnað Gode to lace for hys sunu Isaac.
By contrast, the anonymous translator tends to be far less consistent when rendering Latin present participles in heavily participial or complex syntax. Several omitted verses, 26.8, 26.13, 26.32, 28.6, 28.7, 29.31, 31.52, 35.14, 35.18, and 49.25, contain more than one Latin present participle, although future studies will have to investigate whether there is a statistically significant correlation between heavily participial syntax and verse-omission. When the Latin contains present participles in simple parallel structure, the anonymous translator renders the participles in some way. Indeed, the concept of “simplicity” may vary from translator to translator; however, I consider contexts in which parallelism is induced by “et” and the present participles are generally in close proximity. In fact, apart from the OE participial translation in 37.35 discussed above, the remaining four of the seven OE present participles after Genesis 24.51 occur in such simply parallel structures:

24.62 eo tempore Isaac deambulabat per viam quae ducit ad puteum cuius nomen est Viventis (Sub Gen) et videntis (Sub Gen) habitabat enim in terra australi (DR) At the same time Isaac was walking along the way to the well which is called Of the living and the seeing: for he dwelt in the south country. (OEGEN) Eode Isaac on þam wege þe scyt to þam pytte ðe ys genemned Puteus Viuientis, et Videntis, þæt is “Lybbendes Pytt 7 Geseonides.” He eardode soðlice on þam suðlandum.

28.12 viditque in somnis scalam stantem (Post-Acc) super terram et cacumen illius tangens (Post-Acc) caelum angelos quoque Dei ascendentes (Post-Acc) et descendentes (Post-Acc) per eam (DR) And he saw in his sleep a ladder standing upon the earth, and the top thereof touching heaven: the angels also of God ascending and descending by it; (OEGEN) Da geseah he þam swefne standan (Inf) ane hlæddre fra<m> eorþan (Omitted) to heofonan 7 Godes englas upp stigende 7 nyðer stigende on þære

However, even in this context of simple parallelism comes to light the complete omission of a present participle, a feature common in the second portion of Genesis. Generally, the anonymous translator preserves Latin present-participial phrases when they are clearly separated and easy to distinguish from the main clauses in context:
28.18 surgens (Pre-Nom) ergo mane tulit lapidem quem subposuerat capiti suo et erexit in titulum fundens (Post-Nom) oleum desuper
(DR) And Jacob, arising in the morning, took the stone, which he had laid under his head, and set it up for a title, pouring oil upon the top of it.
(OEGEN) On morgen, ða he aras (V), he nam þone stan ðe he under hys heafod lede, 7 arærde hyne to mearce, 7 get (V) ele ðon uppan

32.4 praecepitque eis dicens (Post-Nom) sic loquimini domino meo Esau haec dicit frater tuus Iacob apud Laban peregrinatus sum et fui usque in praesentem (Pre-Acc Adjective) diem
(DR) And he commanded them, saying: Thus shall ye speak to my lord Esau: Thus saith thy brother Jacob: I have sojourned with Laban, and have been with him until this day.
(OEGEN) 7 cwæð (V) to him : Seçgað Esauwe minum hlaforde, þæt ic wracnode mid Labane 7 fleah hyne oð ðisne (Det) ðæg.

38.27 instante (Abl Abs) autem partu apparuerunt gemini in utero atque in ipsa effusione infantum unus protulit manum in qua obsetrix ligavit coccinum dicens (Post-Nom)
(DR) And when she was ready to be brought to bed, there appeared twins in her womb: and in the very delivery of the infants, one put forth a hand, whereon the midwife tied a scarlet thread, saying:
(OEGEN) On þære cenningtide (PP-N) æteowdon twegen getwisan on hire innoþe: 7 on þæra cilda forðcyme, se oþer ræhte forð his hand, 7 seó byrþerþinenu wraþ wyrmeadne þræð þæron, 7 cwæð (V):

45.26 et nuntiaverunt ei dicentes (Post-Nom) Ioseph vivit et ipse dominatur in omni terra Aegypti quo audito quasi de gravi somno evigilans (Pre-Nom) tamen non credebat eis
(DR) And they told him, saying: Joseph thy son is living: and he is ruler in all the land of Egypt. Which when Jacob heard, he awaked as it were out of a deep sleep, yet did not believe them.
(OEGEN) 7 cwædon (V) to hym : Iosep leofaþ, þin sunu, 7 wealt ealles Egypta landes. Ða Iacob þæt gehyrde, þa þuhte hym swylce he of hefegum slæpe awæcnode (V), 7 þeah hym ne gelyfde.

41.55 qua esuriente (Abl Abs) clamavit populus ad Pharaonem alimenta petens (Post-Nom) quibus ille respondit ðe ad Ioseph et quicquid vobis dixerit facite
(DR) And when there also they began to be famished, the people cried to Pharao for food. And he said to them: Go to Joseph: and do all that he shall say to you.
(OEGEN) Þa þæt folc hingrode (V), þa cliodon hi to Pharaone, 7 bædon (V) him metes. He andswaroðe 7 cwæð : Gaþ to Iosepe 7 dop swa hwæt swa he eow sege. (Note that the subject “populus” separates the two participles)

In three cases, the anonymous translator does manage to render Latin present participles in even closer proximity. In 37.28, the translator reproduces an ablative-absolute preceding a pre-positive
nominative, which places two participial phases in tandem before the main clause can begin with “vendiderunt”, and similar proximity is evident in 41.7 and 47.15:

37.28 et **praetereuntibus (Abl Abs)** Madianitis negotiatoribus **extrahentes (Pre-Nom)** eum de cisterna vendiderunt Ismahelitis viginti argenteis qui duxerunt eum in Aegyptum (DR) And when the Madianite merchants passed by, they drew him out of the pit, and sold him to the Ismaelites, for twenty pieces of silver: and they led him into Egypt. (OEGEN) 7 þa ðær forun (V) Madianisce cypan, hu tugon (V) hyne up of þam pytte 7 sealdon hyne Ismaelitum wið ðrittigum penegum. 7 hi hyne læddon on Egypta land.

41.7 **devorantes (Post-Nom)** omnen prorum pulchritudinem **evigilans (Pre-Nom)** post quietem (DR) And devoured all the beauty of the former. Pharao awaked after his rest: (OEGEN) Đa fraetón (V) ealle þa fægeran. Đa awoc (V) Pharao of slæpe.

47.15 cumque defecisset emptoris pretium venit cuncta Aegyptus ad Ioseph **dicens (Post-Nom)** da nobis panes quare morimur coram te **deficiente (Abl. Abs)** pecunia (DR) And when the buyers wanted money, all Egypt came to Joseph, saying: Give us bread: why should we die in thy presence, having now no money. (OEGEN) þa heora feoh geteorode, þa com eall Egypta folc to Iosepe, 7 cwædon (V) to him: Sile us mete ; hwi swelte we beforan þe, nu we feoh nabbap (V) ?

Although the Latin present participles are close to each other and might therefore present complexity, both 41.7 and 47.15 provide ample opportunity to distinguish the functions of the participial phrases. In 41.7, the previous plural post-positive participle signals the end of a sentence, while the singular pre-positive “evigilans” signals the beginning of a new one. In 47.15, despite the proximity of the participles, the embedded ablative absolute occurs clearly within the dialogue, introduced by the post-positive participle. The clarity of these constructions may explain why the anonymous translator chose to preserve all the Latin present participles in the translation as verbal constructs, even if not as OE present participles.

However, quite unlike Ælfric’s rendering of Genesis 1-24.22, the second portion of Genesis often omits participles and participial phrases completely in heavily participial syntax. These omissions do not simply remove redundancies, but often delete unique information from
the translation. Verses 27.6 and 27.42 contain doubled speech participles, which the anonymous translator reduces, as Ælfric does, perhaps as redundancies:

27.6 dixit filio suo Iacob audivi patrem tuum loquentem (Post-Acc) cum Esau fratre tuo et dicentem (Post-Acc) ei 
(DR) She said to her son Jacob: I heard thy father talking with Esau thy brother, and saying to him: 
(OEGEN) Da cwæð heo to Iacobe hye suna : Ic gehyrde þæt ðin fæder cwæð (V) to Esauwe þinum breðer, (Omitted)

27.42 nuntiata sunt haec Rebeccaeae quae mittens (Post-Nom) et vocans (Post-Nom) Iacob filium suum dixit ad eum ecce Esau frater tuus minatur ut occidat te 
(DR) These things were told to Rebecca: and she sent and called Jacob her son, and said to him: Behold Esau thy brother threateneth to kill thee. 
(OEGEN) Þa cydde man ðæt Rebeccan heora meder ; þa (Omitted) het (V) heo feccan hyre sunu, 7 cwæð to him : Esau ðin broðor þe ðencð to ofsleane.

However, many more omissions are not attributable to the elimination of redundant speech participles, but rather excise unique information. In 28.12, the translation omits the information that the ladder is “tangens” (touching) heaven:

28.12 viditque in somnis scalam stantem (Post-Acc) super terram et cacumen illius tangens (Post-Acc) caelum angelos quoque Dei ascendentes (Post-Acc) et descendentes (Post-Acc) per eam 
(DR) And he saw in his sleep a ladder standing upon the earth, and the top thereof touching heaven: the angels also of God ascending and descending by it; 
(OEGEN) Da geseah he on swefne standan (Inf) ane hlædre fra<m> eorþan to heofonan 7 Godes englas upp stigende 7 nyðer stigende on þære

The Old English reads that the ladder extends “fra<m> eorþan to heofonan” (from earth to heaven), which implies that the ladder may be in fact touching heaven, making the rendering of the Latin “tangens” arguably redundant. However, it is also possible to make the argument that extending “to heaven” may not be the same as “touching” heaven, especially when the anonymous portion of the Old English Genesis either avoids using the OE present participle or omits it altogether, as it appears to do here. In 31.34, the translation omits all three participles and other information: that Rachel is “festinans” (hurrying), that she hid the “idola” (idols), that
she “sedit desuper” (sits on top of) the camel, and the entire ablative absolute phrase, “scrutantique omne tentorium et nihil invenienti” (with him ransacking each tent and with him finding nothing):

31.34 illa festinans (Post-Nom) abscondit idola subter stramen cameli et sedit desuper scrutantique (Abl Abs) omne tentorium et nihil invenienti (Abl Abs)
(DR) She in haste hid the idols under the camel's furniture, and sat upon them: and when he had searched all the tent, and found nothing,
(OEGEN) Rachel (Omitted) hi hæfde gehydd under anes oflendes seame. (Omitted) and (Omitted).

In 33.1, the translation omits the participle that shows Esau “venientem” (coming) toward him. Rather, the Old English translation reads idiomatically, “Indeed, when Jacob saw Esau, then he saw him approaching with four hundred men.” The reader should be able to infer the motion, but the lack of the participle in any form removes a unique action:

33.1 levans (Pre-Nom) autem Iacob oculos suos vidit venientem (Pre-Acc) Esau et cum eo quadringentos viros divisitque filios Liae et Rahel ambarumque famularum
(DR) And Jacob lifting up his eyes, saw Esau coming, and with him four hundred men: and he divided the children of Lia, and of Rachel, and of the two handmaids:
(OEGEN) Soðlice þa Iacob hyne beseah (V paraphrase), þa geseah he Esau him (Omitted) toweard mid feowerhund mannum. Iacob todælde ða Lian bearn 7 Rachele begra ðæra ðinena.

In 33.11, the translation omits the details that God is “tribuens omnia” (assigning all things) and that “fratre conpellente” (the brother is compelling) the agent:

33.11 et suscipe benedictionem quam adtuli tibi et quam donavit mihi Deus tribuens (Post-Nom) omnia vix fratre conpellente (Abl Abs) susciptiens (Pre-Nom)
(DR) And take the blessing, which I have brought thee, and which God hath given me, who giveth all things. He took it with much ado at his brother's earnest pressing him,
(OEGEN) Đa (Omitted) (Omitted) underfeng (V) he hi uneaþe.

In 37.35, the translation omits the entire ablative absolute phrase “et illo perseverante in fletu”, which explains that Jacob is “persevering in weeping” as he resigns himself to depression over the death of his son, Joseph:
37.35 congregatis autem cunctis liberis eius ut lenirent dolorem patris noluit consolationem recipere et ait descendam ad filium meum lugens (Post-Nom) in infernum et illo perseverante (Abl Abs) in fletu (DR) And all his children being gathered together to comfort their father in his sorrow, he would not receive comfort, but said: I will go down to my son into hell, mourning. And whilst he continued weeping, (OEGEN) Soðlice hys bearn hi gesamnodon to þam þæt hi heora fæder gefrefrodon : he nolde nane frefrunge underfon, ac cwæð wepende : (Omitted) Ic fare to minum suna to helle.

In 42.25, the translation simply omits all the Latin present participles and begins in the coordinate verb phrase that follows the participles. These three participles explain that Joseph is “tollens Symeon, et ligans illis praesentibus” (taking and binding Simeon in front of those present). This is key information that explains how Joseph perpetuates his deception of his brothers, who sold him to slave-traders, and who are now before Joseph without realizing whom they face as the Emperor’s representative. Removing this information changes the reader’s understanding of how Joseph is imposing his will on his brothers by seizing his brother Simeon by force, but sending his other brothers on their way:

42.25 tollens (Post-Nom) Symeon et ligans (Post-Nom) illis praesentibus (Ob Post-Abl) iussitque ministris ut implerent saccos eorum tritico et reponerent pecunias singulorum in sacculis sui supra cibariis in via qui fecerunt ita (DR) And taking Simeon, and binding him in their presence, he commanded his servants to fill their sacks with wheat, and to put every man’s money again in their sacks, and to give them besides provisions for the way: and they did so. (OEGEN) (Omitted) (Omitted) (Omitted) 7 bead his þegnum þæt hi gefyldon heora saccas mid hwæte, 7 ledon dearninga heora ælces feoh on hys sacc 7 formete to eacan ; 7 hi didon swa.

In 45.23, the translation also omits details about Joseph’s actions towards his family as he reconciles with his brothers, who had betrayed him before their meeting, and with his estranged father. The Latin explains that Joseph is “addens eis” (adding to them), adding to the money and garments that he will send to his father. However, the translation explains that Joseph sends the donkeys laden with the supplies, not that he added donkeys to the supplies:
45.23 tantundem pecuniae et vestium mittens (Pre-Nom) patri suo addens (Pre-Nom) eis asinos decem qui subveherent ex omnibus divitiis Aegypti et totidem asinas triticum (DR) Sending to his father as much money and raiment, adding besides ten she asses to carry off all the riches of Egypt, and as many she asses, carrying wheat and bread for the journey.

(OEGEN) 7 he sende (V) hys fæder tyn assan þa wæron gesymed mid feo (Omitted) 7 mid hrægle 7 mid Egypta welum, 7 tyn ðe bærón (V) hwæte 7 hlaf.

In 47.19, the translator must tackle Latin that relies on ablative absolutes, and the translator responds by omitting the ablative-absolute present participles completely. In Latin, the speakers frame their question with the absolute phrase that shows that Joseph can see the famine that is happening in Egypt, “te vidente” (with you seeing). Rather, the translator omits the idea of seeing and begins the next clause in which the speakers promise “et nos et terra nostra tui erimus” (both we and our land will be yours). The translator writes, “We 7 ure land beoþ ðine” (we and our land will be yours). The translator also omits the ablative absolute “pereunte cultore” (with the cultivator being lost):

47.19 cur ergo morimur te vidente (Abl Abs) et nos et terra nostra tui erimus eme nos in servitutem regiam et præbe semina ne pereunte (Abl Abs) cultore redigatur terra in solitudinem (DR) Why therefore shall we die before thy eyes? we will be thine, both we and our lands: buy us to be the king’ s servants, and give us seed, lest for want of tillers the land be turned into a wilderness.

(OEGEN) Hwi swelte we beforan ðe (Omitted) ? We 7 ure land beoþ ðine ; bige us to þæs cyncges þeowote 7 sile us sæd, (Omitted) þæt þæt land ne licge weste 7 we forwurþon.

In 48.14, the translator omits a participial phrase that requires some interpretation. There is a problem in 48.14: Joseph, himself a young brother among his brothers, received his father’ s blessing. When he presents his own sons Ephraim and Manasses, he presents them so that Ephraim, the younger, is to his father’ s right, and Manasses, the elder, to his father’ s left. Generally, Manasses should be on the right and receive Israel’ s blessing, but the two boys are reversed. The Latin emphasizes this point with the participial phrase “commutans manus”
(exchanging his hands), to explain that Israel’s hands are exchanging, or in the wrong positions, by tradition. However, the translator omits this phrase completely:

48.14 qui extendens (Post-Nom) manum dextram posuit super caput Ephraim iunioris fratris sinistram autem super caput Manasse qui maior natu erat commutans (Post-Nom) manus

(DR) But he stretching forth his right hand, put it upon the head of Ephraim the younger brother; and the left upon the head of Manasses who was the elder, changing his hands.

(OEGEN) He hefde (V) þa his swyþran hand ofer Efraimes heafod, þæs gyngran broðor, 7 hys winstran ofer Mannases heafod, þe yldra wæs. (Omitted)

Perhaps the translator believes that the explanation of the story in 48.17, in which Israel reveals that he is aware of the reversed order but insists on maintaining it as it is, suffices for the reader to understand the passage. However, the decision to excise this phrase may also reflect a common decision by the anonymous translator to remove a challenging element without explaining it. Omitting such details occurs again in 50.1, where the Latin explains that Joseph is not only weeping as he realizes that his father has died, but that Joseph is also “deosculans eum” (kissing him). However, the anonymous translator once again omits this unique detail:

50.1 quod cernens (Pre-Nom) Ioseph ruit super faciem patris flens (Post-Nom) et deosculans (Post-Nom) eum

(DR) And when Joseph saw this, he fell upon his father's face weeping and kissing him.

(OEGEN) Đa Iosep þæt geseah (V), þa feol he upon hine 7 weop (V) & (Omitted).

These omissions are very much uncharacteristic of Ælfric, who generally does not omit participial phrases containing unique information, except in the anomalous 23.10, which appears to lose most of the verse in C. These very specific decisions in the anonymous translation reveal a strikingly different approach to the rendering and even preservation of the Latin present participle from the approach evident in Ælfric’s translation. These qualitative results are consistent with the quantitative results, together strongly reflecting the break in translation in Genesis chapter 24 and demonstrating that the rendering of the Latin present participle can indicate patterns of authorship.
1.5b. The accusative participle

The Latin accusative present participle occurs significantly less frequently than does the nominative one, but still in sufficiently large numbers to reflect another significant difference in the practice of translation in the Old English Genesis. The Latin Genesis contains 51 accusative present participles: 22 in Genesis 1-24.22, and 29 in Genesis 24.61 to the end. Ælfric renders 15 of the 22 accusatives (68%) with Old English present participles, while the anonymous translator renders only 3 of 29 (10%) with OE participles. In chapters 1 and 9, where accusative participles are numerous, Ælfric almost always renders the Latin participle with the OE participle:

![Figure 1.11: Translations of the Latin accusative present participle in the Old English Hexateuch Genesis.](image)

The pre-positive accusative

This study did consider whether pre-positive and post-positive accusative present participles might receive different approaches to translation. However, the study found that pre-positive accusatives are relatively rare in the text, occurring only six times in the first portion of Genesis. Ælfric renders two of these with OE participles in 1.11 and 1.12. In 15.16 and 19.37, the participle “praesen-” is easily translated with the Old English adjective “andweardan”:

15.16 generatione autem quarta revertentur huc necdum enim completae sunt iniquitates Amorrorum usque ad praesens (Pre-Acc) tempus
(DR) But in the fourth generation they shall return hither: for as yet the iniquities of the Amorrhites are not at the full until this present time.

(OEGEN) On ðære feorðan mægðe hi geccyrrað eft hider: ne sind na gyt gefyldede ðises folces unrihtwisnyssa, ðises Amoreiscra, oð ða andweardan (Adj) tid.

19.37 peperitque maior filium et vocavit nomen eius Moab ipse est pater Moabitarum usque in praesentem (Pre-Acc) diem

(DR) And the elder bore a son, and she called his name Moab: he is the father of the Moabites unto this day.

(OEGEN) 7 seo yldre acende sunu, þone heo het Moab, se ys Moabitiscra fæder oð ðisne andweardan (Adj) dæg.

In the final two cases of Latin pre-positive accusative present participles in 19.28 and 21.16, the translation of the overall line is heavily reduced in ways that affect far more than the participial phrase itself. In 19.28, the Old English omits the names of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, the phrase “et universam terram regionis illius” (and the whole land of that region) and the comparison “quasi fumum fornicis” (just like a fume of a furnace):

19.28 intuitus est Sodomam et Gomorrham et universam terram regionis illius viditque ascendentem (Pre-Acc) favillam de terra quasi fornacis fumum

(DR) He looked towards Sodom and Gomorrrha, and the whole land of that country: and he saw the ashes rise up from the earth as the smoke of a furnace.

(OEGEN) 7 geseah hu ða ysla upp flugon (V) mid þam smice.

In 21.16, Ælfric again removes several subtle details of the overall Latin passage. Ælfric omits “abiit” (she left), “e regione” (from the region), the entire description “quantum potest arcus iacere” (as far as a bow can cast), the agency from the first-person quote “dixit enim non videbo morientem puerum” (for she said, “I will not see my dying boy”), and the action of lifting her voice as she “levavit vocem suam” (lifted her voice):

21.16 et abiit seditque e regione procul quantum potest arcus iacere dixit enim non videbo morientem (Pre-Acc) puerum et sedens (Pre-Nom) contra levavit vocem suam et flevit

(DR) And she went her way, and sat over against him a great way off as far as a bow can carry, for she said: I will not see the boy die: and sitting over against, she lifted up her voice and wept.

(OEGEN) 7 sæt (V) hyre ferran wepende (unatt), cwæð þæ heo nolde geseon hu þæt cild swulte (V).
In both of these cases, in which Ælfric opts for an OE verb rather than a participle, Ælfric has extensively condensed the line into a simpler, perhaps more direct, version of the story with more peripheral details omitted. This stands in contrast to Ælfric’s earlier renderings of 1.11 and 1.12, in which Ælfric meticulously transposes the Latin into Old English, almost verbatim:

1.11 et ait germinet terra herbam *virentem (Post-Acc)* et *facientem (Pre-Acc)* semen et lignum pomiferum *faciens (Post-Acc)* fructum

(DR) And he said: Let the earth bring forth the green herb, and such as may seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit

(OEGEN) Ond he cwæð, "Sprytte seo eorðe *growende* gærs ond sæd *wyrcende (Pos)* ond æppelbære treow wæst­m *wyrcende*

iuxta genus suum cuius semen in semet ipso sit super terram et factum est ita

(DR) after its kind, which may have seed in itself upon the earth. And it was so done.

(OEGEN) æfter his cynne, ðæs sæd sy on him syluum ofer eorðan." Hit wæs ða swa gedon.

1.12 et protulit terra herbam *virentem (Post-Acc)* et *adferentem (Pre-Acc)* semen iuxta genus suum lignun­que *faciens (Post-Acc)* fructum

(OEGEN) Ond seo eorðe forðteah *growende (Pos)* wyrta ond sæd *berende* be hyre cynne ond treow wæst­m *wyrcende*

et *habens (Post-Acc)* unumquodque semente­m secundum speciem suam et vidit Deus quod esset bonum

(DR) having seed each one according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

(OEGEN) ond gehwilc sæd *haeb­bende* æfter his hiwe. God geseah ða ðæt hit god wæs.

By contrast, the anonymous translator does not render a single pre-positive accusative with an Old English participle, despite seven opportunities to do so. The Latin present participle “praesen-” accounts for three of these seven occurrences, and in a study of the choice to render Latin present participles with OE participles, it is important to note that neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translators ever chooses to render Latin “praesen-” with a present participle in any of the thirteen instances in the translation. As mentioned above, Ælfric renders “praesens” at 15.16 and praesentem at 19.37 with “andweardan”. The anonymous translator omits the entire
verse at 26.33, 31.50, and 35.20. The anonymous translator also renders Latin “praesen-” with andweardan at 46.34 and 47.26:

46.34 respondebitis viri pastores sumus servi tui ab infantia nostra usque in praesens (Sub Acc) et nos et patres nostri haec autem dicetis ut habitare possitis in terra Gessen quia detestantur Aegyptii omnes pastores ovium (DR) You shall answer: We thy servants are shepherds, from our infancy until now, both we and our fathers. And this you shall say, that you may dwell in the land of Gessen, because the Egyptians have all shepherds in abomination.

(OEGEN) Donne secge hym þæt ge synd scephyrdas fram cyldhade, ge we ge fæders, őf ðísne andweardan (Adj) dæg. Secað ðus, þæt ge magon eardian on Gessen lande, for þam þe ealle Egyptisce onsunciað scephyrdas.

47.26 ex eo tempore usque in praesentem (Pre-Acc) diem in universa terra Aegypti regibus quinta pars solvitur et factum est quasi in legem absque terra sacerdotali quae libera ab hac condicione fuit (DR) From that time unto this day, in the whole land of Egypt, the fifth part is paid to the king, and it is become as a law, except the land of the priests, which was free from this covenant.

(OEGEN) Þonne secge hym þæt ge synd scephyrdas fram cyldhade, ge we ge fæders, őf ðísne andweardan (Adj) dæg. Secað ðus, þæt ge magon eardian on Gessen lande, for þam þe ealle Egyptisce onsunciað scephyrdas.

As Ælfric does at 19.37, the anonymous translator combines the demonstrative determiner “ðis” with “andweardan” to render the Latin form. However, in three more cases, the anonymous translator does not render “praesen-” with “andweardan”, but rather chooses only the demonstrative determiner “ðis-”:

32.4 praecepitque eis dicens (Post-Nom) sic loquimini domino meo Esau haec dicit frater tuus Iacob apud Laban peregrinatus sum et fui usque in praesentem (Pre-Acc) diem (DR) And he commanded them, saying: Thus shall ye speak to my lord Esau: Thus saith thy brother Jacob: I have sojourned with Laban, and have been with him until this day.

(OEGEN) 7 cwæð (V) to him : Secgað Esauwe minum hlaforðe, þæt ic wrancnode mid Labane 7 fleah hyne oð ðísne (Det) dæg.

32.32 quam ob causam non comedunt filii Israhel nervum qui emarcuit in femore Iacob usque in praesentem (Pre-Acc) diem eo quod tetigerit nervum femoris eius et obstipuerit (DR) Therefore the children of Israel, unto this day, eat not the sinew, that shrank in Jacob’ s thigh: because he touched the sinew of his thigh and it shrank.

(OEGEN) For þam nellàð Israhela folc etan sine gyt oð ðísne (Det) dæg, for þam ðe heo forscranc on Iacobes ðeo 7 astifode.
And Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, and said: God, in whose sight my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, God that feedeth me from my youth until this day;

The anonymous translator’s occasional reliance on the determiner “ðís” to render Latin “praesentem” suggests some difference from Ælfric’s approach. In the remaining four instances in which the anonymous translator renders a Latin pre-positive accusative with a non-participial form, the Latin participles are formed from action verbs. Ælfric renders the ablative absolute “venientibus” in 13.10 with OE “becumendum”, although Ælfric does omit another ablative absolute of “venientibus” in 10.19, which does not even appear to require the Latin ablative absolute:

While the anonymous translator renders Latin “dicentem” with a verb, Ælfric renders the Latin “dicen-” with OE participles on several occasions, as I describe in my discussion of the pre-positive and post-positive nominative present participle. When Ælfric does translate the pre-positive accusative with an OE participle, he shifts the position to place the participle after the
modified noun\textsuperscript{28}, which is very much his usual syntax, since Ælfric does not use pre-positive nominative present participles\textsuperscript{29}:

1.11 et ait germinet terra herbam \textit{virentem (Post-Acc)} et \textit{facientem (Pre-Acc)} semen et lignum pomiferum \textit{faciens (Post-Acc)} fructum

(DR) And he said: Let the earth bring forth the green herb, and such as may seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit

(OEGEN) Ond he cwæð, "Sprytte seo eorðe \textit{growende} gærs ond sæd \textit{wyrconde (Pos)}
ond æppelbære treow wæstm \textit{wyrconde}

iuxta genus suum cuius semen in semet ipso sit super terram et factum est ita

(DR) after its kind, which may have seed in itself upon the earth. And it was so done.

(OEGEN) æfter his cynne, ðæs sæd sy on him syluum ofer eorðan." Hit ðæs ðæ swa gedon.

1.12 et protulit terra herbam \textit{virentem (Post-Acc)} et \textit{adferentem (Pre-Acc)} semen iuxta genus suum lignumque \textit{faciens (Post-Acc)} fructum

(DR) And the earth brought forth the green herb, and such as yieldeth seed according to its kind, and the tree that beareth fruit,

(OEGEN) Ond seo eorðe forðteah \textit{growende (Pos)} wyrta ond sæd \textit{berende} be hyre cynne ond treow wæstm \textit{wyrconde}

et \textit{habens (Post-Acc)} unumquodque sementem secundum speciem suam et vidit Deus quod esset bonum

(DR) having seed each one according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

(OEGEN) ond gehwilc sæd \textit{hæbbende} æfter his hiwe. God geseah ða ðæt hit god wæs.

Ælfric appears sensitive to the position of a present participle because he chooses to change the position in this way. However, the anonymous translator chooses to avoid the OE participle even in two verses syntactically comparable to 1.11 and 1.12:

33.1 \textit{levans (Pre-Nom)} autem Iacob oculos suos vidit \textit{venientem (Pre-Acc)} Esau et cum eo quadringentos viros divisitque filios Liae et Rahel ambarumque famularum

(DR) And Jacob lifting up his eyes, saw Esau coming, and with him four hundred men: and he divided the children of Lia, and of Rachel, and of the two handmaids:

(OEGEN) Soðlice þa Iacob hyne beseah \textit{(V)}, þa geseah he Esau him \textit{(Omitted)} toweard mid feowerhund mannum. Iacob todælde ða Lian bearn 7 Rachele begra ðæra ðæs safn ðinena.

\textsuperscript{28} Where an Old English participle in the translation changes its position from pre- to post-positive, or vice-verse, I tagged this phenomenon by adding “\textit{(Pos)}” after the Old English participle.

\textsuperscript{29} The previous discussion of the rendering of the pre-positive nominative present participle shows that Ælfric only uses the post-positive OE participle to render nominatives, regardless of the original position of the Latin participle.
50.10 veneruntque ad aream Atad quae sita est trans Iordanem ubi celebrantes (Pre-Acc) exequias planctu magno atque vehementi ipleverunt septem dies (DR) And they came to the threshingfloor of Atad, which is situated beyond the Jordan: where celebrating the exequies with a great and vehement lamentation, they spent full seven days. (OEGEN) Da foron hi op hi comon to þære þirsecflore þe is begeondan Iordanen ; þar hi waren (Omitted) seofon dagas fulle, 7 þær mærlice þæt behwurfon mid miclum wope.

In both situations, the anonymous translator not only avoids using an OE participle, but omits the Latin participle completely. Despite the relatively rare incidence of the pre-positive accusative present participle in the Latin Genesis, there appears a dramatic difference between the ways in which Ælfric and the anonymous translator render these structures. Whereas Ælfric uses the OE participle with position shift, the anonymous translator uses non-participial structures or omission.

**The post-positive accusative participle.**

The post-positive accusative present participle occurs 39 times in the Latin Genesis, but Ælfric renders 13 of 18 (72%) of these with OE participles, while the anonymous translator renders only 3 of 21 (14%) of these with OE participles. In addition, Ælfric does not omit a single one of these participles from the translation until Genesis 24.22, which recalls previous scholarly debate over where exactly Ælfric ended his translation. By contrast, the anonymous translator omits four of these participles. Ælfric largely tends to preserve the accusative participle unless either a simpler wording is available, or the Latin is problematic. Ælfric renders participial constructions representing living animals instead with the Old English noun “nyten” (nieten) at 1.24, 1.28, 1.30, 2.20, 3.1, 3.14, 6.7, 7.2, 7.8, 7.21, and 8.1. He couples various forms of “nyten” with OE participles to render these constructions at 2.19, 9.10 and 9.12, and he adds the unattended present participle “creopende” in 1.24 and 1.25, perhaps to supplement the sense that
living creatures in this context tend to creep and slither. This pattern suggests that Ælfric does take advantage of the potential for simple parts of speech in Old English, such as nouns and adjectives, to convey a more complex Latin present participle, when the opportunity arises. An example of this is evident in Genesis 1.24:

1.24 dixit quoque Deus producat terra animam viventem (Post Acc) in genere suo iumenta et reptilia et bestias terrae secundum species suas factumque est ita

(DR) And God said: Let the earth bring forth the living creature in its kind, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth, according to their kinds. And it was so done.

(OEGEN) God cwæð eac swilce, "Læde seo eorðe forð cuce (N) nytena ond heora cynne ond creopende (unatt) cyn ond deor æfter heora hiwum." Hit wæs ða swa gedon.

Simplicity also appears to explain why Ælfric renders 20.4 with the adjective “unscyldigne” rather than a difficult participial construction to explain the state of “not knowing” or “not being guilty”, conveyed by Latin “ignorantem”, although Ælfric still reverses the rendered participle and noun. Where a simple adjective is available in 20.4, Ælfric opts to avoid the participle:

20.4 Abimelech vero non tetigerat eam et ait Domine num gentem ignorantem (Post-Pos Acc) et iustam interficies

(DR) Now Abimelech had not touched her, and he said: Lord, wilt thou slay a nation, that is ignorant and just?

(OEGEN) Abimalech andwyrde earhlice, 7 cwæð : Ne ofsleh ðu Drihten unscyldigne (Adj) mannan.

In the remaining two cases where Ælfric elects not to use an OE present participle to render a Latin post-positive accusative, the translation demonstrates a decision by Ælfric to clarify a difficult passage. In 21.9, the Latin explains that Sarra has seen the son of Agar of Egypt playing:

21.9 cumque vidisset Sarra filium Agar Aegyptiae ludentem (Post-Acc) dixit ad Abraham

(DR) And when Sara had seen the son of Agar the Egyptian playing with Isaac her son, she said to Abraham:

(OEGEN) Hyt gelamp eft syðdan, þæt Sarra behold hu Agares sunu wið Isaac plegode (V).

Sarra then demands in 21.20 that Abraham cast out Agar, “non enim erit heres filius ancillae cum filio meo Isaac” (since the son of the servant-girl will not be an heir with my son Isaac).
However, Ælfric appears to perceive a difficulty for the reader, because the Latin does not convey why seeing Agar’s son playing, apparently on his own, should elicit this reaction from Sarra. Rather, it is the perceived threat that Agar’s son’s socialization through play with Isaac, the true heir, could undermine Isaac’s position in the eyes of his father and thus Sarra’s child’s claim to the family’s inheritance that prompts this reaction. Ælfric adds that “Agares sunu wið Isaac plegode” (Agar’s son played with Isaac), rearranging the line considerably to illuminate this point of clarification, as does the Douay-Rheims translation. In the process, Ælfric converts the otherwise participial syntax into a simpler clause-based structure, but does so in the process of re-writing and enhancing the original for clarity.

Ælfric again converts a Latin present participle in 22.13, this time to clarify a rather confusing Latin passage whose use of the present active participle is unintuitive. In this incident, Abraham sees a ram amidst some thornbushes, entangled by its horns in the bushes; Abraham seizes the ram and presents it as an offering on his son’s behalf. The Latin, however, uses a present participle to explain how the ram is entangled in these bushes. The Latin reads, “levavit Abraham oculos viditque post tergum arietem inter vepres haerentem cornibus quem adsumens obtulit holocaustum pro filio.” A literal reading of the present participle suggests that the ram is doing the entangling in an active sense: “Abraham lifted his eyes, and saw behind his back a ram among thornbushes sticking by the horns, which, taking, he presented as an offering for his son.” The Latin raises the question, “What is the ram sticking by or with its horns?” The ram is in fact the object of the process of entangling in a passive sense, a problem that Ælfric rather deftly corrects with an Old English past participle, which confers the necessary passive sense to the passage, and then converts the following nominative participial phrase to a clause to ensure clarity in the verse:
22.13 levavit Abraham oculos viditque post tergum arietem inter vepres h(a)erentem (Post-Pos Acc) cornibus quem adsumens (Pre-Nom) obtulit holocaustum pro filio (DR) Abraham lifted up his eyes, and saw behind his back a ram amongst the briers sticking fast by the horns, which he took and offered for a holocaust instead of his son. (OEGEN) Da beseah Abraham sona underbæc, 7 geseah ðær ænne ram betwux þam bremelum be ðam hornum gehæft, 7 he ahefde (V) ðone ram to ðære offrunge 7 hyne þær ofsnað Gode to lace for hys sunu Isaac.

In the aforementioned four non-participial translations, Ælfric appears to have a clear rationale for his relatively rare decision to render a Latin post-positive accusative present participle with another structure, either because a simpler noun or adjective was available, or because problematic Latin participial syntax required clarification. Only in Genesis 24.22, the final verse of MS. C, does Ælfric stray from this practice with the post-positive accusative. Genesis 24.22 is uncharacteristically reduced and paraphrased:

24.22 postquam ergo biberunt cameli protulit vir inaures aureas adpendentes (Post-Acc) siclos duos et armillas totidem pondo siclorum decem (DR) And after that the camels had drunk, the man took out golden earrings, weighing two sicles: and as many bracelets of ten sicles weight. (OEGEN) 7 sealde hyre earpreonas eallgildene sona, 7 gildene biagas (Omitted) God herieNDe

The rendering of this line appears to be incomplete, suggesting possibly that it may not be the product of Ælfric himself, or that it may not represent his general practice of translation of Genesis. Marsden too finds this part of Genesis “a rather odd place to stop, and it could be that C gives us an incomplete version of Ælfric’s Genesis” (The Old English Heptateuch lxxiii). The Old English translation reads, “and immediately gave her earrings all-golden, and golden bracelets.” However, the Latin contains additional details, including that the camels drank, and that the earrings and bracelets were equivalent in weight to, or “weighing”, ten shekels. The Old English translation curtails the Latin before the Latin participial phrase begins, and ends abruptly.

The unintuitive capitalization of “ND” here is as it is rendered in Crawford’s edition. Marsden does not preserve these capitals. However, I do so because they appear to signal the end of the manuscript and the translation. The OE participle “herieNDe” is the last word in MS C. I cannot say how significant these capitals are, so I erred on the side of caution and presented them for the reader’s consideration.

---

30 The unintuitive capitalization of “ND” here is as it is rendered in Crawford’s edition. Marsden does not preserve these capitals. However, I do so because they appear to signal the end of the manuscript and the translation. The OE participle “herieNDe” is the last word in MS C. I cannot say how significant these capitals are, so I erred on the side of caution and presented them for the reader’s consideration.
with “God herieNDe”, or “God commending”. This appears to induce an abrupt conclusion imparting that God approves of the aforementioned actions and signalling the end of the entire translation (or quite possibly, the process of copying Ælfric’s translation). The omission of this participle appears to be related to a larger decision to end the work of translation, rather than to omit the translation of a participle. As a result, Ælfric’s practice of translating post-positive accusative present participles favours the use of the OE participle, simpler structures such as nouns and adjectives where available, and clause-based clarifications of confusing Latin-participial structures, but not omission, as the anonymous translator often applies.

The anonymous translator’s difference from Ælfric’s approach to the post-positive accusative participle is stark but not absolute, since the anonymous translator does render 3 of 21 such Latin participles with OE participles. These three renderings occur in two verses, Genesis 28.12 and 29.2, standing in contrast to the rest of Genesis 24.61 to the end. Both Latin verses contain parallelism that appears to promote the retention of the Old English participle, and yet both OE translations engage in the excision of non-redundant details. Verse 28.12 contains four post-positive participles, of which only three survive and two are rendered with OE participles. The anonymous translator converts the Latin “stantem” to an infinitive, the only such use of the infinitive of its kind in the whole Genesis translation, and omits the Latin “tangens”. However, the translation retains the participles conveying that angels were ascending and descending the ladder. The translation also excises the detail that the peak of the ladder is touching the sky:

28.12 viditque in somnis scalam stantem (Post-Acc) super terram et cacumen illius tangens (Post-Acc) caelum angelos quoque Dei ascendentes (Post-Acc) et descendentes (Post-Acc) per eam (DR)

And he saw in his sleep a ladder standing upon the earth, and the top thereof touching heaven: the angels also of God ascending and descending by it;

(OEGEN) Da geseah he on swefne standan (Inf) ane hlæddre fra<ṃ> eorpæn (Omitted) to heofonan 7 Godes englas upp stigende 7 nyðer stigende on þære
The anonymous translation also preserves the OE participle in 29.2, where two direct objects lie in parallel. Abraham’s servant “vidit puteum in agro tresque greges ovium accubantes iuxta eum” (saw a well in the field and three flocks of sheep lying next to it). The anonymous translator preserves the parallelism of the Latin by retaining the OE present participle:

29.2 et vidit puteum in agro tresque greges ovium accubantes (Post-Acc) iuxta eum nam ex illo adaquabantur pecora et os eius grandi lapide claudebatur

(DR) And he saw a well in the field, and three flocks of sheep lying by it: for the beasts were watered out of it, and the mouth thereof was closed with a great stone.

(OEGEN) ða geseah he ðær anne pytt on þam lande, 7 ðreo heorda sceapa sittende wið þone pytt, 7 se pett wæs beheled mid anum stane.

When the anonymous translator renders a Latin present participle at all, the translator tends to do so with coordinate clauses, such as occurs in 28.13:

28.13 et Dominum innixum scalae dicentem (Post-Acc) sibi ego sum Dominus Deus Abraham patris tui et Deus Isaac terram in qua dormis tibi dabo et semini tuo

(DR) And the Lord leaning upon the ladder, saying to him: I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land, wherein thou sleepest, I will give to thee and to thy seed.

(OEGEN) He geseah Drihten on ufeweardre þære hlæddre, 7 Drihten cwæð (V) to him : Ic eom Drihten God Abrahames ðines fæder, 7 Isaaces God ; þæ land, ðe ðu on slæpst, ic sylle ðe 7 dinum ofsprincge.

The anonymous translator does use a noun clause in 27.6 and even a relative clause in 45.23:

27.6 dixit filio suo Iacob audivi patrem tuum loquentem (Post-Acc) cum Esau fratre tuo et dicentem (Post-Acc) ei

(DR) She said to her son Jacob: I heard thy father talking with Esau thy brother, and saying to him:

(OEGEN) Ða cwæð heo to Iacobe hye suna : Ic gehyrde þæt ðin fæder cwæð (V) to Esauwe þinum breðer, (Omitted)

45.23 tantundem pecuniae et vestium mittens (Pre-Nom) patri suo addens (Pre-Nom) eis asinos decem qui subveherent ex omnibus divitiis Aegypti et totidem asinas triticum in itinere portantes (Post-Acc)

(DR) Sending to his father as much money and raiment, adding besides ten she asses to carry off all the riches of Egypt, and as many she asses, carrying wheat and bread for the journey.

(OEGEN) 7 he sende (V) hys fæder tyn assan þa wæron gesymed mid feo (Omitted) 7 mid hrægle 7 mid Egypta welum, 7 tyn ðe bæron (V) hwæte 7 hlaf.
However, these noun and relative clauses are exceptions. To render Genesis 29.2 with a coordinate clause, the anonymous translator would have had to disturb the intuitive structure of the parallelism in 29.2. Other than in Genesis 28.12 and 29.2, however, the anonymous translator renders no Latin post-positive accusative present participle with an OE present participle. Even when the participial syntax has relatively similar parallel structure, the anonymous translator does not retain the OE participle, as occurs in 46.2:

46.2 audivit eum per visionem nocte *vocantem* (Post-Pos Acc) se et *dicientem* (Post-Pos Acc) sibi Iacob Iacob cui respondit ecce adsum (DR) He heard him by a vision in the night calling him, and saying to him: Jacob, Jacob. And he answered him: Lo, here I am. (OEGEN) 7 God hyne gehirde 7 *clypode* (V) hyne, 7 *cwæþ* (V) to hym: Iacob, Iacob! 7 he hym andswarode 7 *cwæþ* : Her ic eom.

Although the Latin participles “*vocantem*” and “*dicientem*” clearly post-modify “*eum*”, the translator converts these participles in parallel to verbs, and re-arranges the syntax into simple form. While the Latin reads that “[Israel] heard God calling him and saying to him…”, the anonymous translator misattributes the action of hearing to God, and prefers the simple clause-based rendering, “And God heard [Israel], and called him, and said to him…”. The inconsistency between 29.2 and 46.2 exemplifies the anonymous translator’s significant tendency to avoid the Old English present participle even when the syntax is unchallenging, whereas Ælfric only deviates from using an OE participle to render a Latin post-positive accusative when available simplicity enables it or problematic Latin requires it.

The analyses of both the pre-positive and the post-positive accusative participle in the Old English Genesis demonstrate that there is considerable difference in the approaches of Ælfric and the anonymous translator to the rendering of Latin present participles. Even in the rendering of the rare pre-positive present participle, Ælfric translates the participle, sometimes with OE participles, whereas the anonymous translators omits participles or does not render them
with OE participles. In the rendering of post-positive participles, Ælfric translates them in some way, and does so a majority of the time with OE present participles, whereas the anonymous translator sometimes omits participles entirely or largely tends to render these participles with other structures. As such, accusative present participles in this study reflect significant variations in authorship style that can reflect on authorship attribution.

1.5c. The ablative-absolute participle

The ablative-absolute present participle does not appear as frequently as do nominative or accusative participles, but it is still numerous enough to provide potential insight on differences in authorship style between Ælfric and the anonymous translator. However, although the Latin contains 48 present participles embedded in ablative absolutes, neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translator translates them with OE participles. Latin present participles embedded in ablative absolutes receive various treatments, including translation with simpler nouns. In 1.30 and 2.19, Ælfric renders Latin “animantibus” with OE “nyten”, and in 14.20 Latin “protegente” with “scyldnysse” (scield-nes). In 19.1, 19.16, and 20.17, Ælfric uses verbs in clause-based renderings.

The difference in this practice between the first and second portions of Genesis is insufficient to reflect much of a difference in translation practice. However, the general unity of practice in the rendering of this feature does raise the question of why Ælfric shows such difference in the practice of translating other subcategories of participles, further supporting this study’s hypothesis that the present participle is not a single phenomenon, but rather that its subcategories receive different treatments in translation. A translator or author’s variation in translating different categories of participles suggests a strong potential for the present participle to signify patterns of authorship.
**1.5d. The substantive participle**

The substantive present participle, which acts in place of the noun it would otherwise modify, occurs 52 times in the Latin Genesis, but is rendered with an OE participle only five times, a rate of slightly less than 10%. Ælfric uses the OE participle once at 3.20 and twice at 16.14 in a parallel structure; the anonymous translator preserves the OE participle twice in similar parallel structure at 24.62. Ælfric’s use of the substantive participle at 3.20 moves the present participle phrase “cunctorum viventium” from post-position to pre-position, but otherwise preserves the syntax of the Latin:

3.20 et vocavit Adam nomen uxoris suae Hava eo quod mater esset cunctorum **viventium**
(Sub gen)
(DR) And Adam called the name of his wife Eve: because she was the mother of all the living.
(OEGEN) Da gesceop Adam naman his wife, Eua, ðæt is lif, for ðan ðe heo is ealra **libbendra** (Pos) modor.

The only other context in which Ælfric preserves the substantive participle in his translation occurs in the parallel structure of 16.14, in which Agar names a well “**puteum Viventis** (Sub Gen) et **videntis** (Sub Gen) *me***” (the well of the living [one], and of [the one] seeing me). Ælfric preserves this important name in the translation as closely as possible in his translation:

16.14 propterea appellavit puthe illum putheum **Viventium** (Sub Gen) et **videntis** (Sub Gen) *me*
(DR) Therefore she called that well, The well of him that liveth and seeth me. The same is between Cades and Barad.
(OEGEN) And for þi heo het ðone wæterpytt “**Libbendes 7 Seondes** Me.” Se pytt is betwux Cades 7 Barath.

The only two cases in which the anonymous translator preserves substantive present participles, when the translator is generally so very reluctant to use OE participles in general, occur in 24.62, right at the beginning of the anonymous translation. Here, the translator encounters the proper name of the same well, and similar participial Latin, which explains that “**Isaac deambulabat per**
viam quae ducit ad puteum cuius nomen est viventis et videntis” (Isaac was walking through the street, which led to the well, whose name is “of the living and of the seeing”). The anonymous translator at the outset of his translation is very careful to replicate the Latin proper name and then to preserve the participial syntax of the name, explaining that “Eode Isaac on þam wege þe sçyt to þam pytte ðe ys genemned Puteus Viuentis, et Videntis, þæt is ‘Lybbendes Pytt 7 Geseondes.’” (Isaac went on the way, which led to the pit, which is named “Puteus Viventis, et Videntis”; that is, “of the living [one] pit and of the seeing one”):

24.62 eo tempore Isaac deambulabat per viam quae ducit ad puteum cuius nomen est *Viventis* (Sub Gen) et *videntis* (Sub Gen) habitabat enim in terra australi

(DR) At the same time Isaac was walking along the way to the well which is called Of the living and the seeing: for he dwelt in the south country.

(OEGEN) Eode Isaac on þam wege þe sçyt to þam pytte ðe ys genemned *Puteus Viuentis, et Videntis*, þæt is “*Lybbendes Pytt 7 Geseondes.*” He eardode soðlice on þam suðlandum.

The translation of this passage is the only one in the anonymous translation that preserves substantive participles, although sixteen more occur in the Latin Genesis after 24.62. The anonymous translator even omits a verse that refers to the same well in 25.11.

The similarity of content between 16.14 and 24.62 suggests several possibilities that may explain this anomaly. The anonymous translator may have read Ælfric’s translation, and then decided to preserve the rendering of this key name; however, Ælfric’s own preface suggests that the anonymous translation existed before his. It is also possible that the anonymous translator started out with the best of intentions to preserve as much of the original as possible, a notion supported by the replication of the Latin name in the translation; over time, however, the translator may have relaxed his standards as the task drew out, leading to the excision of verse 25.11 and its repeated material from 24.62. It is even possible that Ælfric may have continued work on the second portion, at least initially, although the dearth of accusative or nominative
participial renderings after 24.62 suggests that any contribution that Ælfric might have made would have been extremely minimal and highly initial. The significance of this evidence is mitigated by the relatively small sample size of 52 instances in over 25,000 words; nonetheless, the limited tendency there is to render substantive participles with OE participles either occurs in Ælfric’s translation, or it is tied to a specific name at the very beginning of the translation of 24.61 to the end.

1.5e. The predicative participle and the oblique-case participle

Although the Vulgate gospels Matthew, Mark, Luke and John present significant sample sizes of the predicative participle for study, only four predicative participles occur in Genesis. Ælfric renders the predicative “potens” in 10.8 with the adjective “mihtig”, but “ludens” with a participle in 19.14. The third predicative occurs at 24.41, which lies within the large omitted text between the end of MS C and the resumption of MS B and L at 24.61, cannot be informative to the practice of translation. The final predicative occurs at 39.2, which the anonymous translator quite uncharacteristically renders with an OE participle. The lack of a sufficient sample of eligible instances prevents this study from extrapolating useful information about the practice of translation except the contribution of these renderings to the overall pattern of rendering, as discussed above.

Oblique-case participles, specifically genitives, datives, and non-absolute ablatives, occur fifteen times in Genesis, and are therefore slightly more numerous than predicatives. Ælfric renders the first two with OE participles at 1.20 and 2.19, but none after this point. Even in these two participial renderings, Ælfric changes the translation to place these participles in strong cases. In 1.20, the Latin explains that God commands, “producant aquae reptile animae
viventis” (let the waters produce a creeping animal of a living spirit), but Ælfric changes “creeping” to “swimming”, and casts the genitive substantive participle in the accusative to instruct, “Teon nu ða wæteru forð swymmende cynn” (Now [let] the waters produce forth swimming kind). To create parallelism, Ælfric adds the unattested participle “fleogende” to render the Latin adjective “volatile”:

1.20 dixit etiam Deus producant aquae reptile animae viventis (Ob gen) et volatile super terram sub firmamento caeli
(DR) God also said: Let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly over the earth under the firmament of heaven.
(OEGEN) God cwæð eac swylce, “Teon nu ða wæteru forð swymmende (Func) cynn cucu on life ond fleogende (unatt) cynn ofer eorðan under þære heofenan fæstnisse!”

Ælfric also renders the Latin genitive participle viventis with an OE participle in 2.19, but Ælfric converts phrases to clauses and restructures the Latin participle in the nominative as part of a fragmented clause:

2.19 formatis igitur Dominus Deus de humo cunctis animantibus terrae et universis volatilibus caeli adduxit ea ad Adam ut videret quid vocaret ea omne enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis (Ob gen) ipsum est nomen eius
(DR) And the Lord God having formed out of the ground all the beasts of the earth, and all the fowls of the air, brought them to Adam to see what he would call them: for whatsoever Adam called any living creature the same is its name.
(OEGEN) God soðlice gelædde ða nytenu (N), ðe he of eorðan gesceop, ond ðære lyfte fugelas to Adame, ðæt he foresceawode hu he hi gecygde. Soðlice ælc libbende (Pos) nyten, swa swa Adam hit gecygde, swa is his nama.

The Latin verse contains a coordinate clause with “enim”, explaining that “enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis ipsum est nomen eius” (for that which Adam called of the living spirit, that is its name), but Ælfric chooses to start a new sentence with an adverb “Soðlice” and the participle in the nominative, explaining that “Soðlice ælc libbende nyten, swa swa Adam hit gecygde, swa is his nama.” (Truly each living animal, just as Adam named it, such is its name).

As later discussion will explain, I designate an “unattested” participle as an OE present participle used by the OE translation when the Latin text does not use a present participle here.
After this point, neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translator renders an oblique-case participle with an Old English participle. This shift in practice within Ælfric’s translation recalls the finding that Ælfric generally renders Latin present participles with OE participles more at the beginning of Genesis than he does towards the end. As previous discussions address, however, Ælfric’s non-participial renderings later in MS C arise often from exigencies of the Latin text, either because nouns and adjectives present simpler options, or because the Latin is problematic and requires clarification or even correction. Several oblique-case present participles do present simpler opportunities for translation. Verses 7.2, 7.8, and 7.21 present the participles “animans/t”, which easily lend themselves to translation with OE “nyten”. Verse 9.15 presents a similar structure and meaning with the Latin “anima vivente”, but in this case, the translation omits the larger phrase in which it is contained. Verse 8.11 also presents the participle “virentibus”, which Ælfric renders idiomatically with the adjective “grenum”:

7.2 ex omnibus animantibus (Ob abl) mundis tolle septena septena masculum et feminam de animantibus vero non mundis duo duo masculum et feminam
(DR) Of all clean beasts take seven and seven, the male and the female.
(OEGEN) Nim in to ðe of eallum clænum nytenum (N) seofan 7 seofan ægðres gecyndes 7 of unclænum twam 7 twam.

7.8 de animantibus (Ob abl) quoque mundis et inmundis et de volucribus et ex omni quod movetur super terram
(DR) And of beasts clean and unclean, and of fowls, and of every thing that moveth upon the earth,
(OEGEN) Eac swylce ða nytenu (N) of eallum cynne, & eallum fugolcynne

7.21 consumptaque est omnis caro quae movebatur super terram volucrum animantium (Ob gen) bestiarum omniumque reptilium quae reptant super terram universi homines
(DR) And all flesh was destroyed that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of all creeping things that creep upon the earth: and all men.
(OEGEN) Wearð ða fornumen eal flæsc ðe ofer eorðan styrode, manna & fugela, nytenu (N) & creopendra.

8.11 at illa venit ad eum ad vesperam portans (Post-Nom) ramum olivae virentibus (Ob Abl) foliis in ore suo intellexit; ergo Noe quod cessassent aquae super terram
(DR) And she came to him in the evening, carrying a bough of an olive tree, with green leaves, in her mouth. Noe therefore understood that the waters were ceased upon the earth.

(OEGEN) Heo com ða on æfnunge eft to Noe, & brohte (V) an twig of anum elebeame mid grenum (Adj) leafum on hyre muðe. ða undergeat Noe ðæt ða wætera wær on adruwode ofer eordan.

9.15 et recordabor foederis mei vobiscum et cum omni anima vivente (Ob Abl) quae carmen vegetat et non erunt ultra aquae diluvii ad delendam universam carnem (DR) And I will remember my covenant with you, and with every living soul that beareth flesh: and there shall no more be waters of a flood to destroy all flesh.

(OEGEN) Ic beo gemyndig mines weddes wið eow (the second OP and its relative clause are omitted), ðæt heononforð ne byð flod to adylgienne eall flæsc.

Of the nine oblique-case participles that Ælfric encounters in Genesis 1-24.61, four do not contain participles that are easily translated with OE nouns or adjectives as above. Ælfric renders two with participles at 1.20 and 2.19, but Ælfric still elects to render a post-positive genitive participle in 3.8 and a dative in 18.1 with verbs. Verse 3.8 does not appear to present any particular reason why Ælfric might have decided against a participle other than for stylistic reasons, but a closer inspection of the syntax of 18.1 reveals that Ælfric may actually have attempted to address potentially confusing Latin. The Latin reads that “apparuit autem ei Dominus in convalle Mambre sedenti in ostio tabernaculi sui in ipso fervore diei” (However, the Lord appeared to him in the valley of Mambre, sitting in the gate of his temple in the heat of the day). The participle “sedenti” agrees with the dative pronoun “ei”, although it is separated from it by the prepositional phrase “in convalle Mambre”. The ending of the Latin third-declension “convalle” clearly conveys that the word is ablative, and so the meaning should not be confusing in Latin. However, to create an OE participle in this position, which has not such precision in its endings, could induce some confusion about whether the man to whom God appears, or the valley of Mambre, sits at the door of the tent. Ælfric uses a clause to explain that “God þa æteowde eft Abrahame on þam dene Mambre, þær þær he sæt (V) on hys geteldes ingange on
`þære hætan þæs dæges` (God then appeared again to Abraham in the valley Mambre, where he sat at his tent’s entrance in the heat of the day). Ælfric’s decision to specify “Abraham” instead of using the pronoun “him” suggests that Ælfric is attempting to clarify the Latin and avoid confusion. The use of a clause here removes any potential for a misplaced participial modifier, and may reflect a conscious decision to clarify this aspect of the Latin text in the Old English version, rather than merely to avoid a participial rendering.

Although the sample size of oblique-case participles is rather small, which certainly limits the capacity for the translation of this type of participle to comment dramatically on the overall practice of translation in Genesis, there remains a significant difference in the ways in which Ælfric and the anonymous translator render these Latin participles. After Ælfric contends with participles that are easily translated with simpler nouns or adjectives, he renders half of them with participles, and half with verbs. By contrast, the anonymous translator, although only six such participles occur after 24.61, renders none with an OE participle.

**Synopsis of the qualitative studies of the sub-categories of participles**

Ælfric and the anonymous translator of the Old English Genesis clearly engaged in substantially different approaches to the renderings of the given subcategories of Latin present participles. Ælfric’s translation renders pre-positive nominative participles differently from post-positive nominatives, whereas the anonymous translator does not differentiate them. Ælfric translates accusative present participles, usually with OE present participles; however, the anonymous translator tends not to render them with OE participles and sometimes omits them altogether. Ælfric also translates substantive and oblique-case participles more than the anonymous translator does. Ælfric and the anonymous translator do not differ significantly in their rates of
rendering participles in ablative absolutes, and predicative participles in Genesis are not numerous enough to produce helpful signals about the practice of translation. Overall, however, these qualitative studies, combined with studies of OE present participles unattested in the Latin source, indicate the strong potential of the present participle to signify shifts in style and authorship.

1.5f. The unattested OE present participle

This study’s focus on how the translation renders the Latin present participle raises the question of whether the translators use the OE present participle independently from the Latin, which this study classifies as an unattested participle. The presence of unattested participles in this translation has implications for how idiomatic the translators may have considered the Old English present participle. If a translator were to use present participles only in response to Latin participles, the practice of translation might support arguments that the OE present participle developed as a response to Latin syntax. However, 38 unattested participles appear in the Old English Genesis, 27 in Ālfric’s translation and 11 in the anonymous translation.

Ālfric and the anonymous translator use many unattested participles to address different wording and contexts, but there are three key contexts in which Ālfric and the anonymous translator’s uses of unattested participles reveal different translations of similar wording. In contexts in which women bear children, Ālfric renders the Latin verb “concipere” with the Old English verb “eacnian” at 3.16, 4.1, 4.17, 16.4, 16.5, 16.11, and 19.36. Two of Ālfric’s renderings occur with OE present participles, but the anonymous translator omits Latin “concep-” in parallel with “peperit”, or uses a prepositional phrase denoting that a woman is “with child”

David Denison (p. 397) and Mitchell (Old English Syntax, Section 689) both explain the theory that the Old English present participle may have evolved as a response to the need to translate the Latin present participle.
to render Latin “concipere”. The anonymous translator does not use an unattested present participle in this context.

Ælfric renders the Latin preposition “apud” with a variety of forms: the preposition “in” in 6.12, combinations with unattested participles in 23.4 and 23.6, and illustrative paraphrases in 12.15 and 23.8. Only in 8.17 does Ælfric render “apud te” with OE “mid ðe”. The anonymous translator, by contrast, relies almost entirely on simple prepositional phrases using “mid” in 29.19, 32.4, 42.33, 44.10, and 44.16. The anonymous translator also uses the preposition “æt” in 27.15, and omission of “apud” and its complements in 31.32 and 37.2.

Although there are only three relevant cases, unattested participles in the anonymous translation also reveal another difference between the two portions of Genesis. Ælfric and the anonymous translator differently render verbs of growing, specifically verbs ending in “-escere”.

The Latin Genesis 17.6 presents a complementary infinitive: “faciamque te crescere vehementissime” (I will make you to grow most vehemently). Ælfric translates the infinitive form “crescere” with a verb: “7 ic gedo þæt ðu wyxt” (and I act so that you grow). The Latin Genesis 38.24 has a comparable syntax, which gives an accusative infinitive after a passive verb: “fornicata est Thamar nurus tua et videtur uterus illius intumescere” (Thamar your daughter-in-law has fornicated, and the uterus of that one is seen to grow). The anonymous translator handles this similar syntax quite differently from Ælfric’s approach: the anonymous translator converts this infinitive into a progressive construction with the present participle of “weaxan”: “Thamar þin snoru is forlegen 7 hire innoð is weaxende.” (Thamar, your daughter-in-law, is adulterous, and her inside is growing). The Latin Genesis 40.9 and 40.10 contain another instance of such a complementary infinitive of growing. The Latin is rather complex because the complementary infinitive “crescere” is separated by a relative clause from the direct object that it complements.
The Latin reads, “(40.9) narravit prior praepositus pincernarum somnum videbam coram me vitem (40.10) in qua erant tres propagines crescere paulatim gemmas et post flores uvas maturescere” (First, the chief of the butlers narrated his dream: “I saw before me a grape-vine, on which were three propagates, to grow buds a little, and afterwards flowers to mature as grapes). The anonymous translator attempts to overcome the intervening relative clause by ending the first clause of the chief butler’s speech as its own sentence, and then rearranging the following relative clause and complementary infinitive as their own separate clauses:

40.9 narravit prior praepositus pincernarum somnum videbam coram me vitem
(DR) The chief butler first told his dream: I saw before me a vine,
(OEGEN) Þa rehte þæra byra ealdor him his swefn, 7 cwæþ: Ic geseah wingeard.

40.10 in qua erant tres propagines crescere paulatim gemmas et post flores uvas maturescere
(DR) On which were three branches, which by little and little sent out buds, and after the blossoms brought forth ripe grapes:
(OEGEN) On þam wæron þreo clystru, ic geseah þæron weaxende blostman litlum, 7 æfter þam blostmum winberian,

The anonymous translator, in a rather rare move, converts the infinitive “crescere” into the OE present participle “weaxende”, and then omits the second infinitive “maturescere”. These three examples are limited in their overall scope in the Genesis text, but they are similar enough in the Latin structure to show a noticeably different approach to translation by Ælfric and the anonymous translator: the latter applies OE present participles where Ælfric sees no need to do so.

The use of the unattested participle in these three contexts reveals that, when Ælfric and the anonymous translator render similar constructions in their respective translations, their approaches to translation are significantly different. The Old English present participle may have been idiomatic to some degree for each translator, which may explain why Ælfric and the anonymous translator use them differently and render certain words and phrases differently. Not
only does this examination of unattested participles reveal differences in the use of native, unattested participles, but it also provides markers with which to examine surrounding contexts for difference, which have shown further difference between the two portions of the translation. However, the use of unattested participles by translators has even greater implications for translation studies, since it represents another feature of the use of participles that may indicate differences in authorship in translations. As such, it broadens the applicability of the present participle to authorship-attrtribution studies.

1.6. Relationship with Ælfric’s writing on the Old and New Testament: Ælfric’s native OE present participle

The analysis of Ælfric’s and the anonymous translator’s rendering of the Latin present participle in Genesis raises the question of how to calibrate these findings. In an attempt to contextualize Ælfric’s rendering of participles in Genesis against a known work of similar subject matter by Ælfric, I explored whether and how Ælfric employs the OE present participle in his own writings in his Libellus de veteri testamento et novo, 1273 lines of Ælfric’s prose in MSS L and X. If Ælfric did not use the OE participle at all, or if his application of the OE present participle differed significantly from his translation of Genesis 1-24.22, this would raise questions about whether the technique used in this study is relevant to the authorship attribution of Genesis 1-24.22 to Ælfric. In fact, Ælfric does use the OE present participle 77 times in this work. Of these instances, 39 are substantive participles for God as “Scippend” (5) and Christ as “Hælend” (34). Ælfric does use “God” in the text, but distinguishes God from a creator by using “Scippend”; Ælfric also uses “Crisi”, often as an appositive to “Hælend”. However, the
remaining 38 uses of the OE present participle appear consistent with the practice of translation in Genesis 1-24.22.

The analysis of the OE Genesis reveals that Ælfric never renders a Latin pre-positive nominative present participle with an OE participle, but rather prefers various non-participial renderings for pre-positive nominatives, usually clauses. Quite consistently, Ælfric never uses a pre-positive present participle in his *Book on the Old and New Testament*. However, the analysis of Genesis also revealed that Ælfric rendered 27% of Latin post-positive nominatives with OE participles, a practice consistent with Ælfric’s book, in which he uses eighteen post-positive nominative present participles in various contexts. Ælfric uses both “cwédende” and “secgende” as post-positive nominative participles in his *Libellus*, as he does in Genesis. Ælfric’s apparent sensitivity to the position of nominative participles in the translation quite agrees with his own writing in his book, and stands in significant contrast to the work of the anonymous translator, who renders only one such participle of 117 with an OE participle.

While Ælfric appears to treat pre-positive and post-positive nominatives differently, the analysis of Genesis suggests that he does not appear to distinguish accusatives similarly. Ælfric renders two of six pre-positive accusatives with OE participles (33%), which is certainly a very small sample, and thirteen of eighteen post-positive accusatives with OE participles (72%). Ælfric indeed uses both kinds of participles in the *Libellus*: six pre-positive accusatives and two post-positives. These results in the translation and the book at least demonstrate that Ælfric is willing to use accusative present participles in both positions, and suggest that Ælfric’s response to position in accusatives is quite different from his response to position in nominatives. They also differ from the anonymous translator’s rendering of only three of 21 (14%) such participles in the second portion of Genesis. It is only logical to point out that the relative consistency that I
describe here is somewhat problematic, because we cannot necessarily measure how many participles Ælfric could have used instead of other forms. In the study of the translation of Genesis, I have discussed how many Latin participles Ælfric renders with OE participles. When it comes to Ælfric’s own writing, it is more difficult to ascertain just how consistent his use of OE present participles is. Such a question is, however, an interesting one, and later studies could certainly attempt to provide a more precise answer by measuring verb-to-participle ratios in Ælfric’s translations and his writings.

The analysis of the translation found smaller sample sizes for ablative-absolufe participles, substantives, predicatives, and obliques; however, Ælfric’s use of these participles in his book generally agrees with these findings. Ælfric renders not one of thirteen Latin ablative-absolute present participles with an OE participle in Genesis, and Ælfric, who does not appear to use the dative absolute much to begin with in the Libellus, does not use a single OE participle in a dative absolute in his book. Ælfric renders only three Latin substantive participles with OE participles in Genesis, but he also uses substantive participles three times in his book, not including his references to “Scippend” and “Hælend”. Ælfric renders one of two predicatives with an OE participle in Genesis, and uses four predicative participles in his book, two in strongly progressive form. For oblique-case participles in the Genesis translation, Ælfric does use simple nouns and adjectives for words relating to living creatures, but Ælfric also translates some oblique-case participles with OE participles, and does use four pre-positive participles and one post-positive dative present participle in his Libellus, something the anonymous translator does not do.

The results of this comparison between Genesis 1-24.22 and Ælfric’s Libellus place the translation in a context that situates it more securely within Ælfric’s practice of translation and
writing. The agreement between these texts generates a clearer picture of how different the anonymous translation of Genesis 24.61-50.25 is from Ælfric’s treatment. Whereas Ælfric has very specific preferences for certain types of present participles in his writing, he is generally comfortable with the feature and uses it in his own composition. By contrast, the anonymous translator of Genesis 24.61-50.25 almost completely avoids the present participle; on the handful of occasions when the anonymous translator uses the OE participle, he does so in parallel, simple structure, or early on in response to a very specific name whose core is composed of present participles. Although it goes beyond the scope of this study, future work could examine Ælfric’s writing as a whole and establish how Ælfric responds to the OE present participle in his translation of Maccabees and incorporates the present participle in his homilies. The comparison of Ælfric’s use of the unattested OE present participle in his translation of Genesis and his own idiomatic use of the OE present participle in the *Libellus* also demonstrates that the present participle is a valuable marker of stylistic and authorship shift beyond translation: the approximate correlation between the features in this study suggests that the present participle is a feature of authorship style in original writings, as well.

1.7. Limitations, future work, and conclusions

a. Limitations

This study breaks new ground in the pursuit of authorship attribution studies by proposing to raise the standard of proof with the synthesis of traditional and non-traditional authorship-attribution methods, examines the translation of Genesis in a previously unexplored way, adds key findings to confirm the scholarly view of the split authorship of the Old English Genesis, and demonstrates the utility of the present participle as a marker of stylistic shift and
authorship. However, this study is subject to some limitations that should be explored in future work. The first limitation is that this study would benefit from a larger calibration of Ælfric’s practice of translation by an expansion of this technique to more or all of Ælfric’s work. To obtain an exhaustively accurate picture of Ælfric’s treatment of the present participle, a complete study of his writings is necessary. The outcome of such a comprehensive study of Ælfric’s writings would then allow scholars to re-visit Clemoes’ assertion that Byrhtferth of Ramsey may have been the anonymous translator of Genesis, and Baker’s refutation of Clemoes’ proposition (Baker 32). Whether the outcome of such a study connects or dissociates Byrhtferth from the Hexateuch, the data gained from a comparison of the use of the present participle would helpfully illuminate the utility of the present participle as a marker of authorship. A natural expansion of this study would then be to expand the study of the present participle and perhaps other features to the entire Hexateuch, since far less scholarly consensus exists about how many authors worked on Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua.

The second limitation of this study of Genesis is that, although the present participle occurs over 400 times in the Latin Genesis, the present participle suffers the same limitation as does any particular feature: representativeness. As this study has itself revealed, the present participle is only one feature that could be supplemented by examinations of other verbal structures such as past participles and infinitives, as well as other structures such as clause coordination and subordination. Before future studies attempt to address either of these first two limitations, scholars must overcome the problem of workload with better technological means. This will require using emerging concordancing software and marking structures, which is a very time-consuming task because computers cannot easily differentiate between present participles and other structures such as progressives and nouns. However, it should be possible to apply to
participles the same technological aids that are used to facilitate lexical analysis, and any work on the development of such technological aids will be a worthwhile investment. This study has certainly demonstrated to me the crucial importance of developing an efficient way to conduct this kind of analysis, one that allows a computer to scan marked elements for efficient computation and re-calculation.

Although this study has employed some basic tests from statistical science to evaluate and support its findings, the third key limitation of this study is that there is so much more that may be done with statistical analysis. Currently, statisticians are heavily focused on various ratios of content-to-function word analysis, and it appears that most scholarship on the statistics of authorship attribution applies to lexical analysis. Several statistical methods will probably prove useful in further evaluation of the rendering of syntactic structures. Binomial probability and Bernoulli processes will allow the researchers to analyze the probability that any particular feature or set of features will be rendered similarly to the original or differently from it. In this study, it was not clear that the translator’s decision to render later participles was independent of earlier renderings. Since independence is a requirement of binomial probability (McClave and Sincich 204), this study did not employ it. However, more sophisticated statistical studies may be able to use binomial probability for this purpose. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), which allows two-factor experiments (McClave and Sincich 517), and maximum-likelihood estimation (MLE), which allows researchers to estimate the parameters of an experiment without having to test all the samples, may aid studies of authorship attribution by helping define boundaries.

---

33 Binomial probability is, for example, a suitable technique for coin-flipping experiments, in which there are only two possible outcomes, which is suitable for this kind of study since it examines whether a translator uses a participle or does not. However, binomial probability also requires independence: in a coin-flipping experiment, the outcome of a previous coin-flip has no influence on the next outcome. However, a translator who is applying a practice of translation, even if that practice is not a strongly conscious process, may not make completely independent decisions about translating a participle from instance to instance. For this reason, I ultimately elected not to apply binomial probability. Future work should evaluate whether methods like binomial and Poisson probability can be applied to this kind of study.
between samples. The incidence of participles will need to be evaluated for its compatibility with these additional methods.

Before work of this kind can reach its full potential, however, there is a fourth limitation to this work that far transcends the scope of this project, but will be truly instructive in the future of authorship-attribution studies: a firm model to explain how much authors can vary their practices for different audiences, different types of writing tasks, and even different moods. This is a question that remains largely unanswered in current scholarship. Where do the versatility of the individual author and the probabilities of inferential statistics intersect? How do we know whether the models of probability in inferential statistics are compatible with the potential variation of individual authorship? Hugh Craig in 1999 warned, “Precious few theoretical models bridge the gap between, on one hand, the counting and analysing of linguistic features, and, on the other, the eclectic, holistic, impressionistic, and yet indispensable business of capturing the impact and flavour of a group of texts” (103).

One fascinating and perhaps unexpected field of emerging research may provide some context for this question, if not perhaps a direct answer. Authorship-attribution studies of known works by authors who have suffered from Alzheimer’s disease are addressing whether current methods can differentiate between works by the same author, before and after the onset of the disease, whose effects “may include a reduced, vague, and more abstract vocabulary, and reduced syntactic complexity” (Hirst and Wang 357). In 2011, Xuan Le, Ian Lancashire, Graeme Hirst and Regina Jokel built on the work of Garrard et al.’s 2005 study by using large corpora and assessing linguistic markers for “signs of dementia” (438) in the works of Iris Murdoch, Agatha Christie, and P. D. James. Le et al. considered lexical variation and ratios of nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and pronouns (443, 448). However, Le et al. also considered syntax,
including complexity (450), parse-tree depth (451), and passive voice (453). The authors found evidence of dementia through linguistic loss in Murdoch’s and Christie’s writings, but not in the writings of James (457). However, the authors also reported that syntactic complexity and passivization did not distinguish the authors according to their hypotheses (457). Le et al. explain that they will seek larger sample sizes but also “other aspects of syntactic complexity such as gapping and conjunction” (458) in order to enhance their methodology. The authors’ acknowledgement that complexity may differentiate authors suggests that this study’s use of present participles, though a complex feature to analyze and quantify, may be helpful in this direction of research.

Noting that an “author’s essential stylistic signature is taken to be largely independent of the topics upon which they write, and invariant, or largely so, even across different genres in which they write” (358), Hirst and Wang in 2012 further tested the novels of Iris Murdoch, who was diagnosed with Alzheimer’s, and Agatha Christie, who was suspected to have the disease, against those of P. D. James, who is not believed to suffer from the disease (358). Their hypothesis was that Murdoch and Christie’s novels would appear to have been written by different authors because of the cognitive changes resulting from Alzheimer’s, but that James’s novels would not appear to be different even over years of aging (359). Hirst and Wang did detect evidence of change in all three authors, but they tentatively attribute it to age-related change of style. However, the authors caution that “unmasking could not discriminate the authors by age very well, or could not do so at all, depending on what baseline was chosen. Unmasking is a less well-established method; although Koppel and colleagues report good results with it, and it worked well in our preliminary study, it has not been widely used by other researchers” (366).
Research in which scholars mobilize medical and scientific knowledge of verifiable conditions that cause measurable cognitive difference, and then apply current and emerging authorship-attribution tests to the writings of affected authors, will help the field understand how and how much individuals vary the use of features that researchers currently consider markers of authorship. In the most current state of research, such questions remain largely unanswered. Future studies may wish to spend a great deal of time analyzing works of absolutely known origin, both by single authors and by different authors, to develop a better sense of how much authors can vary their styles. Kestemont et al. note that the “few remarks that have been made on this issue agree that authorship attribution is difficult within a single textual genre, even more difficult when several topics are involved” (341). Kestemont et al. were able to verify authors within genres, but found cross-genre verification difficult (354). Studies of this kind will probably need to seek large sample sizes and account for variations of culture, gender, education, and even temporal context. Such information is vastly beyond the scope of this study of the translation of the Old English Genesis, but it will be a worthwhile investment if authorship-attribution studies, both traditional and non-traditional, are to become reliable. Work of this type is only beginning to emerge as researchers are starting to question whether current techniques can verify the same known author of texts of different genres.

**b. Conclusions**

Despite the given limitations of this study, which tend to exceed the scope of already a very large project, this examination of the translation of Genesis has found extensive evidence to support the hypothesis that the present participle is a significant marker of authorship change in the Old English Genesis, and that the statistical tests used to support this conclusion helpfully
reveal this shift and characterize the extent of this shift. This conclusion accomplishes the objective of this study, which is to assess whether the present participle can signify a shift in authorship, by comparing these results to the widely accepted conclusions of Jost, Clemoes, and Marsden, whose lexical studies have been widely accepted as convincing proof of this authorship in chapter 24 of Genesis. The renderings of present participles alone demonstrate that it is very unlikely that Ælfric produced much of the translation starting at 24.61, if any at all. Ælfric, who directly claims authorship of Genesis up to the end of the story of Isaac, renders the Latin present participle quite specifically, with a strong preference for some sub-categories of present participles, and quite a strong distaste for others. By contrast, the translation of Genesis starting at 24.61, shows hardly any similarity with Ælfric’s particular approaches to present participles either in his translation of Genesis, or in his own writings in his Libellus. The following points summarize the chief findings of this rather extensive examination of present participles in Genesis, for clarity:

1. The 500-, 600-, and 800-word segmenting methods use standard segment sizes and demonstrate that the present participle, which Ælfric translates with frequency up to Genesis 24.22, all but disappears when the translation resumes at 24.61.

2. The statistical 2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction shows that, even after verse omissions are removed from the calculation, Genesis 1-24.22 and Genesis 24.61-50.25 have rates of translation dramatically different enough to suggest that they do not come from the same practice of translation.

3. Proportion tests of the rates of translation of individual subcategories of present participles suggest that most of the subcategories’ rates of translation are not consistent with the overall rates of translation of the present participle. This indicates that the
translation of the present participle into OE is not a single phenomenon, but a set of different phenomena that must be examined individually.

4. Ælfric renders the post-positive nominative present participle 30% of the time in 56 occurrences, and the participle of Latin “dicere” even more frequently at 38%, whereas the anonymous translator of Genesis 24.61-50.25 renders only 1 of 117, less than 1%. Ælfric translates the post-positive nominative at a rate very similar to all four Old English Gospels; the anonymous translation of Genesis stands in very stark contrast to all of these. Even when the second portion of Genesis contains Latin syntactically similar to that found in Genesis 1-24.22, the anonymous translator still does not render post-positive participles with OE participles.

5. When the syntax of the Latin becomes complex, that is to say laden with two or more participial phrases, Ælfric almost never omits any of the Latin participles in the translation, whereas the anonymous translator tends to omit Latin participles, even when they convey unique information.

6. Ælfric renders the Latin accusative participle 15 of 22 times (68% of the time), whereas the anonymous translator does so only 3 of 29 times (just over 10% of the time). Although Ælfric clearly differentiates between pre-positive and post-positive nominative participles in his translation, he does not take such a divided approach to accusative participles, based on their position.

7. Neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translator tends to render the ablative-absolute participle with OE participles.

8. Ælfric tends not to render Latin substantive present participles with OE participles, but he does so in three of 25 instances. The anonymous translator only does so in 24.62, the
second verse of that part of the translation, where the Latin and the translation are nearly identical to 16.14, which Ælfric renders with OE present participles.

9. Ælfric renders two of fifteen oblique-case participles with OE participles, and elects to use simpler nouns and adjectives to render Latin participles of living creatures. The anonymous translator renders no oblique-case participle with an OE participle. Both Ælfric and the anonymous translator render at least one predicative participle with an OE participle, but the sample of predicatives is too small to indicate a practice of translation.

10. Both translators use OE present participles where present participles do not exist in the Latin text, and many of these are used in different contexts that resist easy comparison. However, Ælfric does so 27 times, whereas the anonymous translator does so only 11 times. Also, Ælfric and the anonymous translator do differ in three contexts in which one, but not the other, uses unattested participles: verbs of bearing children, the preposition *apud*, and verbs of growing.

11. An analysis of Ælfric’s use of the present participle in his *Libellus de veteri testamento et novo* reveals that his own writing reflects similarities to the translation of Genesis 1-24.22. These two texts are arguably consistent with each other, and sharply different from the translation of Genesis 24.61-50.25.

12. The OE Genesis in both portions differs from the translation of the Old English Gospels, because neither portion translates a single pre-positive nominative participle with an OE participle. Although the OE Gospels texts differ in their rates of translation, all render these with OE participles to some degree. This suggests that some further comparison of the OE Genesis to the Old English Gospels may reveal additional insights about each text, and suggests that, at least in this respect, they are not likely of shared authorship.
This body of evidence suggests two overall conclusions, one specific to Genesis, and a second relevant to larger studies of translation and authorship attribution. First, this evidence strongly confirms with new syntactic and statistical evidence that the Old English translation of Genesis is a product of divided authorship, and this finding supports earlier conclusions by Jost, Clemoes and Marsden that Ælfric is very likely the author of only Genesis 1-24.22, although the exact end of Ælfric’s translation remains subject to some debate. This study adds considerable evidentiary weight to these findings, which were lexical in nature, by providing syntactic evidence and by adding statistical tests of validity to demonstrate that the perceived differences in the rates of translation are statistically significant, and not simply variations of one practice of translation.

The second conclusion of this study is more far-reaching. The result that the rendering of the Latin present participle can dramatically reflect a widely accepted shift in a text of known divided authorship indicates a largely unexplored but useful direction in which authorship-attribution studies can explore still-unresolved authorship questions, like that of the Old English Gospels. While most authorship-attribution studies have focused on the rates of incidence and translation of specific tokens, or words, current scholars in authorship attribution have cautioned that such lexical ratios may not be able to account for a complete picture of stylometric difference, or difference in authorship. The objective of this study of the present participle in Genesis was to function as a sort of “control experiment” and ask whether a specific syntactic feature could demonstrate evidence of difference, where, how, and how much. As a control experiment, this study has succeeded, because it has shown the potential for the present participle to discriminate between separate practices of translation. The study of participial phrases in stylometry and authorship attribution can allow researchers to examine structures beyond the
scope of the word, and beyond the scope of the clause, by examining how different authors use this hypotactic construction to combine larger ideas in their writing. Therefore, I will apply the methodology tested in this study to my study of the Old English Gospels, whose authorship is still subject to considerable debate, by examining the rendering of the Latin present participle in those texts.

The participial phrase, like its verbal siblings, the absolute, the infinitive and the various gerundives, has the power to connect subject-verb units, quite beyond the power of the word or the non-verbal phrase, but without engaging in clause structure. However, this bridging unit of syntax has not received nearly the attention that word-based and clause-based studies have received. This study of the Old English Genesis, as does that of the Old English Gospels, has demonstrated that the participial phrase is a powerful and sophisticated construction that varies a great deal from text to text, and perhaps from author to author. When such studies employ the rigor of even the most traditional, basic statistical techniques, analyses of participial phrases can reveal dramatic shifts in authorship style that may help answer many of the questions of authorship that remain unsolved, and they can likely be applied to any language that uses the participial construction, ancient or modern, with necessary modifications for each target language. These studies have been an attempt to break the ice and show the potential of the construction; now it is up to scholars to determine whether and how to add this promising technique to the field of authorship attribution, which is far from an exact or established science, and which has yet to find its reliable footing.
Part Two:

Inter- and Intra-textual Patterns and Variations in the Rendering of Present Participles in the Old English Gospels

2.1. Introduction: variations in the rendering of present participles in the Old English Gospels

The Old English translation of the gospels is one of the largest single collections of Old English, and is the largest translation of the bible, even larger than the Old English Heptateuch, the combined translation of the first seven books of the Old Testament, of which Ælfric translated at least part (“Translated by Committee”, Marsden 41). Completed around the year 1,000 C.E. (Liuzza, “Who Read” 6), the translation offers insight into late Old English (OE) before Norman influences would stimulate the extensive transition into Middle English (ME). As such, the text can reflect on a vast array of linguistic and cultural aspects of the late-OE period: Latin learning and transmission, OE syntax, lexical diversity and lexical evolution, textual production and scholarship, and the very perceptions and practice of translation, both biblical and general, in the pre-Norman period.

Eight manuscripts of the translation survive, but none appears to be the original. The most recent scholarly edition is Roy Liuzza’s, based primarily on the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140 (Cp) manuscript with corrections from the Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 441 (B) and London, BL Cotton Otho C.i. Vol. 1 (C) manuscripts (Old English Version, Vol. 1, lxxiv). In his study of the eight MSS, Liuzza suggests that other manuscripts make independent improvements or emendations of earlier MSS (lxxiv). The manuscripts differ, but this dissertation has used an electronic version of Skeat’s text¹ for analysis, checked it against

¹ The purpose of using Skeat’s text was to enable electronic text searches to assist in the analysis of the translation of present participles in the four gospels. Skeat’s text was made available by the DOE project at the University of Toronto, to which I owe my gratitude for providing me access to these electronic versions. As the methodology will
Liuzza’s edition and noted variations that could influence the findings of this study. Despite several extant manuscripts and the size of the translation, it is not clear that the translation was widely used. Robert Stanton cautions that the purpose of the translation is still not known (130). Liuzza notes that translation does not appear to have been used as a basis for other translations (“Who Read” 6), is not quoted in any other works (5), and is unknown to Ælfric² (6). Liuzza also explains that the manuscripts were kept in libraries, likely away from public access (11). Although the Bodley manuscript contained only the Old English translation (11), later manuscripts contain Latin headings and some even instructions for lectionary use (12), suggesting that at least some manuscripts were used for public reading (13). Liuzza argues that “in all probability the Old English Gospels reached the general lay audience, if at all, in the voice of a narrator, as a gloss on a recited Latin liturgical reading rather than as an independent text” (15), a suggestion with which Robert Stanton agrees (131), and an observation that may well inform the practice of translation, especially in passages that differ from the rest of the translation. In other words, a lectionary to an Anglo-Saxon audience may, at times, have needed adjustment to mitigate the complications of foreign Latin syntax, or to accommodate the idiom of Old English. This is a possibility that this dissertation considers.

The poorly understood provenance of the translation is a considerable disappointment for scholars who would dearly like to know more about the production of large texts and biblical translations in this period of Anglo-Saxon history. Indeed, the resources required to produce a translation of such size would have been considerable: the sheer length of the text would have explain in further detail, I performed most of the analysis through my own translation and close reading; however, the electronic texts allowed me to use text strings to search for errors and omissions in my own analysis. Roy Liuzza’s most recent edition was cross-checked for the presence of participles in Skeat’s version.
² My previous study of the Genesis will indirectly support Liuzza’s assertion here, since the previous study found that Ælfric never translates a Latin pre-positive nominative present participle with an OE present participle, while the Old English translations of the Gospels all render at least some OE pre-positive nominative present participles with OE participles.
required well-trained staff to execute the translation\(^3\), a facility in which to do it, and access to
manuscripts of the Latin exemplar that were certainly not widely owned in society. The
undertaking would also have required materials to produce the manuscript of the translation.
Without any concrete historical documents, scholars today are left wondering how many people
may have worked on the translation, whether it was the product of one very ambitious translator,
or whether it was the product of divided labour and management.

Several scholars have already explored this question with great interest, but without much
consensus about whether the Old English Gospels are the result of single or multiple authorship.
Allison Drake’s conclusion in 1894 that the gospels are of divided authorship stimulated a
number of studies that at first rejected the theory of multiple authorship, while later studies
differed on how many translators there may have been, which parts may be of shared authorship,
and even how to approach the question. Lexical studies have focused on which words are
employed to translate certain Latin structures but have not attempted to employ statistical
validity in their studies\(^4\), and later lexical studies have focused on statistical studies of rates of

\(^3\) Ælfric reported significant concerns about the act of translating the Latin bible into Old English. Jonathan Wilcox
notes that Ælfric promises at the end of the *Catholic Homilies II* that he will not translate “gospel or homilies from
Latin to English” (1). Again in his preface to his translation of Genesis, Ælfric warns, “Ic cwêðe nu ðæt ic ne dearr
ne ic nelle nane hæc æfter ðísre of Ledene on Englisc awendan; 7 ic bidde ðe, leof ealdormann, ðæt du me ðæs na
leng na bidde” (I say now that I do not dare, and I will not, translate any book after this from Latin into English, and
I pray you, dear alderman, that you not longer ask me this) (Heptateuch, ed. Crawford 80). Ælfric was very
cconcerned that translators could mis-interpret the Latin bible: “gif sum dysig man þæs hæc ræt oððe rædan gehyrþ,
þæt he wille wenan, þæt he mote lybban nu on þære niwan æ, swa swa þa ealdan fædoræ lofodon þa on þære tide,
að þæs þe seo ealdæ æ gesett were, ofþe swa swa men lofodon under Mosysæ æ” (if some ignorant man reads this
book or hears it read, that he will think that he might live now in the new law, just as the old fathers lived then in
that time, before the old law was set down, or just as men lived under Moses’s law) (Heptateuch, ed. Crawford 76).
Wilcox explains further that in the *Lives of the Saints*, Ælfric again vows not to engage in translation of the bible (2-3).

\(^4\) Drake in 1894, Abel in 1961 considered the authorship of the Old English Gospels from lexical viewpoints but did
not apply statistical tests to assess their findings. Statistical science was still very much an emerging discipline in
Drake’s time. Even in Abel’s time, statistical authorship-attribution studies were only beginning to emerge.
Mosteller and Wallace’s seminal statistical study on the authorship of the *Federalist Papers* was not published until
types of content words to function words. However, as discussed in my previous study of the Old English Genesis, authorship-attribution scholars warn that lexical tokens cannot alone answer questions of authorship. Scholars have also approached the question from a syntactic point of view, focusing on *beon/wesan* + the present participle, periphrastic renderings, and verb-object word orders, and each has found some evidence of difference among the gospels texts. However, many scholars have assumed that divided authorship would naturally occur only between gospel translations, not within them. This contrasts with emerging perceptions of the Old English Heptateuch that individual texts may be of shared authorship, as Richard Marsden argues (42-3). Further, these syntactic studies have not applied statistical tests to assess whether the perceived differences in translation are actual differences. As I argue in my study of the OE Genesis, different rates of translation may indeed reflect differences in the practice of translation. However, at what point do we argue a difference between the natural fluctuations in a single process and fluctuations that indicate a significant difference and perhaps a shift in authorship? Statistical principles and tests provide a well-tested framework within which to assess such differences, but they have not been widely applied to the study of the Old English Gospels.

---

5 I refer here to studies by Antonio Miranda-García, Javier Calle-Martín, and Teresa Marqués-Aguado, whose work I discuss at greater length in the literature review. However, I make note of them here because these authors expanded upon the types of lexical work by earlier authors by applying some sound statistical principles in their analysis, even as simple as reporting averages, standard deviations, and rankings of word types by text.

6 In the introduction to my study of the Old English Genesis, I note that Joseph Rudman warns that studies of particular words or types of words “may not in themselves be an indicator of a unique style, but when used in conjunction with all of the other quantifiable indicators that make up style, they become important” (360). I reiterate his words in this note because of their importance.

7 As I will explain further in the literature and the argument, one very notable exception to this trend has been the work of Roy Liuzza, who considered the possibility that the Old English Matthew may be of divided authorship around chapter 21 (*The Old English Version of the Gospels*, Vol. 2, 119). Liuzza’s suggestion sparked the underlying research question of this entire dissertation: whether inter-textual difference may be only part of the issue, and whether intra-textual shifts are evident.

8 This is one reason why I believe that the work of Antonio Miranda-García, Javier Calle-Martín, and Teresa Marqués-Aguado has been so important to the exploration of the Old English Gospels. These authors have assembled data and subjected the data to clearly explained statistical tests that reflect some of the current trends in statistical authorship-attribution studies. Their work in part motivated this research, particularly the decision to pause in order to acquire the ability to subject my data to some statistically valid methods and tests.
The objective of this study is to build upon the work of past scholars by exploring the question of authorship in the Old English Gospels syntactically and statistically. Syntactically, by drawing on the method explored and tested in my study of the Old English Heptateuch Genesis, I have examined how the gospel translations render the Latin present participle with an Old English present participle or other construction. Such an approach allows me to assess stylistic variation at the level of the participial phrase, a feature that has been little represented in scholarship. In the Old English Genesis, this approach detected 443 participles to use as markers by which to assess potential shifts in translation. In the Old English Gospels, this approach detected 1461 participles, a very large sample size to evaluate shift and perform statistical tests. Statistically, expanding on the statistical techniques tested in my study of the Old English Genesis, I performed statistical tests that allow this study to draw several informed conclusions about potential differences in authorship. These approaches have produced results that support much of the recent work into the authorship of the Old English Gospels, and suggest new possibilities of intra-textual breaks in authorship where they had not been previously detected.

Scholars have tended to assume that the attribution of authorship can be ascertained by treating each gospel text as a single product of one author or of the same authors. Liuzza’s analysis in 2000, however, suggests the possibility of intra-textual shift, a finding supported in this study. This study reveals other intra-textual shifts and considers whether the practice of translation did not vary only at the textual boundaries between gospels, but also within certain

---

9 Both Roy Liuzza and Horiguchi Kasuhisa (I have preserved the author’s use of family name first, followed by personal names in this case, since the original article follows that format) examine the rendering of the Latin present participle in the Old English Gospels. Liuzza’s study examined the participle more broadly, while Horiguchi focuses on the present participle after beon/wesan (to be) structures. Lea Olsan argued in 1973, “The Vulgate Gospel Version contains so many participles that they cannot be transferred into English smoothly. The translation of participles is, therefore, one excellent guide to the translator’s approach to his Latin source” (125). Olsan’s impression is that the translator “translates the participial construction with whatever English construction seems to best convey the specific meaning and function of the Latin” (128). Olsan does not apply the analysis to comment on split authorship, but to argue that the translator’s approach “clarifies the function of the Latin participle” (125).
texts. As a result, this study innovates by challenging the assumption that authorship shifts would necessarily occur between texts. These findings contextualize some observed similarities between gospels that also display significant differences, and suggest that authorship may cross textual boundaries. This study demonstrates that there are not only inter-textual differences among the gospel translations, but also that there are very likely intra-textual differences in Matthew and John. This study also contributes to scholarly understanding of the texts by applying statistical tests that strongly indicate the presence of these proposed breaks in practice. As did my previous study of the Old English Genesis, this study demonstrates that traditional qualitative analysis of complex syntactic features such as the participial phrase can employ quantitative methods to discern the variation within a single process from significant variation indicating possible shifts in authorship. This study benefits from the study of the Old English Genesis, which showed that statistically significant differences in the rendering of the Latin present participle were visible across the break in authorship attested by Ælfric, as well as evidence of that break found by Jost, Clemoes, and Marsden; the same methodology in this study reveals similarly significant breaks in the practice of rendering the Latin present participle in the Old English Gospels.

This chapter proceeds in Section 2 by reviewing in greater detail the history of scholarship on the authorship of the Old English Gospels. Section 3 describes my methodology and how this study needed to expand upon the methods employed in the study of the Old English Genesis, in order to overcome a lack of critical consensus about where breaks may exist, if at all. Section 4 reports on the quantitative results of all six stages of the quantitative component, and then discusses and synthesizes these results as they mount considerable data and test results. Section 5 reports on the qualitative results of my studies of the subcategories of present
participles. Section 6 concludes by considering the limitations of this work and discussing those issues that this study could not fully resolve, then reviewing the contributions that this work has made to an understanding of the authorship of the Old English Gospels. This section also suggests new studies that will expand upon this study’s contributions and further enlighten scholarly understanding of this and other authorship-attribution questions.

2.2. Literature review: the question of authorship of the Old English Gospels

The debate over whether the OE Gospels is a product of single, dual, or even multiple authorship appears to have begun in 1894, when Allison Drake performed a lexical study of the four gospels and argued that “the authorship is at least dual, and probably triple; more explicitly, that the Matthew is by one translator, the Mark and Luke by another, and the John by a third (unless possibly by the translator of the Matthew)” (18). However, in 1904, James Bright underscored the difficulty for stylistics studies and authorship attribution to distinguish persuasively between authorial change and shared authorship. Bright rejected Drake’s theory of multiple authorship and suggested that “the translator clearly varies his manner somewhat, and in details, at times, differs from himself; but the task of translation was a long one, and was probably resumed at intervals, and carried on without constant or uniform care for consistency” (Bright xxv). Even so, William Craigie, in his 1940 article “The English Versions (to Wyclif)”, accepted Drake’s conclusions (130).

In 1962, Arthur Abel in his dissertation *Ælfric and the West-Saxon Gospels* conceded that “nearly all critics have accepted the main tenets” of Drake’s argument about multiple authorship, but that they have “voiced vague doubts as to its general validity” (196). Abel suggests that Drake relies too much on anecdotal, “isolated” features (198), and that the text in fact
demonstrates an over-arching unity of authorship that Abel attributes to Ælfric (290). Abel warns that the sample sizes of some of the features that Drake examines are not enough to “outline a characteristic syntactic pattern, nor any kind of pattern” (204). Abel rather strongly denounces Drake’s theory of divided authorship\textsuperscript{10} and instead supports a theory of unified authorship, although “the fact remains that there are wide discrepancies in the version, and single authorship cannot be proved beyond question” (242). Abel marshals lexical evidence and suggests that the texts are of “the same degree of literalness and the same respect for English word order and idiom in all of them. The most logical reason that can be assigned is that they were written by the same man” (264). Abel argues that Ælfric also wrote in the West-Saxon dialect, lived around the time when the Old English Gospels were produced, and completed other large biblical translations at a time when few priests could read Latin (296). Abel suggests that there is much potential for Ælfric to be the author of the OE Gospels, an assertion that this dissertation will consider through comparative analysis, but that does not appear to have gained much support since Abel’s work\textsuperscript{11}.

Roy Liuzza in 2000 completed an expansive textual study to accompany his 1994 critical edition of the OE Gospels. Liuzza’s study not only addresses extensive lexical material, as do previous studies of the OE Gospels, but also key syntactic analyses of absolute constructions, $ut$ + the subjunctive, $quia$ + the declarative, periphrastic imperatives, and present participles. Drawing upon this massive collection of new information, Liuzza argues that there is

\textsuperscript{10} Abel rather strongly argues that “the view of multiple authorship, as formulated by Drake, has continued to hold the field for almost another sixty years since Bright. It is worthless and is an impediment to correct thinking about the version. Henceforth, it should be disregarded completely” (242). Abel cautions that neither Skeat, the original editor of the version, nor his successor Bright, publicly advocated a theory of multiple authorship (241). However, more recent scholarship certainly motivates researchers to reconsider Drake’s notion and re-examine the unity that Abel so strongly proposes.

\textsuperscript{11} Indeed, the findings of my previous study, as mentioned earlier, reveal that neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translator of the OE Genesis renders pre-positive nominative present participles with OE participles, whereas the Old English translations do. For this reason, this study contributes additional evidence that Ælfric was probably not the translator of the Old English Gospels.
“cumulative support for the hypothesis that several hands worked on the translation” (*The Old English Version of the Gospels*, Vol. 2, 119). Liuzza suggests that Mark and Luke share similarities that distinguish them from both Matthew and John, and also that Matthew and John are substantially different from one another (119). Liuzza essentially supports Drake’s original theory, but with far more extensive evidence. In addition to an inter-textual theory of multiple authorship among the Old English Gospels, however, Liuzza also considers intra-textual variation within gospel translations, and observes “a change in translation at ch. 21” in the OE Matthew, suggesting “the possibility that Mt was translated by at least two hands” (119). Liuzza also suggests another break in the rendering of participles between chapters 8-13 and chapters 14-18, a finding that this study independently supports. It is this particular observation that sparked the governing line of inquiry behind this dissertation, which looks more closely at the practice of rendering Latin present participles. This dissertation is much indebted to Liuzza, whose innovative and extensive examination of syntax and consideration of intra-textual difference inspired this entire dissertation.

Several scholars have reacted to Liuzza’s study and his suggestions of multiple authorship in the translations. In 2007, Laura Segura and Nadia Obegi Gallardo, in their article “Latin Ablative-Absolute Constructions in the Old English Gospels: A Case Study,” noted a lack of consensus among scholars about the independence of the Old English absolute construction and responded to Liuzza’s analysis. Segura and Gallardo asserted similarities between the OE Mark and Luke that could indicate multiple authorship in the Old English Gospels, but suggested a more detailed authorship-attribution study would be needed to explore this issue (95, 102).

Around the same time, Antonio Miranda-García, Javier Calle-Martín, and Teresa Marqués-

---

12 See section 2.4e, the sliding proportion test of the OE Matthew. My own independent survey of participles and my use of the sliding proportion test to seek the point of greatest difference finds the statistically most significant break almost exactly where Roy Liuzza suggests a difference in the rendering of participles occurs.
Aguado published computational-lexical studies and a syntactic study of the Old English Gospels. In their 2007 study of the OE Gospels in “Function Words in Authorship Attribution Studies,” Miranda-García and Calle-Martín found that the OE Matthew and John are most unlike in functional density and delta scores, while Mark and Luke are most similar (59); these findings appear to agree with Liuzza’s and Drake’s findings. However, in their 2008 study “Morphological Features in the Translatorship Attribution of the West Saxon Gospels”, the same authors and Teresa Marqués-Aguado observe that the OE Matthew and Luke share morphological similarities in the declension of adjectives. They reject Liuzza’s assertion that Matthew and Luke are distinct, and argue that Matthew and Luke probably share authorship (222). My dissertation does find evidence of unique similarities between the OE Matthew and Luke, and discusses this evidence in light of other inter-textual comparisons. Further complicating these authors’ impressions of the authorship of the OE Gospels, Calle-Martín and Miranda-García, in a second 2009 study of the Old English Gospels, examine *ond*-clauses and find similarities among the synoptic gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke, and differences in John; the authors suggest the possibility for this feature to reflect on authorship attribution, but the close similarities among the three synoptic translations resists further authorship attribution of the OE Gospels. These authors’ work further supports the hypothesis that the Old English Gospels are the product of multiple authorship; however, their contradictory findings also reveal the potential limitations of inter-textual comparison. Of the three studies, Miranda-García’s and Calle-Martín’s study of function words most closely agrees with my study’s findings of clear similarities between the OE Mark and Luke, and of difference between the OE Matthew and John. However, findings of the second study of adjectives and the third study of *ond*-clauses differ from mine and those of Liuzza. Clearly, Liuzza’s assertion that individual gospels may be
products of shared authorship remains a matter of scholarly debate and therefore deserves further attention, which this dissertation will address.

Such studies as those mentioned above tended to focus on lexical variation, but as I discuss in my previous study of Genesis, lexical markers alone may not be sufficient to evaluate variation in a text. Taejin Kim in 1992 studied the incidence and context of the particle “ha” in order to examine whether “ha is a marker of various kinds of discourse shift” (152) in the translation. Kim’s study enumerates all incidents of “ha” and provides the percentages of how often the particle coincides with phenomena such as “topic shift”, “listener shift”, “scene shift”, “content shift”, “time-line shift”, and “action shift” (138). Kim does not apply these findings to any question of divided practice or authorship among the translations and does not apply statistical tests, but Kim’s philological study demonstrates a strong interest in complete, statistical data. Several recent studies of the Old English Gospels by Japanese scholars in the last decade have also addressed the generally untapped potential of syntax to reveal trends within the Old English Gospels. Horiguchi Kazuhisa in 2004 examined “The Expanded Form in the Old English Version of the Gospels” and found that different gospels translate the Latin verb esse + the present participle differently. Horiguchi notes that the OE John does not use the OE equivalent of beon/wesan + the present participle at all, while the OE Luke uses the OE participle far more often than do the OE Matthew or Mark (25), and argues that this indicates multiple authorship of the Old English Gospels.

Michiko Ogura in 2008 examined “Periphrastic Renderings and their Element Order in Old English Versions of the Gospels”, and focuses on the presence of OE present participles in

---

13 As I explain in footnote 10, I have preserved the author’s use name order as it is used in the original article.
14 Although I make such reference in my acknowledgements, I would like to take the opportunity to recognize the kind assistance of Ms. Yasuko Yuki Hanaoka, who translated this article from Japanese into English for me, and helped me extensively to understand Horiguchi Kazuhisa’s arguments about the Old English Gospels. Without Ms. Hanaoka’s assistance, I could not have accessed the scholarship contained in this article or applied it to this study.
the OE Gospels compared to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth interlinear glosses. Ogura finds evidence that the OE Matthew and John share similarities in their uses, as do the OE Mark and Luke, even when the comparable passages and structures in the Lindisfarne and Rushworth translations do not (67). Ogura’s study is not exhaustive, but its examination of representative samples of participles in the OE Gospels adds support to Liuzza’s findings, and suggests the potential for the rendering of present participles to reflect the practice of translation in these texts. Kosuka Yoshitaka’s 2007 study examined object-verb order in the Old English Gospels and found that the OE Matthew and John tend to present VO order in coordinate clauses far more often than do the OE Mark and Luke, and that each pair of gospels displays close similarity of their rates (81). Kozuka’s 2010 book examines a number of lexical variations in the OE Gospels and also considers clause syntax, something Abel argues would reveal an overarching unity of authorship. However, Kosuka argues that, although both scribal change and variation in a single translator’s style are possibilities, multiple authorship is the “most tenable” (148) position. Kosuka argues that Mark differs significantly from John, and that Matthew and John cannot have shared authorship, but that Matthew, Mark and Luke have sufficient similarity to support the possibility of shared authorship. This view is problematic because these three texts share such similarity as the synoptic gospels that scholars must be careful to question similarities among their translations, which may be the result of having the same translator, but may also be the result of coming from Latin translations that already share a tremendous amount of similarity. This is also a question that this dissertation addresses, and finds evidence to suggest that, despite the shared quality of the Latin synoptic gospels, the Old English translations display marked differences from one another, even when they translate parallel incidents.
2.3. Manuscript considerations and methodology

Before this study proceeds with a discussion of the methodology, it is necessary to discuss some concerns about the manuscripts themselves. The Latin source of the OE Gospels is unknown, and so any exact enumeration of present participles in the Latin source of the OE Gospels may potentially be slightly inconsistent with the original, lost translation. Grünberg explains that various scholars have offered diverse opinions on the nature of the Latin source of the OE Gospels, and that there may have been several sources. Grünberg cites L. M. Harris’s theory, quoted in Bright, that the OE Matthew has a relationship with manuscripts “that exhibit the Irish type of text” and contain “many Old Latin readings and independent revisions from the Greek” (Grünberg 267). Harris also suggests that there were either three separate manuscripts, or that the translation was made from one manuscript of a varied type”. Grünberg adds that the translator “need not have limited himself to one MS. either” (267). Grünberg notes Glunz’s differing interpretation that the Latin source of the OE Gospels was heavily influenced by Greek readings (Grünberg 268). As a result, “an attempt to reconstruct the underlying Latin can only be tentative” at best, and “a verbally exact reconstruction of the Latin text used by the translator is an impossibility” (Grünberg 270).

Roy Liuzza, in his study of present participles, acknowledges that this clouds the ability of any study to pinpoint exactly how the OE Gospels responds to the deployment of Latin present participles (Old English Version, Vol. 2, 117, note 107). In his discussion of the Latin sources of the OE Gospels, Liuzza explains that Gneuss’s “Preliminary List” reveals that there were “74 Gospel MSS (and five Bibles containing the Gospels ) either written or used in England during the Anglo-Saxon period”, and that “no two of these are identical” (Old English Version, Vol. 2, 1-2). Liuzza adds that “textual admixture was nearly universal” among surviving
manuscripts, and describes Loewe’s diagram of the possible lines of transmission of Latin manuscripts as “a cat’s cradle of intersecting lines representing promiscuous cross-contamination among nearly all the different textual traditions” (2). Liuzza counts 650 variations in the OE text from “the modern Vulgate” (26), but isolates 140 readings that allow the OE version to “be traced to the influence of a narrow range of possible Latin textual families” (33). Even so, Liuzza explains that the “variants characteristic of the OE version are not found in any one Latin MS; nor is it possible to say whether the OE Gospels were made from a single eclectic Latin text or from a collection of gospel-books” (49). Therefore, this study has proceeded with caution, and acknowledgement that it can only comment upon the way in which the OE Gospels translation, in Liuzza’s corrected scholarly edition, responds to the most current scholarly edition of the Latin version of the gospels, or Vulgate. However, while some exact data may not reflect the original source or sources of the OE Gospels translation, the overall effect of slight variations will be small, in consideration of the many hundreds of present participles studied. As a result, this study will be able to comment upon trends in the translation’s response to the Latin gospels as a tradition.

In order to approach the question of authorship by analyzing the rendering of the Latin present participle, I began by considering the possibility that a break in practice may be visible where Liuzza suggests around chapter 21, but I decided that I would set out only to investigate whether a break, or multiple breaks, could be detected by an objective means. I describe much of this approach in the methodology section of my study of the Old English Genesis. I will survey here the main points made in that methodology, for clarity, but I will focus on how my method in the study of the Old English Gospels expands upon the previous methodology, and why I began
by translating the Latin Vulgate gospels\textsuperscript{15} of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John on my own, and then analyzed the Latin to detect the presence and type of Latin participles\textsuperscript{16}.

It is important to emphasize that this study performs this task exhaustively, while other studies have analyzed the incidence of the present participle more selectively. Liuzza’s study focuses on Latin “respondere”, a dialogue verb that tends to be repeated regularly in the texts \textit{(Old English Version, Vol. 2 117-8)}\textsuperscript{17}, while Horiguchi’s 2004 study focuses on the expanded form, or a main linking verb working with a present participle. This study expands upon these scholars’ work by analyzing all incidents of the Latin present participle. Deciding what is and what is not a present participle, however, is an even more complex task because of the ways in which the present participle and the adjective tend to overlap in language. An example that illustrates this ambiguity is the Latin word “potens”, a nominative that resembles a participle in its inflection, but that may be more accurately considered an adjective. The effect of this in English would be to consider whether “potens” literally means “[one] having power”, or whether


\textsuperscript{16} The purpose of this translation, as it was in the previous study, was to produce a close translation that would facilitate analysis. As I will explain later, I supplement these close translations with those from the Douay-Rheims version for clarity.

\textsuperscript{17} Employing Mitchell’s categories in his study of present participles in the Old English Gospels, Liuzza bases his overall categorization on Mitchell’s \textit{Old English Syntax}: independent (‘noun’), attributive (‘adjective’), predicative, and appositional uses (\textit{Old English Version, Vol. 2}, 117). Then, Liuzza collects pre- and post-positive present participles under the appositional category (\textit{Old English Version, Vol. 2}, 117, Mitchell §975). Mitchell defines the appositional use as “equivalent to an adjectival clause as well as that which is equal to an adverbial clause” (§975). Mitchell clarifies that a participle may “precede or follow the word it qualifies, either immediately or separated by other elements” (\textit{OES} §1562, p 650). Liuzza exemplifies the appositional use with three Latin passages containing pre-positive nominative present participles, but which are treated variably by the OE. The Latin Mark 11.22 reads, “\textit{et respondens Iesus ait illis,}” in which the present participle pre-modifies \textit{Iesus}, while the OE reads, “\textit{Da cwað se Hælend him andswarigende,}” in which the OE uses a post-positive present participle. Liuzza’s second example from the Latin Matthew 21.21 reads, “\textit{respondens autem Iesus ait eis,}” also containing the pre-positive participle “\textit{respondens,}”, while the OE reads, “\textit{Pa andswarode he him & cwað,}” which renders the Latin participle as a verb but in inverted position, reflective of the Latin text’s pre-position. Liuzza’s third example from Matthew 4.18 reads, “\textit{Ambulans autem iuxta mare Galilæae vidit duos fratres,}” in which “\textit{ambulans}” is pre-positive to the implicit subject of “\textit{vidit,}” while the OE reads, “\textit{Pa se Hælend eode wið ða galileisecean sae,}”, which both renders the Latin participle as a verb and transfers its position after the subject. Liuzza’s examples contain Latin pre-positive present participles, while the OE responses suggest that Latin post-positive present participles may also fall into this category of treatment by the OE Gospels. I feel it necessary to clarify my understanding of Liuzza’s definition in order to explain how this study responds to Liuzza’s work. Liuzza reports 292 total appositional uses of the present participle; however, this study finds far more present participles than 292.
the word simply communicates “powerful”. Certainly, “potens” derives from the Latin intransitive verb *posse* (to be able), but whether Jerome and/or his predecessors intended this concept in an active, ongoing, continuous sense, and not in a sense conveying a simple state, is unclear. This study therefore recognizes that “potens” and “potent-” may be adjectives; however, I list below those forms that I excluded from each text because they did not appear to function as participles, but rather as other forms such as adjectives and nouns.

I marked the Latin present participles and divided them into eight categories: pre- and post-positive nominatives, pre- and post-positive accusatives, substantives, predicatives, ablative absolutes, and present participles in oblique cases: genitive, dative, and non-absolute ablative. This process was particularly time-consuming because there are instances in which a nominative participle could arguably be construed as either pre- or post-positive. To resolve this situation, when the nominative participial phrase appeared to modify the later subject of a verb, I took it as pre-positive; when the nominative participial phrase appeared to add information about a previously stated subject, I took it as post-positive. As I did in the study of the Old English Genesis, I also engaged in error-checking to ensure that I had not missed any Latin participles. To do so, I created and used an electronic version of the Latin text, and then performed text searches to seek any Latin present participles missed in my close reading. Using the “Find” and “Highlight” functions in Microsoft Word, I searched for the strings “-ens”, “-ent”, “-ans”, “-ant”, and all four in combination with all case endings and the suffixes “-ne” and “-que”. This method productively detected errors in each of my translations: 49 in Matthew (my first translation), 5 in Mark, 7 in Luke, and 5 in John. I excluded certain forms that looked like participles but that functioned more as nouns or adjectives\(^\text{18}\). In Matthew, I excluded “adolescens”, “prudens”.

\(^{18}\) The classifications of these Latin words are drawn from *A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary. revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by. Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and. Charles

Once these had been excluded, I proceeded to analyze the Old English translations of the gospels, first by examining Skeat’s version and then cross-checking the existence of present participles against Liuzza’s edition. After comparing the Old English translations with the Latin Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, I analyzed how the translation renders the Latin present participle, whether the translation uses an Old English present participle and whether the translation preserves the position\(^{19}\) (pre- or post-positive) and function (the same case and overall function in the passage). When the translation uses some other rendering than an OE present participle, I examined whether the translation uses a verb, past participle, infinitive, noun, prepositional phrase, adjective, determiner, or omission.

Capitalizing on the standard-size segmenting technique explored and used in my study of the Old English Genesis, I segmented these analyzed and marked translation into segments 500-Latin words long\(^{20}\). Like the Vulgate Genesis, the Latin gospels experience considerable range in

\(^{19}\) The position of the Old English present participle was also a focus of this study, because Old English has the capacity to pre-position or post-position adjectives around their referents, and to decline them strongly or weakly to accommodate Germanic weak and strong declination patterns in arrangement with demonstratives or possessives (Mitchell, *Old English Syntax*, Vol. 1 §102-25). Old English could certainly accommodate pre-positive adjectives, even more than one (§144), a fact that quickly becomes relevant to this study of the positioning of present participles in translation. Mitchell notes that positioning an adjective before the noun is “the commonest pattern in OE prose” (§159), but also that post-position happens frequently in Ælfric’s and the Blickling Homilies (§§159-60). Mitchell suggests that post-positioned adjectives result from Latin influence in translation (§172), another detail that this dissertation examines. This dissertation finds some surprising results in this area, in which different gospel translations handle this quite differently – even oppositely.

\(^{20}\) The methodology of the Genesis study discusses this issue at length, but it is worthwhile to reiterate here that there is no single, standard segment size used in authorship attribution. Koppel et al. use blocks of 500 and 2000 words to perform their “unmasking” technique (286, 288), while David Hoover’s 2012 authorship attribution of Charles Kingsley’s “The Tutor’s Story”, uses various block sizes. Miranda-García, Calle-Martín, and Marqués-
chapter sizes: for example, Matthew chapter 3 has only 17 verses and 288 words, while Matthew chapter 26 has 75 verses and 1140 words. At first, the assumption was that I would need equally weighted 500-word, 600-word, and 800-word block sizes for me to analyze the resulting graphs for signs of possible breaks in translation without being biased by one block size. Then, the original plan was to perform tests on the individual rates of translation in the blocks themselves as the data. The use of the proportion test in the Genesis study eventually eliminated the second objective, while the lack of any critical consensus on where a break might happen in the Old English translations made the first approach rather subjective and unreliable. However, the 500-word segmenting proved invaluable in the development of a sliding proportion test, which I will describe shortly and which allowed me to search for potential breaks in the practice of translating the Latin present participle.

At this point, this study of the Old English Gospels begins to diverge methodologically from that of the Old English Genesis, specifically in the consideration of normal probability and the use of descriptive statistics. In the study of the Old English Genesis, I subjected the resulting 500-word blocks to tests to ascertain whether they fit normal distribution. My intent had been to apply hypothesis-testing to the blocks themselves to determine whether their rates of translation showed statistical evidence of difference by using the Student’s t-test or hypothesis (z) tests. However, my exploration of statistical questions in the study of the Old English Genesis revealed

Aguado use 3,000 word block sizes in “Morphological Features in the Translatorship Attribution of the West Saxon Gospels” (211). My objective was to establish block sizes small enough to give a large sample of blocks for statistical tests, but large enough to ensure that some Latin participles would probably occur in each block, so that the study would not have to analyze blocks with no participles, and therefore no relevant data. Based on my findings that the rates of participles to words in each text were approximately 1:39 in Matthew, 1:33 in Mark, 1:40 in Luke, but 1:114 in John, and 1:65 in Genesis, I estimated that 500-word blocks were the best overall standard size. I fully confess that this number was not the result of any detailed mathematical calculation, but an informed guess meant to produce a number consistent with a block size used in other studies.

A detailed discussion of this line on inquiry is given in the methodology of the study of the Old English Genesis, p. 34-36. I will only make brief reference to it here, in order to place the omission of this line of inquiry in context in the study of the Old English Gospels.
that such tests on the blocks themselves were inappropriate, because testing the rates of translation within each block gave equal weight\textsuperscript{22} to blocks that could have very different numbers of actual participles in them\textsuperscript{23}. Because the tests that somewhat depend on normal distribution are not appropriate to the study, I do not report the results of my tests of normal distribution of the Old English Gospels here. Also, in the methodology of the Old English Genesis, I produced a set of descriptive statistics, including such measures of dispersion as standard deviation, on the 500-word blocks. The resulting statistics gave me rudimentary reasons to suspect the possibility of the statistical difference, and so I included them for the purposes of illustrating some of the approaches I took to the statistical side of that study. However, because those descriptive statistics were also based on the frequencies or rates of translation within each block, which suffers from the same flaw of equal weighting, and although I did produce similar statistics on the Old English Gospels, I do not report them here nor use them to frame my argument. The proportion test, which I finally used as the main test with which to analyze the renderings of the Latin present participle, is a far more reliable indicator of difference.

As I did in the study of the Old English Genesis, I applied the proportion test in the software platform known as “R” to examine whether there is statistically significant evidence of difference in the rendering of the Latin present participle among and within the four translations in the Old English Gospels. The proportion test allowed me to compare the number of OE-participial renderings in one part of a text to the number of such translations in any other text or part of a text. To give a real example, the OE Matthew renders 127 of 491 (25.8\%) of Latin present participles with OE present participles, while the OE Mark renders 125 of 386 (32.3\%)

\textsuperscript{22} I discuss this problem of equally weighting the rates of translation in each block in the methodology to the previous study. I direct the reader there for further clarification, if desired.

\textsuperscript{23} Again, I wish to acknowledge the invaluable support and assistance of Dr. Daphna Heller from the University of Toronto Department of Linguistics for her insight and advice in this regard.
with OE present participles. The proportion test allows me to compare those numbers and produce a result that suggests how likely it is that those different rates are statistically similar or different. The proportion test, which is a version of the widely used chi-square test\textsuperscript{24}, produces a result called a p-value, which indicates the likelihood that the samples compared in the test are statistically the same. I chose to apply a 99\% confidence interval to the results to minimize the chance that I would produce a finding of difference when there may not be difference. The confidence interval is a parameter that determines the likelihood that the sample taken represents the real population (the actual text). To use the p-value that the proportion test produces, the experimenter must convert the p-value into an “alpha”, which is essentially the total probability (100\%, or 1) minus the confidence interval, which produces the alpha, or the threshold to which the experimenter compares the result of the proportion test. Because the proportion tests used in this study tested for similarity and not whether one sample was higher or lower than another, I used a two-tailed hypothesis for each test\textsuperscript{25}. This two-tailed parameter requires the experimenter to divide the alpha in half to produce the appropriate threshold to which to compare the p-value\textsuperscript{26}. Therefore, a 99\% confidence interval produces the following equations and alpha values:

\begin{align*}
\text{For a 99\% confidence interval:} \\
&1 \text{ (total probability)} -- .99 \text{ (99\% confidence interval)} = 0.01 \text{ (alpha of one-tailed test)} \\
&0.01 / 2 \text{ (for a two-tailed test)} = 0.005 \text{ (alpha of two-tailed test).}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{For a 95\% confidence interval:}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{24} I discuss the basic utility of the chi-square test at greater length in the study of the Old English Genesis. However, I reiterate here that Anthony Kenny suggests the chi-square test as “the significance test of the widest and most general application” (110).

\textsuperscript{25} In section 1.4c of the study of the Old English Genesis, I explain what the confidence interval is, and why I opted for a 99\% confidence interval, which is stricter than the 95\% confidence interval generally used in most scientific sampling studies. As I will concede in my discussion of the results, this decision at times posed challenges when the results fell within the realm of similarity under a 99\% confidence interval, but outside the realm of similarity under a 95\% confidence interval. Where this occurs, I report this complication. I also acknowledge the advice of Daphna Heller, who warned me that a 95\% confidence interval was the standard. In section 1.4c of the Old English Genesis study, I also explain the “alpha”, which I briefly review in this study only for clarity.

\textsuperscript{26} Section 1.4c, particularly Figure 1.5 of the Old English Genesis study, explains this rather technical process in better detail. Again, I direct the reader to that discussion for a more thorough treatment of these parameters of the proportion test, p. 46-48.
1 (total probability) -- .95 (95% confidence interval) = 0.05 (alpha of one-tailed test)
0.05 / 2 (for a two-tailed test) = 0.025 (alpha of two-tailed test).

If a proportion test produces a p-value result that is lower than the alpha number, that test
indicates that the samples studied are not statistically similar. For a real example, a comparison
of blocks 1-22 and 23-34 of the OE Matthew produce a p-value of 0.002642. This number is
smaller than the alpha of 0.005 of even a 99% confidence interval; therefore, the proportion test
indicates that blocks 1-22 and 23-34 are statistically different. However, a comparison of blocks
1-23 and 24-34 produces a p-value of 0.02948, a number larger than even the 0.025 alpha of a
95% confidence interval; therefore, the proportion test indicates that blocks 1-23 and 24-34 are
statistically similar, although only barely so.

The preceding example also illustrates a significant addition I made to the methodology
of the study of the Old English Gospels: the sliding proportion test. As I will discuss further in
the reporting and discussion of my quantitative results, the study of the Old English Genesis
benefited from a preponderance of evidence that a break in authorship exists between Genesis
24.22 and 24.61. Such a clear indication is not available in this study, save for Roy Liuzza’s
astute observation that a break in practice may be visible around chapter 21 of Matthew. Simply
viewing the graphs of 500-, 600-, and 800-word segments relies too heavily on a guess that a
break might be visible in such-and-such a location. To overcome this problem, I used the 500-
word segments to create a standard unit by which to “slide” the hypothetical break and use the
proportion test to assess evidence of difference and similarity.\footnote{Although this is not exactly what Daphna Heller suggested, I wish to give full credit for this idea to Prof. Heller, whose idea about “sliding” the proportion test to refine the proposed location of difference inspired me to adapt her idea to search the texts for possible breaks in practice.}

The sliding proportion test is based on some assumptions that deserve a brief discussion.
First, in the sliding proportion test of the OE Matthew, for example, I restricted the sliding action
so that each “side” of the test would have several blocks in it, so that I would not compare a relatively very small sample on one side to a very large sample on the other. Such a method does admit the possibility that a break either very early or very late in a translation could go undetected. However, I do not believe that such a break would be very feasible to detect through a study of the renderings of present participles, since there would be very little data before a very early break, or after a very late break, to use in such a comparison. Such an approach also rests on the assumption that there would be only one major break to find. Indeed, as the results will show, the sliding proportion test of the OE Mark indicates that there may be two very profound breaks in the practice of rendering the Latin present participle. There could potentially be several, even dozens of breaks. Scholars really have no sure way to know. In the case of the Old English Gospels, very little work has even been done to assess whether individual gospel translations are the products of multiple authorship; consequently, we really have very little to frame our assumptions of how many breaks there may be. However, the results of the sliding proportion test indicate that only one or two breaks appear to occur in each translation. Therefore, these assumptions, while indeed assumptions, appear to support reasonable conclusions in the study. The quantitative portion of this study’s methodology proceeds by applying the proportion test to texts and synthesizing those results with those of the sliding proportion test, in order to comment on where evidence of difference exists in the translation of the given subcategories of Latin present participles. The discussion of quantitative results explains these procedures and attempts at synthesis further.

This study then proceeds with a detailed qualitative analysis of how each subcategory of Latin present participles is rendered in the Old English translations. In this part of the discussion, I describe and explain specific differences in how the Old English translations handle certain
words, phrases, and concepts in order to demonstrate variation and show the reader how the
practice of rendering the Latin present participle varies in these texts. Several of these variations
support findings in the quantitative analysis that the translation of the Latin present participle in
the Old English Gospels undergoes significant variation across and within texts. The qualitative
analysis also supports quantitative findings that the rendering of the Latin present participle is
not a single phenomenon, but rather the result of differing approaches to translating participles in
different cases and positions.

2.4. Quantitative analyses and discussion

This stage of the study of the OE Gospels proceeds from an analysis of general trends of
the Latin present participle to quantitative measurements of which sections in particular texts
most closely resemble sections in other texts. In Section 2.4a, I discuss my analysis of trends in
the occurrence in the Latin present participle. As I found in the previous study of the Old English
Genesis, the occurrence of the Latin present participle does not significantly decline throughout
the four Vulgate gospels, but the use of the Old English present participle to translate these Latin
participles does vary and decline in the Old English Gospels translation. In Section 2.4b, I then
discuss the limitations of the common scholarly use of chapters as textual divisions for such
analyses and explain how a standardized block method reveals more consistent and comparable
results. In Section 2.4c, I set out the six specific types of quantitative tests I have performed to
evaluate authorship in the OE Gospels; I report these tests and results in sections 2.4d to 2.4i. In
Section 2.4j, I summarize the results of the quantitative tests and their implications for the
subsequent qualitative analyses in Section 2.5.
2.4a. Trends in the Latin texts

The initial objective of this study was to ascertain how often the OE Gospels translation rendered the Latin present participle with an Old English present participle, and the study proceeded with the assumption that any significant trend in the translation of this feature, or lack thereof, would reveal telling characteristics of the practice of translation. However, as the study proceeded to discover significant trends, the results raised the question of whether the Latin version itself could exert any influence on the OE Gospels translation by means of trends within the Latin text itself. If a Latin gospel were to decrease the use of the present participle, this could influence the translator differently from a tendency in the Latin to increase the use of the present participle, or to maintain it, over the course of a text. Before this study can objectively interpret data regarding trends in the use of OE present participles in the translation of the Latin, it is necessary to consider the possibility that the Latin source itself may undergo certain trends that could affect a translator’s reaction to it.

Conducting such an analysis is more challenging than it might appear at first, since the four Latin texts range in size from Mark at 10,311 words to Luke at 18,081. A chapter-by-chapter analysis would not only produce graphs of different lengths, but would weight chapters equally, when they are of different sizes. The alternative method of standard block sizes, which affords samples of equal size, also produces graphs of unequal lengths and therefore more difficult comparison. However, because the objective of this part of the analysis is to describe a very general trend in the incidence of Latin present participles over each text, a method was

---

28 A similar study of the incidence of Latin participles in my previous study of the Old English Genesis revealed that, although the Old English present participle almost disappears entirely in the second half of the translation, the Latin present participle is slightly more numerous in the second half of the Latin Genesis. See section 1.4a of the study of the Old English Genesis.

29 I discuss the limitations of chapter-by-chapter analysis on pages 28 and 29 in the methodology of the previous study of the Old English Genesis and in the methodology of this study, above. A standard block-size method allows samples of equal sizes to be weighted equally.
needed to allow the study to discuss comparative trends in such texts of unequal size. This study innovatively devised an *ad hoc* solution that I have provisionally named “quartering”. I ascertained the total number of words in each Latin gospel, then divided by four to determine the exact size of each quarter to produce a standard unit of measurement. This presented a problem, however, that threatened to create a division that might not have been reasonable to the translator or translators: splitting individual sentences, even phrases, into separate excerpts. If the objective is to evaluate how the translation changes in its practice over time, splitting a sentence or phrase into separate units might taint the results. This study proceeds on the assumption, and it is admittedly an assumption, that a translator is less likely to stop work in the middle of a phrase, or even a clause or sentence, than to stop work between such structures as verses. Anything is possible, of course: a translator could stop work mid-sentence, due to illness or death, or natural disaster. However, I believe that the proposed solution to the problem should have minimal effect on the results, even if the assumption is faulty. That solution was first to calculate the exact value of a quarter or segment of other size, and plot that value in the text. If that exact value caused the border of the excerpt to fall within a single verse of the Latin text, I calculated whether the border was closer to the end of the verse or the previous verse. I then adjusted the boundary of the segment to whichever was closest. This minimizes the potential for error that would result by cutting off a translator mid-sentence or mid-phrase. The size of such an adjustment is extremely small, never more than 15 words; at this resolution in a text of well over 10,000 words, the relative infrequency of Latin present participles, and the fact that this technique never caused a segment to include or exclude a Latin participle, the effect should be extremely small, such that it can be effectively disregarded.
i. Segmenting the Latin text and trends in the Latin use of the present participle

A chapter-by-chapter analysis of the incidence of the Latin present participle in Matthew shows very mixed results that can be difficult to interpret, although it may be possible to extrapolate a trend from these data:

![Figure 2.1: Incidence of Latin present participles in Matthew by chapter.](image1)

The data suggest the potential for some visible trends, and would be better represented with a marked line graph to show internal trends:

![Figure 2.2: Line graph of present participles by chapter in Matthew.](image2)
As the data show, although there appear to be higher peaks in chapters 22 and 27, the incidence of Latin present participles also drops precipitously in several parts of the text. This is the result of both the problem of inconsistent chapter size, as discussed, and the problem of high resolution: chapters are so small and present participles so infrequent that a unit the size of a chapter cannot accurately represent the trends in the text.

A quartering analysis shows very different results that benefit from consistent unit size and appropriate resolution. I have included two types of quartering here, to demonstrate the importance of using accurate quarters, rather than using chapter boundaries:

![Graph 1](image1)

**Figure 2.3:** Quartering analysis by chapters and by accurate quartering.

As the tables demonstrate, the results of a quartering analysis vary quite extensively, depending on how the quarters are calculated. The rough quartering shown on the left suggests a much larger difference between the first quarter and the remainder, and suggests a more even distribution in the second, third, and fourth quarters. However, a precise quartering analysis demonstrates that the Latin Matthew undergoes a smoother increase in the use of present participles over the course of the text. This study uses the same method of precise quartering to assess the incidence of the Latin present participle in the gospels of Mark, Luke and John.
A composite line graph measuring the quarterly usage of the present participle in the Latin version of the gospels reveals significant similarities among the synoptic gospels Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and a special difference from the Latin John:

![Composite line graph of quartering analysis of the incidence of present participle in the Latin Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.](image)

The three synoptic gospels present a strikingly similar pattern of use of the present participle, increasing from the first to second quarter in each, falling in the third, and then increasing in the fourth quarter. The Matthew and Mark texts present patterns that look nearly identical in shape, although not in value, but the Matthew text is 60.29% larger than the Mark text and uses 40% more present participles. The Latin Luke also presents an almost identical trend for the first two quarters, then a more pronounced drop in the third quarter, and more pronounced rise in the fourth. The Latin John presents a very different trend. First, it clearly uses far fewer present participles than do the others, revealing its difference as not one of the synoptic gospels. Second, its use of the present participle remains rather even over the course of the text, drops where the others rise in the second quarter, rises instead of drops in the third, and drops in the fourth where the synoptics rise. The variation is so slight among the first three quarters as to be probably statistically negligible, but the final quarter’s value of only 31 Latin present participles suggests
an overall significant drop from the 40 of the first quarter. The overall significance of this analysis is that the Latin texts generally preserve a strong presence of the Latin present participle at the very least, and increase its use significantly in the synoptic gospels.

**ii. Trends in OE present participles in the Old English Gospels**

To compare the incidence of the Old English present participle in response to the Latin present participle, this study quartered the Old English texts according to the Latin divisions, down to the resolution of verse boundaries. Although this necessarily could result in Old English quarters of unequal size, it does allow the analysis to observe the translation’s response to the Latin present participle. The four Old English translations present some very different patterns. First, although all four Latin gospels at least preserve the use of the present participle as in the Latin John, or increase its use as in the Latin Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the Old English Mark, Luke and John translations reduce the use of the Old English present participle in the second quarter of the text:

![Figure 2.5: Line-graph OE present-participial renderings of Latin present participles in the four Latin gospels, by percentage.](image-url)
As the graph and accompanying table show, these drops are quite significant, indeed: Mark drops from over 57% in the first quarter to only 35.87% in the second, Luke drops more than 20% from 50.89% to 30.23%, and John drops exactly 30% from 50% in the first quarter to 20% in the second. The Old English Matthew, however, increases the use of the Old English present participle between quarters one and two. The increase is not a very significant one at 3.75%; however, the increase is strikingly different from the sharp drops of the other texts. The previous analysis shows that the Latin Matthew and Mark texts behave almost identically in the use of the present participle, but the Old English versions definitely do not. The Old English Matthew and Mark resurge in their use of the OE present participle, whereas the OE Luke and John do not. The Old English translations as a group reduce their use of the OE participle, while the Latin texts generally increase it. Further, the OE John stands out as a text that, somewhat similar to the Old English Genesis, largely drops off its use of the OE participle in the later text. These results of the quartering analysis are not conclusive, but they describe early stages of this study that indicated the potential for the rendering of the present participle to suggest differences in the practice of translation. The results of the many subsequent proportion tests will reflect more precisely on the nature and degree of such differences.

As an overview of the four gospels reveals only about a 9% variance in the overall rendering of Latin present participles with Old English present participles:
This rate of variance is potentially statistically significant, as earlier discussion of authorship-attribution studies has argued\(^\text{30}\), but a 9% range may still suggest more similarity than difference among the four texts. Whether these rates are indeed statistically different will be addressed in section 2.4d. At this point, these data suggest the potential for inter-textual difference; at the same time, they raise questions about not only the potential for inter-textual difference, but also the potential for difference within texts and among sub-categories of participles.

2.4b. 500-word segments vs. chapter analyses: a more standardized image of OE participles in the Old English Gospels

Although the methodology does not rely on the practice of scanning graphs of rates of translation in segments of different sizes to detect shifts in practice, because such an “eyeballing”

\(^{30}\) Miranda-Garcia et al. use similar ranges to support the grouping of texts in their study “Morphological Features in the Translatorship Attribution of the West Saxon Gospels”. For example, the authors argue that the four Old English Gospels, which decline nouns strong on average 78% of the time, can be grouped separately from both Apollonius of Tyre and the Cura Pastoralis, which do so 88% of the time – a range of 10%. Miranda-Garcia et al. also use the incidence of strongly declined adjectives to group the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke together, though they differ by a range of 5%, but the authors distinguish these from the John and the Cura Pastoralis, though these texts decline adjectives strongly only about 10% more often than the three OE Gospels texts. The authors argue that these differences prevent the authors “from considering the idea of a unique translator for Jn and any of the other two (Lk or Mt), as Liuzza suggests” (216).
method of searching for breaks is unreliable\textsuperscript{31}, the results of the 500-word segmenting analysis still provide some valuable context for the quantitative analysis of the rendering of the Latin present participle. The 500-word segmenting analysis of the rendering of Latin present participles in the OE Matthew implies that the translation uses the OE present participle more between segments 1 and 13 than it does thereafter:

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2_7.png}
\caption{Numbers of Latin present participles in the Old English Matthew rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 500-word blocks. OE-participial renderings are given in dark grey; non-participial renderings are given in light grey. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.}
\end{figure}

Particularly, segments 19 through 26 appear to demonstrate a very much-reduced use of the OE participle. Segment 27 is anomalous, but part of the stark contrast here occurs because of the arbitrary segment size of 500 words; however, there is a spike in the use of the OE present participle in segment 27, which occurs between 24.19 and 25.3. This graph does imply a shift, but the sliding proportion test will give a much clearer picture of where any statistically significant shift occurs\textsuperscript{32}.

\textsuperscript{31} I address this concern in the methodology section of this study, where I discuss my selection of segment sizes for quantitative sampling and analysis.

\textsuperscript{32} In section 2.4e, the sliding proportion test of the OE Matthew will demonstrate that there is indeed a statistically significant shift in the rate of rendering the Latin present participle around the boundary of segments 13 and 14,
By contrast, the graph of the OE Mark demonstrates how easily such a graph can produce inconclusive results. At the widest perspective, the graph implies that roughly the first half of the Mark translation uses more OE present participles than does the second, but where such a break occurs is more difficult to argue with much certainty:

![Figure 2.8: Numbers of Latin present participles in the Old English Mark rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 500-word blocks. OE-participial renderings are given in dark grey; non-participial renderings are given in light grey. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.]

While segment 13 contains no OE participles, it is important to bear in mind that the neighbouring segments do, and that the 500-word segment size is arbitrary; it is hardly likely that the translators counted out 500-word parcels and then either changed authorship or decided to take drastically different approaches to rendering the Latin present participle. The later sliding proportion test clarifies that the boundary between segments 12 and 13 is not the most statistically significant point of difference in the OE Mark.\(^{33}\)

The 500-word segmenting analysis of Luke also produces results that are difficult to interpret reliably. Certainly, the earlier 11 segments or so of Luke appear to use more OE present

---

which occurs at Matthew 13.17. However, I freely confess and warn that this graph alone is not a very reliable way to assert the presence of a difference without supporting tests and evidence.

\(^{33}\) Rather, the sliding proportion test finds that the most statistically significant boundaries occur between segments 5 and 6 (Mark 5.21) and between segments 11 and 12 (Mark 9.40).
participles than do later segments, and a point of difference appears possible around segment 25, which presents no OE present participles:

![Figure 2.9: Numbers of Latin present participles in the Old English Luke rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 500-word blocks. OE-participial renderings are given in dark grey; non-participial renderings are given in light grey. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.](image)

However, the sliding proportion test shows that, although these general implications are very roughly possible, the most statistically significant point of difference occurs elsewhere, between segments 12 and 13 (Luke 8.27), and a very borderline and therefore questionable point of difference centering near the border between segments 21 and 22 (Luke 13.17). This graph suggests very general possibilities, but the proportion test is much more precise.

The 500-word segmenting analysis of the OE John reveals quite clearly how John differs from the other three texts: there are much fewer present participles in the Latin text, and the use of the OE present participle is rather infrequent. The graph implies that, like the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the OE John uses more OE present participles earlier in the text, and noticeably fewer later on:
Indeed, the sliding proportion confirms that there is a statistically significant difference in the rate of translating the Latin present participle in the OE John. Testing a break anywhere between segment 6 and 24 produces a finding of difference, but the most significant difference occurs between segments 9 and 10 (John 7.4), as subsequent discussion will address. Again, plotting and graphing segments of standard size is helpful and illuminating, but not entirely obvious on its own. Therefore, this study opts to forego the 600-word and 800-word block size analysis.

**2.4c. The 2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction: quantitative results**

The quantitative portion of this study applies the proportion test in six stages or parts, which are ordered to explore general questions first, and then focus on more specific data and tests in order to identify potential breaks in the pattern of translating the Latin present participle in the Old English Gospels. Because the overarching research question considers whether the Old English Gospels are the product of a single translator, Part I of the quantitative study compares the overall rates of translating the Latin present participle with the Old English present

---

**Figure 2.10**: Numbers of Latin present participles in the Old English John rendered with Old English present participles vs. those rendered with non-participial methods, in 500-word blocks. OE-participial renderings are given in dark grey; non-participial renderings are given in light grey. The data here represent the actual numbers of participles in each category.
participle among the four gospels and the two portions of the Old English Heptateuch Genesis, as identified in the previous study. Generally, the OE Matthew, OE John, and Ælfric’s portion of Genesis (1-24.22) are very similar, and the OE Mark and OE Luke are also very similar. All four gospels and Ælfric’s portion of Genesis are extremely different from the anonymously translated portion of Genesis (24.61-50.25).

Part II proceeds by investigating whether there are intra-textual differences within each text, specifically whether statistically significant differences in the rate of translating the Latin present participle occur within each gospel translation of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Such an intra-textual study of the Old English Gospels presents a key challenge beyond that of the study of the Old English Genesis: there is little clear information to suggest where an intra-textual break might even occur, if one even exists. Only Roy Liuzza suggests potential breaks around chapters 14 and 21 of the Old English Matthew (The Old English Version of the Gospels Vol. 2, 119). Without clear indications of a break in practice, as past scholarship has suggested about the Old English Genesis, it was necessary to devise a method to search for and identify previously unknown breaks in practice. This study uses a “sliding proportion test” to search for and identify the most significant points of difference, and finds that there is statistically very significant evidence of difference in all four gospel translations. All four translations tend to be “front heavy” in Old English present participles, while the use of the OE present participle flags in later portions of each translation.

Because Part II finds evidence of statistically significant breaks in each gospel, and because the first portion in each gospel uses significantly more OE present participles than does the second, Part III investigates whether the first portions of the four translations are statistically similar to each other, and whether the second portions are also similar to each other. This third
part of the study finds that the first portions of the OE Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John meet the threshold for similarity, although certainly not by a wide margin, while the four second portions do not come close to doing so. However, when the John translation is excluded, the second portions of Matthew, Mark and Luke come very close to meeting the threshold, so much so that the first portions and second portions come very close to each other’s results, although technically on either side of the threshold of similarity.

Part IV takes into the consideration that, as the study of the Old English Genesis found, the translation of the Latin present participle may not be a single process; rather, subcategories of participles may be translated at significantly different rates. This stage of the study compares the rate of translation of each subcategory to the overall rate of translation, and to the rate of translating other subcategories of Latin present participles with OE present participles. Test results are consistent with the study of the Old English Genesis to the extent that they indicate statistically significant difference between the translation of some subcategories of Latin present participles and both the overall rate and the rates of some other subcategories. This part adds support to the hypothesis in these studies that the translation of the Latin present participle is more complex than a single process.

Part V synthesizes the results of Part II and Part IV by exploring whether each subcategory of Latin present participle (Part IV) is translated at different rates on either side of the breaks proposed in Part II; this stage finds evidence that some subcategories of participles are translated at statistically very different rates across these boundaries. Part VI then synthesizes the results of Part IV and Part V by testing whether various portions in each text are similar to portions in other texts, in order to suggest where subcategories of present participles receive statistically similar or different rates of translating the Latin present participle.
2.4d. Inter-textual R results on the OE Gospels – total OE participial renderings in the four gospels

The question most widely considered in authorship-attribution studies of the Old English Gospels is whether the four gospel texts are products of single or multiple authorship. Such an approach makes crucial assumptions that each gospel text would naturally be the product of a single translator, and that any differences in translation would be visible inter-textually. Antonio Miranda-García and Javier Calle-Martín have already explored the inter-textual question statistically by examining the ratio of function words (pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, and adverbs other than those that convey manner) to content words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs of manner) (Miranda-García and Calle-Martín, “Function Words in Authorship Attribution Studies” 51). In their 2006 study of function words, Miranda-García and Calle-Martín concluded that the Old English Matthew and Old English John are not likely products of the same translation (64), and that they cannot support Liuzza’s proposal otherwise. Although such a study makes the critical assumption that each gospel would have unified authorship, this study proceeded to investigate this debate by examining how frequently each gospel translation renders the Latin present participle with the Old English present participle.

To put the rates of translation into simple context, it is helpful to note that the OE Matthew renders the Latin present participle with the OE present participle 127/491 times (25.8%) and the OE John 33/137 times (24%). By contrast, the OE Mark renders the Latin present participle with the OE present participle 125/386 times (32.3%) and the OE Luke 168/497 times (33.8%). In terms of these overall rates of translating the Latin present participle with the OE present participle, Genesis chapter 1 to 24.22, attributed to Ælfric, uses the OE
present participle 38/153 times (25.4%), while the anonymously translated portion of Genesis, chapters 24.61 to 50.25 does so 7 of 198 times (3.5%), even after factoring in line omissions. Although these overall percentages seem to indicate close similarity between the Old English Matthew and the Old English John, similarity between the OE Mark and OE Luke, and dissimilarity between the two pairs, this study applied the proportion test to examine whether these apparent differences were statistically significant. All proportion tests were executed with the following generic command line, modified to incorporate the numbers in each test:

\[
\text{prop.test}(x=c(x1,x2), n=c(n1,n2), \text{conf.level} = 0.99)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Gen Æ</th>
<th>Gen Anon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.04113</td>
<td>0.007902</td>
<td>0.7555</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.246e-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>0.04113</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.7097</td>
<td>0.08756</td>
<td>0.1431</td>
<td>6.928e-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>0.007902</td>
<td>0.7097</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
<td>0.06715</td>
<td>2.386e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>0.7555</td>
<td>0.08756</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.8887</td>
<td>3.165e-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Æ</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1431</td>
<td>0.06715</td>
<td>0.8887</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3.989e-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Anon</td>
<td>4.246e-11</td>
<td>6.928e-15</td>
<td>2.386e-16</td>
<td>3.165e-08</td>
<td>3.989e-09</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Tabulated proportion-test results in R of inter-textual differences in the rendering of the Latin present participle with the Old English present participle. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

These quantitative results deserve some explanation. Each individual number represents the result of one proportion test that compares two texts. Comparing the six texts produced fifteen unique pairs and therefore fifteen individual proportion tests in R, but the mirror of each result (Matthew compared to John, for example, is the same as John compared to Matthew) is provided for ease of comparison. To put these numbers into a more helpful format, the result of the test of the OE Matthew and Mark translations is 0.0413; in other words, a 4.13% chance that they are the same. By the standard of using either a 99% confidence interval (which produces a p-value threshold of 0.005) or a 95% confidence interval (p-value threshold of 0.025), Matthew
and Mark barely meet the threshold to be considered statistically similar. By contrast, the 
comparison of the OE Matthew and the OE John produces a result of 0.7555, a 75.5% chance of 
statistical similarity and a much closer similarity than the former example of the OE Matthew 
and OE Mark. Again by contrast, the comparison of the OE Matthew and the anonymous portion 
of the Old English Heptateuch Genesis produced a result of 4.246e-11, in scientific notation 
4.246 \times 10^{-11}, or as a percentage 0.00000004246%, or roughly one in 400 million. Leaving 
aside the aforementioned problems of assuming that each text is a single product and that the 
translation of Latin present participles is a single process, several tentative conclusions arise. 
First, all four Old English Gospel translations and Ælfric’s translation of Genesis 1-24.22 meet 
the threshold for similarity. However, the OE Matthew, OE John and Ælfric’s translation of 
Genesis 1-24.22 have very high significance to one another at this level\textsuperscript{34}. These three texts meet 
the threshold of similarity to the OE Mark and the OE Luke, but they do so only barely. The OE 
Mark and the OE Luke show a very high degree of similarity to each other: roughly a 71% 
chance that their rendering of present participles with Old English present participles come from 
the same sample (or approach to translation). However, these results are only significant if intra-
textual evidence shows that each text is the product of a unified practice.

\textit{2.4e. Intra-textual R results: sliding proportion tests to seek breaks}

As I concede in the previous section, such inter-textual studies rely on the unsupported 
assumption that each gospel text would be the product of a single translator, or at least a uniform 
practice of translation. However, my preceding study of the Old English Genesis supplemented a

\textsuperscript{34} As I note earlier in my discussion of Arthur Abel’s work, and as I discuss later in the analysis of the pre-positive nominative present participle, I do not believe that Ælfric is the author of any of the Old English Gospels because Ælfric never uses the OE present participle to render the Latin pre-positive nominative in either Genesis or his \textit{Libellus}, whereas all four Old English Gospel translations do use the OE present participle in this context.
variety of scholarly evidence that at least the Old English Genesis was a product of divided authorship, not at all a product of one approach to translation for the entire text. Once the various evidence of divided authorship indicated the likely location of the break, the study of the Old English Genesis revealed that analyzing the text in differing, non-divisible block sizes of 500, 600, and 800 words could allow a researcher to view the resulting graph and observe potential breaks in the practice of rendering Latin present participles with OE present participles.

However, a significant limitation of this approach quickly became apparent in the study of the Old English Gospels for one particular reason: for Genesis, it was fairly clear where to look at the graph and decide whether a break was apparent, but for the Old English Gospels there is a lack of general consensus about where a break might exist, if any exists at all. Since examining the graphs amounted to little more than “eyeballing” the data and guessing about potential breaks in practice, I realized that a much more scientific and unbiased approach was needed. Therefore, I realized that the proportion test could be used to search for possible breaks in translation by “sliding” the hypothetical break along the text and testing the proportions for difference. The 500-word segments afforded a pre-fabricated set of standard increments along which to slide the hypothetical break and execute the proportion test. Therefore, to search for possible breaks in translation, I executed this “sliding” proportion test to seek two types of information: (a) in which areas a statistical difference was detectable with the proportion test, and (b) in which location or locations such a break was the most statistically significant. This possible bias of the block size itself is minimal, because the 500-word segment only creates the increment of sliding, but the test measures the entire number of participial translations on one side of the break against the entire number of translations on the other side.
Table 2.3: Sliding proportion test in R of the Old English Matthew. Each pair of numbers separated by a “/” indicates the two 500-word blocks between which a hypothetical break was tested for evidence of difference. For example, a test labelled “10/11” indicates that all participial translations in blocks 1-10 were compared to all participial translations in block 11 and after. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

The most statistically prominent difference in the rendering of Latin present participles with OE present participles in the OE Matthew occurs between segments 13 and 14; this boundary occurs at Matthew 13.17. This approximately coincides with the study’s finding that the OE Matthew changes its rendering of the Latin word for Pharisees (“pharisei”) from the OE noun “sundorhalga” to the borrowing “farise-” and then “pharise-”35. This also coincides with Liuzza’s argument that chapters 8-13 differ from 14-18, which I discuss below36.

There is a secondary difference in the practice of translation that occurs between segments 20 and 21, at which point the translation begins to use the OE present participle to render Latin participles more than it does in segments 14-20. The data show that, as the proposed break moved past segment 20, the two parts of Matthew begin to look more and more the same.

---

35 Section 2.5k, “Correlations with lexical shifts”, addresses the details of this issue.
36 As the later discussion will explain, this result strongly agrees with Liuzza’s observations. Not only did Liuzza propose a juncture that shows difference, but he also appears to have found the location of the greatest point of difference, at least as far as the rate of rendering the Latin present participle goes.
Part of this may be due to the increasing differences in sample size, but this shift also suggests that something significant happens to the practice of translation around segment 21 (beginning at Matthew 19.13). At this point, the translation begins to resemble the combined practice of the first 20 segments of the text, even though they are still statistically different. This shift roughly coincides with Roy Liuzza’s suspicion that there is a change in the practice of translation at around chapter 21 (*The Old English Version of the Gospels*, Vol. 2, 119). Both statistical shifts described here roughly coincide with changes in the numbers of omissions of Latin participles in the translation, which rises around chapter 14 and trails off around chapter 22. Liuzza’s suspicion appears to have been quite perceptive, indeed.

In his 2000 study, Roy Liuzza detects some compelling evidence of shifts in the translation of present participles in the OE Matthew. Focusing upon the appositional use of the participle, Liuzza finds that only 17.12% of the Latin present participles are rendered with OE participles (*Old English Version*, Vol. 2, 118). Liuzza also notes that, of the 50 Latin present participles in this category translated with OE participles, 31 of them occur in chapters 8-13, and none occur in chapters 14-18. Liuzza’s findings suggest that 62% of all OE present-participial renderings of the Latin appositional use occur in chapters 8-13, six of the 28 chapters of the text. Liuzza’s observations are keen here, and my more extended analysis clarifies and supports them further. The Latin text does undergo some shifts in the incidence of the Latin present participle. To proceed with Liuzza’s divisions, this study does find that chapters 1-7 of the Latin Matthew use proportionately fewer present participles, while chapter 8 and beyond use more. The Latin uses more present participles in chapters 8-13: 127 of 491 (25%) Latin present participles in the

---

37 Section 2.5i discusses the omission of Latin present participles in the OE Matthew.
OE Matthew occur in these chapters\textsuperscript{38}; of these, 55 are rendered with OE participles (43%).

Chapters 8-13 contain only 22.3\% of total words, but the slightly elevated frequency of Latin present participles appears to be negligible. The text of chapters 14-18 represents 14.6\% of the Matthew text, and contains 80 of 491 Latin participles (16.3\%)\textsuperscript{39}, but only 11 of these (13.8\%) are rendered with OE participles. The OE present participle does not entirely disappear in chapters 14-18, but its frequency does drop sharply. These rates do appear significantly different, and a 2-sample proportion test indeed shows that the rates of rendering the Latin present participle in chapters 8-13 vs. 14-18 are statistically very different:

\begin{verbatim}
prop.test(x=c(55,11), n=c(127,80), conf.level = 0.99)

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction

data:  c(55, 11) out of c(127, 80)
X-squared = 18.406, df = 1, p-value = 1.785e-05
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
 0.1348431 0.4562986
sample estimates:
 prop 1  prop 2
 0.4330709 0.1375000
\end{verbatim}

The result of this proportion test demonstrates that Roy Liuzza’s observations may have been right on the mark, at least as far as the rendering of Latin present participles goes. The sliding

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{38} In case the reader is wondering whether this number is a mistake, it is a coincidence that the number of OE present participles in the whole OE Matthew and the number of Latin present participles in chapters 8-13 both number 127.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{39} Part of the reason for the fact that chapters 8-19 have a slightly higher proportion of the text’s present participles than their share of words is that chapters 1-7 contain disproportionately fewer Latin present participles. Chapters 1-7 contain 18.4\% of the Latin Matthew text, but only 70 Latin present participles (14.3\% of all present participles), of which 23 (32.9\%) are rendered with OE present participles. This occurs partly because of the very formulaic first 17 verses of Matthew, which deal with genealogical matter in very simple clause-based narration. Matthew 1:15, for example, reads, “Eliud autem genuit Eleazar. Eleazar autem genuit Mathan. Mathan autem genuit Jacob” (And Eliud begat Eleazar. And Eleazar begat Mathan. And Mathan begat Jacob). However, this formula only persists for slightly more than half of chapter 1.}
proportion test of the OE Matthew showed the greatest statistical difference between 500-word segments 13 and 14, which border each other at Matthew 13.17. This result means that there is only a 0.001785% chance that chapters 8-13 are statistically similar to chapter 14-18. Liuzza’s suggestion that a break in the practice of translation occurs around chapter 21 also finds support from the sliding proportion test, which finds very significant difference between 500-word segments 19 and 20, which border each other at Matthew 18.18. This boundary is not the greatest point of difference, and it is likely not the location of the break, but it still presents significant difference and shows a trend in which the difference begins suddenly to disappear.

The affirmation of Liuzza’s observation of these breaks in practice raises questions about whether chapters 14-18 constitute a second portion that may contrast statistically with a third portion in chapters 19-28. Although the sliding proportion test above does not imply a third portion, Liuzza’s observations deserve further attention. As stated, chapters 14-18 contain 80 Latin participles, of which 11 (13.8%) are rendered with OE participles. Chapters 19-28 contain 214 Latin participles, of which 38 (17.8%) are rendered with OE participles. A proportion test of these two samples does not produce a statistical finding of difference:

40 The subsequent sliding proportion test of the OE Mark suggests two separate breaks in the practice of translation. Here in Matthew, there is a break in the practice of rendering present participles between 500-words segments 10 and 23, with the greatest point of different between 13/14. The subsequent study of Mark shows two separate areas of difference.
prop.test(x=c(11,38), n=c(80,214), conf.level = 0.99)

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction
data:  c(11, 38) out of c(80, 214)
X-squared = 0.4156, df = 1, p-value = 0.5191
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
-0.16850451  0.08836432
sample estimates:
      prop 1   prop 2
0.1375000 0.1775701

With a p-value of 0.5191, this proportion test suggests that the rendering of the Latin present participle in chapters 14-18 is statistically similar to that in chapters 19-28; in other words, the test indicates that there is about a 52% chance that these two proportions are statistically similar.

Even so, Liuzza does propose a break around chapter 21: a proportion test of chapters 14-20 and 21-28 could shed additional light on Liuzza`s suspicions. Chapters 14-20 contain 105 Latin present participles, of which 17 (16.2%) are rendered with OE participles. Chapters 21-28 contain 189 Latin present participles, of which 32 (16.9%) are rendered with OE participles. As the proportion test shows, these rates of translation are also not statistically different:

prop.test(x=c(17,32), n=c(105,189), conf.level = 0.99)

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction
data:  c(17, 32) out of c(105, 189)
X-squared = 0, df = 1, p-value = 1
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
-0.1310546  0.1162398
sample estimates:
      prop 1   prop 2
0.1619048 0.1693122
As far as the rendering of the Latin present participle and the proportion test can demonstrate, there is not a statistical difference between the rendering of the overall Latin present participle in chapters 14-20 and 21-28. This appears to contradict Roy Liuzza’s suspicions of a change in practice in chapter 21; however, there may still be a difference. First, as I acknowledge in my methodology, this study’s limitation to present participles and proportion tests may not be able to detect as many breaks as may exist. Second, a change of sorts does occur in chapter 18, the end of Liuzza’s proposed section of chapters 14-18. The results of the sliding proportion test show a very sharp drop in the amount of difference between the border of segments 19 and 20 and the border of segments 20 and 21; a significant shift is occurring in this area, which Liuzza appears to have sensed. Further work with additional features may elucidate the nature of such a break in practice. However, the most statistically significant shift in the rendering of the Latin present participle occurs near the boundary of segments 13 and 14, Matthew 13.17, which coincides closely with the boundary between chapters 13 and 14, one of the two breaks Liuzza suggests.

**Sliding Proportion Test of the OE Gospels Mark**

Appraising the graph that results from the 500-word segmenting analysis of how frequently the OE Mark renders the Latin present participle with an OE present participle\(^{41}\), I estimated that a difference might be evident around segment 13. To evaluate this objectively, I applied a sliding proportion test to detect possible statistical differences, and found that the results were a little more complicated than I had anticipated:

---

\(^{41}\) Please refer back to Section 2.4d to review this graph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Break point</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Break point</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>0.0001249</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>0.01915</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>3.837e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>9.29e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>0.0001299</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>0.001657</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>0.003862</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>0.06842</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>0.000221</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>0.1183</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>0.0006334</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>0.6268</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Sliding proportion test in R of the Old English Mark. Each pair of numbers separated by a “/” indicates the two 500-word blocks between which a hypothetical break was tested for evidence of difference. For example, a test labelled “10/11” indicates that all participial translations in blocks 1-10 were compared to all participial translations in block 11 and after. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

This sliding proportion test of the OE suggests two valuable conclusions. First, there are two p-values that suggest an extremely high significance of difference: there appears to be a break in practice around the boundaries between segments 5 and 6, and between segments 11 and 12.

This finding supports my assertion that treating each text as a unified work is an assumption that may not be borne out by closer study. The OE Mark appears to present three statistically independent portions, which subsequent studies will examine further. Second, these results also reveal the weakness of performing statistical analysis with frequencies of translation in segments: segments 11 and 12 have fairly similar frequencies of translation at 50% and just under 42%, respectively. However, analyzing these percentages of rendering overlooks the problem of how a percentage of a small number could carry the same weight as the same percentage of a larger number. Using the proportion test removes this bias and produces a more objective view of how the translation behaves as a whole, rather than from segment to segment.

**Sliding Proportion Test of the OE Gospels Luke**

The sliding proportion test of the OE Luke also produced results that suggested evidence of difference, and a potential secondary point of difference:
Table 2.5: Sliding proportion test in R of the Old English Luke. Each pair of numbers separated by a “/” indicates the two 500-word blocks between which a hypothetical break was tested for evidence of difference. For example, a test labelled “10/11” indicates that all participial translations in blocks 1-10 were compared to all participial translations in block 11 and after. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

There is strong statistical evidence of a break in the OE Luke, particularly around the border between segments 12 and 13. Segment 13 begins at Luke 8.27, but 8.27 may not be the exact location of the shift. Indeed, the OE Luke tends to translate the Latin present participle quite frequently: in segments 1-12, the OE Luke renders the Latin present participle with the OE present participle 79 of 164 times (48.1%), but in segments 13-37 only 89 of 333 times (26.7%). This reflects a general tendency in the Old English Gospels for translations to use the OE present participle fairly frequently in roughly the first half of each text, relative to relatively infrequent use in the second half. At segment 18, which starts in Luke 11.9, the statistical difference disappears, suggesting that there is enough overlap between the two practices by splitting the text at segment 18 that the difference is no longer visible at such a proposed break. In fact, a proportion test of segments 18-27 vs. 28-37 produces a p-value of 1, which means that these two proportions are statistically the same. For this reason, I suggest that we may cautiously dismiss the finding that there is a slight “valley” in similarity around the border between segments 21 and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Break point</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Break point</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>2.347e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>0.007896</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>1.532e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>0.008012</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>2.092e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>0.003725</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>1.442e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21/22</td>
<td><strong>0.001996</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12/13</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.301e-06</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>0.004456</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>2.456e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23/24</td>
<td>0.02258</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>0.0001017</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24/25</td>
<td>0.03103</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>0.0001796</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>0.04942</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>0.0008464</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26/27</td>
<td>0.01461</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>0.00517</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27/28</td>
<td>0.06183</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22, which only barely crosses the line into dissimilarity. From roughly the beginning of Luke chapter 11, the rate of translating Latin present participles with OE participles remains very consistent.

**Sliding Proportion Test of the OE Gospels John**

The sliding proportion test of John demonstrates considerable difference from tests of the other three gospels, because no test produces a finding of similarity. The question remains where the greatest point of similarity occurs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Break point</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Break point</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>0.001937</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>0.001167</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>3.565e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>0.0005382</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>5.757e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>0.001341</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9/10</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.233e-06</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td><strong>18/19</strong></td>
<td>0.001291</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>1.268e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>0.003907</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>7.884e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>0.001498</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>0.0001714</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>0.002586</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>0.000105</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>0.002586</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>0.0002192</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23/24</td>
<td>0.002586</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.6:** Sliding proportion test in R of the Old English John. Each pair of numbers separated by a “/” indicates the two 500-word blocks between which a hypothetical break was tested for evidence of difference. For example, a test labelled “10/11” indicates that all participial translations in blocks 1-10 were compared to all participial translations in block 11 and after. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar. Values of zero Latin present participles in segments 23 and 24 cause the results after the break between segments 21 and 22 to remain the same.

The OE John translation appears to be a widely divided text: no test of any point between segments ranging from segment 6 to 29 produced a result that suggested the translation was statistically similar over the course of the entire text; rather, the statistical results indicated statistical difference, no matter where I conducted the test. The most prominent statistical difference appears at the boundary of segments 9 and 10 (in the middle of John 7.4, although this
may not be the precise location of the break in the practice of translation). As do the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the OE John tends to use the OE present participle to translate the Latin present participle much more frequently in earlier parts of the translation than it does in later parts. There almost appears to be similarity starting around the boundary between segments 12 and 13, where the p-value hovers fairly close to the threshold of similarity; however, the statistical results are of somewhat limited value. Because the Latin John presents far fewer participles than do the other three gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke, there are not enough incidents of the Latin participle between segments 11 and 29 to use the proportion test reliably. Indeed, when I proceeded by attempting proportion tests of the text between segments 11 and 29, R produced a p-value of 0.133, which suggests similarity. However, R also warned, “Warning message: In prop.test(x = c(7, 1), n = c(45, 35), conf.level = 0.99) : Chi-squared approximation may be incorrect.” For this reason, I will only provisionally argue that it appears very possible that the practice of rendering the Latin present participle with the Old English present participle remains statistically within the limits of similarity after the boundary between segments 9 and 10, where the proportion test indicates statistically very significant difference; however, the relatively small sample sizes available limit the ability to produce the more reliable statistical conclusions that the study has produced with larger sample sizes. These considerations exemplify the special difficulties that occur with the analysis of participles in John, and demonstrate why future authorship-attribution studies will benefit from analyzing multiple features.
2.4f. Inter-textual R results: all first vs. all second proportions

The many proportion tests executed in this study revealed an emerging pattern in the practice of translating the Latin present participle with the OE present participle: each text shows statistical evidence of difference, and the first portion of each uses the OE present participle more than the second portion uses the OE present participle. Because there is no historical or biographical information to inform a hypothesis about how many translators may have worked on these translations, a question recommended itself: “Could it be that the same person started each translation, and then handed over the project to an assistant, apprentice, or other such colleague?” To investigate this further, I executed proportion tests of the four first portions of the OE Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John:

Matthew portion 1 (1-13): 75/183 (40.9%)
Mark portion 1 (1-5): 40/67 (59.7%)
Luke portion 1 (1-12): 79/164 (48.1%)
John portion 1 (1-9): 24/52 (46.2%)

Command line for a 4-sample proportion test:
```r
prop.test(x=c(75, 40, 79, 24), n=c(183, 67, 164, 52), conf.level = 0.99)
```

4-sample test for equality of proportions without continuity correction

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prop 1</td>
<td>prop 2</td>
<td>prop 3</td>
<td>prop 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4098361</td>
<td>0.5970149</td>
<td>0.4817073</td>
<td>0.4615385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These four proportions meet the statistical threshold for similarity, although not by a wide margin. This does not by any means prove that they are the work of the same translator;
however, this finding does not disprove such a finding, and in fact it suggests that there is
potential for such a possible explanation of the difference in the translation of the Old English
Gospels. This finding begs a second question: “What statistical evidence is there that the second
portions after the statistical breaks in each text may be statistically similar?

To investigate this possibility, I conducted a similar proportion test of the second portions
of the OE Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Because the OE Mark appears to contain two
statistical breaks, I conducted two additional tests to account for this:

Matthew portion 2 (14-34): 52/308
Mark portion 2 (6-21): 85/269
    Mark portion 2a (6-11): 38/106
    Mark portion 2b (12-21): 47/163
John portion 2 (10-29): 9/85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text portions in the proportion test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 2, Mark 2, Luke 2, John 2</td>
<td>5.819e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 2, Mark 2a, Luke 2, John 2</td>
<td>6.977e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 2, Mark 2b, Luke 2, John 2</td>
<td>0.0001862</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 2, Mark 2 Luke 2</td>
<td>0.000146</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 2, Mark 2a Luke 2</td>
<td>0.0001181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 2, Mark 2b Luke 2</td>
<td>0.002423</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7: Proportion tests of the second portions in the Old English Gospels, or a third in the OE Mark, in which
there were two significant points of difference. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break,
in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that
the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically
similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

The second portions of the translations do not meet the statistical threshold of similarity. This is
particularly true when two conditions are met: (a) the John 2 portion is included in the
calculation, and (b) the Mark 2a portion is included in the Mark 2 portion or when the Mark 2a
portion is used alone. The John 2 portion renders the Latin present participle with an OE
participle far less than do the second portions of the OE Matthew, Mark, or Luke. When the John
2 portion is excluded from the comparison, the second portions almost reach the threshold of similarity, particularly when the Mark 2b portion is used to represent Mark 2. These findings suggest that the addition of more markers may help clarify the relationships among the first portions and among the second portions. It is too early to conclude that there were two translators for the entire Old English Gospels translation, one who started each translation and another who took up the work later, but there is a suggestion that this may be the case. Future work with more markers will address this.

2.4g. Intra-textual R results on the OE Gospels: subcategories vs. all participles

So far, the first three parts of this study have explored variations in the practice of translation by examining the overall rendering of the Latin present participle with the Old English present participle. These studies are predicated on the assumption that the rendering of the Latin present participle is a single process, and that each translator’s rendering of a participle is no more specific than a decision about what to do with Latin present participles. Liuzza’s study also suggests that the independent and attributive classes are satisfactorily translated “nearly regularly with the participle in all gospels” (Old English Version, Vol. 2, 117), but Liuzza assigns to the appositional class participial phrases that differ in terms of placement, as some are pre-positive and others post-positive to nominative nouns. However, the preceding study of the Old English Genesis showed that there are significant statistical differences in the rates of translating Latin present participles, depending on their pre- and post-position in nominatives, and their case or function among nominatives, accusatives, predicatives, substantives, ablative-absolutes, and oblique cases (dative, genitive, and ablative). Therefore, this part of the study sought to assess whether the renderings of these subcategories of Latin present

participles showed evidence of statistically significant difference. In short, all four gospel translations show evidence that at least some subcategories of Latin present participles are rendered at rates statistically different from the overall rate for each text, and from the rates of some other subcategories. As a result, it is necessary to think about the translation of the Latin present participle in the Old English Gospels, as in Genesis, as a series of phenomena that must be examined independently.

**Intra-textual categories in the OE Matthew**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of comparison</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>4.708e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.7301</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive accusatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>1.784e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.01005</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicatives vs. all present participles *</td>
<td>4.983e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative-absolute participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.1807</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique-case participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive nominatives</td>
<td>7.298e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>4.779e-14</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>3.392e-06</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8: Proportion tests of the subcategories of present participles and the overall rendering of the Latin present participle in the Old English Matthew. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar. Items marked with an asterisk present small sample sizes. They are likely too small to produce reliable results. For such tests, R presents a warning message that the results may not be accurate because of the small sample size.

These results demonstrate that the renderings of the subcategories of the present participle are statistically not a single process. They show tremendous variation that suggests that they should be examined separately. The findings also demonstrate that the renderings of post-positive nominatives, substantives, and ablative-absolutes only show that these rates are consistent with the overall average, which may not represent any particular approach on the part of the translator(s).
**Intra-textual categories in the OE Mark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of comparison</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.0461</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.006874</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive accusatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>2.955e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.9098</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.001383</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative-absolute participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique-case participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive nominatives</td>
<td>0.7116</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>5.357e-07</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>3.378e-08</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.9:** Proportion tests of the subcategories of present participles and the overall rendering of the Latin present participle in the Old English Mark. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

The results here indicate that the renderings of the subcategories of the present participle in the Old English Mark are statistically not a single process. They show tremendous variation that suggests that they should be examined separately. As in the OE Matthew, some findings demonstrate similarity to the overall use of participles. However, these only show that these rates are consistent with the overall average. This may not represent a specific similarity to the practice of translation.
### Intra-textual categories in the OE Luke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of comparison</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.005774</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.01582</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive accusatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>2.482e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.3107</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>1.896e-07</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative-absolute participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.06803</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique-case participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.4481</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive nominatives</td>
<td>0.3574</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>6.088e-08</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>1.312e-07</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.10:** Proportion tests of the subcategories of present participles and the overall rendering of the Latin present participle in the Old English Luke. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar. Items marked with an asterisk present small sample sizes. They are likely too small to produce reliable results. For such tests, R presents a warning message that the results may not be accurate because of the small sample size.

The translation of the OE Luke shows more statistical unity among the subcategories of present participles than do either the OE Matthew or OE Mark. Still, the renderings of accusative and predicative participles are significantly different from the overall rate of rendering Latin present participles with OE present participles.

### Intra-textual categories in the OE John

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of comparison</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. all present participles *</td>
<td>0.1915</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.3076</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive accusatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>0.0006278</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicatives vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative-absolute participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique-case participles vs. all present participles</td>
<td>sample too small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive nominatives *</td>
<td>0.5071</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>0.001847</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positive nominatives vs. post-positive accusatives</td>
<td>0.0001153</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.11: Proportion tests of the subcategories of present participles and the overall rendering of the Latin present participle in the Old English John. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar. Items marked with an asterisk present small sample sizes. They are likely too small to produce reliable results. For such tests, R presents a warning message that the results may not be accurate because of the small sample size.

As in the OE Luke, the rate of rendering accusatives stands out from the rates of rendering nominatives as different from the overall practice of rendering Latin present participles with OE participles. Because the Latin John employs considerably fewer Latin present participles than do the Latin Matthew, Mark, John texts, I have elected not to perform proportion tests with some categories that contain very few participles for examination. The relatively small sample size of pre-positive nominative participles elicits a warning from R that the results may not be entirely accurate. However, I believe that we may cautiously accept the results of tests, at least in the cases of pre-positive nominatives vs. all participles, and of pre-positive nominatives vs. post-positive nominatives, because these values are quite well within the statistical threshold of similarity.

2.4h. Intra-textual R results on the OE Gospels: subcategories across proposed boundaries

The growing amount of data from various tests requires some synthesis to ensure that the data do not become unwieldy or produced simply for the sake of accruing data. What is the significance of the facts that (a) Part I indicated that there is some statistical difference between some translations, and similarity between others, but that (b) Part II suggested that each text contains statistically significant breaks in translation, and that (c) Part III demonstrated that the first portions of the four translations are statistically similar but that the second portions are not, but that (d) Part IV revealed that the translation of the Latin present participle is statistically not a single process, but rather apparently a collection of sub-processes? This is a very complicated
question, and one that can quickly grow out of control. To attempt to make some sense of these various findings and bring them together under a new question, Part V of this study tests whether the proposed breaks in the overall practice of translating the Latin present participle apply to the translation of the individual subcategories of Latin present participles. In other words, do the subcategories also show difference across the overall breaks?

The simple answer is that some subcategories of present participles show statistically significant differences across the breaks, but that the four gospel texts do not show entirely similar patterns of results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Comparison</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew pre-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.001517</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew post-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>5.506e-10</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew post-acc portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.5072</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark pre-nom all 3 portions</td>
<td>0.02134</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark pre-nom portion 1 vs. portions 2 and 3</td>
<td>0.01667</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark pre-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark pre-nom portion 1 vs. portion 3</td>
<td>0.01485</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark pre-nom portion 2 vs. portion 3</td>
<td>0.5552*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-nom all 3 portions</td>
<td>0.01974*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-nom portion 1 vs. portions 2 and 3</td>
<td>0.06802*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.4922</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-nom portion 1 vs. portion 3</td>
<td>0.01767*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-nom portion 2 vs. portion 3</td>
<td>0.09104</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-acc all 3 portions</td>
<td>0.2303*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-acc portion 1 vs. portions 2 and 3</td>
<td>0.9092*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-acc portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.3776*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-acc portion 1 vs. portion 3</td>
<td>0.3776*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark post-acc portion 2 vs. portion 3</td>
<td>0.3776*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke pre-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.1456</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke post-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>4.161e-07</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke post-acc portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.2875</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John pre-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.4083</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John post-nom portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.3307</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John post-acc portion 1 vs. portion 2</td>
<td>0.005458</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.12: Proportion test results in R of whether subcategories of present participles show statistical difference across the proposed overall break in each text. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar. Items marked with an asterisk present small sample sizes. They are likely too small to produce reliable results. For such tests, R presents a warning message that the results may not be accurate because of the small sample size.

Some illuminating patterns emerge and suggest that there is evidence of statistically significant breaks in the practice of translating subcategories of the Latin present participles within some of the Old English Gospels. In Matthew, the renderings of both pre-positive and post-positive nominative participles in each of the two proposed portions show statistical difference, although the rendering of post-positive nominative participles is extremely different, with a p-value of $5.506 \times 10^{-10}$ ($0.0000005506\%$ chance of similarity), whereas pre-positives had a less dramatic p-value of 0.001517 ($0.1517\%$ chance of similarity). However, the test of post-positive accusative participles produced a finding of statistical similarity with a p-value of 0.5072 ($50.72\%$ chance of similarity). A somewhat similar pattern emerged in the study of the OE Luke: the test of pre-positive nominative participles produced a p-value of 0.1456 ($14\%$ chance of similarity, which easily meets the threshold for similarity), but the test of post-positive nominatives produced a p-value of $4.161 \times 10^{-7}$ ($0.00004167\%$ chance of similarity). The test of post-positive accusatives produced a p-value of 0.2875 ($28.75\%$ chance of similarity). The similarity of these patterns does not necessarily demonstrate that the OE Matthew and the OE Luke are products of the same pattern of authorship, but rather that both show similar amounts of internal difference, which may or may not be due to similar patterns of divided authorship.

The results of the tests of the OE Mark are more complex, since the OE Mark showed evidence of two statistically significant breaks in the overall pattern of translating the Latin present participle with the Old English present participle. As a result, this part of the study
examined three separate portions in Mark: portion 1 (500-word segments 1-5: chapters 1 – 5.21), portion 2 (segments 6-11: chapters 5.22 – 9.40), and portion 3 (segment 12-21: chapters 9.40 – 16.20). Part V began with the study of Mark by testing whether all three portions meet the statistical threshold of similarity in each of the three subcategories tested: pre-positive nominatives, post-positive nominatives, and post-positive accusatives. All three results are borderline results, and they highlight the potential problems with my choice of a 99% confidence interval, which is generally stricter than the 95% interval used in most studies. At a 99% confidence interval and using a two-tailed hypothesis, the threshold for similarity is a p-value of 0.005 (\(\frac{1}{2}\times 99\%\) confidence interval) / 2). Since any p-value of a proportion test higher than 0.005 meets the threshold for similarity under these test parameters, all three portions of Mark meet the threshold of similarity in all three subcategories: pre-positive nominatives have a p-value of 0.02134, post-positive nominatives have a p-value of 0.01974, and post-positive accusatives have a p-value of 0.2303. However, if this study applied a 95% confidence interval, which is more often the standard, the threshold p-value would become 0.025 (\(\frac{1}{2}\times 95\%\) confidence interval) / 2). Under these circumstances, neither pre-positive nor post-positive nominatives in all three portions of Mark would meet the threshold of similarity. Changing the threshold, of course, risks the bias of “cherry-picking” the statistics and parameters that suit the hypothesis, but my objective in reporting this issue is to illustrate, first, how my choice of a 99%

---

42 In the previous section, I refer to Mark portion 2 and “2a” and Mark portion 3 and “2b”. The reason for this discrepancy is that I was testing whether Mark portion 1 was different from the rest of the text, which either included both 2a and 2b, or only one. However, since that test revealed that Mark portions 2a and 2b affect the results differently, I now designate Mark portion 2a as portion 2, and portion 2b as portion 3.

43 To remind the reader, the two-tailed hypothesis measures whether one sample is different from the other. The methodology of the Genesis study contains the most-detailed discussion. However, here I simply remind that the two-tailed hypothesis requires the researcher to divide the alpha (the threshold) by two, one half for each side of the realm of difference.

44 As I explain in the Genesis study, the choice of the 99% confidence interval was a choice meant to defend against potentially incorrect findings of difference. However, as I explain in the methodology to the Genesis study, a 95% confidence interval is generally the standard value.
confidence interval reduces the chances of finding difference where there is none, but also excludes findings that other statistical studies might consider evidence of difference. Second, this result also illustrates more specifically just how borderline these results are, and how complex the question of the authorship of the OE Mark really is, at least far as the rendering of Latin present participles goes. However, these results do remain consistent with those of the OE Matthew and Luke, to the extent that they show that post-positive accusatives display less variation in their practice of rendering than do nominative participles. Generally, Ælfric and the translators of the OE Matthew, Luke, and Mark tend to render Latin accusative present participles with OE present participles far more often than they render Latin nominative present participles with OE present participles.

The results of the tests of the OE Mark became more complex when this study began comparing pairs of the three portions for each of the three subcategories. It is a painstaking aspect of this study that has produced tremendous amounts of data and results that require some discussion and attempts at interpretation. In tests of pre-positive nominatives, a test of portion 1 of Mark versus portions 2 and 3 together produced a p-value of 0.01667, a borderline result that qualifies as different with a 95% confidence interval, but statistically similar with a 99% confidence interval. Portions 1 and 3 produce a similarly borderline result of 0.01485. Portions 1 and 2 are within the threshold of similarity with a p-value of 0.1013, but portions 2 and 3 present the most dramatic similarity with a p-value of 0.5552 (55% chance of similarity). Overall, in terms of pre-positive nominatives, segments 1-5 are most different from segments 12-21 and lie between the thresholds of 95% and 99% confidence intervals. Segments 1-5 are within the threshold of similarity to 6-11, but segments 6-11 are very similar to portions 12-21.
portion of Mark appears to be arguably different from the second and third portions, again depending on which confidence interval is applied.

However, the results from the tests of post-positive nominative participles are somewhat different. A three-sample test of the rendering of post-positive nominative participles in all three portions produced a p-value of 0.01974; like the result for pre-positive nominatives, this result lies between the 0.005 threshold of a 99% confidence interval and the 0.025 threshold of a 95% confidence interval. Post-positive nominative participles in Mark portion 1 compared to portions 2 and 3 together produced a p-value of 0.06802 (a 6.8% chance of similarity), which lies within even the threshold of a 95% confidence interval, although it is not far from the pre-positive nominative result of 0.01667 (1.7% chance of similarity). Portions 1 and 3 produced a p-value of 0.01767 (a 1.7% chance of similarity), on the borderline between the two thresholds and similar to the same test for pre-positive nominative participles, which produced a p-value of 0.01485. The remaining two pair tests of post-positive nominative participles in Mark, however, produce results contradictory to the results of pre-positive nominatives. A test of post-positive nominative participles in portions 1 and 2 produced a p-value 0.4922 (49% chance of similarity), whereas for pre-positive nominatives the p-value was 0.1013 (10% chance); by contrast, a test of post-positive nominatives in portions 2 and 3 produced a p-value of 0.09104 (9% chance), whereas for pre-positive nominatives the p-value was 0.5552 (55% chance). Here in the subcategory of post-positive nominative participles, the greater similarity exists between portions 1 and 2, while in the category of pre-positive nominative participles, the greater similarity exists between portions 2 and 3. However, both subcategories show a large amount of difference between portions 1 and 3. Somewhere between portions 1 and 3, a statistically significant shift occurs in the translation of subcategories of Latin present participles.
Post-positive accusative present participles in the OE Mark produce results very different from tests of both types of nominative participles, but generally consistent with tests of accusatives in the OE Matthew and OE Luke. The proportion test of post-positive accusative present participles in the three portions of the OE Mark produced a p-value of 0.2303 (23% chance of similarity), which lies very well inside the threshold of even the 0.025 threshold of a 95% confidence interval. Tests of both the OE Matthew and OE Luke, despite statistical evidence of difference in the renderings of nominative participles, produce findings of similarity among accusative participles: the p-value for accusatives in Matthew was 0.5072 (51%) chance of similarity, and for Luke was 0.2875 (29%). These findings demonstrate that there is far less difference in the practice of translating post-positive accusative participles in the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke than there is in the translation of nominatives, a finding that reinforces earlier work in the Genesis study to suggest that these subcategories of present participles sometime receive significantly different treatments, and that the translation of the Latin present participle is not a single process, at least in the studied texts. In all these findings of similarity, this study therefore cautiously suggests evidence of difference among the subcategories, since the variation among nominatives is far more pronounced than it is among accusatives, even if all results fall with the realm of similarity, with the parameter of a 99% confidence interval. Future studies will need to explore this potential further in order to unmask statistically verifiable difference.

The OE John translation stands out from the translations of Matthew, Mark, and Luke in ways that justify leaving an analysis of the OE John to last in this part of the study. A proportion test of pre-positive nominative participles in the OE John produced a p-value of 0.4083 (41% chance of similarity), and a test of post-positive nominatives produced a p-value of 0.3307 (33%
chance of similarity), both well within the threshold for similarity. These values present a significant contrast with the results of similar tests in the OE Matthew, Mark, and John, which showed significant difference or very borderline results (Matthew: pre-positives 0.001517, post-positives $5.506 \times 10^{-10}$; Mark portions 1 and 3: pre-positives 0.01485, post-positives 0.01767; Luke: pre-positives 0.1456, post-positives $4.161 \times 10^{-7}$). These results suggest two unique features of the OE John: first, that the renderings of nominative participles, whether pre- or post-positive, are clearly statistically similar across the overall statistical breaks in translating the Latin present participle; and second, that there is less variation between the translations of the two subcategories, in other words, that the OE John is different from the OE Matthew and the OE Luke to the extent that the OE John displays roughly the same probability of difference for both pre- and post-positive nominative participles.

These results beg the question of how Part II could have found statistical evidence of difference between segments 9 and 10, with a dramatic p-value of $6.233 \times 10^{-6}$, when the tests of nominative participles show such similarity. One part of the answer to this question may come from the result of the proportion test of accusative participles in the two portions of the OE John, which rendered a p-value of 0.005458 (0.54% chance of similarity), which is only very barely within the 99% confidence interval’s threshold of 0.005, although well beyond the 95% confidence interval’s threshold of 0.025. Even though both qualify as similar, the degree to which nominatives and accusatives are statistically similar varies considerably. Future work with more stylistic features may clarify this issue further. A second part of the answer may come from the relative rarity of the Latin present participle in the Latin John: as reported earlier in this study, the rate of Latin present participles to overall Latin words is only 1:110, but 1:36 in the Latin Matthew, 1:33 in the Latin Mark, and 1:38 in the Latin Luke. The relative rarity of present...
participles in the Latin John simply allows fewer samples to test, and by extension, undermines
the ability of the Latin present participle to represent trends in the overall translation.
Nonetheless, perhaps the overall proportions themselves may provide a third part of the answer:
in segments 1-9, the OE John renders 24 of 52 (46.15%) Latin present participles with OE
present participles, but only 9 of 85 (10.59%) in segments 10-29. There is, overall, evidence of
difference in the translation of the OE John, but the difference is not visible in the renderings of
nominative participles; however, the difference begins to be visible in the rendering of accusative
participles, and in the overall practice of rendering present participles.

2.4i. Inter-textual R results on the OE Gospels: subcategories in portions 1 and 2

The results of Part V suggested that some follow-up could provide further evidence of
shifts in the translation of the Latin present participle in the Old English Gospels. In the sliding
proportion tests (Part II), used to seek statistically significant breaks in the overall rate of
translating Latin present participles with OE present participles, the results demonstrated that the
first portion in each gospel translates the Latin present participle with an OE present participle
significantly more often than does the second portion. In the inter-textual analysis of all first
portions and all second portions (Part III), the proportion-test results indicated that first portions
met the threshold for similarity, but the second portions did not. Part IV tested the translation of
individual sub-categories of participles against the overall translation of participles in each text,
and demonstrated that the translations of subcategories of participles were not all statistically
similar either to the whole translation or to other sub-categories, suggesting that subcategories of
participles may be individual phenomena. Part V then tested whether the translation of each
subcategory showed statistical evidence of difference across the approximate boundaries
suggested in Part II, and found that pre-positive nominatives showed some difference, and post-positive nominatives showed some extreme difference, but post-positive accusatives were not statistically different, except in the OE John, which appears to present patterns different from those in the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Part V additionally showed that portions 1 and 3 of Mark (Mark shows evidence of two statistically significant breaks in the overall rendering) differ from each other more than either differs from portion 2.

This final stage of the quantitative analysis, Part VI, examines whether intra-textual differences in the ways sub-categories are translated can be compared across texts. In short, the objective here is to explore whether the portions in one text resemble the portions in another text, at the level of sub-categories. I have restricted this final set of tests to examine whether statistically significant similarity exists between the practices of translating pre-positive and post-positive nominative participles in the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke. I restricted the tests thus for three reasons: (1) small sample sizes in pre-positive accusatives, substantives, predicatives, ablative-absolutes, and oblique-case participles make reliable testing difficult; (2) the rendering of post-positive accusatives does not show statistically significant difference across the boundaries within each text except arguably in John; and (3) the results of the proportion tests of nominatives in the OE John do not show anything close to statistical difference. In testing the OE Mark translation, I contrasted portions 1 and 3, because these show greater difference from each other than either shows difference from portion 2. In short, this part of the study seeks to examine whether the first portions of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are similar at least as far as nominative participles, which are by far the most numerous, are concerned. The results show some enlightening, although not totally unanimous results:
### Types of comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of comparison</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Matthew 1, Mark 1, Luke 1</td>
<td>0.03398</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Matthew 2, Mark 3, Luke 2</td>
<td>0.003344</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Counter-argument 1: Matthew 1 and Mark 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Counter-argument 2: Matthew 2 and Mark 1</td>
<td>2.776e-09</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Counter-argument 3: Matthew 1 and Luke 2</td>
<td>0.7827</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Counter-argument 4: Matthew 2 and Luke 1</td>
<td>1.236e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Follow-up test: Matthew 1, Mark 3, Luke 1</td>
<td>0.3873</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-noms: Follow-up test: Matthew 1, Mark 3, Luke 2</td>
<td>0.8639</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Matthew 1, Mark 1, Luke 1</td>
<td>0.8595</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Matthew 2, Mark 3, Luke 2</td>
<td>0.4447</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Counter-argument 1: Matthew 1 and Mark 3</td>
<td>2.005e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Counter-argument 2: Matthew 2 and Mark 1</td>
<td>0.0008351</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Counter-argument 3: Matthew 1 and Luke 2</td>
<td>4.181e-08</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Counter-argument 4: Matthew 2 and Luke 1</td>
<td>5.983e-09</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Follow-up test: Matthew 1, Mark 3, Luke 1</td>
<td>1.447e-05</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-noms: Follow-up test: Matthew 1, Mark 3, Luke 2</td>
<td>5.191e-09</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.13**: Proportion test results in R of whether subcategories of present participles in specific portions show statistical difference from or similarity with subcategories of participles in other portions of other texts. Where the test suggests that there is no statistically significant break, in the “Same” column, the letter “Y” indicates “Yes”, that the two portions are similar. The letter “N” indicates that the two portions are not statistically similar. With a p-value of 0.005, any value above 0.005 qualifies as statistically similar. With a more conventional p-value of 0.025, any value above 0.025 qualifies as statistically similar.

These findings can appear highly contradictory and difficult to interpret. However, this comparison of subcategories in different texts does produce some useful and illuminating results. First, the most over-arching result is that pre-positive and post-positive nominative present participles act differently from one another. Second, the only comparison from both pre- and post-positive nominatives that produces a unified result is that the renderings of nominatives in the first portions of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are statistically similar, although not overwhelmingly so; such a finding satisfies a 99% confidence interval, but not a 95% confidence interval. However, the use of the proportion test to evaluate rates of translation among these subcategories across portions of each text has not been successful in producing a clear pattern of similarity among portions of the texts.
On the other hand, this study has produced some convincing evidence of difference. First, the second portion of Matthew and the first portion of Mark are not statistically similar in either pre-positive or post-positive nominatives. Second, Matthew portion 2 and Luke portion 1 are not statistically similar. This study cannot identify how many translators there probably were, based on the quantitative analysis of present participles, but this study can argue that Matthew portion 2 (13.17 to the end) is not statistically likely to have been authored by the translator of either Mark portion 1 (1.1-5.21) or Luke portion 1 (1.1-7.47).

2.4j. Conclusions about the quantitative analysis

At this point, the quantitative analysis, using the current methodology, has done all that it can do. However, before proceeding with the qualitative analysis of the use of OE present participles in the Old English Gospels, it is useful to synthesize the many results of the quantitative analysis. First, at the inter-textual level in Part I, the OE Matthew and OE John are statistically very similar, and similar also to Ælfric’s overall use of the OE present participle to render Latin present participles in Genesis 1-24.22. The OE Mark and Luke form a second group with close similarity. All five texts differ very significantly from Genesis 24.61 – end. Second (Part II), there appear statistically significant breaks in the overall pattern of rendering the Latin present participle in each of the four gospels: in chapter 13 (the 500-word segment boundary occurs at 13.17) of Matthew, in chapters 5 (5.21) and 9 (9.40) of Mark, in chapter 7 (7.47) of Luke, and in chapter 7 (7.4) of John. Third, at the level of the overall practice of rendering the Latin present participle (Part III), the first portions of Matthew, Mark and John meet the threshold for statistical similarity. Fourth, however, the rates of rendering individual

45 However, they are dissimilar in the use of the OE present participle to render the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle.
sub-categories of Latin present participles (pre- and post-positive nominative, accusatives, substantives, predicatives, ablative-absolutes, and oblique-case participles) show that the renderings of sub-categories are not all statistically similar (Part IV). Fifth, testing the larger subcategories across the overall boundaries (Part V) showed evidence of difference in the renderings of pre- and post-positive nominative present participles in the OE Matthew, and in post-positive nominatives in the OE Luke; however, the subcategories themselves did not demonstrate difference in the OE Mark or John. Sixth and last, although the tests show that subcategories in the portions across individual texts (Part VI) did not yield an entirely clear pattern of difference or similarity, it does suggest the possibility that the first portions of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are at least statistically similar. Also, this last part indicates that the second portion of Matthew, which begins around the middle of chapter 13, is not statistically similar to either Mark 1.1 to 5.21 or Luke 1.1-7.47. These texts all demonstrate some evidence of split authorship. They begin with more frequent use of the OE present participle, but trail off in later parts of each text. There is some evidence that the first portions are statistically similar in the use of the OE present participle, and that different texts render subcategories of Latin present participles in differing ways.

2.5. Qualitative analyses of the subcategories at the textual level

The qualitative portion of this study will explore the specific practices of translation demonstrated in each of the sub-categories of present participles examined in the quantitative section, and proceed with further examinations of how the use of Old English present participles without a Latin origin, omissions of participles, shifts in position, and correlating lexical shifts contextualize these results. Overall, these sub-studies add support for a significant difference in
the practice of translation between the OE Matthew and John as one group, and the OE Mark and Luke as another. They further suggest differences between the OE Matthew and the OE John, and they add support for a stark break in the practice of translation somewhere near the boundary between Matthew chapters 13 and 14. The OE Matthew and John are far less likely to preserve the pre-positive nominative Latin present participle than are the OE Mark or Luke. Although the four OE translations generally render the post-positive nominative participle at similar rates, the OE Matthew and John render such participles of “dicere” more often than do the OE Mark or Luke, but Matthew sharply reduces this practice around the beginning of chapter 14. The four OE translations generally render the post-positive accusative at similar rates, but such accusative participles indicate evidence of internal breaks in practice in the OE Matthew and OE John. Ablative-absolutes show higher use of the OE present participle in the OE Mark and Luke than in the OE Matthew and John, and the study of parallel phrases and the rendering of state verbs as substantive present participles, predicative participles, oblique-case participles, and unattested OE participles supports this division. The studies of the omissions of Latin participles in the OE translation and of shifted position of rendered participles further reveals similarity between the OE Matthew and John and between the OE Mark and Luke. The final study of the Old English translation of the Latin noun “phariseus” reveals dramatic evidence of internal shift in the translation of the OE Matthew.

2.5a. The pre-positive nominative participle

This study anticipated the possibility that the position of Latin present participles could affect the ways in which the translation rendered them. This study considers Mitchell’s classification of participles as attributive and appositive, and re-names these categories as “pre-
positive” and “post-positive” to isolate this distinction. This particular re-naming offers two advantages: first, the nomenclature frames the study’s larger attention to the “position” of the participle; second, the re-naming is part of this study’s use of more specific sub-categories of participles, the examinations of which facilitate new insight into the translation of the OE Gospels. The study proceeded from the hypothesis that Latin pre- and post-positive participles could receive substantially different treatments in the translation as a whole among the gospels, and within each gospel. Indeed, the four gospel translations show some variety in the rendering of the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle: 11 of 145 (7.6%) are rendered with OE present participles in the OE Matthew, 29 of 111 (26.1%) in Mark, 22 of 111 (19.8%) in Luke,

46 and 1 of 16 (6.3%) in John. This analysis demonstrates that the OE Matthew and OE John use the OE present participle to render the Latin pre-positive Latin present participle less often than the OE Mark or Luke do; however, the OE Matthew is less likely to change the position or function of an OE present participle than is the OE Mark or Luke.

Pre-positive nominative present participles in the OE Matthew

As section 2.4g reports, the rendering of pre-positive nominative present participles in the OE Matthew is very significantly different from the overall rendering of participles: only 11 of 145 (7.6%) pre-positives are rendered with OE present participles, while 127 of 491 (25.9%) of overall present participles are rendered with OE participles. Nine of these eleven OE-participial renderings occur before 13.17, where the quantitative analysis suggests a statistical break in practice. The OE Matthew renders six of these pre-positive Latin participles as OE pre-positive.

46 Another odd coincidence is that Mark and Luke have the same number of Latin pre-positive nominative present participles. It is not an error.
47 This small number of pre-positive nominative participles in John makes for a rather small sample size, so comparing this rate to the rate in other translations must be done with caution, and with recognition that the proportions are not precisely comparable.
participles, as it does in 2.11, 12.44, 12.45, 13.13 (which is a relatively complex structure) and
13.14:

2.11 et **intrantes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) domum, invenerunt puerum cum Maria matre eius et **procidentes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) adoraverunt eum et apertis thesauris suis obtulerunt ei munera aurum tus, et murram.

(DR) And entering into the house, they found the child with Mary his mother, and falling down they adored him; and opening their treasures, they offered him gifts; gold, frankincense, and myrrh.

(OE) & **gangende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) into þam huse hi gemet þæt cild mid Marian hys meder & hi **adenedon** (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) hi & hi to him gebædon; And hi untyndon hyra goldhordas & him lac brohton þæt wæs gold & recels & myrre.

12.44 tunc dicit revertar in domum meam unde exivi et **veniens** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) invenit **vacantem** (LPrt) (Post-Acc) scopis mundatam et ornatam.

(DR) Then he saith: I will return into my house from whence I came out. And coming he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished.

(OE) Þonne cwyþ he, ic gecyrre on min hus þanon ic uteode; & **cumende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) he gemet hyt æmtig (non) (V) (non Post-Acc) & geclænsod mid besmum & gefrætwod.

12.45 tunc vadit, et adsumit septem alios spiritus secum nequiores se et **intrantes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) habitant ibi

(DR) Then he goeth, and taketh with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there

(OE) Ðonne gæþ he & him togenymþ seofun oþre gastas wyrsan þonne he & **ingangende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hig eardigeað þær;

13.13 Ideo in parabolis loquor eis quia **videntes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non vident et **audientes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non audiunt neque intelligunt.

(DR) Therefore do I speak to them in parables: because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

(OE) Forðam ic spece to him mid bigspellum forþam þe **lociende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hig ne geseoþ & **gehyrende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hig ne gehyræþ ne ne ongytæþ.

13.14 et adimpletur in eis prophetia Esaiæ **dicens** (LPrt) (Post-Nom) auditu audietis et non intelligetis et **videntes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) videbitis et non videbitis.

(DR) And the prophecy of Isaias is fulfilled in them, who saith: By hearing you shall hear, and shall not understand: and seeing you shall see, and shall not perceive.

---

48 As I do in the study of Genesis, I have also provided the Douay-Rheims translation of the Latin Vulgate, in order to provide a more readable version of the text, on the advice of Professor A. diPaolo Healey. Because my own translation used in this study was executed to illustrate the structure of the Latin, I have opted to use the Douay-Rheims translation here as a widely accepted translation. The Douay-Rheims translation is marked with “(DR)"
(OE) Þæt on him si gefylled Esaias witegung (non) (Omitted) (non Ob). Of gehyrnysse ge gehyræþ & ge ne ongytaþ, & lociende (OE Prt) (OE Pre-Nom) ge geseoþ & ne geseoð.

However, the OE Matthew subjects five such pre-positives to either a shift of position or function, or both, to accommodate the Latin present participle. In Matthew 4.9, the Latin subject is attached to the verb "adaraveris", making the participle "cadens" pre-positive to the subject. However, the translation places the OE subject "þu" before the participle "feallende":

4.9 et dixit illi haec tibi omnia dabo si cadens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) adoraveris me (DR) And said to him: All these will I give thee, if falling down thou wilt adore me. (OE) & cwæþ to him, Ealle þas ic sylle þe gyf þu feallende (OE Prt) (OE Pre-Nom) to me geeadmetst.

The OE Matthew engages in a similar shift in 11.25, even though the position of the Latin participles "respondens" is clearly before the subject "Iesus":

11.25 In illo tempore respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesus dixit confiteor tibi Pater Domine caeli et terrae quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et revelasti ea parvulis. (DR) At that time Jesus answered and said: I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to the little ones. (OE) Se Hælynd cwæð andswariende (OE Prt) (OE Pre-Nom), Ic andytte þe, Drihten heofenes & eorþan, þu þe behyddyst þas þing fram wisun & gleawun & onwruge þa lytlingun.

In 13.1, the translation converts the pre-positive nominative into a post-positive dative-absolute construction, bringing it into alignment with the preceding dative in the prepositional phrase "On þam dæge", even though the structure of the verse is otherwise relatively simple, and a nominative participial phrase would have been intelligible and consistent with the Latin49:

13.1 In illo die exiens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesus de domo, sedebat secus mare. (DR) The same day Jesus going out of the house, sat by the sea side. (OE) On þam dæge þam Hælende utgangendum (OE Prt) (OE Pre-Nom) of huse he sæt wiþ ða sæ.

---

49 I thank Professor David Townsend for this observation that a nominative present-participial phrase would have been suitable, and that this conversion appears unnecessary.
After the break proposed in the quantitative analysis, the OE Matthew uses OE participles to render two Latin pre-positive in close proximity in chapter 27, the location of an unusual spike in the use of the OE present participle. In 27.39, the Latin poses the participle “praetereuntes” before the inflected subject of the verb “blasphemabant”, but the OE shifts the position to post-position:

27.39 *Praetereuntes* (LPrt) *(Pre-Nom)* autem blasphemabant eum *moventes* (LPrt) *(Post-Nom)* capita sua (DR) And they that passed by, blasphemed him, wagging their heads,

(OE) Witodlice þa *wegferendan* (OEPrt) *(OE Pre-Nom)* hyne bysmeredon & *cwehton* *(non)* *(V)* *(non Post-Nom)* heora heafod.

In 27.36, the translation may either create a misplaced modifier, by moving “sittende” out of proximity with those who serve in this passage, or even an error, indicating that Jesus, the one being watched over, was the one sitting. The plural of the Latin participle resists such a translation:

27.36 *et sedentes* (LPrt) *(Pre-Nom)* servabant eum (DR) And they sat and watched him.

(OE) & hig beheoldon hyne *sittende* (OEPrt) *(OE Pre-Nom)*.

A summary table of those Latin present participles that the OE Matthew does render with an OE participle at least once demonstrates that, on the whole, the entire practice of using the OE participle in this position is very much the exception, not the rule:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin participle</th>
<th>Participial translations</th>
<th>Non-participial translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.11 intrantes</td>
<td>2.11, 12.45</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 cadens</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25 respondens</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.44 veniens</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>2.23, 5.24, 8.33, 13.54, 14.12, 20.10, 25.27,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 exiens</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13 audientes</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>2.3, 2.22, 8.10, 13.13, 17.6, 20.24, 22.22, 22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.36 sedentes</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>13.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.39 praetereuntes</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.14:** Incidence and rendering of those Latin present participles in the OE Matthew that are rendered with OE participles at least once.

Section 2.4h explained that the use of the OE present participle to render the Latin pre-positive present participle is statistically different between Matthew 1-13.17 and 13.17 – end. This analysis puts that result in some context: the second portion of Matthew only renders two such participles, and in close proximity. Even so, this analysis also demonstrates that the translators of the OE Matthew generally did not prefer to render Latin pre-positive nominative present participles with OE participles, but still do so. This stands in contrast with both Ælfric and the anonymous translator of the Old English Genesis, who do not use the OE present participle to render these structures.
In contrast with the rendering of pre-positive nominative participles in the OE Matthew, the OE Mark does not demonstrate a statistically significant difference in the rendering of pre-positive nominative present participles. As such, the incidents are more evenly distributed through the OE Mark. Of the 29 pre-positive nominative participles, the OE Mark maintains the position of five at 1.31, 1.35, 6.12, 6.32, and 6.55:

1.31 et **accedens** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) elevavit eam adprehensa manu eius et continuo
dimisit eam febris et ministrabat eis
(DR) And coming to her, he lifted her up, taking her by the hand; and immediately the
fever left her, and she ministered unto them.
(OE) & **genealæcende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) he hi up ahof hyre handa gegripenre, &
hraedlice se fefor hi forlet, & heo þenode him.

1.35 Et diluculo valde **surgens** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) egressus abiit in desertum locum
ibique orabat
(DR) And rising very early, going out, he went into a desert place: and there he prayed.
(OE) And swiðe ær **arisende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) he ferde on weste stowe & hine
þar gebæd.

6.12 Et **excutentes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) praedicabant ut paenitentiam agerent:
(DR) And going forth they preached that men should do penance:
(OE) And **utgangende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hi bodedon þæt hi dædbote dydon.

6.32 Et **ascendentes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) in navi abierunt in desertum locum seorsum
(DR) And going up into a ship, they went into a desert place apart.
(OE) & on scype **stigende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), hi foron onsundran on weste stowe.

6.55 et **percurrentes** (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) universam regionem illam coeperunt in grabattis
eos qui se male habebant circumferre ubi audiebant eum esse
(DR) And running through that whole country, they began to carry about in beds those
that were sick, where they heard he was.
(OE) And eall þæt rice **befarende** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hi on sæcingum bæron þa
untruman, þær hi hine gehyrdon.

However, the OE tends to shift the position of the pre-positive present participle, even
when the structure of a verse is relatively simple. In Mark 1.26, 3.6, 11.22 and 14.48, a clearly
inflected Latin nominative subject is pre-modified by the participle, but the translation shifts this
structure to the post-positive:

1.26 Et discerpens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) eum spiritus immundus et exclamans (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) voce magna exivit ab eo
(DR) And the unclean spirit tearing him, and crying out with a loud voice, went out of
him.
(OE) & se unclæna gast hine slitende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) & mycelre stefne
clypiende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) him of eode.

3.6 Exeuntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) autem statim Pharisaei cum Herodianis consilium
faciebant adversus eum quomodo eum perderent
(DR) And the Pharisees going out, immediately made a consultation with the Herodians
against him, how they might destroy him.
(OE) Þa Pharisei mid Herodianiscum utgangende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)
þeahtedon ongen hine, hu hi hine fordon mihton.

11.22 Et respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesu ait illis abete fidem Dei.
(DR) And Jesus answering, saith to them: Have the faith of God.
(OE) Ða cwæð se Hælend him andswarigende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), habbað
Godes truwan (faith).

14.48 Et respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesu ait illis tamquam ad latronem existis cum
gladiis et lignis comprehendere me
(DR) And Jesus answering, said to them: Have you come out as if to a robber, with
swords and staves to apprehend me?
(OE) Þa cwæð se Hælend him andswariende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), swa swa to
anum sceæðan ge ferdon mid swurdon & treowum me gefon.

In the remaining 20 instances in which the OE Mark shifts the position from pre- to post-
positive, the modified subjects are all inflected on subsequent verbs. The translation responds to
this structure by adding a subject, which is generally necessary in Old English, since the
translator cannot rely so easily on inflected subjects. However, the translation then places the OE
present participle in post-position. A very representative and interesting example of this occurs at
4.12, where the verse parallels Matthew 13.13-14. However, whereas the OE Matthew preserves
the pre-position of the participles “videntes” and “audientes”, the OE Mark shifts them into post-
position after the expressed subject:
The other examples of this kind of position shift occur at 3.5, 3.8, 3.34, 5.7, 7.33, 7.34, 8.12, 8.13, 9.14, 9.25 (2), 10.16, 10.23, 11.24, 13.5, 14.22, 14.28, and 15.39. Generally, the larger contexts of such passages rely on pronominal subjects conveyed by the inflection of the verb. The translation appears not to attach the participial phrase to a potential earlier noun subject, but rather to pursue a preference. For example, in the story of the man with the withered hand in the beginning of Mark chapter 3, the actual nouns “Dominus” and “Filius”, denoting Jesus, appear in 2.28. The Latin then relies on various pronouns and verb-inflected pronominal subjects to communicate what Jesus is doing. By the time Mark 3.5 appears, the participle “circumspiciens” is in parallel with the passive participle “contristatus” and easily most closely associated with the pronominal subject of “dicit”, which is “he” or “Jesus”. However, the OE Mark places the pronominal subject “hi” before the participle:

3.5 et circumspiciens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) eos cum ira contristatus super caecitatem cordis eorum dicit homini extende manum tuam
(DR) And looking round about on them with anger, being grieved for the blindness of their hearts, he saith to the man: Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth: and his hand was restored unto him.
(OE) & hi besceawiende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) mid yrre ofer hyra heortan blindnesse geunret (unrightness) , cwæð to ðam men. Aþene þine hand;

In 3.8, the Latin does present a syntactic problem that the translation’s use of post-position might be an attempt to resolve. As the Pharisees plot to destroy Jesus, he departs and many people follow him. The Latin uses both plurals and a singular noun to refer to these people. The text reads, “et qui circa Tyrum et Sidonem multitudi magna audientes quae faciebat venerunt ad
eum” (and those who were around Tyre and Sidon – a great multitude – hearing what things he was doing, came to him). The Latin noun phrase “multitudo magna” is singular, but it is an appositive for the subject of “venerunt”, which is “qui” (they/those who). The translator responds by re-arranging the Old English so that “multitudo magna” becomes the subject “mycel menegeo” (a great multitude). Still, the translation shifts the position of the participle after this subject:

3.8 et ab Jerosolymis et ab Idumaea et trans Jordanem et qui circa Tyrum et Sidonem multitudo magna audientes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) quae faciebat venerunt ad eum (DR) And from Jerusalem, and from Idumea, and from beyond the Jordan. And they about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing the things which he did, came to him. (OE) & Hierusalem, & fram Iudea & begeondan Iordane, & to him com mycel menegeo ymbe Tirum & Sidone gehyrende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) þa ðing þe he worhte.

The OE Mark tends to engage in such arrangement with pre-positive nominatives where the Latin relies somewhat on verb-inflected subjects. To give one more example, Mark 5.2-7 tells the story of a man “in spiritu immundo” in 5.2. When the man is the subject of the verb “dixit” in 5.7, the OE Mark attaches the pre-positive nominative in 5.7 as a post-positive to the inserted pronoun “he” in 5.6:

5.6 videns (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) autem Iesum a lange cucurrit et adoravit eum (DR) And seeing Jesus afar off, he ran and adored him. (OE) Soðlice ða he þone Hælend feorran geseah (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom), he arn & hine gebæd.

5.7 et clamans (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) voce magna dicit quid mihi et tibi Iesu Fili Dei summi? adjuro te per Deum, ne me torqueas (DR) And crying with a loud voice, he said: What have I to do with thee, Jesus the Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God that thou torment me not. (OE) & mycelre stemne hrymende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) & þus cwæð, eala mæra Hælend Godes sunu, hwæt is me & þe; Ic halsige þe ðurh God þæt ðu me ne þreage.
Those remaining examples of position shift essentially follow this pattern. The OE Mark is more likely to use a post-positioned nominative OE participle to render a pre-positioned Latin participle when the participial phrase modifies a subject that is conveyed by the inflection of a verb.

**Pre-positive nominative present participles in the OE Luke**

The rendering of pre-positive nominative present participles in the OE Luke is statistically similar to the overall rate of rendering the present participle, but only barely so with a p-value of 0.005774. Across the point of difference in Luke suggested at 8.27, the test of pre-positive nominative participles produces a p-value of 0.1456, safely above the threshold of 0.005. As a result, the pre-positive nominative does not present statistical difference across the break suggested by the sliding proportion test. The OE Luke renders 22 of 111 (19.8%) pre-positive nominative participles with OE participles, of which the translation preserves the position of two at 3.18 and 24.12:

3.18 multa quidem et alia **exhortans (LPrt) (Pre-Nom)** evangelizabat populum (DR) And many other things exhorting, did he preach to the people. (OE) Manega oðre þing **bodigende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)** he ðæt folc lærde.

24.12 Petrus autem **surgens (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** cucurrit ad monumentum et **procumbens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom)** videt linteamina sola posita et abiit secum **mirans (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** quod factum fuerat (DR) But Peter rising up, ran to the sepulchre, and stooping down, he saw the linen cloths laid by themselves; and went away wondering in himself at that which was come to pass. (OE) Þa **aras (non) (V) (non Post-Nom)** Petrus & arn to þære byrgyne, & **alutende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)** he geseah þa linwæda sylfe alede, & he ferde **wundrigende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)** þæs þar geworden wæs.

However, the tendency of the OE Luke translation is to shift the position of the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle, even when clearly nominative nouns are present as

---

50 Certainly, a detailed discussion of every single example listed above could be informative, but for the purposes of some needed brevity, I use 3.5, 3.8, and 5.7 as representative examples.
subjects. In six cases in 4.12, 5.5, 7.40, 10.30, 17.17, and 23.46, the translation shifts the present participle into post-position after a clearly expressed noun subject:

4.12 *et respondens (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* Iesus ait illi dictum est non temptabis Dominum Deum tuum

(DR) And Jesus answering, said to him: It is said: Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

(OE) Ða cwæð se hælend him *andswariende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)*, Hyt is gecweden, ne costa þu Drihten þinne god.

5.5 *et respondens (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* Simon dixit illi praeeptor per totam noctem laborantes (LPr) (Pre-Nom) nihil cepimus

(DR) And Simon answering said to him: Master, we have labored all the night, and have taken nothing: but at thy word I will let down the net.

(OE) Ða cwæþ Simon him *andswariende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)*, Eala bebeodend ealle niht swincende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) we naht ne gefengon;

7.40 *et respondens (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* Iesus dixit ad illum Simon habeo tibi aliquid dicere at ille ait magister dic.

(DR) And Jesus answering, said to him: Simon, I have somewhat to say to thee. But he said: Master, say it.

(OE) Ða cwæð se hælend him *andswariende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)*, Symon ic hæbbe þe to secgenne sum ðing; þa cwæð he, lareow, sege þænne.

10.30 *susciptiens (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* autem Iesu dixit homo quidam descendebat ab Jerusalem in Jericho et incidit in latrones qui etiam despoliaverunt eum et plagis inpositis abierunt semivivo relieto.

(DR) And Jesus answering, said: A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among robbers, who also stripped him, and having wounded him went away, leaving him half dead.

(OE) Ða cwæþ se Hælend hine *upbeseonde (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)*, Sum man ferde fram Hierusalem to Hiericho & becom on þa sceadan, þa hine bereafodon & tintregodon hine, & forleton hine samcucene.

17.17 *respondens (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* autem Iesu dixit nonne decem mundati sunt? et novem ubi sunt?

(DR) And Jesus answering, said, Were not ten made clean? and where are the nine?

(OE) Þa cwæþ se Hælend him *andswariende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)*, Hu ne synt tyn geclænsude; hwær synt þa nigone?

23.46 *Et clamans (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* voce magna Iesus ait pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum et haec *dicens (LPr) (Pre-Nom)* expiravit.

(DR) And Jesus crying out with a loud voice, said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit. And saying this, he gave up the ghost.
These renderings suggest that the OE Luke, like the OE Mark, tends to avoid placing an OE present participle in pre-position, even when the Latin explicitly does so. At 6.17, however, the difference in the translation may result from more than avoidance, but perhaps error. The translation shifts the pre-positive nominative into an OE dative absolute phrase, which appears to mis-construe the original Latin. The Latin explains that Jesus, “descendens cum illis stetit in loco campestri” (descending with those ones, stood in a spot on the plain). Jesus conducts the action of “going” in the participle “descendens”; however, the OE Luke changes the arrangement so that those with Jesus are the ones going with Jesus: “And mid him farendum he stod on feldlice stowe” (and with those going, he stood on the rural spot):

6.17 Et descendens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) cum illis stetit in loco campestri et turba discipulorum eiusmod et multitudo copiosae plebis ab omni Iudaea et Jerusalem et maritima Tyri et Sidonis
   (DR) And coming down with them, he stood in a plain place, and the company of his disciples, and a very great multitude of people from all Judea and Jerusalem, and the sea coast both of Tyre and Sidon,
   (OE) And mid him farendum (Func) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) he stod on feldlice stowe, & mycel wered his leorningcnihta, & mycel menegeo fram ealra Iudea & fram Ierusalem, & ofer muþan & sægemæro Tiri & Sidonis,

The change from the Latin verb “descendere”, which clearly denotes downward motion, to the OE verb “faran”, which denotes only motion, is notable but not the difference of interest here. The translation changes the agency of the action from Jesus to his companions, which is indeed a minor difference, but more importantly the translation alters the syntax so that a pre-positive Latin present participle becomes an OE post-positive dative participle. In the remaining cases, the OE Luke also resembles the OE Mark in its tendency to render passages that rely heavily on verb-inflected subjects by adding pronominal subjects and then post-positioning the OE present participle. This occurs in 4.39, 5.3 (but the translation preserves the position of the second
participle), 8.10, 8.16, 8.28, 12.37, 13.2, 14.5, and 22.65. Of particular interest is the rendering of Luke 8.10, which parallels Matthew 13.13-14 and Mark 4.12. The OE Matthew preserves the pre-position of this formulaic phrasing, but like the OE Mark, the OE Luke shifts the position to post-position:

8.10 quibus ipse dixit vobis datum est nosse mysterium regni Dei, Ceteris autem in parabolis ut videntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non videant et audientes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non intelligant

(DR) To whom he said: To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but to the rest in parables, that seeing they may not see, and hearing may not understand. (OE) Þa cwæð he, eow is geseald þæt ge witun Godes rices geryne & oðrum on bigspellum, þæt hi gesende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) ne geseon, & gehyrende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) ne ongyton.

This rendering not only contrasts to the OE Matthew, but it also reflects a strong tendency in the OE Luke to shift pre-positive nominative participles. One representative example occurs in 4.39, where the participle would be difficult to link to an earlier subject, and therefore make the participle post-positive. In 4.39, the subject of “imperavit” (he ordered) is Jesus, a name that appears earlier in 4.38. However, the subject “socrus” follows in the next clause in 4.38; if “stans” in 4.39 were post-positive, it could modify “socrus”, and not Jesus, who obviously is the one with the power to order a fever to depart. Nonetheless, the OE Luke places the inserted pronoun subject “he” and then post-positions the present participle:

4.38 Surgens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) autem Iesu de synagogae introivit in domum Simonis socrus autem Simonis tenebatur magnis febris et rogaverunt illum pro ea

(DR) And Jesus rising up out of the synagogue, went into Simon’ s house. And Simon’ s wife’ s mother was taken with a great fever, and they besought him for her. (OE) Soþlice he aras (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) of heora gesamnunge & ferde on Simones hus. Ða wæs Simones sweger geswenced on mycelum feferum, & hig hyne for hyre bædon.

4.39 et stans (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) super illam imperavit febri et dimisit illum et continuo surgens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) ministrabat illis

(DR) And standing over her, he commanded the fever, and it left her. And immediately rising, she ministered to them.
Although the structure of the Latin is rather clear in the context of 4.38, the OE Luke’s approach to the Latin pre-positive nominative participle is to shift its position.

Another representative example of this practice occurs at 13.2, in which Jesus responds to an announcement from the Galileans. The subject of the first verb is clearly Jesus, who is responding, but a noun form of Jesus has not appeared later than 12.42, where Jesus is identified as “Dominus”. The text could potentially perceive “respondens” as a post-positive modifier some 19 verses later, although this is a terribly long distance; still, the text post-positions the participle after the pronoun subject “he” in order to effect this approach to the pre-positive nominative participle:

13.2 et respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) dixit illis putatis quod hi Galilaei prae omnibus Galilaeis peccatores fuerint quia talia passi sunt
   (DR) And he answering, said to them: Think you that these Galileans were sinners above all the men of Galilee, because they suffered such things?
   (OE) Þa cwæð he him andswarigende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), wenege wæron þa Galileiscan synfulle toforan eallum Galileiscum, forþam þe hig swylc þoledon?

A very similar sort of rendering appears with “respondens” again in 14.5. The pattern that begins to emerge from this qualitative analysis is that the OE Mark and Luke, neither of which present statistically significant intra-textual differences in the rate of using the OE present participle to render Latin pre-positive nominatives, tend to post-position participles out of some kind of preference or approach rather than a necessity. However, the OE Matthew engages in this practice less often. The sample sizes are too small for proportion tests to be effective, but these close examinations do suggest a difference here, a difference that generally agrees with this study’s findings that the OE Mark and Luke share features that differ from the OE Matthew.
Pre-positive nominative present participles in the OE John

As reported in Section 2.4g, the rendering of the pre-positive nominative present participle in John is statistically similar to the overall rate of rendering Latin present participles, with a p-value of 0.1915. However, certain limitations arise that deserve to be put in context. First is that the Latin John only contains 16 pre-positive nominative present participles, of which only 1 is rendered with an OE present participle. This small sample size does not entirely nullify the significance of the category, but it does limit the extent to which this category can reflect on the practice of translation. Second is that it reflects a relative dearth in the use of the Latin present participle in the Latin version, a fact which may be of some interest to scholars interested in the authorship of the Latin version.

The limited number of participles is also relevant to the finding in the quantitative study that the rendering of the pre-positive nominative shows statistical similarity across the break in John proposed around John 7.4, with a p-value of 0.4083, even though the overall rate of translating the Latin participle does show statistical evidence of difference. The one OE-participial rendering of the pre-positive nominative participle in John occurs at 6.58, where the OE John rather neatly preserves the structure of the Latin:

6.58 sicut misit me vivens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Pater et ego vivo propter Patrem et qui manducat me, et ipse vivet propter me
(DR) As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.
(OE) Swa swa lybbende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) Fæder me sende & ic lybbe þurh Fæder & se ðe me ytt he leofaþ þurh me.

The question remains why this is the only incidence of an OE-participial rendering. In one case, it is arguable that the translator may have perceived either a difficult passage, or at least difficult reading, and made changes to clarify understanding. The Latin presents the pre-positive
nominative present participle “respiciens” that includes its own direct object “Iesum” and that object’s accusative present participle “ambulantem”, which the translation preserves:

1.36 et respiciens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesum ambulantem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) dicit ecce agnus Dei
(DR) And beholding Jesus walking, he saith: Behold the Lamb of God.
(OE) & he cwæð þa he geseah (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) þæne Hælend gangende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc), her is Godes lamb.

In this case, the translation re-organizes the OE version so that the subject “he” executes the verb “geseah” clearly, and then the direct object “þæne Hælend” can be post-modified clearly by its present participle “gangende”.

However, the other fourteen cases of OE non-participial renderings either fall into the category of text that relies on verb-inflected subjects or even clear syntax with explicit noun subjects. Examples of those participles in passages relying on verb-inflected subjects occur at 8.2, 8.8, 8.9, 9.38, 12.6, 13.3, 19.17, and 20.31. John 8.2 is a representative example of a rendering that uses a verb where the text relies on verb-inflected subjects. The Latin pre-positive present participle “sedens” pre-modifies “he”, Jesus, the verbally inflected subject of “docebat”.

The translation uses a subject and verb to render this phrasing unambiguously:

8.2 et diluculo iterum venit in templum et omnis populus venit ad eum et sedens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) docebat eos
(DR) And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came to him, and sitting down he taught them.
(OE) & com eft on dægred to þam temple & eall þæt folc com to him & he sæt (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) & lærde hig.

A very similar structure and rendering occur in 8.8, where the pre-positive participle modifies the subject conveyed by the verbal inflection:

8.8 et iterum se inclinans (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) scribebat in terra.
(DR) And again stooping down, he wrote on the ground.
(OE) & he abeah (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) eft & wrat on þære eorþan.
Once again, the translation opts for a subject and verb in a similar situation in 9.38, where the verb “adoravit” supplies the subject with a verbal inflection, but the OE John chooses a verb rather than a participle:

9.38 at ille ait credo Domine et procidens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) adoravit eum (DR) And he said: I believe, Lord. And falling down, he adored him.
(OE) Da cwæþ he, Drihten ic gelyfe. & he feoll nyþer (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) & geeaðmedde hyne.

In such situations where the inflections of verbs supply the necessary subjects as understood pronouns, the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke at least sometimes use the OE present participle to render Latin pre-positive nominative present participles; however, the OE John generally does not.

Even where the subject of a verb is a clearly expressed noun, the OE John opts for the finite verb when the other three translations will use the OE participle some of the time. In John 6.62, 8.10, 9.1, 11.4, 13.1, and 19.28, the subject modified by the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle is a clearly given and declined Latin nominative noun. Whereas the other three gospels regularly render these with OE present participles, although subject to more post-positioning in the OE Mark and OE Luke, the OE John opts for verbs. All six cases use the clearly expressed and declined “Iesu” as the subsequent subject of a verb and as the subject pre-modified by the pre-positive participle. John 8.10 is a representative example, in which the participial phrase “Erigens autem se” (and straightening himself) premodifies the subject “Iesu” in the main clause, “Iesu dixit ei” (Jesus said to her):

8.10 erigens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) autem se Iesu dixit ei mulier ubi sunt qui te accusabant⁵¹? nemo te condemnavit?
(DR) Then Jesus lifting up himself, said to her: Woman, where are they that accused thee? Hath no man condemned thee?

⁵¹ The Stuttgart edition does not include “qui te accusabant” in the text, but notes that several MSS include this clause. I have kept it because the Douay-Rheims renders it, and it does not affect the study of participles.
(OE) Se Hælend aras (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) upp & cwæð to hyre, wif, hwær synd þa ðe þe wregdon; Ne fordemde þe nan man?

The contrast between the OE John’s response to the pre-positive nominative present participle and the responses of the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke suggests that there is a significant difference between the practices of rendering the pre-positive nominative in each text. Although the number of such participles is small in John, and although the other three also use verbs to render such structures a majority of the time, the general lack of willingness in the OE John to use the OE present participle in these situations is conspicuous.

As a result, this close analysis of the pre-positive nominative present participle suggests some conclusions that, while more subjective than the results of the proportion test, inform subtle differences in the translation of the Old English Gospels. The OE Matthew appears more likely to preserve the position and function of a pre-positive participle, although far less likely to preserve the Latin present participle itself than are the OE Mark or Luke, which in turn are more likely to shift the position of the participle. The OE Matthew and the OE John use the OE present participle to render the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle at very similar rates, although the OE John does not use the participle in structures where the Matthew does. However, the very large difference in sample sizes between the OE Matthew and the OE John (145 in Matthew but 16 in John) may mitigate this argument of difference: if the Latin John had used more present participles, perhaps the translator may have rendered them in ways similar to those used in the OE Matthew.

2.5b. The post-positive nominative participle

The Latin post-positive present participle is more numerous in the Old English Gospels than is its pre-positive counterpart. Matthew contains 222, of which 54 (24.3%) are rendered
with OE present participles. Mark renders 29 of 125 (23.2%) with OE participles, Luke 63 of 253 (24.9%), and John 11 of 66 (16.7%). As is immediately evident, the translations of the three synoptic gospels Matthew, Mark, and Luke share very similar rates of preserving the post-positive present participle, while the rendering of the pre-positive participle produces much more variety: 11 of 145 (7.6%) are rendered with OE present participles in the OE Matthew, 29 of 111 (26.1%) in Mark, 22 of 111 (19.8%) in Luke, and 1 of 16 (6.3%) in John. This difference again adds support for the hypothesis that the position of a nominative participle can influence the translator’s rendering of the participle, and may help discern shifts in the pattern of authorship. These rates also add support for the possibility that Old English perceptions of the pre-positive nominative participle may be less consistent among translators. Ælfric does not render the pre-positive nominative participle with an OE participle at all, whereas the Old English translations all use the pre-positive nominative participle to varying degrees. However, Ælfric does render the post-positive participle about 30% of the time, a rate not far from the rates of the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke.52 Especially when the numbers of post-positive nominative participles are as large as they are in these texts, these differences certainly invite consideration. This study found that the rendering of present participles of the Latin verb “dicere” was particularly illuminating of difference among the four OE Gospels. Particularly, the OE Matthew and John render the present participle of “dicere” with an OE participle significantly more than the OE Mark and Luke do, but the OE Matthew demonstrates a significant reduction in this practice around chapter 14.

The large body of post-positive participles would benefit from a standalone, dedicated study that exceeds the scope of the study here, and section 2.5j will address how shifts in

52 See Section 1.5a in the Genesis study for a further discussion of the rendering of the Latin pre- and post-positive nominative present participle in Genesis.
position in the Old English Gospels further distinguish different practices of translation with the post-positive nominative participle. Here, this study has made some relevant observations that may help explain why the OE John differs from the Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The eleven OE participles used to render Latin post-positive nominative participles in the OE John occur at 1.15, 1.32, 5.35 (2), 6.6, 8.6, 8.7, 9.7, 11.28, 11.31, and 12.15. Five of them involve speech verbs, one with “interrogare” at 8.7, and four with “dicere” at 1.15, 1.32, 11.28 and 11.31:

1.15 Ioannes testimonium perhibet de ipso et clamat **dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** hic erat quem dixi vobis qui post me venturus est ante me factus est quia prior me erat

(DR) John beareth witness of him, and crieth out, saying: This was he of whom I spoke: He that shall come after me, is preferred before me: because he was before me.

(OE) Iohannes cyþ gewitnesse be him & clypað þus **cweðende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)**, þes wæs þe ic sæde, se ðe to cumenne is æfter me wæs geworden beforan me forðam he wæs ær þonne ic.

1.32 Et testimonium perhibuit Ioannes **dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** quia vidi Spiritum

descendentem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) quasi columbam de caelo et mansit super eum

(DR) And John gave testimony, saying: I saw the Spirit coming down, as a dove from heaven, and he remained upon him.

(OE) And Iohannes cyþde gewitnesse **cweðende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)** þæt ic geseah

yðercumendne (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) gast of heofenum swa swa culfran & wunode ofer hine.

8.7 cum autem perseverarent **interrogantes (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** eum erexit se et dixit eis qui sine peccato est vestrum, primus in illam lapidem mittat.

(DR) When therefore they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said to them: He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

(OE) Þa hig þurhwunedon hine **axsiende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)** þa aras he upp & cwæð to him, loca, hwylc eower si synleas wurpe ærest stan on hi.

11.28 et cum haec dixisset abiit et vocavit Mariam sororem suam silentio **dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** magister adest, et vocat te

(DR) And when she had said these things, she went, and called her sister Mary secretly, saying: The master is come, and calleth for thee.

(OE) & þa he ðas þing sæde heo eode & clypode diglice Marian hyre swustor þus **cweþende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)**, her is ure lareow & clypað þe.

11.31 Iudaei igitur qui erant cum ea in domo et consolabantur eam cum vidissent Mariam quia cito surrexit et exiit secuti sunt eam **dicentes (LPrt) (Post-Nom)** quia vadit ad monumentum ut ploret ibi
(DR) The Jews therefore, who were with her in the house, and comforted her, when they saw Mary that she rose up speedily and went out, followed her, saying: She goeth to the grave to weep there.

(OE) Þa Iudeas þe wæron mid hyre on huse & hi frefrodon þa hig gesawon þæt Maria aras & mid ofste uteodon hig fyligdon hyre ðus cwejende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom), heo gað to his byrgenne þæt heo wepe þara.

The OE John renders seventeen “dicen-” participles without OE participles at 1.26, 4.31, 4.51, 6.53, 7.15, 7.28, 7.37, 8.12, 9.19, 11.3, 12.21, 12.23, 18.22, 18.40, 19.6, 19.12, and 19.24. Of the 21 such pre-positive participles, the OE John renders 19% with an OE participle. The remaining six OE participles used to translate Latin post-positive nominatives occur at 6.6 and 8.6 (temptans, temptantes), 5.35 (ardens, lucens), 9.7 (videns), and 12.15 (sedens):

5.35 ille erat lucerna ardens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) et lucens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) vos autem voluistis exsultare ad horam in luce eius

(DR) He was a burning and a shining light: and you were willing for a time to rejoice in his light.

(UE) He wæs byrnende (Func (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)) leochtæt & lyhtende (Func) (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom). Ge woldon sume hwile gebliessian on his leohte.

6.6 hoc autem dicebat temptans (LPrt) (Post-Nom) eum ipse enim sciebat quid esset facturus

(DR) And this he said to try him; for he himself knew what he would do.

(UE) Þæt he cwæþ his fandigende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom). He wiste hwæt he don wolde.

8.6 haec autem dicebant temptantes (LPrt) (Post-Nom) eum ut possent accusare eum Iesus autem inclinans (LPrt) (Post-Nom) se deorsum digito scribebat in terra

(DR) And this they said tempting him, that they might accuse him. But Jesus bowing himself down, wrote with his finger on the ground.

(UE) Ðis hig cwædon his fandigende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom) þæt hig hine wrehton. Se Hælend abeah (non) (V) (non Post-Nom) nyþer & wrat mid his fingre on þære eorþan.

9.7 et dixit ei vade lava in natatoria Siloae quod interpretatur Missus abiit ergo et lavit et venit videns (LPrt) (Post-Nom)

(DR) And said to him: Go, wash in the pool of Siloe, which is interpreted, Sent. He went therefore, and washed, and he came seeing.

(UE) & cwæð to him, ga & þweah þe on Syloes mere. He for & þwoh hine & com gesconde (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom).

12.15 noli timere filia Sion ecce rex tuus venit sedens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) super pullum asinae
(DR) Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy king cometh, sitting on an ass' s colt.
(OE) ne ondræd þu Siones dohtor, nu þin cing cymþ uppan assan folan sittende (OEPrt)
(OE Post-Nom).

Although the study of post-positive nominative participles affords a large sample size, a close analysis of the use of these participles is complicated by the wide variety of different Latin verbs cast as present participles. These many different verbs and their diverse semantic fields and illocutionary force (such as transitive, intransitive, and stative) resist any easily detected patterns. To make some sense of these participles, this study sorted every Latin post-positive nominative participle rendered with an OE participle into a table by text and such semantic fields that appeared to describe the participles found therein:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Field</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 2.15: A complete inventory of all Latin post-positive nominative present participles rendered with OE present participles, segregated by text and by semantic field.

Many of these participles are only rendered with OE participles once in a text, and most others are rendered rarely with OE participles. As a result, gleaning patterns of translation from the treatment of most of these individual participles would be difficult. However, one phenomenon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a</td>
<td>Stare: 6.5, 1.11</td>
<td>Febricitare: 1.30</td>
<td>Stare: 1.11, Sedere: 12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shining</td>
<td>Habere: 15.30</td>
<td>Tenere: 7.3</td>
<td>Habere: 4.33, 7.8, Lucere: 5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>Illudere: 15.31</td>
<td>Gaudere: 15.5</td>
<td>Gaudere: 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions</td>
<td>Moerere: 10.22</td>
<td>Incipere: 23.5</td>
<td>Incipere: 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spumare: 9.19</td>
<td>Mendicare: 18.35</td>
<td>Mendicare: 18.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Movement       | 20.12             | 20.47             | 20.47            |
| Quaerere: 12.43, 12.46, 12.47, Sanare: 4.23, Temptare: 19.3 | 4.40 | 14.7 | 22.30 |
from this analysis presents itself as deserving of additional attention: the rendering of the present participle of Latin “dicere”, which appears to vary over the four translations.

The Latin present participle of the verb “dicere” is fairly common in the Old English Gospels, and so its rendering may be a helpful marker of the approach to translating the Latin present participle. Matthew contains 118 present participles of “dicere”, Mark 45, Luke 103, and John 21. However, the table above shows that the OE Matthew generally translates the present participle of “dicere” far more often than do either the OE Mark or Luke. When it comes to translating the post-positive nominative present participle, the results demonstrate some dramatic variation. The OE Matthew renders 20 of 104 (19.2%) post-positive nominative present participles$^{54}$ of “dicere” with OE present participles. However, 15 of these are found before chapter 14, up to which point there are only 31 such Latin present participles, a rate of 48.4%. By contrast, after the start of chapter 14, the OE Matthew simply stops rendering the Latin post-positive nominative of “dicere” with an OE participle. Of 73 post-positive nominative Latin participles of “dicere” after the start of chapter 14, only 5 (6.8%) of them are rendered with OE present participles, but all of these occur within chapters 26 and 27.

Although these rates are rather dramatically different, and although this part of the study is devoted to qualitative discussion, these numbers are large enough for a proportion test, which would add further weight to the impression that there is a significant difference in the practice of rendering post-positive nominative participles of “dicere”. Matthew chapters 1-13 render 15 of 31 such participles with OE participles, while chapters 14-28 render only 5 of 73 such participles.

---

with OE participles. The proportion test shows that there is a very statistically significant
difference between the rendering of post-positive nominative “\textit{dicens/dicentes}” in chapters 1-13
vs. chapters 14-28 (the end):

\begin{verbatim}
prop.test(x=c(15,5), n=c(31,73), conf.level = 0.99)
\end{verbatim}

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction

data: c(15, 5) out of c(31, 73)
X-squared = 21.5708, df = 1, p-value = 3.41e-06
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
0.1489853 0.6817703
sample estimates:
  prop 1  prop 2
0.48387097 0.06849315

The p-value of this test reveals that there is a 0.000341 % chance that these two proportions are
the same. This makes a strong case that the rendering of post-positive nominative
“\textit{dicens/dicentes}” reveals a significant break in the practice of translation between chapters 13
and 14.

This outcome has significant implications for other findings in this study, and on those of
Roy Liuzza. First, this dramatic disappearance of the OE present participle to render post-
positive nominative “\textit{dicens/dicentes}” coincides almost exactly with the findings of the sliding
proportion test in Section 2.4e, which indicates that there is a statistically significant break in the
overall rate of rendering Latin participles with OE participles between chapters 13 and 14.
Second, this finding further confirms Roy Liuzza’s argument that the translation of present
participles in chapters 8-13 differs from the translation of chapters 14-18. Third, as the
qualitative analysis will explain further, this finding also coincides with variations in the
rendering of the Latin “phariseus” in its various inflections with the OE\(^{55}\). As the later discussion shows, the OE changes its approach to rendering this Latin noun: up to Matthew 12.38, the OE Matthew uses the OE noun “sundorhalga” to render Latin “phariseus”. The Latin noun “phariseus” does not appear again until chapter 15, at which point the OE Matthew uses the Latin borrowing “farisc-” and later “pharisc-” to render the OE noun. The Latin “phariseus” appears at 23.29, where it is translated with the OE noun “Pharisei”, after which the Latin noun does not appear again until Matthew 27.62. However, at this point, the OE Matthew once against renders it with the OE “sundorhalga”, a change that coincides with a short spate of rendering the Latin post-positive nominative participle of “dicere” with OE participles in a part of the text that otherwise simply does not do so at all\(^{56}\).

A comparison with the OE Mark reveals that the translation does not use the OE participle much at all to render the Latin post-positive nominative of “dicens/dicentes”. The OE Mark does so 3 of 42 times\(^{57}\) at 1.15, 3.11, and 9.24, a rate of only 7.1%, which is a clear contrast with chapters 1-13 of the OE Matthew. Despite ample opportunities to do so throughout the Latin Mark, the OE Mark very rarely uses the OE participle to render the post-positive nominative participle of “dicere”. The evenness of the distribution of the Latin participle but the rarity of the OE participle imply the possibility that this outcome could support earlier quantitative findings of statistical difference between the first of three portions of the OE Mark and the third portion, but there are not enough OE participles to make a convincing case here.

\(^{55}\) See section 2.5k entitled “Correlations with lexical shifts” for a detailed account of the rendering of Latin “phariseus” either with OE “sundorhalga” or borrowings from the Latin word.

\(^{56}\) As the discussion of the rendering of the Latin “phariseus” will also demonstrate, the spelling of the borrowed word itself also has further supportive implications for Liuza’s theory that a break in translation occurs around chapter 21.

\(^{57}\) Post-positive nominative present participles of “dicere” in the Latin Mark occur at 1.7, 1.15, 1.24, 1.25, 1.27, 2.12, 3.11, 5.12, 5.23, 5.35, 6.2, 6.25, 6.35, 7.37, 8.15, 8.16, 8.26, 8.27, 8.28, 8.33, 9.6, 9.10, 9.24, 9.37, 10.26, 10.35, 10.49, 11.9, 11.17, 11.31, 12.6, 12.18, 13.6, 14.39, 14.44, 14.57, 14.60, 14.68, 15.4, 15.29, 15.34, and 15.36.
An analysis of the rendering of such “dicere” participles in the OE Luke reveals an approach similar to that of the OE Mark. The OE Luke renders only 2 of 93 (2.2%) post-positive nominative present participles\textsuperscript{58} of “dicere” with OE participles. The two OE-participial renderings occur at 3.16 and 4.41, another clear contrast with the first 13 chapters of the OE Matthew. Like the OE Mark, the OE Luke translation hardly ever uses the OE participle to render the post-positive nominative participle of “dicere”. The Latin participle is evenly distributed throughout the text, but the two OE-participial translations are not numerous enough to be very helpful in assessing any shift in the practice of translation. Still, the two OE-participial renderings that do occur are located in the first portion of Luke, which does not contradict the findings in the quantitative analysis that the first portion of Luke uses the OE participle more than does the second portion.

The OE John’s rendering of the post-positive nominative participle of “dicere” presents results different from those of the OE Mark or Luke, but closer to those of the OE Matthew, although with far fewer samples. The OE John renders 4 of 21 “dicere” participles\textsuperscript{59} with OE participles at 1.15, 1.32, 11.28 and 11.31, a rate of 19% OE-participial renderings and almost identical to the rate of rendering in the OE Matthew, although the discussion above suggests that there is a split in the practice of translation between chapters 13 and 14 of Matthew. The small number of OE participles and their distribution do not easily lend much support to the quantitative result\textsuperscript{60} that a break in the overall translation occurs around John 7.4. However


\textsuperscript{60} Please refer back to the results of the sliding proportion tests in section 2.4e. to review these findings.
because the numbers of participles available in the four translations are large enough, some
follow-up proportion tests are possible to explore where the rendering of post-positive
nominative participles of “dicere” may show evidence of difference.

First, as far as this rendering is concerned, the OE Mark and Luke are statistically similar
to each other, with 3 of 42 OE renderings in Mark, and 2 of 93 in Luke:

```
prop.test(x=c(3, 2), n=c(42, 93), conf.level = 0.99)

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction
data:  c(3, 2) out of c(42, 93)
X-squared = 0.8644, df = 1, p-value = 0.3525
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
-0.07680704  0.17665343
sample estimates:
prop 1     prop 2
0.07142857 0.02150538
Warning message:
In prop.test(x = c(3, 2), n = c(42, 93), conf.level = 0.99) :
  Chi-squared approximation may be incorrect
```

Although the different sample sizes between Mark and Luke cause this warning message in R, I
believe we may cautiously accept the finding of similarity, since it falls so well above the
threshold of similarity of 0.025 (95% confidence interval). Second, even the OE Mark, which has
the higher rate of OE participial renderings of the two, is not statistically similar to the first 13
chapters of the OE Matthew:
prop.test(x=c(15,3), n=c(31,42), conf.level = 0.99)

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction

data:  c(15, 3) out of c(31, 42)
X-squared = 14.1868, df = 1, p-value = 0.0001655
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
0.1315660 0.6933188
sample estimates:
  prop 1  prop 2
0.48387097 0.07142857

The result of this test falls well below even the 0.005 threshold of a 99% confidence interval, demonstrating clear statistical difference. Third, the OE Mark (with the higher rate of OE-participial renderings) and the OE John are statistically similar with a p-value of 0.3211, and the OE Luke and John are similar with a p-value of 0.009568, a borderline result that falls between the thresholds of the 95% and 99% confidence intervals. The post-positive nominative participle of “dicere” does not reveal clear patterns of difference within the OE Mark, Luke, and John. Overall, however, this portion of the analysis of the post-positive present participle has revealed the first 13 chapters of the OE Matthew are significantly different from chapters 14-28, and from the OE Mark and Luke.

2.5c. The post-positive accusative participle

Whereas the preceding analyses of the nominative present participle reveals evidence of difference intertextually, this analysis of the accusative participle finds much less intertextual variation, but strong evidence of internal breaks in the practice of translation in the OE Matthew and the OE John. The Latin post-positive accusative present participle⁶¹ occurs less frequently in

---

⁶¹ The pre-positive accusative participle does occur in the Old English Gospels; however, it is so rare that it does not appear to be of much use at all in reflecting patterns of authorship. This study found none in the Latin Matthew, one
the four Old English Gospels than does the nominative present participle, particularly the post-positive nominative. However, the Old English Gospels generally preserve the accusative participle more often than they do the nominative participle:

![Figure 2.18](image.png)

**Figure 2.18**: Percentages of Latin present participles rendered with OE present participles in the Old English Gospels. These are sorted by text according to pre-positive nominative, post-positive nominative, and post-positive accusative participles.

The OE Matthew renders 31 of 52 (59.6%) such participles with OE present participles, Mark 28 of 38 (73.7%), Luke 20 of 27 (74%), and John 16 of 27 (59.3%). At the inter-textual level, the OE Matthew and John are nearly identical, and the OE Mark and Luke are nearly identical. The results of the quantitative analysis showed that the rendering of the post-positive accusative participle is not statistically different across the breaks in overall practice suggested by the sliding proportion test. However, the same tests showed that post-positive nominatives in the OE Matthew and Luke, and pre-positives in the OE Matthew did show statistical evidence of difference. Therefore, although the accusative participle does not present statistical evidence of difference, such a finding may not preclude the possibility that different translators worked on

---

62 The results of proportion tests comparing the renderings of nominative and accusative participles across the suggested overall breaks in practice are given in Section 2.4h.
63 The results of the sliding proportion test to determine overall breaks in the rate of rendering the Latin present participle with OE present participles are given in Section 2.4e.
the translations. Rather, it is possible that the translators who worked on the Old English Gospels had similar approaches to rendering the accusative participle. To examine this more closely, this study inventoried those Latin post-positive accusative participles rendered with OE participles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Field</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech</strong></td>
<td>Dicere: 8.17, 12.17, 27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogare: 2.46</td>
<td>Loqui: 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loqui: 15.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murmurare: 7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitive actions</strong></td>
<td>Facere: 24.46</td>
<td>Aspicere: 14.67</td>
<td>Arare: 17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mittere: 4.18</td>
<td>Comprimere: 5.31</td>
<td>Eijicere: 9.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reficere: 4.21</td>
<td>Ejicere: 9.37</td>
<td>Facere: 12.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mittere: 1.16</td>
<td>Pascere: 17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prohibere: 23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subvertere: 23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensing</strong></td>
<td>Videre: 15.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audire: 2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movement</strong></td>
<td>Ambulare: 15.31</td>
<td>Abire: 6.33</td>
<td>Cadere: 10.18</td>
<td>Ambulare: 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descendere: 3.16, 8.24</td>
<td>Ambulare: 6.49,</td>
<td>Oriri: 12.54</td>
<td>Ascendere: 1.51,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ascendere: 1.10, 4.8</td>
<td>Venire: 21.27</td>
<td>Descendere: 1.32,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praeterire: 15.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33, 1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintaining a position or state</strong></td>
<td>Febricitare: 8.14</td>
<td>Iacere: 7.30</td>
<td>Sedere: 2.46, 5.27, 22.56</td>
<td>Manere: 1.33, 5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iacere: 8.14, 9.2</td>
<td>Manere: 1.10</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>Sedere: 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedere: 9.9</td>
<td>Sedere: 2.14, 16.5</td>
<td>Stare: 5.2</td>
<td>Stare: 19.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stare: 20.6, 26.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vivere: 24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shining</strong></td>
<td>Habere: 4.24, 8.16</td>
<td>Habere: 9.16, 9.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intransitive actions</strong></td>
<td>Dormire: 26.40, 26.43, 26.64</td>
<td>Conquirere: 9.13, 12.28</td>
<td>Dormire: 22.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esurire: 25.37, 25.44</td>
<td>Crescere: 4.8</td>
<td>Supereffluere: 6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitire: 25.37, 25.44</td>
<td>Eijulare: 5.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tumultuare: 9.23</td>
<td>Flere: 5.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laborare: 6.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.16: A complete inventory of all Latin post-positive accusative present participles rendered with OE present participles, segregated by text and by semantic field.
Three interesting phenomena emerge from this inventory that deserve some discussion: rare OE participles in parallel Latin passages, the rendering of “dicere” participles in Matthew to confirm earlier observations about a break in Matthew, and the near-disappearance of the accusative OE participle in John to add support to a proposed break in John. First, some of the same rare participles occur in more than one gospel translation because they occur in parallel passages. The use of the accusative participle of “ejicere” in Mark 9.47 and Luke 9.49, in which Christ is casting out demons, is one example. OE-participial renderings of the Latin verb “dormire” in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in passages in which Christ finds the disciples sleeping, is another. These participles are not numerous enough to suggest a pattern of authorship, but they do demonstrate the potential for parallel constructions in possibly very formulaic phrases to have an effect on the translation. They may provide convincing support for shared authorship, but they may also suggest which phrases in the text were formulaic, or perhaps widely known, so that the translators felt comfortable preserving the present participles within them. Here, this argument is really only an observation, although my later discussion of substantives in section 2.5e will examine the renderings of parallel constructions in more detail.

Second, and perhaps far more interesting, is the way in which these translations handle the post-positive accusative present participle of “dicere.” The previous analysis of post-positive nominative participles found that the first 13 chapters of the OE Matthew use the OE present participle to render the Latin post-positive nominative participle of “dicere” 15 of 31 times, while this practice abruptly stops in chapter 14, despite 73 such Latin participles in chapters 14-28, only resuming with 5 such OE-participial renderings in chapters 26 and 27, where renderings of the Latin “phariseus” also undergo a similar reversion to a practice used before chapter 14. Various results given above and in the Genesis study have already indicated that translators
responded differently to Latin present participles according to the case and position of a participle. A similar pattern emerges with the rendering of accusative participles of “dicere” in Matthew. The OE Matthew only renders such accusative participles with OE participles in 8.17, 12.17, and 27.9, although 11 post-positive accusative participles of “dicere” occur at 1.22, 2.15, 2.17, and 3.3, which are all simply omitted; 8.17, 12.17, and 27.9, which are rendered with OE present participles; and 13.35 (verb), 21.4 (omitted), 21.15 (verb), and 27.35 (verb). These renderings suggest that the translation in chapters 1-13 of the OE Matthew is different from that of chapters 14-28. At first, the OE Matthew omits accusative “dicentem/dicentes”, but when it does render the participle, it uses a participle in 8.17 and 12.17. The sliding proportion test suggested a break in the overall rate of translating the Latin present participle with the OE present participle around Matthew 13.17; at 13.35, the OE Matthew begins to use non-participial renderings. The previous analysis of the post-positive nominative linked the return of the OE present participle to the return of OE “sundorhalga” to translate Latin “phariseus” in chapters 26 and 27; the OE participle returns also to render the accusative participle of “dicere” at 27.9. The renderings of accusative participles of “dicere”, though relatively few in number and of somewhat limited ability to reflect the pattern of translation, do generally agree with other quantitative and qualitative findings that a shift in practice appears to occur between chapters 13 and 14, further adding to support to Roy Liuzza’s suggestion of a break at this point.

A third phenomenon emerges in this analysis of accusative participles that sheds additional light on quantitative findings suggesting that the OE John undergoes a statistically

64 The Genesis study found, for example, that neither Ælfric nor the anonymous translator of Genesis rendered the Latin pre-positive nominative participle with an OE participle, yet Ælfric did use the OE participle to render the post-positive nominative. See the Genesis study, section 1.5a for those findings. Also, this section’s comparison of the rates of OE-participal renderings of pre- and post-positive nominative participles and of accusative participles shows that all four translations treat the three categories quite differently, especially in a comparison of nominative vs. accusative participles.

65 See section 2.4e for the results suggesting that a break in the practice of translating participles occurs around Matthew 13.17.
significant change in the rate of rendering the Latin accusative participle: the OE participle is used to translate all Latin accusative participles in chapter 1, but this style of rendering almost disappears entirely after John chapter 7. Section 2.4e reported that the sliding proportion test of a break between 500-word segments 9 and 10, the boundary of which occurs at John 7.4, produced a statistically significant p-value of 6.233e-06, or 6.233^{-6}, or a 0.0006233% chance of similarity. However, proportion tests of individual sub-categories of participles did not find evidence of difference. Tests of nominative participles showed a very solid likelihood of similarity: a 40.83% chance of similarity for pre-positive nominatives and a 33.07% chance for post-positive nominatives. However, the results for accusative participles were far less conclusive: a 0.5458% (0.005458 is just about the threshold of 0.005) chance of similarity, just inside the threshold of similarity with a 99% confidence interval, but outside the threshold for a more liberal 95% confidence interval. The boundary of that test was the arbitrary product of the 500-word sliding technique, which set the boundary at John 7.4 simply because the experiment was sliding the boundary along 500 words at a time. As a result, the 17 accusative participles in John 1-7.4 were counted in the first portion for comparison, and the 10 between 7.4 and the end were counted in the second portion. The resulting numbers were 14 OE-participial translations of 17 Latin accusative participles in the first portion, and 2 OE of 10 Latin in the second. The assignment of these portions was, however, based on the arbitrary sliding method.

The inventory of OE-participial renderings of Latin accusative participles, given above in this section, however, suggests a slight modification. The inventory shows that 15 (83.3% of the 18 Latin accusatives between chapters 1 and 7) of the OE John’s 16 OE participial renderings of Latin accusative participles occur between chapters 1 and 7, and only one (11.1% of a total of 9) thereafter, at 19.26. The OE John basically stops using the OE participle after chapter 7, with one
exception. What if the proportion test in section 2.4e had tested this slightly adjusted distribution, which seems appropriate since the boundary was only approximate, anyway?

```
prop.test(x=c(15,1), n=c(18,9), conf.level = 0.99)
```

2-sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction

data:  c(15, 1) out of c(18, 9)
X-squared = 10.1442, df = 1, p-value = **0.001448**
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
99 percent confidence interval:
0.2867439 1.0000000
sample estimates:
prop 1    prop 2
0.8333333 0.1111111

Warning message:
In prop.test(x = c(15, 1), n = c(18, 9), conf.level = 0.99) :
  Chi-squared approximation may be incorrect

The sample sizes here are a little small, so R returns a warning that the result may not be as accurate as it would be with larger sample sizes. Nonetheless, the test does indicate that such an adjustment would indeed show evidence of statistically significant difference in the rendering of accusative present participles of “dicere” after chapter 7, roughly where the sliding proportion test suggested the existence of a statistically significant break in the rate of translating the Latin present participle. Because this result is the product of relatively small samples, and because the p-value is not dramatically below the threshold of 0.005, it would not be appropriate to consider this evidence very convincing. However, I believe we may cautiously accept this result as supporting evidence that John may show a statistically significant break in the rate of rendering the Latin present participle around chapter 7 of John.

At the intertextual level, the four OE Gospels do render the Latin post-positive accusative present participle with OE present participle the majority of the time and with relatively high
uniformity, a situation that limits the utility of this feature to distinguish among gospel translations. However, the rendering of accusative participles of “dicere” in the OE Matthew suggests support for the hypothesis of a break in Matthew around chapter 14, and a potential resurgence around chapter 27 of the practice of translating participles before chapter 14, an assertion also supported later in section 2.5k. The sudden disappearance of the OE present participle in renderings of Latin accusative participles in the OE John reveals a shift in practice around chapter 7, a shift not previously noted in scholarship.

2.5d. The ablative-absolute participle

It may be tempting in such a study to focus on the largest categories of present participles such as the nominatives and accusatives, but a close analysis of the small categories of present participles also produces illuminating results about different practices of translation in the OE Gospels. Latin present participles in ablative-absolute constructions in Jerome’s version receive different approaches to translation in the OE Gospels. This analysis reveals that the OE Luke and Mark far more frequently use OE present participles to render Latin present participles in ablative absolutes, and that the OE Matthew and John share a similarly infrequent use of the OE present participle to render a Latin present participle in an ablative-absolute.

A variety of scholarship has already considered more how Old English translations render Latin ablative absolutes in the Old English Gospels, although none has focused in detail on the treatment of the present participle within these constructions. In their 2007 study, “Absolute Constructions in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels: A Case Study”, Laura Segura and Nadia Obegi Gallardo review scholarship by Callaway, Kellner, and Visser, who note that the absolute...
construction is not dependent on a noun in another clause, but is rather a detached structure. Segura and Gallardo’s study focuses on assessing the degree of independence of the dative absolute in Old English, but their study draws on the work of Liuzza and comments on the frequency of such dative-absolute renderings in the Old English Gospels. Liuzza’s study performs a very informative analysis of the preservation of Latin ablative-absolute constructions in the Old English Gospels, and he reports dramatic diversity in each translation’s response to this feature. Liuzza explains that the OE Matthew generally prefers subordinate clauses and coordinating verbs to the dative absolute, that the OE Mark heavily prefers the OE dative absolute, the OE Luke roughly balances OE dative absolutes with other renderings, and that the OE John prefers subordinate clauses and coordinating verbs (Old English Version, Vol. 2, 113-18), as does the OE Matthew. This study of the present participle explored how the OE present participle is rendered within these absolute constructions. The translations’ renderings of the ablative-absolute present participle vary dramatically, in accordance with Liuzza’s overall analysis of the rendering of the Latin ablative-absolute:

---

66 Segura and Gallardo address this on page 88. As Segura and Gallardo also acknowledge, Morgan Callaway asserts that the absolute participle is significantly different from the appositive participle, such as the pre- and post-positive nominative and the accusatives I have discussed so far. Calloway explains that a participle in an absolute “is easily distinguished from the appositive participle by the fact that the latter has no distinct subject of its own, but agrees with the subject of the verb or a word” found elsewhere (317). In Latin, since verbs convey pronominal subjects by means of inflection, and since the Latin ablative-absolutes can communicate number, Latin ablative-absolutes can present some challenges to the analysis, whether to include OE renderings of absolutes only if they provide an explicit subject for the participle, as Segura and Gallardo do (96), or to allow ablative-absolutes with an implied but independent subject, as Liuzza does at Matthew 4.16 and 26.20. Callaway concedes, “Occasionally, however, it is difficult to decide whether the substantive is dependent and the participle appositive or independent and the participle absolute” (317). In this study, I have attempted to err on the side of inclusiveness and generally follow Liuzza’s approach.

67 W. B. Owen, in his 1882 article “The Influence of the Latin Syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels,” studied the Old English Gospels Matthew and Mark, and noticed that the OE Mark renders the Latin ablative-absolute construction with the OE dative absolute proportionately much more than does the OE Matthew (61). Owen’s study is a description of the potential influence of Latin syntax on the Old English Gospels version, but it does not otherwise assert arguments about divergent practices or multiple authorship.
The overall range of incidence across the four gospel translations is nearly 60%, which is very significant in consideration of previous results for nominative present participles. However, there is some ambiguity about how to interpret what these findings can indicate about the practice of translation in the four gospel translations, based on this particular feature. The difference between the Mark translation (78%) and the Luke translation (45%) is considerable, and suggests some dissimilarity between the two translations. However, the two rates have in common a clear willingness in the translation to preserve Latin present participles in ablative absolutes as OE present participles. By contrast, the Matthew translation only preserves this type of Latin present participle as an OE present participle 10% of the time, and the John translation 17% of the time, although the rate in John is actually the result of only one such participial rendering in the entire John translation, which suggests only a minority practice in John, but not much more. These independent analyses of the present participle in the absolute echo the findings of Segura and Gallardo, who also detect “a similar amount of absolute datives” in the OE Mark and Luke, significant variety between the OE Matthew and Luke, and the possibility of “a stylistic feature that could point out to a different authorship” (95). However, the rates of preserving the OE
present participle in the absolute construction also differ from the rates presented in Segura and Gallardo’s study, which explains in its conclusion that none of the Old English gospel translations preserves the absolute construction as much as 50% of the time, but this analysis shows that the number of present participles preserved in Mark is much higher, at 78%. This finding accentuates the kinds of difference that Segura and Gallardo suggest could indicate difference in authorship (102).

Before the significance of these data can be considered further, it is necessary to account for the sample sizes in these translations. In the Latin exemplar, present participles embedded within ablative-absolute constructions are fairly rare. Only 20 occur in the Latin Matthew, 9 in the Latin Mark, 31 in the Latin Luke, and only 6 in the Latin John. The relative rarity of these participles introduces the potential problem of inductive error: the sample size may not be large enough in each case, especially in Mark and John, to reflect the intended practice of the translator or translators. This study does examine all the available present participles in absolute constructions, but the paucity of examples may not indicate a clear pattern of practice. If the Latin exemplar presented ten times as many Latin present participles in absolutes, the proportion of participial vs. non-participial translation might be significantly different from the rates suggested by the small sample size in the OE Gospels. Although the actual numbers of examples of these participles are relatively low in each case, these samples represent all available samples in the text.
**Ablative-Absolute Present Participles in the OE Matthew**

The OE Matthew very rarely uses an OE present participle to render a Latin one in an ablative absolute. Out of a total of 20 such Latin present participles, the OE Matthew uses an OE present participle only twice, in Mt 1:20 and 17:5. This 10% rate of OE participial rendering suggests a clear reluctance to use the OE present participle to render the Latin absolute, but the two uses of the OE present participle are especially surprising because both occur in locations where the OE Matthew uses the OE participle less frequently. As the analyses of both pre- and post-positive nominative present participles demonstrates above, the OE Matthew displays a heightened tendency to use the OE present participle in chapters 8-13; in contrast, of the 40 chapters 1-7 use the OE present participle less frequently. In chapters 16-18, of 38 Latin nominative present participles, the OE Matthew translates only four with OE present participles. The OE Matthew’s use of OE participles to translate Latin ablative-absolute participles is unusual even in comparison to the OE Matthew’s translation of the Latin accusative present participle: although the OE Matthew heavily favours the OE participle over other options in this category, it does not use an OE participle to translate any of the three such participles in the first two chapters. It is in exactly these areas, in which the OE Matthew avoids the OE present participle, even conspicuously, where the translation does use the OE present participle to render the Latin ablative-absolute present participle, and in no other place.

The Latin ablative-absolute in 1.20 is relatively unusual, compared to all the other examples, because it is the only absolute to use the Latin verb “cogitare”, the only verb to denote thinking or internal dialogue as a Latin absolute:

---

69 See section 2.5a and 2.5b for these qualitative discussions.
1.20 haec autem eo cogitante (LPr) (Abl) ecce angelus Domini apparuit in somnis ei
dicens (LPr) (Post-Nom) Ioseph fili David noli timere accipere Mariam coniugem tuam
quod enim in ea natum est de Spiritu Sancto est.

(DR) But while he thought on these things, behold the angel of the Lord appeared to him
in his sleep, saying: Joseph, son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for
that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost.

(OE) Him þa sóðlice þas þing ðencendum (OEPrt) (OE Dat)70 Drihtnes engel on
swefnum ætywde & him to cwæð (non) (V) (non Post-Nom), Iosep, Dauides sunu, nelle
þu ondrædan Marian þine gemæccean to onfonne; þæt on hire acenned ys hyt ys of þam
halgan gaste.

The uniqueness of this verb among the absolute present participles suggests the possibility that
the OE Matthew may have tended to use the participle to render this participle in other
categories. However, the only other use of “cogitare” as a present participle in the Latin
Matthew occurs in 6.27, in which the OE Matthew translates this present participle with a verb
phrase:

6.27 quis autem vestrum cogitans (LPr) (Post-Nom) potest adicere ad staturam suam
cubitum unum

(DR) And which of you by taking thought, can add to his stature by one cubit?

(OE) Hwylc eower mæg sóðlice geþencan (non) (V) (non Post-Nom) þæt he geeacnige
ane elne to hys anlicnesse?

The inconsistency of the OE Matthew’s treatment of the ablative-absolute present participle is
also visible in a comparison of the OE-participial rendering of 17.5 with similarly worded Latin
absolutes elsewhere. This passage renders a reasonably common phrase not only in the Latin
Matthew but also in all three other gospels, a dialogue phrase of concurrent or circumstantial
speech:

17.5 adhuc eo loquente (LPr) (Abl) ecce nubes lucida obumbravit eos et ecce vox de
nube, dicens (LPr) (Post-Nom) hic est Filius meus dilectus in quo mihi bene complacui
ipsum audite

(DR) And as he was yet speaking, behold a bright cloud overshadowed them. And lo, a
voice out of the cloud, saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear
ye him.

70 The tag “OE Dat” specifically indicates a Latin present participle in an ablative absolute that is rendered in the OE
Gospels with an OE present participle in the dative case.
This particular Latin ablative absolute occurs several times in Matthew, in 9.18, 12.46, and 26.47, but the translation does not use the OE present participle to render the Latin participle:

9.18 Haec illo *loquente (LPrt) (Abl)* ad eos ecce princeps unus accessit et adorabat eum *dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom)* filia mea modo defuncta est sed veni inpone manum tuam super eam et vivet

(DR) As he was speaking these things unto them, behold a certain ruler came up, and adored him, saying: Lord, my daughter is even now dead; but come, lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.

(OE) Ða ðas þing to him *spræc (non) (V) (non Abl)*, þa genealæhte an ealdor & geeæðmedde hyne to him þus *cweðende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)*, Drihten, min dohtor is dead; Ac cum & sete þine hand uppan hig & heo lyfað.

12.46 Adhuc eo *loquente (LPrt) (Abl)* ad turbas ecce mater eius et fratres stabant foris *quaerentes (LPrt) (Post-Nom)* loqui ei

(DR) As he was yet speaking to the multitudes, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him.

(OE) Ða he þas þing þa gyt *spæc (non) (V) (non Abl)* to þam mænegum þa stod hys modor & his gebroðra þærute *secende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)* spareon to him.

26.47 Adhuc ipso *loquente (LPrt) (Abl)* ecce Iudas unus de duodecim venit et cum eo turba multa cum gladiis et fustibus a principibus sacerdotum et senioribus populi

(DR) As he yet spoke, behold Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and clubs, sent from the chief priests and the ancients of the people.

(OE) Ða he þas þing *spræc (non) (V) (non Abl)* þa com Iudas an of þam twelfum & micel folc mid hym mid swurdum & sahlum asende fram þera sacerda ealdrum & þæs folces ealdrum.

The similarities among the Latin verses in all four cases are striking: Christ is the one speaking in all four Latin ablative absolutes, the main clause initiaties with the call to “behold” with “ecce”, and all main clauses describe an interrupting action. The Latin present participle very clearly indicates the ongoing action of Christ’s speech, and in each case interrupts that ongoing action with a simple action. However, the OE Matthew avoids the participle in these cases. The combination of these inconsistencies in the OE Matthew’s treatment of similar
wording and the choice of the OE participle in areas where the translation otherwise shuns it invites questions about why the translation would shift so counter-intuitively from its own general practice.

The remainder of the Latin present participles embedded in ablative absolutes convey typically circumstantial actions of motion, maintaining position, and speech, but also eating, sleeping, and making. In all these renderings, the OE Matthew uses a main verb, and in most cases within a subordinate “when” clause with “þa”. Despite the OE Matthew’s avoidance of the OE present participle, the translation does not omit the translation of any Latin present participles.

**Ablative-Absolute Present Participles in the OE Mark**

The Old English Mark translation has fewer Latin present participles in ablative absolutes to render, but it takes an approach to them very different from that of the OE Matthew. Out of nine Latin present participles embedded in ablative absolutes, the OE Mark translates seven of them with OE present participles: 5.2, 5.35, 14.22, 14.43, and 16.20 (3). The two non-participial translations occur in 9.8 and 10.46. In both cases, the OE Mark uses main verbs in clauses to render the Latin participles, and these two non-participial renderings are closer to each other than to any other Latin ablative-absolute present participle. Both ablative absolutes convey the motion of one agent as the circumstance for the action of another agent:

9.8 et **descenditibus (LPrt) (Abl)** illis de monte præcepit illis ne cui quae vidissent narrarent nisi cum Filius hominis a mortuis resurrexerit (DR) And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them not to tell any man what things they had seen, till the Son of man shall be risen again from the dead. (OE) And þa hi of þam munte **astigōn (non) (non Abl)** he bead him þæt hi nanum ne sædon þa ðing þe hi gesawon buton þonne mannes sunu of deade arise.
10.46 Et veniunt Hierichum et profisciscende (LPrt) (Abl) eo de Hiericho et discipulis eius et plurima multitudine filius Timaei Bartimaeus caecus sedebat iuxta viam mendicans (LPrt) (Post-Nom) (DR) And they came to Jericho: and as he went out of Jericho, with his disciples, and a very great multitude, Bartimeus the blind man, the son of Timeus, sat by the way side begging. (OE) Þa comon hi to Gericho & he ferde (non) (V) (non Abl) fram Gericho & his leorningcnihtas & mycel menegu; Timeus sunu Bartimeus sæt blind wið þone weg wædla (non) (V) (non Post-Nom) (Adj) (poor).

In Mark 9.8, the ablative absolute describes the movement of Jesus, Peter, Jacob and John as they descend from a mountain after seeing Jesus commune with Elias and Moses, and after hearing God speak to them. During their ongoing descent, Jesus instructs them not to recount what they have seen to anyone whom they might see. The ablative absolute in Mark 10.46 creates a similar context of ongoing movement, in which Jesus, together with his disciples, is in the middle of leaving from Jericho, when the blind son of Timaeus Bartimaeus, sitting and begging by the road, interrupts their journey to call out to Jesus for pity in 10.47. Both follow the conjunction “et” in a similar position and reside thus in very similar syntactic contexts. Although the OE Mark renders both with main verbs, this context of the movement of one agent as the circumstance for another agent, presented with an ablative-absolute present participle, is not unique in the Latin Mark. In fact, a similar ablative absolute occurs in 5.2:

5.2 et exuncti (LPrt) (Abl) ei de navi statim occurrit ei de monumentis homo in spiritu immundo (DR) And as he went out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the monuments a man with an unclean spirit, (OE) & him of scipe gangendum (OEPrt) (OE Dat) him sona agen arn an man of þam byrgenum on unclænum gaste.

In this passage, Jesus is still in the process of exiting from the ship, when a person of unclean spirit rushes up to him from out of the monuments. This ablative absolute too is connected by “et” to its clause, very similar to the non-participial translations. The similarity of the context of movement and the relatively comparable syntactic structure of all three passages raise questions
about what could account for the difference in rendering, whether it stems from the particular verbs used, single-author variety, or a shift in practice. The present participle of Latin “descendere” only occurs elsewhere at 1.10 and 15.30. In 1.10, it occurs as an accusative participle, where the OE Mark uses the OE present participle in keeping with the translation’s preference for the OE participle in this category:

1.10 Et statim ascendens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) de aqua vidit caelos apertos et Spiritum tamquam columbam descendens (LPrt) (Post-Acc) et manentem in ipso (DR) And forthwith coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit as a dove descending, and remaining on him. (OE) & sona (Omitted) (non) (non Pre-Nom) of ðam wætere he geseah opene heofonas, & haligne gast swa culfran astigende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) & on him wunigende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc)

In 15.30, “descendens” occurs as a post-positive nominative present participle, a category that the OE Mark only translates with the OE participle about 25% of the time. However, in chapter 15, it is one of only two post-positive nominative participles out of eighteen that the OE Mark translates with an OE participle:

15.30 salvum fac temet ipsum descendens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) de cruce (DR) Save thyself, coming down from the cross. (OE) Gehæl ðe sylfne of þære rode stigende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom).

The OE Mark translates the Latin verb “descendere” as a present participle, even in areas where the translation generally avoids the OE present participle. This makes the translation of the Latin ablative-absolute present participle “descendentibus” in 9.8 all the more conspicuous, when the OE Mark tends to translate Latin ablative-absolute participles with OE present participles.

Finding passages with which to compare the ablative absolute in 10.46 is more difficult, because the Latin verb “proficisci” is not rendered as a Latin present participle anywhere else in the Latin Mark, and therefore offers no other Latin present participle for comparison. It is also not used in any simple tense. However, it appears in perfect forms in 9.29, 13.34 and 16.20 as
perfect participles, and in 12.1 as a main verb. The OE Mark renders the Latin past participle in 9.29 and 13.34, and the Latin main verb in 12.1, with the OE main verb “faran”:

9.29 Et inde profecti prætergrediebantur Galilæam nec volebat quemquam scire  
(DR) And departing from thence, they passed through Galilee, and he would not that any  
man should know it.  
(OE) Þa hi þanon ferdon hi forbugon Galileam; He nolde þæt hit ænig man wiste.  

12.1 Et coepit illis in parabolis loqui vineam pastinavit homo et circumdedit sepem et  
fodit lacum et aedificavit turrem et locavit eam agricolis et peregre profectus est  
(DR) And he began to speak to them in parables: A certain man planted a vineyard and  
made a hedge about it, and dug a place for the winefat, and built a tower, and let it to  
husbandmen; and went into a far country.  
(OE) Þa ongan he him bigspell reccan; Sum mann him plantode wingeard & betynde  
hine & deafl anne seað & getimbrode ænne stypel & gesette hine mid eorðtilium; & ferde  
on elþeodignyssse.  

13.34 Sicut homo qui peregre profectus reliquit domum suam et dedit servis suis  
potestatem cuiusque operis, et ianitori præcipiat ut vigilet,  
(DR) Even as a man who going into a far country, left his house; and gave authority to  
his servants over every work, and commanded the porter to watch.  
(OE) Swa se man ælþeodilice ferde forlet his hus & sealde his þeowum ðæne anwald  
gehwylces weorces & beode þam durewearde þæt he wacige.  

However, the OE Mark takes an unusual approach to the Latin past participle “profecti” in 16.20,  
where the translation uses the OE present participle “farende”:

16.20 illi autem profecti praedicaverunt ubique Domino cooperante (LPrt) (Abl) et  
sermonem confirmante (LPrt) (Abl) sequentibus (LPrt) (Abl) signis  
(DR) But they going forth preached everywhere: the Lord working withal, and  
confirming the word with signs that followed.  
(OE) Soplice hi ða farende (unatt) æghwar (æghwær – everywhere) bodedon, Drihtne  
midwyrccdendum (OEPrt) (OE Dat) & trymmendre (OEPrt) (OE Dat) spræce  
afterfyligendum (OEPrt) (OE Dat) tacnum.  

The syntactic context of this inconsistent rendering of the Latin perfect participle may yield some  
clues about it. Perhaps most immediate is the presence of three other Latin present participles, all  
embedded within ablative absolutes: “cooperante”, “confirmante”, and “sequentibus”. The OE  
Mark renders all three with present participles in absolute phrases as well. Even though the Latin  
does not use a present participle, the OE Mark provides one. This stands in stark contrast with
the rendering in 10.46, where the OE Mark uses a verb to translate “*profiscisce*nte” with the OE verb “*ferde*” and yet adds a present participle where one does not exist in 16.20. It is possible, of course, that this could be the result of a manuscript variation in the Latin exemplar, but it could also indicate a different approach to the translation of Latin ablative-absolute present participles.

**Ablative-Absolute Present Participles in the OE Luke**

The OE Luke allows a more robust analysis of the translation’s treatment of the Latin ablative-absolute present participle, with 31 such participles available for translation, the largest number of any of the Latin gospels. The OE Luke translates fourteen of these with OE present participles, and a simple chapter-by-chapter analysis shows that the distribution of these variations is fairly even except in chapters two and three:

![Figure 2.21: Renderings of the ablative-absolute present participle in the OE Luke.](image)

The Latin Luke uses the ablative-absolute present participle in four main clusters in the text: chapters 2 and 3; chapters 8 and 9; chapters 11, 12, and 13; and chapters 19-24. The OE Luke tends to use the OE participle to render these a little less than half the time. Although the overall rate of OE-participial rendering of the ablative-absolute is just over 45%, this graph suggests a

---

potential difference between the practice of translation in the first cluster, where the OE Luke heavily favours the OE present participle, and in the remaining three clusters, where the OE present participle is less frequent. The trend continues downward from the second cluster, where the OE Luke uses the OE present participle half the time, to the third and fourth clusters, where the translation uses fewer OE participles than other forms to render the Latin ablative–absolute participle. However, at this level, the sample sizes are far too small for accurate proportion tests, and therefore do not justify the proposal of a strong trend, but it does raise the question of what might be so different in chapter 3 that the translation so heavily favours the OE participle. This analysis also generally agrees with the result of the sliding proportion test, which indicated a statistical difference in the overall rate of rendering the Latin present participle around Luke 8.27. The data in this qualitative study are not so precise to confirm this finding clearly, but they do support it approximately. However, a closer look at which participles are translated in which ways will cast additional light on what is happening with the rendering of Latin ablative–absolute present participles in the OE Luke.

To provide a framework within which to organize this analysis, it is helpful first to organize the Latin ablative absolutes into semantic categories in order to observe whether some actions tend to preserve an OE present–participial rendering more than others:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Semantic Field</th>
<th>Participial Translation</th>
<th>Non-Participial Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement:</td>
<td>9.34, 9.37, 22.44</td>
<td>2.42, 8.23, 9.57, 11.29, 19.36, 22.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being present, non-motion</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>22.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking:</td>
<td>3.15 (2), 9.44</td>
<td>24.41 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking:</td>
<td>3.21, 8.49, 22.4</td>
<td>8.45, 9.34, 22.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing:</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (inchoative):</td>
<td>21.28, 24.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background actions:</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.32, 19.33, 20.1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governing, acting, loosening, starting (inchoative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing state:</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.17: OE renderings of Latin present participles in ablative absolutes in the OE Luke, sorted by semantic field.

The OE Luke tends to render members of most categories with both OE present participles and OE main verbs, and does so roughly proportionately to the general trend of rendering Latin ablative-absolute participles with OE participles 45% of the time. The only exception to this distribution occurs with verbs that indicate a change of state, as in 21.28, 24.47, and 21.26. However, with only three samples available in this category, it is not statistically valid to propose a clear pattern of practice. A larger study of the use of inchoative verbs in the OE Gospels and in OE would be necessary to address this possibility persuasively.

These data demonstrate, then, that the OE Luke tends to follow its overall distribution of renderings of Latin ablative-absolute participles with a generally similar practice over the translation. This mixed practice is particularly visible in the treatment of the formulaic ablative absolute “haec illo loquente” and its variations, which are present in all four Latin gospels. The
Latin Luke presents this phrase in close proximity at 8.49 and 9.34, and again in close proximity in 22.47 and 22.60:

8.49 adhuc illo *loquente* (*LPrt*) (*Abl*) *venit* a principe *synagogae* *dicens* (*LPrt*) (*Post-Nom*) ei quia mortua est filia tua noli vexare illum

(DR) As he was yet speaking, there cometh one to the ruler of the synagogue, saying to him: Thy daughter is dead, trouble him not.

(OE) Him þa gyt *specendum* (*OEPrt*) (*OE Dat*), þa com sum man to þære gesamnunge ealdre & *cwæð* (*V*) (*non Post-Nom*) to him, ne drece þu hyne.

9.34 haec autem illo *loquente* (*LPrt*) (*Abl*) *facta* est nubes et obumbravit eos et *timuerunt* *intrantibus* (*LPrt*) (*Abl*) illis in nubem

(DR) And as he spoke these things, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them; and they were afraid, when they entered into the cloud.

(OE) Ða he þis *spæc* (*V*) (*non Abl*), ða wearð genip & ofersceadude hig, & hi ondredon him *gangende* (*OEPrt*) (*OE Dat*) on þæt genip.

22.47 Adhuc eo *loquente* (*LPrt*) (*Abl*) ecce turba et qui vocabatur Judas unus de duodecim antecedebat eos Et adpropinquavit Iesu ut oscularetur eum.

(DR) As he was yet speaking, behold a multitude; and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them, and drew near to Jesus, for to kiss him.

(OE) Ða cwæð Petrus, eala man, nat ic hwæt þu segst. And þa hig þæt *spræcon* (*non*) (*V*) (*non Abl*) samninga se hana crew.

22.60 et ait Petrus homo nescio quid dicis et continuo adhuc illo *loquente* (*LPrt*) (*Abl*), cantavit gallus

(DR) And Peter said: Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately, as he was yet speaking, the cock crew.

(OE) Ða cwæð Petrus, eala man, nat ic hwæt þu segst. And þa hig þæt *spræcon* (*non*) (*V*) (*non Abl*) samninga se hana crew.

There are some differences in the semantic contexts of these ablative absolutes, but the differences do not appear to correlate with whether the translation favours or avoids the OE present participle. The presence of “*adhuc*” occurs with both participial translations in 8.49 and 22.47, and a verbal translation in 22.60. Both 8.49 and 22.60 follow the absolute phrase with a clear subject and action verb, but the passages differ in their rendering of the Latin ablative-absolute present participle. Both 9.34 and 22.47 follow the ablative absolute with verbs of coming into being: in 9.34, “*facta est nubes*” (a cloud appeared), and in 22.47, “*ecce turba*”
(behold a crowd [appeared]). However, the translation uses a main verb to render the Latin absolute in 9.34 and a present participle in 22.47. These easily comparable passages, spread out as they are in the Luke gospel, suggest that the Luke accommodates both practices with relatively even distribution. As such, the rendering of the ablative-absolute present participle provides only limited support for the findings of the quantitative study, which indicated a break in practice around Luke 8.27.

**Ablative-Absolute Present Participles in the OE John**

The Latin John uses the ablative-absolute present participle only six times in the entire text\(^{72}\), reflecting the larger tendency of the Latin John not to use the Latin present participle. However, these uses are restricted to the first eight chapters. Of these six Latin ablative-absolute present participles, the OE John renders only one with an OE participle, four with main verbs, and one with a preposition:

2.3 et **deficientes (Abl)** vino dicit mater Iesu ad eum vinum non habent
(DR) And the wine failing, the mother of Jesus saith to him: They have no wine.
(OE) & þa ūþét win **geteorude** þa cwæð þæs Hælendes modor to him, hi nabbæð win.

4.51 iam autem eo **descendente (Abl)** servi occurrerunt ei et nuntiaverunt **dicentes (Post)** quia fìlius eius viveret
(DR) And as he was going down, his servants met him; and they brought word, saying, that his son lived.
(OE) Ða **(Omitted)** he for þa ūþon his þeowas ongean hyne & **sædon** ūþet his sunu leofode.

6.18 mare autem vento magno **flante (LPrt) (Abl)** exsurgebat
(DR) And the sea arose, by reason of a great wind that blew.
(OE) Mycel wind **bleow (non) (V) (non Abl)** & hit wæs hreoh sæ.

6.23 aliae vero supervenerunt naves a Tiberiade iuxta locum ubi manducaverunt panem gratias **agente (LPrt) (Abl)** Domino

---

\(^{72}\) Latin present participles embedded in ablative-absolute constructions occur at 2.3, 4.51, 6.18, 6.23, 7.14, and 8.30. Only the one at 6.23 is rendered with an OE present participle.
But other ships came in from Tiberias; nigh unto the place where they had eaten the bread, the Lord giving thanks.

Oðre scypu com fram Tiberiade wið þa stowe þar hig þone hlaf æton Drihtne þanciende (OE Prt) (OE Dat).

mediante (L Prt) (Abl) ascendit Iesu in templum et docebat

Now about the midst of the feast, Jesus went up into the temple, and taught.

Þa hit wæs mid (non) (Prep) (non Abl) dæg þæs freolsdæges þa eode se Hælend into þam temple & lærde.

loquente (L Prt) (Abl) multi crediderunt in eum.

When he spoke these things, many believed in him.

When he spoke these things, many believed in him.

The OE John’s participial rendering of the Latin “thanking” phrase “gratias agere” is unusual in this category. If the Latin “thanking” phrase occurred as present participles in other categories in the text, and if the OE John used the OE participle to render them, the unusual use of the OE participle to translate the ablative absolute in 6.23 could be a response to translation in the larger text. The Latin “thanking” phrase occurs elsewhere in the Latin John as main verbs in 6.11 and 11.41; however, it does not occur as a present participle in any other category:

Iaccepit ergo panes Iesu et cum gratias egisset distribuit discumbentibus similiter et ex piscibus quantum volebant

And Jesus took the loaves; and when he had given thanks, he distributed to them that were set down. In like manner also of the fishes, as much as they would.

Se Hælend nam þa hlafas & þanc wurðlice dyde & hig todælde þam sittendum & eallswa of þam fixum swa mycel swa hig woldon.

They took therefore the stone away. And Jesus lifting up his eyes said: Father, I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me.

Se Hælend ahof upp his eagan & cwæð, Fæder, ic do þe þancas forþam þu gehyrdest.

If the “thanking” phrase itself does not particularly promote the OE participial translation in 6.23, the larger trends in OE participial translation in the OE John provide some context. The quantitative analysis of the OE John reveals that this translation decreases its use of the OE
present participle over the course of the text, with a statistically significant shift around John 7.4. This suggests that the OE participle used to translate the Latin ablative-absolute participle in 6.23 may be uncharacteristic of what appears to be a decline in the use of the OE participle and the preservation of the participle in ablative-absolute constructions. However, a simple chapter-by-chapter analysis of the overall translation of the Latin present participle reveals a different trend that provides a more informative context for this usage:

**Figure 2.22**: Chapter-by-chapter analysis of OE-participial vs. non-participal renderings of the Latin present participle in the OE John.

Two trends in the OE John are visible from this chapter-by-chapter analysis of the use of the OE participle in all categories in the translation. First, there is a noticeable spike in the presence of the Latin present participle, starting from Chapter 4 and ending in Chapter 10. Second, the use of the OE participle in the OE John appears to respond somewhat proportionately to this curve, rising and falling with the presence of the Latin present participle. Studying gospel texts as whole units, as many scholars have done, suggests that translations engage in relatively proportionate responses to texts; however, this chapter-by-chapter analysis demonstrates that the OE John does not do so throughout the text. The first chapter heavily favours the OE present participle over non-participial translations, while the last four chapters of the OE John use only
one OE participle out of 31 Latin present participles. The OE participial rendering of the ablative absolute in 6.23 occurs at the height of the spike in OE participial rendering in Chapter 6.

In order gain a full understanding of the rendering of the Latin ablative-absolute present participle in the OE John, it is also fruitful to examine the non-participial renderings for the potential influence of trends and similar phrases in other categories. The four non-participial renderings in John 2.3, 4.51, 6.18, 7.14, and 8.30 occur in areas where OE participial renderings are generally low, as the graph above demonstrates. The five Latin ablative-absolute participles are distributed across this rise and fall in overall OE present-participial renderings, with the one participial rendering in 6.23 occurring at the height of this spike.

An examination of the rendering elsewhere of the participles in 2.3, 4.51, 6.18, 7.14, and 8.30 also provides some clarification of the potential influence of the general trend in the OE John. The Latin verbs “deficere” in 2.3 and “mediare” in 7.14 do not occur as participles in any other category in the Latin John, but the Latin verbs “descendere/ascendere” and “loqui” provide some comparisons. The present participle of Latin “descendere” occurs five times in the Latin John, in 1.32, 1.33, 1.51, 4.51, and 6.50. Verses 1.32, 1.33 and 1.51 contain accusative present participles, which the OE John renders with OE present participles. The OE John translates all accusative present participles in chapter 1 with OE participles. John 4.51 contains the ablative absolute discussed above. In John 6.50, the Latin verb “deficere” occurs as a post-positive nominative participle, which the translation renders with a main verb. Even though the accusative participles in 1.32, 1.33 and 1.51 and the nominative participle in 6.50 are all post-positive, the OE John renders them differently:

1.32 Et testimonium perhibuit Ioannes dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) quia vidi Spiritum descendendem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) quasi columbam de caelo et mansit super eum (DR) And John gave testimony, saying: I saw the Spirit coming down, as a dove from heaven, and he remained upon him.
1.33 et ego nesciebam eum sed qui misit me baptizare in aqua ille dixit super quem videris Spiritum descendem (LPr) (Post-Acc) et manentem (LPr) (Post-Acc) super eum hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu Sancto (DR) And I knew him not; but he who sent me to baptize with water, said to me: He upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

(PE) & ic hine ne cuðe ac se þe me sende to fullianne on wætere he cwæð to me, ofer ðæne þe ðu gesyhst nyðerstigendne (Pos) (OEPr) (OE Post-Acc) gast & ofer hine wuniendne (OEPr) (OE Post-Acc) þæt is se ðe fyllað on halgum gaste.

1.51 et dicit ei amen amen I say to you, you shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man. (OE) & he sæde him, soð ic secge eow ge geseoð opene heofonas & Godes englas upstigende (OEPr) (OE Post-Acc) & nyðerstigende (OEPr) (OE Post-Acc) ofer mannnes sunu.

4.51 Iam autem eo descendente (LPr) (Abl) servi occurrerunt ei et nuntiaverunt dicentes (LPr) (Post-Nom) quia filius eius viveret (DR) And as he was going down, his servants met him; and they brought word, saying, that his son lived.

(PE) Ða (Omitted) (non) (non Abl) he for þa urnon his þeowas ongean hyne & sædon (non) (V) (non Post-Nom) þæt his sunu leofode.

6.50 hic est panis de caelo descendens (LPr) (Post-Nom) ut si quis ex ipso manducaverit non moriatur (DR) This is the bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die.

(PE) Ðis is se hlaf þe of heofonum com (non) (V) (non Post-Nom) þæt ne swelte se ðe of him ytt.

The Latin verb “loqui” occurs as a present participle on only one other occasion in the John text, as an accusative present participle. The translation uses an OE participle to render it, as it does all accusative present participles in chapter 1:

1.37 et audierunt eum duo discipuli loquentem (LPr) (Post-Acc) et secuti sunt Iesum (DR) And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.

(PE) Ða gehyrdon hyne twegen leorningcnihtas sprecende (OEPr) (OE Post-Acc) & fylidon þam Hælende.
However, the OE John uses a verb to render the same verb’s present participle in an ablative-absolute construction:

8.30 haec illo *loquente* (LPrt) *(Abl)* multi crediderunt in eum.
(DR) When he spoke these things, many believed in him.
(OE) Þa he ðas ðing *spræc* *(non)* *(V)* *(non Abl)* manega gelyfdon on him.

This detailed examination of the OE Gospels’ treatment of the Latin ablative-absolute present participle suggests that the translators’ decisions to render present participles may have depended on a number of aspects of this approach to translation. It does not depend solely on which verb is being translated, but there has been evidence here and in previous sections that the renderings of some verb’s participles can reflect changes in approach, especially that of the present participle of “*dicere*”73. Rather, the decision to render a Latin present participle with an OE present participle appears to depend significantly on the case, position, and function of the Latin participle. In this analysis of the ablative-absolute participle in the OE John, the limited number of samples (only six) constrains the implications of this analysis, and that constraint is strengthened by the fact that the Latin John does not use the ablative-absolute present participle after chapter 8. However, it does demonstrate some very significant difference from the renderings of the ablative-absolute participle in the OE Mark and Luke, and some notable similarity to the rendering in the OE Matthew. Overall, these findings support work by Liuzza and by Segura and Gallardo with which the central argument in this study agrees that the Old English Gospels are not a product of a unified practice of authorship.

---

73 The preceding analyses of post-positive nominative and of accusative present participles showed that the present participle of “*dicere*” appears to receive very different treatments in the first 13 chapters of Matthew compared to Matthew 14-28, supporting earlier quantitative analyses suggesting the same conclusion. By contrast, participles of “*dicere*” are generally not rendered with OE present participles in the OE Mark and OE Luke. Please refer back to sections 2.5b and 2.5c to review these findings as necessary here.
2.5e. The substantive participle

Like the ablative-absolute present participle, the substantive present participle, though less frequent than the post-positive nominative or accusative, provides further insight into the inter-textual and intra-textual practices of translation in the OE Gospels, particularly in the study of parallel passages. Four episodes afford illuminating comparison: “the voice calling in the desert”, “overturning the tables of the vendors in the temple”, “the stone that the builders reproach”, and “woe to those bringing forth children and nursing”. The first two reveal clear similarities in practice between the OE Matthew and the OE John, and between the OE Mark and the OE Luke. The third differentiates the OE Matthew from the OE Mark and Luke (John does not include this phrase), while the last demonstrates similarity between the OE Matthew and both the OE Mark and Luke. This analysis also reveals that, while the OE translations all tend to render the substantive present participles of action verbs at roughly similar rates, the OE Matthew and John do not render substantive present participles of state verbs with OE present participles, while the OE Mark and Luke do. Both sets of findings further support the pairings of the OE Matthew and John and of the OE Mark and Luke.

This study detected that the Latin exemplar presents substantive present participles in the nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, and ablative (apart from ablative-absolute) cases. The results of this study present only about a 15% variance in the Old English present-participial rendering of Latin substantive present participles.
The results show that the all four translations tend to use the OE present participle to render Latin substantive present participle at least more than 30% and as much as half the time. These results also suggest far more similarity among the four gospel translations than do the results of the studies of other categories. The raw data in this case imply one similarity between the Matthew and Luke translations, and another similarity between the Mark and John translations. These implications, however, are not consistent with the results of earlier quantitative and qualitative studies, which generally point to more similarity between Mark and Luke, and to the strong likelihood of a break in the practice of translation in Matthew. These inconsistencies raise questions about how the OE texts translate Latin substantives.

Substantives offer certain opportunities in translation, because substantivization of an adjective or participle may represent the lack of a fully developed noun in the source language, but the target language may indeed possess either a noun in this semantic field, or a non-participial adjective. This dissertation’s study of substantives reveals that the linguistic difference between Latin and OE affords the translation chances to use OE adjectives and nouns instead of participles. Because OE may offer more choices for some Latin participles than for others, the
translation of Latin substantive present participles in the OE Gospels may at least in part depend on the specific verbs in use. However, unless OE were not to possess a verb matching the meaning of the Latin, a translator would still have the option to use the OE participle. The rendering of substantive participles may be even more significant if the same verb, written as a substantive present participle in Latin, has semantically suitable adjectives or nouns in OE, but is sometimes rendered with OE participles anyway. This study considers such examples and the potential ramifications of such variance.

The Old English Matthew translates 14 of 28 Latin substantive present participles with OE present participles, or 50% of the time. The Old English Mark translates 7 of 21 substantive present participles (33.3%). The Old English Luke translates 13 of 29 substantive present participles with OE present participles (44.8%). The Old English John translates 3 of 9 substantive present participles with OE present participles (33%). This study of substantive present participles uses the same semantic verb fields as does the study of predicative present participles: verbs of speech, action, movement, state, and positing-holding. Substantive present participles of movement are rare, with only one in Mark at 16.12 and one in Luke at 9.53. Their limited number forces this analysis only to consider them among action verbs and in the total statistics for substantives. There are no verbs of beginning used as substantive present participles, so this category is excluded from analysis here. The category of action verbs, including speech, presents some extremely fruitful opportunities to examine Latin passages common to all or three of the gospel translations. The discussion will begin with participles in parallel constructions.
The “voice calling in the desert”

One very conspicuous parallel in the four gospels is the Latin phrase “vox clamantis in deserto”, which occurs in all four gospels and therefore makes for a very significant comparison among the Old English translations. Among all Latin substantive present participles in the four Old English Gospels, only six are verbs of speech, of which this phrase accounts for four. The Old English translations, however, render the phrase differently, specifically with variance of the rendering of the substantive present participle; these differences reflect larger similarities between the OE Matthew and John, and between the OE Mark and Luke.

The Latin phrase “vox clamantis in deserto” ([a] voice of [one] calling in the desert) presents a nominative noun “vox”, post-modified by the genitive present participle “clamantis”. Reading and understanding this expression requires the reader to perceive the substantive capacity of the genitive participle, which requires interpretation. Because the genitive participle cannot directly modify the nominative “vox”, it must modify an ellipted noun or pronoun, such as “a man”, “a person”, or “one”. The OE Matthew and OE John perceive this subtlety and render the substantive present participle with an OE genitive substantive present participle:

Mt 3.3 Hic est enim qui dictus est per Esaiam prophetam dicentem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) vox clamantis (LPrt) (Sub) in deserto parate viam Domini rectas facite semitas eius. (DR) For this is he that was spoken of by Isaias the prophet, saying: A voice of one crying in the desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths. (OE) Ðis ys se be þam þe gecweden ys þurh Esaiam ðone witegan (non) (Omitted) (non Post-Acc), Clypiendes (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Sub) stefn wæs on westene, gegeardiað Drehtnes weg, dop his siðas rihte.

Jn 1.23 Ait ego vox clamantis (Sub gen) in deserto dirigite viam Domini sicut dixit Esaias propheta (DR) He said: I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Isaias. (OE) He cwæð, ic eom clypiendes (Pos) stefn on westene, gerihtæ Drehtnes weg, swa se witega Isaias cwæð.
Although both the OE Matthew and John use the corresponding OE genitive participle, they both engage in position shift by moving the Latin post-positive participle to a pre-positive position. Because this study has demonstrated that the translations are sensitive to the position of a present participle, particularly when it modifies a sentence subject, this shift is out of character in these translations, which generally avoid position-shift. By contrast, both the OE Mark and OE Luke do not appear to recognize the substantive nature of the participle in the Latin phrase. Both translations decline the participle as a pre-positive nominative participle, modifying “vox”:

Mk 1.3 Vox **clamantis (LPrt) (Sub)** in deserto parate viam Domini rectas facite semitas eius.
(DR) A voice of one crying in the desert: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths.
(OE) **Clypiende (Pos) (Func) (OEPrt) (OE Sub)** stefn on þam westene gegeearwið drihtnes weg, doð rihte his siðas.

Lk 3.4 sicut scriptum est in libro sermonum Esaiae prophetae vox **clamantis (Sub Gen)** in deserto
(DR) As it was written in the book of the sayings of Isaias the prophet: A voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths.
(OE) swa hit awritten ys on Isaias bec þæs witegan; **Clypiende (Pos) (Func) (OEPrt) (OE Sub)** stefen on westene,

Liuzza (*Old English Version*, Vol. 1, 104) does note that manuscripts vary on rendering of the present participle in Luke, in which the Cp MS uses “Clypiende”, but that other MSS use “Clypiendes”; Liuzza emends the line to read “Clypiendel[s]”. There is, however, no such variance in the manuscripts of the OE Mark. Because the original translation MS of the OE Gospels is likely lost, the possibility exists that the original OE Luke may have contained the genitive participle. However, it is also possible that later scribes may have corrected this rare error in translation. Manuscripts B and C are related to Cp, and contain the genitive participle, but Cp appears to evolve from earlier MS x, which is listed as closest to the original, while B and C share features that suggest that they derived from intermediary MS y (Liuzza lv). In addition,
Liuzza notes that Latin incipits “are rare in Cp”, but more frequent in other MSS, and suggests that such incipits may have allowed “scribes and readers … to detect and correct errors in a copy of the translation by reference to a Latin text” (xliii). Therefore, it is quite possible that the nominative rendering in Cp may represent the original OE Luke rendering, and that the genitive rendering in other MSS represent corrections to this error74.

**Overturning the tables of the vendors and money-lenders in the temple**

The four Latin gospels present a second common passage involving the substantive present participle, using action verbs of selling and buying. The Latin in each gospel is a larger passage, leading to more variance than in the case of the “vox clamantis” passage. However, the Latin in each case uses the same verbs “vendere” (to sell) and “emere” (to buy), making possible a close reading and comparison of the OE passages. Again, a similar pattern emerges in which the OE Matthew and OE John exhibit similarities, and the Mark and Luke translations exhibit similarities.

The Latin Matthew does not use the verbs “vendere” and “emere” as substantive present participles, but rather as post-positive accusative participles, which modify the pronoun “omnes”. The Latin Matthew undergoes a relative drought in the use of the accusative present participle in chapters 17-23. Of the six accusative participles in chapters 20 and 21, the OE Matthew renders only 2 with OE participles, which is quite out of character with the practice in the earlier and later parts of the translation. Here, the OE Matthew translation renders Latin “vendentes” with

---

74 On pages 202-3, Abel addresses the phrasing of this parallel construction, which Drake includes as evidence of multiple authorship, but Abel dismisses it as insufficient to support Drake’s argument that this variation supported multiple authorship. Alone, this is a valid concern. However, in light of mounting evidence, both statistical and qualitative, as well as studies by other scholars mentioned in the introduction, it is reasonable to re-examine the issue here. My discussion of this passage arose from my own translation and examination of the texts, not as a re-visitation of Drake’s argument, although both suggest the same significance of this parallel here.
the OE main verb “ceapodun” and omits “ementes” entirely; the translation also renders the Latin genitive substantive “vendentium” with the OE main verb “sealdon”:

2.14 Et invenit in templo vendentes (LPrt) (Sub) boves et oves et columbas et nummularios sedentes (LPrt) (Post-Acc)
(DR) And he found in the temple them that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the chargers of money sitting.
(OE) & gemette on þam temple þa þe sealdon (non) (V) (non Sub) oxsan & sceap & culfran & sittende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) myneteras.

Despite the visible syntactic differences between the two versions of this incident, both the OE Matthew and OE John apply similarly verbal renderings.

The Latin Mark and Luke also contain the present participles “vendentes” and “ementes” as substantive accusatives, but both translations render the relevant Latin participles with OE present participles. Both translations pair the OE present participles:

Mk 11.15 Et veniunt Hierosolymam et cum introisset templum coepit eicere vendentes (LPrt) (Sub) et ementes (LPrt) (Sub) in templo et mensas nummulariorum et cathedras vendentium (LPrt) (Sub) columbas evertit
(DR) And they came to Jerusalem. And when he was entered into the temple, he began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the chairs of them that sold doves.
Lk 19.45 Et ingressus in templum coepit eicere *vendentes* (LPr) (Sub) in illo et *ementes* (LPr) (Sub).

(DR) And entering into the temple, he began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought.

(OE) Ða ongan he of þam temple utdrifan þa *sylldan* (OEPrt) (OE Sub) & ða *bicgendan* (OEPrt) (OE Sub).

The OE Mark uses these participles substantively, while the OE Luke makes a small addition to the rendering with the demonstrative “þa”, and declines the participles as weak adjectives used substantively. Like the Latin Matthew, the Latin Mark includes the exact Latin coordinate clause “et cathedras vendentium columbas evertit”, which contains a genitive substantive present participle. Similar to the OE Matthew, the OE Mark renders the genitive substantive “vendentium” with an OE main verb. This reluctance to render a genitive substantive with a present participle, even in the presence of accusative substantives rendered with OE participles, again suggests that OE translation of present participles in the Old English Gospels may be sensitive not only to category but also to case. This comparison also correlates with the practice of translating “vox clamantis” among the four Old English Gospels, and suggests certain similarities between Matthew and John on the one hand, and between Mark and Luke on the other.

*The stone that the builders reproach*

A third episode in this category is common to the three synoptic gospels and uses similar words and syntax in each, which can reflect further on the practice of translating Latin substantive present participles. In this episode, Jesus poses the rather challenging question to his audience whether they have read in the scriptures that the stone rejected by some builders is
made by God into a cornerstone. The Latin and the sense are challenging, but similar enough in each case that the approach in the OE Mark and Luke emerges as quite different from that in the OE Matthew. In the Latin Matthew, the author presents a present participle of “building”:

21.42 dicit illis Iesus numquam legistis in scripturis lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes (LPr) (Sub) hic factus est in caput anguli a Domino factum est istud et est mirabile in oculis nostri
(DR) Jesus saith to them: Have you never read in the Scriptures: The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? By the Lord this has been done; and it is wonderful in our eyes.
(ÖE) Ða cwæð se Hælynd, ne rædde ge næfre on gewritum, Se stan þe ða timbriendan (OEP) (ÖE Sub) awurpon ys geworden to þære hyrnan heafde; ðys ys fram drihtne gewordyn & hyt ys wundorlic on urum eagum.

It is certainly a more complex passage than much of the Latin version, and the noun phrase “caput anguli”, as “head of the angle”, could present a small mystery to a translator. It may indeed mean “cornerstone”, but the translation “head of the corner” persists even in the King James Version. In any case, the OE Matthew, Mark and John translations handle “caput anguli” equally literally. In fact, the three translations of “Lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes” are identical except for the rendering of the substantive participle, which the OE Matthew renders with the OE weak nominative plural participle of “timbrian”, but which the OE Mark and Luke render with the OE noun “wyrhta”:

Mt. 21.42 dicit illis Iesus numquam legistis in scripturis lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes (LPr) (Sub) hic factus est in caput anguli a Domino factum est istud et est mirabile in oculis nostris
(ÖE) Ða cwæð se Hælynd, ne rædde ge næfre on gewritum, Se stan þe ða timbriendan (OEP) (ÖE Sub) awurpon ys geworden to þære hyrnan heafde; ðys ys fram drihtne gewordyn & hyt ys wundorlic on urum eagum.

Mk. 12.10 nec scripturam hanc legistis lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes (LPr) (Sub) hic factus est in caput anguli
(ÖE) Ða cwæð se Hælynd, ne rædde ge næfre on gewritum, Se stan þe ða timbriendan (OEP) (ÖE Sub) awurpon ys geworden to þære hyrnan (“to jut out like a horn – horn’s head - corner) heafde; ðys ys fram drihtne gewordyn & hyt ys wundorlic on urum eagum.
Once again, there is a marked difference between the practice of translation in the OE Matthew and that of the OE Mark and Luke.

**Woe to those bringing forth children and nursing**

There is, however, an exception to this difference in practice between the OE Matthew and the pair of Mark and Luke in the use of a common dative substantive. In the episode in which Jesus warns young mothers against the sufferings of the end of the world, the Latin presents the substantive dative present participles “praegnantibus” (bringing forth children) and “nutrientibus” (nursing). The OE Matthew and Luke both use use “eacniendum” and “fedendum” identically. The OE Mark uses the OE verb “cennan”, displays variance in its form in the MSS, and omits the translation of Latin “nutrientibus” entirely:

Mt 24.19 Vae autem praegnantibus and nutrientibus in illis diebus!

(DR) And woe to them that are with child, and that give suck in those days.

(OE) Wa eacniendum & fedendum on þam dagum.

75 In Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the Stuttgart edition gives the form “praegnatibus” rather than the present participle “praegnantibus”. However, the OE translation renders this form with the OE present participle in the OE Matthew, Mark and Luke. Since the translators in all three texts understood this as a present participle, I have adjusted the reading of the Stuttgart to reflect the use of the OE present participle in the translation.
Mk 13.17 Vae autem praegnantibus (LPrt) (Sub) et nutrientibus (LPrt) (Sub) in illis diebus.
(DR) And woe to them that are with child, and that give suck in those days.
(OE) Wa cenne[n]dum (OEPrt) (OE Sub) (non) (non Sub) (Omitted) on þam dagum.

Lk 21.23 Vae autem praegnantibus (LPrt) (Sub) et nutrientibus (LPrt) (Sub) in illis diebus! erit enim pressura magna super terram, et ira populo huic.
(DR) But woe to them that are with child, and give suck in those days; for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.
(OE) Soðlice wa eacnigendum (OEPrt) (OE Sub) wife & fedendum (OEPrt) (OE Sub) on þam dagum þonne bið mycel ofþriccednys ofer eorðan, & yrre þisum folce,

Liuzza’s manuscript study notes again that the Cp text presents the form “cennedum” in Mark, while other manuscripts use the present participle “cennendum”. The common use of the present participle in this episode once again raises the possibility that the translation is sensitive to differences in case, as earlier analyses of nominative, accusative, and ablative participles have suggested; this study will consider the possibility that the translations also regard the dative and genitive cases differently. It also raises caution in the studies of translation studies that reveal trends in practice, not absolute differences in practices, and that analysis should focus on comparative proportion and not on expectations of absolute contrast.

**Action verbs as substantive present participles**

In general, the four Old English Gospels render substantive present participles of action verbs at about the same rate at which they render substantives: the OE Matthew renders seven of fourteen with OE present participles, the OE Mark five of ten, the OE Luke six of twelve, and the OE John zero of two. Since the sample sizes are so small, the rates for the OE Matthew, Mark and Luke are about consistent with the general rates for substantives. The sample size in John is too small to make a convincing comparison with the other gospels. The OE Matthew,
Mark and Luke also render dative and genitive cases with both OE-participial and non-participial translations.

**State verbs as substantive present participles**

The sub-category of substantive present participles derived from state verbs offers somewhat fewer examples than do verbs of action; however, despite the smaller sample size, there are some differences in the renderings of these participles. The OE Matthew does not render any state verbs in this category with an OE participle:

Mt 5.42 Qui petit a te da ei et *volenti (LPrt) (Sub)* mutuari a te ne avertaris.
(DR) Give to him that asketh of thee and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away.
(OE) Syle þam þe þe *bidde (non) (V) (non Sub)* & þam þe æt þe borgian ne wyrn þu him.

Mt 9.12 At Iesu *audiens (LPrt) (Post-Nom)* ait non est opus *valentibus (LPrt) (Sub)* medico sed male *habentibus (LPrt) (Sub)*
(DR) But Jesus hearing it, said: They that are in health need not a physician, but they that are ill.
(OE) & se Hælend cwæð þis *gehyrende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom)*, Nys *halum (non) (Adj) (non Sub)* læces nan þearf ac *seocum (non) (Adj) (non Sub)*.

Mt 23.34 Ideo ecce ego mitto ad vos prophetas et *sapientes (LPrt) (Sub)* et scribas et ex illis occidetis et crucifigetis et ex eis flagellabitis in synagogis vestris et persequemini de civitate in civitatem
(DR) Therefore behold I send to you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them you will put to death and crucify, and some you will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city:
(OE) Ic sende to eow witegan & *wise (non) (Adj) (non Sub)* bocyras & ge hig ofsleað & hoð & swingað on eowrum gesomnungum & ge hig ehtað of byrig on byrig.

The OE John, although it must render only two such substantive present participles of state, both of the Latin verb “*credere*”, also renders neither with an OE participle:

Jn 6.65 sed sunt quidam ex vobis qui non credunt Sciebat enim ab initio Iesu qui essent *credentes (Pred SPN)* et quis traditurus esset eum.
(DR) But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning, who they were that did not believe, and who he was, that would betray him.
Jn 7.39 hoc autem dixit de Spiritu quem accepturi erant credentes (LPr) (Sub) in eum non enim erat Spiritus quia Iesus nondum fuerat glorificatus.
(DR) Now this he said of the Spirit which they should receive, who believed in him: for as yet the Spirit was not given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.

As Liuzza notes, there is variance among the manuscripts in John 6.65, in which Cp and RH render this with a main verb, while others render this with the form “gelyfedan” (Vol 1, 171); none, however, uses the explicit present participle “gelyfendan”. This sample size alone limits how persuasively these renderings can comment on the overall practice of translation, and it is even less helpful that the Latin Matthew does not use verbs of believing in the substantive, for comparison. However, both the OE Mark and Luke do render some substantive present participles of state verbs with OE participles. The Latin Mark presents only one case, but it too involves the Latin verb “credere”, which it renders with a variant form:

Mk 9.22 Iesu autem ait illi si potes credere omnia possibilia sunt credenti (LPr) (Sub) (DR) And Jesus saith to him: If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth.

Liuzza also notes that R presents “gelyfendum” and H “gelyfenden”, both present participles. Still, these are in the minority and cannot well represent the practice in Mark. In the OE Luke, however, the translation uses the present participle on three occasions to translate state verbs, including an OE participial rendering of Latin dative “habenti” in 19.26:

Lk. 1.50 et misericordia eius in progenies et progenies timentibus (LPr) (Sub) eum (DR) And his mercy is from generation unto generations, to them that fear him.

Lk 1.53 esurientes (LPr) (Sub) implevit bonis et divites dimisit inanes
He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away.

Lk 19.26 Dico autem vobis quia omni habenti (LPrt) (Sub) dabitur ab eo autem qui non habet et quod habet auferetur ab eo

But I say to you, that to every one that hath shall be given, and he shall abound: and from him that hath not, even that which he hath, shall be taken from him.

Soðlice ic sege eow þæt ælcum hæbbendum (OEPrt) (OE Sub) bið geseald, fram þam þe næfð, ge þæt þæt he hæfð him byð afyrred.

These participial renderings are still in the minority in the OE Luke, where only three of eight such substantive present participles of state are rendered with OE participles. Further, the Latin present participle of “habere” appears elsewhere as datives in Luke at 3.11 and 7.42, which the translation renders with OE main verbs. These incidences are, however, negative:

Lk 3.11 respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) autem dicebat illis qui habet duas tunicas det non habenti (LPrt) (Sub) et qui habet escas similiter faciat

But I say to you, that to every one that hath shall be given, and he shall abound: and from him that hath not, even that which he hath, shall be taken from him.

OE Da cwæð (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) he to him: se þe hæfð twa tunecan sylle þam þe næfð (non) (V) (non Sub), & þam gelice do se þe mettas hæfþ.

Lk 7.42 non habentibus (LPrt) (Sub) illis unde redderent donavit utrisque quis ergo eum plus diliget?

And whereas they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both. Which therefore of the two loveth him most?

OE ða hig næfdon (non) (V) (non Sub) hwanon hi hyt aguldon, he hit him bam forgef; Hwæþer lufode hyne swyðor?

As the study of present participles of “habere” in Luke shows in the upcoming discussion of predicative present participles, the negation of “habens/-t-” does not affect whether the translation uses the OE present participle or another form in the translation. However, these results again suggest similarities between the OE Mark and Luke, and other minor similarities between the OE Matthew and Luke. They also reflect similar findings in the discussion of predicative present participles that the OE Matthew far less frequently renders present participles of “habere” with the OE present participle than the OE Luke does, which too suggests a notable difference in the

While the number of substantive present participles in the OE Gospels at times provides fewer examples than those found in the post-positive nominative and accusative categories, another piece of the puzzle is evident here. The OE translations differ in their rendering of substantive present participles in parallel passages, which raises inevitable questions about why a single translator would correctly translate a genitive participle in the Matthew and John texts, but not in the Mark and Luke texts, or why the same translator would render highly formulaic parallel phrases differently. Such variation is not impossible, but my own experience translating these texts suggests the improbability that a single translator would fail to notice the similarity and repetition of the voice calling in the desert, or overturning the money-lenders’ tables, or the challenging stone that the builders reproach, or the solemn warning to those women bearing children and nursing. Of course, this is a larger question whose implications I address in the conclusion to my study of Genesis, but the supposition that the variation in one author seems unlikely is not an unusual one in similar authorship-attribution studies. In his 2000 article, “Translation by Committee,” Richard Marsden asserts that the variant renderings of eight Latin grammar words could be the product of a single translator, but that this “alternative explanation, that they were done by the same translator at different times, seems to me far less plausible” (73). It is reasonable to offer a similar interpretation here: that the variation in the translations of these parallel passages and the rendering of substantive present participles of state verbs reveal significant evidence of difference between the OE Matthew and John texts and the OE Mark and Luke texts.
2.5f. The predicative participle

If the analyses of the previous categories have given the impression that the OE Matthew and John are as close a pair as are the OE Mark and Luke, the renderings of the Latin predicative present participle complicate that view and suggest that the OE John may be unique. The OE John is quite remarkable because it translates not a single Latin predicative present participle with an OE participle, but it even more remarkable because the OE Matthew, Mark and Luke not only do render the feature with the OE present participle, but do so the majority of the time and at similar rates. However, the OE Matthew still stands apart from the OE Mark and Luke in the rendering of predicative present participles of state verbs, a distinction already seen in the OE Matthew’s avoidance of rendering substantive participles of state verbs with OE present participles, whereas the OE Mark and Luke do so with predicative participles, as well.

This analysis of predicative present participles is immediately complicated by the issue of progressivization of verbs in English. Scholars have suggested that the borrowing of Latin present participles through translation may have given rise to later-English established progressive tenses, and the results of this dissertation will definitely contribute to that scholarship. The results of my study of how the Anglo-Saxon translations handle Latin predicative-nominative participles reveal some consistencies, and some surprises. The OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke show similarity in this category as they preserve the predicative the

---

76 Elizabeth Traugott argues that the progressive aspect “typically … has no overt form in OE” (90). Traugott cautions that the OE progressive “occurs most extensively in translations of Latin.” However, Traugott also concedes that the OE progressive occurs in Beowulf, Orosius, and the Chronicle (90). The debate over just how native the English progressive may be is still a matter of scholarly interest, and the findings of this study will add further understanding of the use of the progressive aspect of the Old English Gospels. See David Denison’s English Historical Syntax for a thorough treatment of the problem of the rise of the English progressive aspect. Barbara Strang’s 1970 book A History of English also gives details on the grammaticalization of the English progressive. In A Guide to Old English, Bruce Mitchell and Fred Robinson largely reject the idea of a developed English progressive in OE. Mitchell also makes this argument in Section 689 of Old English Syntax.
majority of the time, while the OE Matthew and Luke are the most similar. However, the John translation differs radically from the translations of the three synoptic gospels:

Figure 2.24: Percentages of Latin predicative present participles rendered with OE present participles in the Old English Gospels.

The John translation presents not a single Old English present-participial rendering of a Latin predicative present participle. The OE Matthew renders 14 of 18 (77.8%) predicative present participles with OE present participles, the Mark translation 19 of 27 (65.5%), the Luke 26 of 32 (81.3%), but the John 0 of 10. The Latin John certainly presents fewer potential opportunities for the Old English translation to render predicative present participles than do the Latin Matthew, Mark and Luke. However, sufficient opportunities exist to demonstrate that the John translation differs very significantly from the practice of translation of the other three texts. An overview of the incidence of participial and non-participial renderings of the Latin predicative participle may place the practice in some clearer context:
## Renderings of Latin predicative present participles in the Old English Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participial renderings</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.18: habens</td>
<td>1.4 (2):</td>
<td>1.10:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25: consentiens</td>
<td>baptizans, praedicans</td>
<td>1.20: tacens</td>
<td>1.21: expectans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.16: ieiunans</td>
<td>praedicans</td>
<td>1.22:</td>
<td>innuens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18: ieiunans</td>
<td>1.22: docens</td>
<td>2.8 (2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30: pascens</td>
<td>1.39 (2):</td>
<td>2.6 (2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.36: iacens</td>
<td>praedicans, vigilans, custodiers</td>
<td>4.20: intendens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3: loquens</td>
<td>ejiciens</td>
<td>4.44: praedicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.38 (4): comedens, bibens, nubens, tradens</td>
<td>2.6 (2):</td>
<td>5.10: capiens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.54: custodiers</td>
<td>sedens, cogitans</td>
<td>5.17: sedens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.55: ministrans</td>
<td>3.1: habens</td>
<td>6.12: pernoctans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.61: sedens</td>
<td>4.38 dormiens</td>
<td>9.18: orans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 (2): clamans, concidens</td>
<td>9.27: stans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.11: pascens</td>
<td>9.29: refulgens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.15: introiens</td>
<td>11.1: orans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2: splendens</td>
<td>11.14: ejiciens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.11: loquens</td>
<td>12.35: ardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.25: decidens</td>
<td>13.10: docens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.49: docens</td>
<td>17.35: molens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.40: aspiciens</td>
<td>19.17: habens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.47: docens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.37: docens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.69: sedens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.32: ardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.53 (2): laudans, benedicens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-participial renderings</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.29 habens</td>
<td>1.22 habens</td>
<td>1.49 potens</td>
<td>1.28 baptizans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.36 non habens</td>
<td>5.40 iacens</td>
<td>3.23 incipiens</td>
<td>3.23 baptizans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.22 habens</td>
<td>6.34 habens</td>
<td>8.40 expectans</td>
<td>5.5 habens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3 loquens</td>
<td>15.1 appropinquans</td>
<td>10.40 baptizans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.22: habens</td>
<td>11.1 languens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.32 ascendens</td>
<td>13.23 recumbens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4 (2): ferens, dicens</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.8 cupiens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stans, calefaciens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.15: stans, calefaciens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.49 conveniens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.43 expectans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.18:** An inventory of all Latin predicative participles in the Old English Gospels, listed in singular nominative form for simplicity, and sorted by OE-participial vs. non-participial rendering.
A more detailed analysis of the four translations is needed to gain a fuller understanding of how and why these translations differ as they do.

**Predicate present participles in the OE Matthew**

The Old English Matthew takes a very consistent approach to the predicative present participle, translating 14 of 18 with OE present participles. However, the OE Matthew renders present participles of the Latin verb “habere” with main verbs in both 9.36 and 19.22:

9.36 Videns (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) autem turbas misertus est eis quia erant vexati et iacentes (LPrt) (Pred) sicut oves non habentes (LPrt) (Pred) pastorem (DR) And seeing the multitudes, he had compassion on them: because they were distressed, and lying like sheep that have no shepherd. (OE) He gemiltsude soðlice þære menigeo þa he hi geseah (non) (V) (non Pre-Nom) forþan hig wærun gedrehte & liegende (OEPrt) (OE Pred) swa swa sceap þe hyrde nabbað (non) (V) (non Pred).

19.22 Cum audisset autem adolescens verbum abiit tristis erat enim habens (LPrt) (Pred) multas possessiones (DR) And when the young man had heard this word, he went away sad: for he had great possessions. (OE) Ða se geonga mann gehyrde þis word þa eode he aweg unrot (unhappy) soðlice he hæfde (non) (V) (non Pred) mycele æhta.

The instance in 9.36 is particularly illuminating because this verse contains two predicative present participles in parallel structure and in close proximity, but the translation conspicuously renders “non habentes” with a main verb, but the earlier “iacentes” with the OE participle “liegende”. As Mitchell explains, distinguishing among the categories of participles can be at times challenging (Old English Syntax, § 975), and so the nominative case of “iacentes” could deserve the classification of this participle as a post-positive nominative, which the OE Matthew tends not to render with the OE participle nearly as much. However, the Latin conjunction
“sicur” creates equal comparison, which places “habentes” in parallel with “iacentes” as a predicative participle.

The fourteen predicative participles rendered with OE participles are action verbs that can be ongoing, with the potential exception of “consentiens” in 5.25; Latin “consentire” means “to agree on”, which is more likely an inchoative verb that happened immediately, rather than a continuative verb. A modern translator of the Latin might be uncomfortable writing “Be agreeing with your adversary.” Mitchell also cautions that there are examples in OE “in which a periphrasis and a simple verb appear in parallel clauses or sentences, in some of which at any rate a modern translator could not possibly use the periphrasis”, and that these “suggest that the two forms were sometimes at any rate mere stylistic variants” (Mitchell, OES § 686). However, this raises the question of whether the translators may be aware of the difference between the potential aspect of state verbs, which tend not to be progressive, and action verbs, which can be progressive and ongoing. The Latin Matthew uses “consentire” as a present participle in only this instance. However, it uses the present participle of “habere” 22 times, of which the OE Matthew translates only four with OE present participles in 1.18, 4.24, 8.16, and 15.30:

1.18 Christi autem generatio sic erat cum esset desponsata mater eius Maria Joseph antequam convenirent inventa est in utero habens (LPrt) (Pred) (CTV) de Spiritu Sancto (DR) Now the generation of Christ was in this wise. When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child, of the Holy Ghost.
(UE) Sóðlice þus wæs Cristes cneores; ða þæs Hælendes modor Maria wæs Iosepe bewedod, ær hi tosomne becomun heo wæs gemet on innoðe hæbbende (OEPrt) (OE Pred) of þam halegan gaste.

4.24 et abii opinio eius in totam Syriam et obtulerunt ei omnes male habentes (LPrt) (Post-Acc) variis languoribus et tormentis comprehensos et qui daemonia habebant et lunaticos et paralyticos et curavit eos

---

77 The Latin present participle of “habere” in the Latin Matthew is found at 1.18, 4.24, 7.29, 8.9, 8.16 (2), 8.28, 9.12, 9.32, 9.36, 12.10, 12.22, 14.35, 15.30, 18.8, 18.9, 19.22, 22.12, 22.24, 22.25, 25.29, and 26.7.
And his fame went throughout all Syria, and they presented to him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and such as were possessed by devils, and lunatics, and those that had palsy, and he cured them:

8.16 vespere autem facto obtulerunt ei multos daemonia habentes (LPrt) (Post-Acc) et eiciebat spiritus verbo et omnes male habentes (LPrt) (Post-Acc) curavit (DR) And when evening was come, they brought to him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word: and all that were sick he healed:

15.30 et accesserunt ad eum turbæ multæ habentes (LPrt) (Post-Nom) secum mutos clodos caecos debiles et alios multos et proiecerunt eos ad pedes eius et curavit eos (DR) And there came to him great multitudes, having with them the dumb, the blind, the lame, the maimed, and many others: and they cast them down at his feet, and he healed them:

Two of these, 4.24. and 8.16, contain accusative present participles, which the OE Matthew tends to translate with OE participles. Verse 1.18 presents a challenging example of an object-complement, which would be accusative in the active voice, rendered in the passive, making it nominative. The active voice of this, with syntax adjusted to make the relationship of the object clear to the complementing participle, might be “Illi invenerunt eam habentem in utero de Spiritu Sancto”. The Latin renders this in the passive voice as “inventa est in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto”. A translator may not consciously respond to the original accusative participle in the voice shift, but this challenging structure does deserve mention when the OE Matthew is so reluctant to render Latin “habere” with an OE participle. Verse 15.30, however, presents an instance of “habentes” as a clearly post-positive nominative present participle, which the OE Matthew renders with the OE participle. However, despite the tendency of the OE Matthew to
render the accusative present participle with an OE participle, it uses non-participial renderings of accusative participles of Latin “habere” in 8.16, 9.32, 14.35, 18.8, and 18.9.

The OE Matthew’s general reluctance to render present participles of Latin “habere” with OE present participles, together with the OE Matthew’s tendency to render all Latin predicative present participles except for those based on “habere” and “posse”, suggests that the translator may observe the potential for action verbs to have progressive aspect, and for state verbs not to do so. It also illustrates how differently the translation accommodates the predicative present participle, compared to others, especially nominative ones. Such data can increase scholarly understanding of the development of the progressive aspect in OE. Although the progressive form was not grammaticalized or largely standardized, the OE Matthew suggests that it may have received serious recognition in late OE, when not all present participles were equally preserved in translation.

*Predicative present participles in the OE Mark*

The Old English Mark does not preserve the Latin predicative present participle nearly as regularly as the OE Matthew does, although it still does so in the majority of cases. Like the OE Matthew, the OE Mark also translates the present participle of “habere” with main verbs in 1.22, 6.34, and 10.22, but it also uses the OE present participle to translate the predicative present participle in 3.1. This slight inconsistency adds to the OE Mark’s tendency to render even those participles derived from action verbs as other forms. Latin present participles of non-stative actions are rendered with non-participial forms at 5.40, 9.3, 10.32, 14.4 (2), and 15.43, all of which can be ongoing in nature. There is some overlap in practice between the OE Mark and
Matthew, but the OE Mark is more diverse in its approach to the Latin predicative present participle.

**Predicative present participles in the OE Luke**

The Old English Luke translates 26 of 32 Latin predicative present participles with OE participles and 6 with non-participial forms, distributed relatively evenly throughout the text. The Old English Luke displays a significant tendency to use the OE present participle to translate Latin predicative participles, but it does not maintain the consistency visible in this category in the OE Matthew, and better resembles the practice in the OE Mark. The largest semantic fields of participles in this category are speech verbs and various action verbs, both of which may easily carry an ongoing meaning. The OE Luke uses the OE present participle to translate speech-verb participles in 1.10, 1.20, 4.44, 9.18, 11.1, 13.10, 19.47, 21.37, and 24.53(2).

The determination of the category of action verbs among these predicatives is complex and requires some context before this study presents the results. There is always a danger of creating categories that are too large or too small. To begin, this category is separate from verbs of speech, which are also action verbs but which are specific and numerous enough to deserve the separate analysis above. Second, this category generally excludes state verbs, such as Latin “habere” and “cupere”, because the weakened potential for these to take a continuous aspect, as the present participle may represent, reduces the likelihood that the translation would consider the option of the OE participle, despite the Latin exemplar’s use of the present participle. Third, this category excludes the two Latin uses of the form “potens”, which is present-participial in form, but which may function more as an adjective. Fourth, this category excludes verbs of beginning, which may carry an inchoative aspect not reliably subsumed under the OE present
participle and progressive form. Last, this category excludes verbs of position, such as sitting and standing, which do not require the same level of deliberate action.

Among the twelve present participles of action verbs in this category, the OE Luke renders eleven (1.21, 1.22, 2.8(2), 4.20, 6.12, 9.29, 11.14, 12.35, 17.35, and 24.32) with OE present participles. Some of these actions are explicitly transitive, as in 1.21, 2.8 (both), and 11.14. Some take complementary dative or prepositional objects, as in 1.22 and 4.20. Others are intransitive, as in 6.12, 9.29, 12.35, 17.35, and 24.32. However, relative transitivity does not appear to interfere with OE participial renderings:

**Transitive:**
1.21 et erat plebs *exspectans* (LPrt) (Pred) Zaccharam et mirabantur quod tardaret ipse in templo
(DR) And the people were waiting for Zachary; and they wondered that he tarried so long in the temple.
(OE) And þæt folc wæs Zachariaem *geanbidiende* (OEPrt) (OE Pred) & wundrodon þæt he on þam temple læt wæs.

2.8 et pastores erant in regione eadem *vigilantes* (LPrt) (Pred) et *custodientes* (LPrt) (Pred) vigilias noctis super gregem suum
(DR) And there were in the same country shepherds watching, and keeping the night watches over their flock.
(OE) & hyrdas wæron on þam ylcan rice *waciende* (OEPrt) (OE Pred), & nihtwæccan *healdende* (OEPrt) (OE Pred) ofer heora heorda.

11.14 Et erat *eiciens* (LPrt) (Pred) daemonium et illud erat mutum et cum eiecisset daemonium locutus est mutus et admiratae sunt turbae
(DR) And he was casting out a devil, and the same was dumb; and when he had cast out the devil, the dumb spoke: and the multitudes were in admiration at it:
(OE) Ða wæs se Hælend *utadrifende* (OEPrt) (OE Pred) suome deofolseocnysse, & seo wæs dumb; And þa he utdraf þa deofolseocnesse þa spræc se dumba, & þa menego wundredon.

**Prepositional:**
1.22 egressus autem non poterat loqui ad illos et cognoverunt quod visionem vidisset in templo et ipse erat *innuens* (LPrt) (Pred) illis, et permansit mutus
(DR) And when he came out, he could not speak to them: and they understood that he had seen a vision in the temple. And he made signs to them, and remained dumb.
(OE) Ða he uteode ne mihte he him to spreccan, & hig oncneowon þæt he on þam temple suome gesihtðe geseah, & he wæs *bicniende* (OEPrt) (OE Pred) him & dum þurhwunede.
4.20 Et cum plicuisset librum reddit ministro et sedit et omnium in synagoga oculi erant intendentes (LPrt) (Pred) in eum (DR) And when he had folded the book, he restored it to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him. (OE) And þa he þa boc befeold he hig þam ðene agef & sæt, & ealra heora eagan on þære gesamnunge wæron on hyne behealdende (OEPr) (OE Pred).

Intransitive:
6.12 Factum est autem in illis diebus exiit in montem orare et erat pernoctans (LPrt) (Pred) in oratione Dei (DR) And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and he passed the whole night in the prayer of God. (OE) Soþlice on þam dagum he ferde on anne munt hine gebiddan, & wæs þar waciende (OEPrt) (OE Pred) on Godes gebede.

9.29 et facta est dum oraret species vultus eius altera et vestitus eius albus refulgens (LPrt) (Pred). (DR) And whilst he prayed, the shape of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became white and glittering. (OE) Þa he hine gebæd þa wæs hys ansyn oþres hiwes, & his reaf hwit scinende (OEPr) (OE Pred).

12.35 Sint lumbi vestri praepecti et lucernae ardentes (LPrt) (Pred). (DR) Let your loins be girt, and lamps burning in your hands. 78 (OE) Sin eower lendenu begyrde & leohtfatu byrnende (OEPr) (OE Pred),

17.35 duae erunt molentes (LPrt) (Pred) in unum adaumetur et altera relinquetur duo in agro unus adaumetur, et alter relinquetur (DR) Two women shall be grinding together: the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left: two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. (OE) Twa beoð ætgædere grindende (OEPr) (OE Pred), an bið genumen & oðer læfed. Twegen beoð æt æcere, an bið genumen & oðer bið læfed.

24.32 et dixerunt ad invicem nonne cor nostrum ardens (LPrt) (Pred) erat in nobis dum loqueretur in via et aperiret nobis Scripturas (DR) And they said one to the other: Was not our heart burning within us, whilst he spoke in this way, and opened to us the scriptures? (OE) And hig cwædon him betwynan næs uncer heohte byrnende (OEPr) (OE Pred) þa he on wege wið unc spæc, & unc halige gewritu ontynde.

Despite the OE Luke’s relative consistency in rendering Latin action verbs as predicative present participles, it renders 8.40 with a main verb:

78 The Stuttgart and the OE both are missing “in manibus vestris” present in some manuscripts, which the Douay-Rheims does render.
8.40 Factum est autem cum redisset Jesus excepit illum turba erunt enim omnes expectantes (LPr) (Pred) eum.
(DR) And it came to pass, that when Jesus was returned, the multitude received him: for they were all waiting for him.
(OE) Soðlice wæs geworden þa se Hælend agen com; seo menegeo hine onfung; ealle hig gebidon (non) (V) (non Pred) his.

The present participle of Latin “exspectare” is not unique in this category: it occurs in three other instances in the Latin Luke and explicitly takes a direct object in all cases, but it is translated there with the Class II weak OE verb “anbidian”, which is not exactly the same as “bidan”, but both have the meaning “to wait for”. The OE Luke renders a similar phrasing in 1.21 with the cognate OE verb “geanbidian”, but as an OE participle. It also renders Latin “exspectare” as a post-positive nominative participle in 2.25 with an OE participle. However, the OE Luke renders a post-positive dative in 12.36 with a main verb:

1.21 et erat plebs expectans (LPr) (Pred) Zachariam et mirabantur quod tardaret ipse in templo.
(DR) And the people were waiting for Zachary; and they wondered that he tarried so long in the temple.
(OE) And þæt folc wæs Zachariam geanbiende (OEPrt) (OE Pred) & wundrodon þæt he on þam temple læt wæs.

2.25 et ecce homo erat in Hierusalem cui nomen Simeon et homo iste justus et timoratus expectans (LPr) (Post-Nom) consolationem Israel et Spiritus Sanctus erat in eo.
(DR) And behold there was a man in Jerusalem named Simeon, and this man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel; and the Holy Ghost was in him.
(OE) & þa wæs an man on Hierusalem þæs nama wæs Simeon & þes man wæs rihtwis & oþ Israhela frofor geanbiende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Nom), & hali gast him on wæs.

12.36 et vos similes hominibus expectantibus (LPr) (Ob) dominum suum quando revertatur a nuptiis ut cum venerit et pulsaverit confestim aperiant ei.
(DR) And you yourselves like to men who wait for their lord, when he shall return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open to him immediately.
(OE) & beo gelice þam mannum þe hyra hlaforðes abidað (non) (V) (non Ob) hwænne he sy fram gyftum gecyrred, þæt hig him sona ontynon þonne he cymð & cnucað.

The rendering of Latin present participles of “exspectare” with OE “anbidian”, or “abidan” in 12.36 suggests that the translation can perceive the Latin verb as capable of ongoing action, but does not render it with a present participle in the predicative in 8.40. Therefore, this non-
participial rendering of the Latin action verb “exspectare” is not unattested elsewhere, but it is inconsistent with an otherwise strong tendency for the OE Luke to render predicative present participles of action with OE present participles.

Two actions verbs excluded from the above category, for the reasons discussed the study of the substantive participle79, are “incipiens” (beginning) in 3.23 and “adpropinquantes” (approaching) in 15.1. The OE Luke omits “incipiens” in 3.23, but the translation significantly rephrases a difficult Latin passage. The Latin uses a predicative form with a present participle to express age: “Et ipse Iesus erat incipiens quasi annorum triginta”. The translation avoids the secondary verbal aspect of this passage completely by omitting “incipiens” and preserves only the copular verb “erat” as “wæs”. The OE Luke renders the Latin participle “adpropinquantes” in 15.1 with a main verb in this case. By contrast, the OE Mark renders its only predicative present participle of movement with an OE present participle. However, these rare occurrences do not provide enough information in order to interpret the OE translations’ approach to movement verbs in progressive forms. As the table above lists, the Latin Matthew contains no movement verbs in the predicative present participle for comparison. However, the Latin Luke presents five predicative present participles that communicate states. The translation renders “habens” in 19.17 with a present participle, but soon after in 20.28 with a main verb. This OE participial rendering of “habere” differs from the OE Matthew, which does so with predicatives only once but avoids doing so in three other cases. Of the eleven instances80 of the present participle of Latin habere, the OE Luke renders four with present participles, two post-positive nominatives at 4.33 and 7.8, the aforementioned predicative in 19.17, and a substantive dative in 19.26.

79 These issues are discussed on pages 255 and 256.
The sample is relatively small, but the data suggest that the OE Luke translator(s) may not be as reluctant to cast the state verb “to have” in the progressive aspect as the translator(s) of the OE Matthew. The OE Luke renders the Latin present participle “cuniens” (desiring), an emotional state that tends not to carry progressive aspect in Present-Day English, in 23.8 with a main verb. It also does so to the post-positive nominative usage in 16.21. The unanimity of these renderings is extremely limited in significance by the paucity of examples. Further research of the renderings of verbs signifying emotional states may yield additional evidence that the OE Luke avoids the progressive aspect of such verbs.

The OE Luke also does not translate the predicative present-participial Latin “posse” with OE participles, but rather with an adjective in 1.49:

1.49 quia fecit mihi magna qui potens (LPrf) (Pred) est et sanctum nomen eius (DR) Because he that is mighty, hath done great things to me; and holy is his name. (OE) forðam þe me micele þing dyde se þe mihtig (non) (Adj) (non Pred) is, & hysnama ys halig

It is necessary to argue, however, that this form is essentially an adjective, and that it would not necessitate a participial rendering. The OE Luke indeed renders “potens” with the OE adjective “mihtig”. An examination of the treatment of this participle in the entire Luke provides some context. Of the four present-participial forms of Latin posse, the OE Luke renders none with the OE participial, but chooses to use the OE adjective mihtig in 1.49 and 24.19, and the OE adjective “rice” as a substantive to translate the Latin substantive in 1.52.

The OE Luke treats Latin present participles of circumstantial sitting and standing, which may also be more stative than active, with OE participles, but inconsistently. It renders “Et erant pharisaei sedentes” in 5.17 with “& þa wæron þa Farisei sittende”, “Dico autem vobis vere: sunt aliqui hic stantes” in 9.27 with “Ic secge eow soðlice, her synd some standende”, and “Ex hoc autem erit Filius hominis sedens a dextris virtutis Dei” in 22.69 with “Heonunforð bid
...mannes sunu sittende on Godes magnes swyþran healfe.” However, right after the OE participial rendering in 5.27, the OE Luke uses a main verb in 5.29, which reads “et aliorum qui cum illis erant discumbentes” to translate another Latin verb for sitting, “discumbere”, with “Oðerra þe mid him sæton.” The Latin verb does not convey purely the action of sitting, but rather of taking places at a table, but the OE Luke still translates this with OE “sittan”.

This analysis of the OE Luke shows that the rendering of the predicative present participle is similar to that of the OE Mark, because both are more likely to render the predicative participles of action verbs with verbs than is the OE Matthew, which tends to preserve the Latin predicative present participle except for verbs of clear state, such as “habere” and “posse”.

**Predicative present participles in the OE John**

The OE John translation takes nothing short of a totally different approach to the Latin predicative present participle, translating none of the ten predicatives with an OE participle, while the OE Matthew, Mark and Luke heavily favour the OE present participle over all other forms in this category. The OE John stands in stark contrast with the OE Matthew in this category, in which the latter translates nearly all predicative present participles except three of Latin “habere” and one of “posse” with OE participles, while the former does not a use a single OE participle to render a Latin predicative present participle. The OE John also stands in contrast with the practice of translation in the OE Mark and Luke, which usually use the OE present participle in this category. Whereas these two regularly render predicative participles of action and speech verbs with the OE participle, the OE John renders Latin “baptizans”, which is generally an action verb and specifically a speech verb, with the OE main verb in 1.28 and 3.23,
and with a prepositional phrase in 10.40. The OE Mark specifically renders the Latin “baptizans” in 1.4 with a present participle. The OE John also uses main verbs to render present participles of position: “recumbens” in 13.23, and “stans” in 18.18 and 18.25. The OE Mark translates “sedentes” in 2.6, “dormiens” in 4.38, while the OE Luke tends to translate predicative present participles of sitting with OE participles, as discussed above, although not at Luke 5.29. These examples are not numerous, which tends to limit their ability to represent the practice across and within the gospel translations. However, the OE John’s differing treatment of predicative present participles of the very same verbs suggests a difference in the practice of translation from the practices of the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke, which vary in their use of the OE present participle to render predicatives of state verbs but otherwise use the OE persent participle at similar rates. The total absence of the predicative present participle from the OE John suggests a substantial difference in the way in which the OE John translation accommodates the progressive aspect of certain common verbs in OE.

2.5g. The oblique-case participle

This dissertation’s aforementioned studies of the nominative and accusative present participle have offered strong evidence that translations may be internally sensitive to the case of a participle, and even to the position of it in the case of the nominative participle. The study of the predicative participle was in a way an extension of the study of the pre-positive and post-positive nominative (since predicatives are nominative in case), and it too receives treatments different among different gospel translations, and even different from treatments of other categories of present participles. Further, these studies have shown that participles embedded in ablative absolutes appear to receive dramatically different treatments by different gospels.
However, the foregoing study of substantive present participles raised the question of whether the translations are sensitive to oblique cases, genitive, dative and ablative, as they are to the strong cases, the nominative and the accusative. The exhaustive nature of this study has facilitated an inventory of either pre- or post-positive present participles in oblique cases, and has revealed something surprising about the Latin exempla: the Latin Matthew and Mark, and the Latin John, rarely use the Latin present participle in oblique cases outside the ablative absolute, which is itself somewhat rare. The Latin Luke, on the other hand, uses more oblique-case present participles than do the other three Latin gospels combined. Although it lies outside the scope of this dissertation to examine what this might suggest about the sources and authorship of the Latin Luke, it is a question that may deserve further study. In the current study, however, the rendering of verbs of building in oblique cases shows yet another distinction between the OE Matthew and both the OE Mark and Luke.

The Latin Matthew uses only seven oblique-case participles, not including ablative absolutes discussed above. The Latin Mark presents five, the Latin Luke fifteen, and the Latin John two, both genitives. The difference in samples sizes, which are already rather small, may not permit a highly representative reflection of translation practice, but they do allow some observations that may be correlated with the many trends observed in this dissertation as a part of growing body of evidence. The OE Matthew renders two of the seven oblique participles with OE participles at 11.16 and 13.47. Although the sample size is extremely small, this finding still generally agrees with a sharp reduction in the number of OE participial renderings between chapters 13 and 14, proposed by Liuzza and supported by several findings in this study, including the sliding proportion test and the rendering of accusative participles.

---

The Latin Mark², quite by contrast, renders four of five oblique participles with OE participles in 8.39, 9.41, and two in 16.10, all post-positive ablatives. The Latin Luke³ renders seven of fifteen oblique-case participles with OE participles at 6.48, 6.49, 7.32 (3), 8.32, and 18.7. Six of the OE participial renderings occur in chapters 6-8, while the rest of the OE Luke avoids the OE participle, except in 18.7. However, this cluster of OE-participial renderings raises questions about the difference in practice suggested in the earlier discussion of “the stone that the builders reproach” in the Matthew, Mark and Luke texts. In that comparison of nominative substantive present participles of the Latin action verb “aedificare”, the OE Matthew uses the present participle of the OE verb “timbrian”, while the OE Mark and Luke use the OE noun “wyrhta”. However, the Latin Luke presents singular dative present participles of “aedificare” in similar structures in 6.48 and 6.49, which the OE Luke renders with the present participle of the OE verb “timbrian”:

6.48 similis est homini **aedificanti (LPrt) (Ob)** domum qui fudit in altum et posuit fundamentum super petram inundatione autem facta inlisum est flumen domui illi et non potuit eam movere: fundata enim erat super petram  
(DR) He is like to a man building a house, who digged deep, and laid the foundation upon a rock. And when a flood came, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and it could not shake it; for it was founded on a rock.  
(OE) He ys gelic **timbriendum (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Ob)** men his hus se dealf deopne & hys grundweall ofer þæne stan asette; Soðlice gewordenum flode hit fleow into þam huse, & hyt ne mihte þæt hus astirian, hit wæs ofer þæne stan getrymed.

6.49 Qui autem audivit et non fecit similis est homini **aedificanti (LPrt) (Ob)** domum suam super terram sine fundamento in quam inlisus est fluvius et continuo concidit et facta est ruina domus illius magna  
(DR) But he that heareth, and doth not, is like to a man building his house upon the earth without a foundation: against which the stream beat vehemently, and immediately it fell, and the ruin of that house was great.  
(OE) Se ðe gehyrð & ne deþ, he is gelic þam **timbriendan (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Ob)** men his hus ofer þa eorþan butan grundwealle, & þæt flod in fleow & hrædllice hyt afeoll & wearð mycel hryre þæs huses.

² Latin oblique-case present participles in Mark occur at 3.3, 8.39, 9.41, 16.10 (2).  
Both renderings engage in the extremely rare practice of position shift in the gospels, but preserve the participial quality of the passage. This affords an opportunity to study the rendering of the OE verb “timbrian” across the four translations and examine whether these differences represent a significant lexical shift.

**Building verbs in the Latin gospels and the OE translations**

This dissertation’s earlier analysis of substantive present participles found a difference between the practice of translating the Latin nominative substantive “aedificantes” in Matthew 21.42, Mark 12.10, and Luke 20.17; the OE Matthew uses the OE participle, while the OE Mark and Luke use the OE noun “wyrhta” (worker). While this suggests the possibility of a difference in practice, the OE Luke’s rendering of 6.48 and 6.49, as discussed immediately above, raises questions about how the four translations render not only the present participle of Latin “aedificare”, but also how they render the verb in all its forms. The results of this particular sub-study offer unusually stark contrasts that reflect on the larger practice of translation in the Old English Gospels.

After finding and collating all occurrences of the Latin verb “aedificare” in the four gospels, this study finds that every form of the Latin verb “aedificare” is rendered with forms of OE “timbrian” in almost every occurrence; in fact, the only exceptions to this occur in Mark 12.10 and Luke 20.17, where the translations use nouns to replace the substantive present participle. The Latin Matthew presents nine instances of “aedificare” in 7.24, 7.26, 16.18, 21.33, 21.42, 23.29, 24.1, 26.61, and 27.40, but renders all with OE “timbrian”, and strives to match form with form: verb with verb, participle with participle, and noun with noun. In 24.1, where
the Latin uses a nominalized version of the verb with “aedificationes”, the OE Matthew responds quite similarly with a noun-derived form of “timbrian”:

24.1 Et egressus Iesu de templo ibat et accesserunt discipuli eius, ut ostenderent ei aedificationes templi
(DR) And Jesus being come out of the temple, went away. And his disciples came to shew him the buildings of the temple.
(OE) & þa se Hælend uteode of þam temple, him togenealæhton hys leorningcnihtas þæt hi him ætywdon þæs temples getimbrunge.

It is worth noting that the OE Matthew translates only one instance of one other Latin verb with OE “timbrian” in 7.25, in which the Latin uses the verb “fundare”, “fundata enim erat super petram”, but the OE retains “timbrian” with “Soðlice hit wæs ofer stan getimbrod”. This variant translation, however, occurs between two uses of “aedificare” in the same context of building in 7.24 and 7.26, and therefore shows semantic consistency on the part of the translation.

The Latin Mark presents five occurrences of the root “aedifica-” in 12.1 (verb “aedificavit”), 12.10 (present participle “aedificantes”), 13.2 (noun “aedificationes”), 14.58 (verb “aedificabo”), and 15.29 (verb “reaedificas”), of which it renders four with OE “timbrian” and 12.10, the previously discussed substantive present participle, with the noun “wyrhta”. The OE Mark matches also verb for verb and even noun for noun, as it does for the noun “aedificationes” in 13.2:

13.2 et respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesus ait illi vides has omnes magnas aedificationes non relinquetur lapis super lapidem qui non destruatur.
(DR) And Jesus answering, said to him: Seest thou all these great buildings? There shall not be left a stone upon a stone, that shall not be thrown down.
(OE) Þa (non) (non Pre-Nom) (Omitted) cwæð se Hælend, ne geseoge ealle þas mycelan getimbrunga; Ne bið her læfed stan ofer stan þe ne beo toworpen.

As the OE Matthew does in 24.1, so does the OE Mark use OE “timbrian” in the context of building in 13.1, where the Latin Mark uses the Latin noun “structura”:

13.1 Et cum egrederetur de templo ait illi unus ex discipulis suis magister aspice quales lapides et quales structurae
(DR) And as he was going out of the temple, one of his disciples said to him: Master, behold what manner of stones and what buildings are here.

(OE) Þæ he of þam temple eode, þa cwæð an of his leorningnihtum to him, Lareow, loca hwylce stanas her synt & hwylce getimbrunga þisses temples.


The Latin John only presents the Latin verb “aedificare” once, at 2.20. The Latin form takes the preterite passive, which the translation renders in the same voice and tense:

2.20 dixerunt ergo Iudaei quadraginta et sex annis aedificatum est templum hoc et tu tribus diebus excitabis illud

(DR) The Jews then said: Six and forty years was this temple in building; and wilt thou raise it up in three days?

(OE) Ða Iudeas cwædon to him, þis tempel wæs getimbrod on six & feowertigon wintron & arærst þu hit on þrym dagon?

With such tremendous consistency in the rendering of the Latin verb “aedificare”, not only in its pairing with OE “timbrian” but also in the matching of form for form across the four gospels, why do only the OE Mark and Luke break from this practice to render the substantive of “aedificare” with OE “wyrhta” when the OE Matthew uses the present participle? Despite the relatively small sample size, the implications of this difference in practice suggest another similarity between the OE Mark and Luke translations, and their common difference from the OE Matthew.
2.5h. The unattested OE present participle

Before the study of present participles in the Old English Gospels can possibly be complete, however, the question remains whether the Old English translations ever use the OE present participle other than to translate a Latin participle, which they most certainly do, although relatively rarely. This possibility raises important questions about over-arching concepts in biblical translation, such as how inviolable the translators considered the text. This line of inquiry responds to critical evaluations of the Old English Gospels as mechanical, and sheds further light on English historical-linguistic studies of the development of both the present participle and the progressive-tense system. As a result, this research could provide further insight into larger questions well outside the specifics of this dissertation. This research also produces results that further distinguish the OE Matthew and John from the OE Mark and John in the translation of the Latin verb “gradi” in its various forms.

All four OE Gospels use Old English present participles to translate a variety of Latin structures other than present participles. The Matthew, Mark and Luke translations do so more than the John translation, while Luke presents the largest number of these unattested present participles:

---

84 In her 1973 dissertation, The Style of the West-Saxon Gospels, Lea Olsan discusses critical suggestions that the Old English Gospels are the product of a very mechanical translation, but that the translation is much more idiomatic than critics realize: “The OE Gospels render the Latin into native English to an extent that has been underestimated. The translation is close, but not slavish. Comparisons with other English versions clearly show the style to be not only more idiomatic than that of the OE interlinear glosses, which is to be expected, but also more idiomatic than the early Wycliffite Bible, modern ‘expanded version’, and in some passages the KJ version” (239).
### Table 2.19: An inventory of unattested OE participles found in the four Old English Gospels. Some of these participles appear to have no exemplum in the Latin, but appear to have been added by the translator(s). I have denoted such cases with the note “(added)”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>debitoribus – gyltendum</td>
<td>1.21 ingressus – ingangende</td>
<td>1.7 sterilis – unberende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>esse solliciti – hogiende</td>
<td>1.45 egressus – utgangende</td>
<td>1.28 ingressus – ingangende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>rapaces – reafigende</td>
<td>5.40 suwiende (added)</td>
<td>1.36 sterilis – unberende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>potator – windrincende</td>
<td>6.33 concurreunt – gangende</td>
<td>2.51 smeagende (added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>benedixit – bletsiende</td>
<td>8.3 ieiunos – fæstende</td>
<td>4.42 egressus – utgangende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>ieiunos – fæstende</td>
<td>9.23 cum lacrimis – wepende</td>
<td>6.20 elevatis oculis – beseonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>adultera – unrihæmende</td>
<td>9.31 interrogare – ahsiende</td>
<td>7.34 devorator - swelgend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>vivi – lyfigendes</td>
<td>10.20 behealdende (added)</td>
<td>7.41 fenerator – lænende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>cweðende (added)</td>
<td>11.17 docebati – lærende (switch)</td>
<td>9.31 conpleturus erat – gefyllende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>gratias egit – þanciende</td>
<td>16.20 profecti – farende</td>
<td>12.11 solliciti esse – embepencynde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>cumende (added)</td>
<td>12.25 cogitando – þencende</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.13 vivendo – lybbende</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.15 regionis illius – burhsittendan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5 suggillet – behropende</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.26 mirati – wundrigende</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More important than the rate of incidence is the question of what in the Latin source the Old English participle translates. My study has found some significant similarities among the unattested Old English present participles. Some are Latin adjectives for which there may be no easy Old English counterpart, particularly “vivus –a –um”. The most common example of unattested Old English present participles is the very name of Christ, who appears in Latin most often as “Iesus” and “Christus”, in the various morphological varieties. The Old English translation, which does use the given names of the disciples and other characters including Satan, uses the unattested present participle “Hælend” as a substantivized present participle, but my study excludes this last example, as it is stable across the four translations, and is clearly used as a proper noun.

Although many of these unattested participles appear unique in the texts, two interesting coincidences occur that may point very generally towards possible shared authorship among certain translations. Because the quantitative analysis found statistical evidence that each of the four gospels undergoes a significant shift in the rate of using the OE present participle to render the Latin present participle, and because the quantitative analysis showed that the first portions of the gospels use participles more often and are statistically similar, it is possible that one translator may have worked on more than one text, perhaps starting a text and handing it off to a colleague, or receiving a started translation. The rendering of Latin “ieiuinos” with the unattested OE participle “fæstende” in Matthew 15.32 and Mark 8.3 is one interesting coincidence in which two different texts use the same unattested response to the Latin. Another very interesting coincidence occurs between the OE Mark and Luke, which both use variations of the OE present participle “gangende” to render the Latin verb “gradi” (to go). At 1.21, the OE Mark renders the Latin passive participle “ingressus” with the unattested OE present participle “ingancgende”, and
at 1.45, the OE Mark renders the Latin passive participle “egressus” with the unattested OE present participle “utgangende”. At 1.28, the OE Luke renders Latin “ingressus” with the unattested OE present participle “ingangende”, and at 4.42, Latin “egressus” with OE “utgangende”.

However, a brief exploration of how the OE Mark and Luke render other attestations of such Latin verbs is necessary to assess whether their renderings help distinguish the translations. At 3.27, the Latin Mark renders “ingressus” with “on his huse gan”, an OE verb form again of the same verb used for the participle. At Mark 5.39, however, Latin “ingressus” is rendered with OE verb “ineode”. At Mark 1.35, Latin “egressus” is rendered with OE verb “ferde”, at 2.13 “ut eode”, at 6.1 “eode”, at 8.27 “eode”, and at 10.17 “eode”. At Luke 1.9, Latin “ingressus” is rendered with “eode”, at 7.36 “eode”, 11.37 “eode”, and at 19.1 “eode”, at 19.45 the Latin passive participle is omitted. At Luke 1.22, the OE Luke renders “egressus” with “ut eode”, at 8.27 with OE verb “com”, at 15.28 “eode”, at 22.39 “uteode”, and at 22.62 “eode”. The OE Mark and Luke have in common both their unattested OE participial renderings of “ingressus” and “egressus” with variations of “gangende” and their general reliance on the preterite verb “eode” the rest of the time.

By contrast, the Latin Matthew presents “ingressus” only once at 26.58, but the translation uses the OE verb “ineode” to render it. At 19.9, the Latin John presents “ingressus”, but the translation renders this with the OE verb “eode.” The OE Matthew renders Latin “egressus” with OE verb “ferde” at 15.21, “eode” at 18.28 and 20.3, “uteode” at 24.1, and “eode” at 26.75. The OE John renders Latin “egressus” with “eode” at 18.1. These results would suggest that the OE Matthew and John share much in common with the OE Mark and Luke in the rendering of Latin “ingressus” and “egressus”, and when the translations use a verb to render
these structures, such a suggestion is indeed valid. However, the OE Matthew and John do not use the OE unattested present participle “gangende” to do so; they do not have very many opportunities to do so, but especially the Matthew has several opportunities to engage in the same variation. Nonetheless, it does not. This variation provides too few renderings to make a very specific comment on the possibility of multiple authorship of the Old English Gospels, and the significance of this variation is further limited by the fact that the structures do not easily allow an evaluation of the proposed overall shifts in rendering the Latin present participles, as proposed in the sliding proportion test. However, this variation still reveals yet another commonality between the OE Mark and Luke not shared by the OE Matthew and John.

2.5i. Omissions

So far, this study has examined how the four Old English Gospels translate the Latin present participle, whether it is rendered with an OE present participle or with some other form, possibly a main verb, another verbal such as a past participle or infinitive, or even a noun or adjective. However, this does not give the full picture of the practice of translating present participles in the OE Gospels, because the translations sometimes simply omit translating the Latin present participle altogether. The previous study of the Old English Genesis demonstrated that extensive omissions of entire verses containing present participles could potentially influence the outcome of statistical tests. In the Old English Gospels, omissions of entire verses are rare, but omissions of individual present participles do occur frequently enough that some analysis is necessary. How does a translator select which participles to translate and which to omit? This is one question that this study asks and attempts to answer, but it also questions two other possibilities: whether there is evidence of a difference in practice between particular gospel
translations, and whether there may even be shifts in practice within a particular gospel. As this discussion will show, there is evidence of both kinds of shifts, which demonstrate additional differences between the practice of omission in the OE Matthew and John on the one hand, and the OE Mark and Luke on the other. Specifically, the OE Mark and Luke omit pre-positive dialogue participles, while the OE Matthew and John never do so. However, the OE Matthew and John omit accusative dialogue participles while the OE Mark and Luke do not. Further, an exhaustive study of all omitted participles reveals that, although the OE Matthew and John share some omissions with the OE Mark and Luke, the OE Mark and Luke have more omissions in common with each other than with the OE Matthew or John.

The omission of a Latin present participle is definitely a minority practice in all four gospel translations. However, the translations omit more of some participles than they omit of others, and do so at different rates:
### Omissions of present participles in the Old English Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Text</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pos nom</td>
<td>9/145 (6.2%)</td>
<td>15/111 (13.5%)</td>
<td>17/111 (15.31%)</td>
<td>0/16 (0%)</td>
<td>41/383 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-pos nom</td>
<td>13/221 (5.9%)</td>
<td>15/125 (12.0%)</td>
<td>18/255 (7.1%)</td>
<td>6/66 (9.0%)</td>
<td>54/667 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>9/52 (17.3%)</td>
<td>0/38 (0%)</td>
<td>1/28 (3.5%)</td>
<td>2/27 (7.4%)</td>
<td>12/145 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative abs</td>
<td>0/20</td>
<td>0/9</td>
<td>1/31</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>2/66 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>0/29</td>
<td>1/32</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>1/79 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>0/28</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>0/29</td>
<td>0/9</td>
<td>3/87 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.20: Numbers and rates of omissions of Latin present participles in the Old English Gospels. Percentages for ablative-absolute, predicative, and substantive participles in individual texts are not given because they are either zero or very low.

The computation of omissions across the four gospels shows less variation than do other computations in this dissertation, including the subsequent study of position shift. However, some variations deserve discussion and consideration in the context of the larger dissertation. Earlier studies of the various sub-categories of present participles in this dissertation have suggested the similarity of the OE Mark and Luke translations, a similarity evident in the rendering of the pre-positive nominative present participle. The total number of 111 such participles in these two translations is mere accident\(^85\), but the rates of omission are strikingly similar at 13.5% and 15.31%, respectively. The OE Matthew does omit some pre-positive nominative present participles, but at a range less than half that of the OE Mark. The OE John

\(^{85}\) A coincidence that has been checked several times to ensure that I have not copied the wrong total.
omits no such participles, although its sample size of only 16 items is so much smaller than the others that it limits the relevance of such data.

An inventory of omitted present participles in the Old English Gospels

Because the rates of omission of nominative participles are somewhat, although not entirely, similar across the Old English Gospels, this dissertation has considered the possibility that a potential difference in practice may relate either to the semantic fields of the verbs in question, such as categories of speech, action, movement, state, and holding position considered above, or even relate to the verbs themselves. As the table above shows, almost all omissions are of nominative and accusative participles; omissions in other categories are extremely rare, if present at all. Therefore, comparisons among gospels in these categories are unreliable, and so the dissertation will consider their evidence in light of the data from the nominatives and accusatives. The inventory is divided first into its three primary categories, then collated into one inventory for broad analysis and discussion. Verbs with present participles omitted more than once are noted in parentheses:
Pre-positive nominative present participles omitted in each gospel, in alphabetical order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accedere</td>
<td>Abire</td>
<td>Dicere (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipere (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Egredi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acudere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revertere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Matthew omits no pre-positive dialogue verb, but that Mark and Luke do so frequently. Also notice that both Mark and Luke omit far more pre-positive present participles than does the OE Matthew.

Post-positive nominative present participles omitted in each gospel, in alphabetical order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accedere</td>
<td>Aspicere</td>
<td>Accedere</td>
<td>Assistere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicere (5)</td>
<td>Deponere</td>
<td>Ascendere</td>
<td>Docere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extendere</td>
<td>Dicere (7)</td>
<td>Facere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondere</td>
<td>Intro-ire</td>
<td>Respondere</td>
<td>Incipere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venire</td>
<td>Respondere</td>
<td>Indignare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videre</td>
<td>Scire</td>
<td>Ire</td>
<td>Respondere</td>
<td>Transire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.21: Pre-positive nominative present participles omitted in the Old English Gospels.

Table 2.22: Post-positive nominative present participles omitted in the Old English Gospels.

---

86 Roy Liuzza performs a thorough analysis of how the Old English Gospels render the present participle of “respondere” in the second volume of his “Old English Version of the Gospels.” See pages 113-18 to review Liuzza’s concisely expressed syntactic evidence, which includes renderings of present participles.
Note that the rates of omission here are far more even across the gospels, although the OE Mark and Luke do omit “dicere” more often than do the OE Matthew or John. By contrast, omissions of post-positive accusative participles show a very different pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambulare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicere (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emere (in parallel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.23: Post-positive accusative present participles omitted in the Old English Gospels.

The OE Matthew stands apart from the other three gospel translations, but particularly from the OE Mark and Luke, which are far more likely to omit “dicere” in the nominative case, but do not omit any as accusatives. However, the OE Matthew does so. Collating all omitted participles reveals larger patterns, particularly with participles of “dicere” and “respondere”:
All present participles omitted in each gospel, in alphabetical order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accedere (2)</td>
<td>Abire</td>
<td>Accedere</td>
<td>Assistere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipere (3)</td>
<td>Apprehendere</td>
<td>Ascendere</td>
<td>Docere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulare</td>
<td>Ascendere</td>
<td>Dicere (13)</td>
<td>Dicere (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspicere</td>
<td>Aspicere</td>
<td>Exire</td>
<td>Habere (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audire</td>
<td>Audire</td>
<td>Extollere</td>
<td>Incipere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicere (10)</td>
<td>Deponere</td>
<td>Facere</td>
<td>Venire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docere</td>
<td>Dicere (7)</td>
<td>Incipere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emere (in parallel)</td>
<td>Egredi</td>
<td>Increpare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extendere</td>
<td>Exsurgere</td>
<td>Indignare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondere</td>
<td>Habere</td>
<td>Intro-ire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revertere</td>
<td>Intro-ire (2)</td>
<td>Invenire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venire</td>
<td>Patefacere</td>
<td>Ire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videre (2)</td>
<td>Respondere (7)</td>
<td>Observare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scire</td>
<td>Respondere (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videre (2)</td>
<td>Revertere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sedere (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surgere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Videre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.24: All present participles omitted in the Old English Gospels, given as infinitives for simplicity.

Many of the omissions are singular, which limits their individual significance. In addition, although this dissertation has demonstrated considerable evidence to suggest that the Old English Gospels react differently to case and position, such criteria may not be the only influences on the translations’ practices of omitting present participles. It is possible, as introduced above, that omission may not be limited to syntactic considerations, but rather may depend on the semantic fields of the participles omitted and lexical considerations about ambiguous meanings, as well.

To consider this possibility, it is helpful to correlate omissions and identify how gospel translations engage in each omission. The following table summarizes the results of the cross-referencing of the omitted verbs tabulated above:
### Tabulation and cross-referencing of omitted present participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination of texts</th>
<th>Present participles of verbs, and participles present in other gospels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (4) Omissions in all 4 gospels:</td>
<td>Dicere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (3) Omissions in Matthew, Mark and Luke: (These are the synoptic gospels)</td>
<td>Respondere: not in John, Videre: John (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (3) Omissions in Matthew, Mark and John:</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (3) Omissions in Matthew, Luke and John:</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (3) Omissions in Mark, Luke and John:</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (2) Omissions in Matthew and Luke only:</td>
<td>Accedere: Mark (3), not in John, Revertere: not in Mark, not in John, (Ex)surgere: Mark (8), not in -John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (2) Omissions in Mark and John:</td>
<td>Habere: Matthew (22), Luke (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

To prevent the words “not in” from creating a very dense table, at this point I use a negative sign “-” to indicate “not in”. 

---

87 To prevent the words “not in” from creating a very dense table, at this point I use a negative sign “-” to indicate “not in”. 

---
Increpare: -Matthew, -Mark, -John
(In)dignare: -Matthew, -Mark, -John
Invenire: -Matthew, -Mark, -John
Observare: -Matthew, -Mark, -John
Sedere: Matthew (11), Mark (6), John (4)


Table 2.25: Tabulations and cross-referencing of all omitted participles in the Old English Gospels. Participles are indicated by the infinitive form of the verb for ease of simplying the various inflections for viewing here.
“Participles present in other gospels” indicates gospels outside a particular comparison in which the Latin present participle exists and it is translated, but it is not omitted.

This particular study reveals several significant results that reflect on the Old English translations of the gospels. First, only Latin “dicere”, in present-participial form, is omitted in all four translations, providing a clue about the kinds of verbs that might be vulnerable to omission in the translations. The present participle of “dicere” not only appears very frequently in the Latin gospels, but tends to coincide with other verbs of speech or dialogue. Often, the context of passages using present participles of “dicere” in its various cases and numbers already contains another speech verb, including “interrogare” or “respondere”, and reveals that speaking is going on. The following examples from each of the four translations are representative of this type of syntactic context:

Mt 16.13 Venit autem Iesu in partes Caesareae Philippi et interrogabat discipulos suos, dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) quem dicunt homines esse Filium hominis
(DR) And Jesus came into the quarters of Caesarea Philippi: and he asked his disciples, saying: Whom do men say that the Son of man is?
(OE) Witodlice þa com se Hælend on þa dælas Cesareæ Philippi; & ahsode hys leorningcnihtas (non) (Omitted) (non Post-Nom), hwæte secgeað menn þæt sy mannæ sunu?

Mk 8.27 Et egressus est Iesu, et discipuli eius in castella Caesareae Philippi et in via interrogabat discipulos suos dicens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) eis quem me dicunt esse homines?
(DR) And Jesus went out, and his disciples, into the towns of Caesarea Philippi. And in the way, he asked his disciples, saying to them: Whom do men say that I am?
(OE) Ða eode he & his leorningcnihtas on þæt castel Cesareæ Philippi; & he on wege his leorningcnihtas ahsode (non) (non Post-Nom) (Omitted), hwæt secgað men þæt ic sy?
Lk 8.30 interrogavit autem illum Iesus *dicens (LPr) (Post-Nom)* quod tibi nomen est at ille dixit Legio quia intraverunt daemonia multa in eum

(DR) And Jesus asked him, saying: What is thy name? But he said: Legion; because many devils were entered into him.

(OE) *Đa ahsode se Hælend hine (Omitted) (non) (non Post-Nom)*, hwæt is þin nama? Đa cwæð he, *Legio*, þæt is on ure geþeode eored, forþam þe manega deoflu on hyne eodun.

Jn 1.26 Respondit eis Iohannes *dicens (LPr) (Post-Nom)* ego baptizo in aqua medius autem vestrum stetit quem vos nescitis

(DR) John answered them, saying: I baptize with water; but there hath stood one in the midst of you, whom you know not.

(OE) Iohannes him andswarode, (Omitted) (non) (non Post-Nom) ic fullige on wætere. Tomiddes eow stod þe ge ne cunnon.

Perhaps not surprisingly in order to reduce redundancy, all four Old English translations sometimes omit the present participle of “*dicere*” in such cases altogether, making the omission of “*dicere*” the most prevalent omission in the OE Gospels. This partly informs which kinds of verbs are omitted in participial form and under which circumstances this omission occurs.

Once the analysis focuses on omissions in three or fewer gospels, however, there are at least two possibilities that require consideration: the issue of the synoptic gospels and the potential for shared or differential practice of translation. Although the Latin John discusses many of the same events as do the other three texts, it differs substantially enough that it is a different account. As a result, the language and also the content are different from the other three. This relevance of the synoptic question starts to become visible in this study of omissions, which finds that the OE Matthew, Mark and Luke share the omissions of “*respondere*” and “*videre*”. The Latin John does not use the present participle of “*respondere*” even once⁸⁸, but it does use four present participles of Latin “*videre*”, which the OE John does not omit even once.

To add weight to the importance of the synoptic issue, John shares omission with any two

---

⁸⁸ Roy Liuzza performed this study first and reports this in Vol. 2, page 118, but this finding is independently verified in this study.
synoptic gospels, but none with all three. Clearly, there is the synoptic issue with “respondere”, but the potential for difference in practice with “videre”. However, one participle cannot adequately represent the issue of omission or its role in the practice of translation among these texts.

What remains is to develop a sensible way to organize the remaining collations and differences among the various possible gospel pairs and individual gospels. Several other aspects of this dissertation have suggested the possibility that the OE Mark and Luke share authorship; this study will consider such evidence first, but interrogate the limitations of omissions as evidence in this regard as well.

**Omissions in the OE Mark and Luke**

These two translations share a considerable number of features of the omission of the Latin present participle. To begin, it is helpful to exclude arguments that they are unique from each other. Items 13 and 14 in the table show that the OE Mark and Luke present numerous unique omissions. However, of the four unique omissions in the OE Mark, three of them are not even present in the Latin Luke to be omitted: “apprehendere”, “deponere”, and “egradi”.

“Scire/nescrire” are present in all three other gospels, but are not omitted. Of the six unique omissions in the OE Luke, five are not present in any other gospel: “(ex)tollere”, “increpare”, “(in)dignare”, “invenire”, and “observare”. “Sedere” is present in the other three Latin gospels, but is not omitted. The OE Mark and Luke do share some omissions of some Latin verbs that are available in the OE Matthew and John, but are not omitted. Both the OE Mark and Luke omit verbs of going based on Latin “ire”: “abire”, “exire”, “intro-ire” (hyphenated to distinguish it clearly), and “transire”. Such verbs, particularly “exire”, are numerous in the OE Matthew, but
are never omitted in any case or position. The Mark and Luke translations also omit present participles of “ascendere” and “facere” or “patefacere”; these verbs exist as present participles in Matthew and John, but are not omitted. Both the exclusions and shared properties suggest the possibility of uniquely shared practice in the OE Mark and Luke.

**Omissions in the OE Matthew and John**

By contrast, the OE Matthew omits fewer present participles than do the OE Mark or Luke, and in different situations, as the individual tables and discussion of the major syntactic categories of participle omissions show. The OE Matthew’s unique omissions, however, are more accessible in the other gospels. While the present participles of Latin “accipere” also occur only in the Latin Mark, and “extendere” in Luke, Latin “emere” occurs in a parallel phase in Mark and Luke. In addition, the Latin “ambulare” occurs in all three other gospels: four times in Mark, thrice in Luke, and twice in John. While this dissertation has shown several features that suggest a relationship of practice between the OE Mark and Luke, the relationship between the OE Matthew and John is more problematic, as the previous data demonstrate. However, the Matthew and John translations do share some omissions of present participles that are numerous in the Mark and Luke translations, but not omitted: “docere”, which occurs five times in Mark and seven times in Luke; and “venire”, which occurs eleven times in Mark and twelve times in Luke, yet neither is omitted in Mark and Luke. Matthew does share, however, omissions with Mark and with Luke, which would appear to undermine the findings above, except that four of the five Latin verbs of these shared omitted present participles do not occur in the Latin John. The OE Matthew shares the omission of Latin “aspicere” with the OE Mark, and the omissions

---

89 See the previous discussion about substantives, “Overturning the tables of the vendors and money-lenders in the temple,” p. 250.
of “accedere”, “revertere” and “(ex)surgere” with Luke, but these do not exist as Latin present participles for the OE John to omit. Only Latin “audire” occurs as a Latin present participle in Luke and John, but is omitted only in the Latin Matthew and Luke.

**Counter-arguments about omission and shared practice**

The complete inventory in this particular study has also produced evidence that could challenge the hypothesis that the OE Mark and Luke texts clearly share a practice of translation that differs from those of the OE Matthew and John. For example, the Matthew and Mark translations share some omissions, the Matthew and Luke share others, and the John translation shares one omitted verb each with the Mark and Luke translations. This dissertation does not attempt to argue that the examination of present participles in the translation produces absolute contrasts, because such an expectation is in all likelihood unreasonable in a task as sophisticated as translation. The Latin exempla share vocabulary, and some of that vocabulary includes verbs of speech, sense and motion that are often repeated in clear contexts. It is understandable that there is some overlap. However, this study of omissions shows that, when all the evidence surrounding omission is considered, there is a preponderance of evidence to show that the OE Mark and Luke texts have much in common with each other, and much in contrast with the OE Matthew especially, and secondarily with the OE John, which has far fewer Latin present participles with which to work in the first place. This notion of overall difference also raises the question of internal difference.
Omissions and internal variations in the Old English Gospel translations

One of the many benefits of this exhaustive analysis of the present participle, and of the use of the categories and methodology of this study, has been that some striking patterns emerge all on their own, patterns that suggest overall consistency in some cases, and surprising inconsistency in other cases. The OE Matthew demonstrates notable inconsistency in its omission of present participles over the course of the translation: the translation does not omit a single pre-positive nominative present participle for the first twelve chapters, then one each in chapters 13 and 15, none in 16-18, then a spike of omissions in chapters 19-22, and then none in chapters 23-28. The translation displays a similar pattern for post-positive nominatives, of which omissions cluster in chapters 14-23, with two more in chapter 2, and two in chapter 26. Omissions of the accusative are also very inconsistent: the first four uses of the accusative present participle of “dicere” are omitted in the chapters 1-3, then no accusative is omitted again until chapter 14, where the nominative omissions also begin. Accusative omissions disappear again until chapter 21, the height of the spike in omissions, where the OE Matthew omits four more accusative participles. After this point, not a single accusative participle is omitted.

By contrast, the OE Mark omits far more consistently throughout the translation, omitting both pre- and post-positive present participles regularly throughout the translation, and not a single accusative participle in the translation. A nearly identical pattern emerges in the OE Luke, which omits both pre- and post-positive nominative present participles regularly throughout the translation, but omits only one accusative. The OE John also omits fairly regularly: of its 10 omissions of participles\(^9\), four occur before chapter 8 and six thereafter. This pattern of omission, limited as it is, nonetheless suggests no significant difference across the break in chapter 7, as indicated by the sliding proportion test and the analysis of post-positive nominative

\(^9\) Omissions of participles in John occur at 1.26, 4.51, 5.5, 7.37, 8.9, 8.20, 10.12, 11.17, 18.1, 18.10
and of accusative participles. The OE John omits both post-positive nominatives and accusatives, as well as one predicative. However, the OE John is definitely consistent in its preservation of the pre-positive nominative present participle, which it does not omit even once. The sample size is indeed smaller, which prevents a more even comparison, but it suggests difference from the other translations and further reveals its complex relationship with the other Old English Gospels. Overall, however, the OE Mark, Luke and John present more even distributions of their omissions, or lack thereof; the OE Matthew’s clear changes in the pattern of omission challenge the assumption that each gospel is a whole unit for comparison to other whole gospels, and once again suggests that the OE Matthew is potentially the product of more than one practice of translation.

2.5j. Shifts in Position

This study examines the question of whether the Old English Gospels preserve Latin present participles instead of translating them into other forms or omitting them. This study classifies and differentiates some of the types of Latin present participles by position, which raises questions about how aware of the position of Latin participles the translators of the Old English Gospels might have been, and how often the translation preserves the position of Latin participles. As noted in previous discussion, the OE Matthew translation preserves pre-positive nominative participles at a rate far lower than it does post-positive participles. Therefore, this study must address the position of those participles preserved in the OE translation, in order to frame a complete view of the translation’s consideration of position. This study demonstrates not only that the OE Matthew tends to preserve the position of a Latin present participle slightly more often, and the OE Mark slightly less often, than the OE Luke or John, but also that there is
a stark contrast between the OE Matthew and both the OE Mark and OE Luke, which take essentially opposite approaches to preserving the position of a pre-positive Latin present participle. These results are all the more dramatic because this study also demonstrates that the four Old English translations generally do not adjust the position of an accusative participle unless the original Latin presents potential ambiguities.

Position is a key issue of linguistic difference between Germanic languages and Latin, and the Old English scholarly world was not unaware of the importance of presenting a translation from a source language in the idiom of the target language. Ælfric certainly attests to this line of thought in his writings on translation in his preface to Genesis. However, the Old English translations do not appear always to agree on the specifics of Old-English idiom in the rendering of Latin present participles. In two respects, the four Old English translations very generally agree: they tend not to prefer the OE present participle in the rendering of a Latin participle but, when they do use an OE present participle to render the Latin participle, they tend to keep the relative position of the participle:

---

Ælfric expresses some reservations about the act of translation and the act of interpreting the text. On the one hand, in his Preface to Genesis, Ælfric feels that the translator has a duty to preserve the original Latin as much as possible. Ælfric warns that “we ne durron na mare awritan on Englisc þonne ðæt Leden hæfð, ne ða endebrydnyssse awendan” (Crawford 79) (we dare not write in English more than the Latin has, nor change the order). However, Ælfric also recognizes the inevitable difference between Latin and English, cautioning “ðæt Leden 7 ðæt Englisc nabbað na ane wisan on ðære spære fandunge” (79) (that Latin and English do not share one custom in their speech); Ælfric therefore directs that a translator “sceal gefadian hit swa ðæt ðæt Englisc hæbbe his agene wisan” (79) (should arrange it so that the English has its own custom). Ælfric’s comments here inform why some consideration of position is in order in this study, since the preservation of an OE participle and the act of shifting its position engage with the sometimes contradictory imperatives of preserving the original Latin but casting the result in the custom of English. The controversy here is further expanded by the possibility that a shift of position may be a translator’s attempt to ensure the comprehension of the reader or listener, or even to somehow improve on or clarify difficult Latin. The line between engaging with the English idiom and interpreting the text is blurred.
Total position shifts and rates of position-preservation in the Old English Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>OE-participal translations</th>
<th>Position shifts</th>
<th>% Position-preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>127 (25.9%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>125 (37.2%)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>168 (33.8%)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>33 (24.1%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.26: Total position shift and preservation in the OE Gospels.

This dissertation has already acknowledged the problem in the Latin John that the Latin present participle is far less frequent than it is in the synoptic gospels, a stylistic difference that goes beyond the merely different content in John, and which deserves further attention in a more retrospective study to examine the Latin version itself. However, another problem arises is the computation of rates of position shift itself: the four OE translations treat different subcategories of the Latin present participle differently. The general statistics above suggest that, although the OE Mark preserves position noticeably less frequently than do the other translations, the range is not so great as to excite too much anticipation of difference.

However, a closer look at the rates of position shift in each sub-category of present participles in each gospel reveals a drastically different situation, in which position shift is negligible or non-existent in some fields, a significant but minority practice elsewhere, and strongly the main practice still elsewhere. The Old English translations do not always observe the same trends in each case:

Position shifts by category in the Old English Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>OE Gospels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Pos nom</td>
<td>2/11 (18.2%)</td>
<td>22/29 (75%)</td>
<td>15/22 (65%)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>39/63 (61.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Pos nom</td>
<td>2/53 (3.7%)</td>
<td>1/29 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0/63 (0%)</td>
<td>2/11 (18.2%)</td>
<td>5/156 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>2/31 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2/28 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1/20 (5%)</td>
<td>1/16 (6.3%)</td>
<td>6/95 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>3/14 (21.4%)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3/24 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.27: Incidence of position shift by category of present participle.
Not all sub-categories of present participles are compatible with such a study, because not all engage in position. For example, the predicative present participle is by nature connected to the clause subject in a copular relationship with “be”-verbs and similar verbs. Substantive present participles, which replace explicit nouns, need not exhibit position as subjects, direct objects, indirect objects, or objects of prepositions. Only genitive substantives modify other nouns or pronouns, and therefore exhibit position, for which reason they are considered here. Pre- and post-positive nominatives, pre- and post-positive accusatives, ablative absolutes and oblique-case participles (genitive, dative and ablative) all exhibit position, but not always in the same ways in these translations.

As earlier discussion and the table immediately above demonstrate, the Old English translations render the pre-positive nominative present participle with very different practices. The Latin pre-positive present participle appears 127 times in Matthew, but the OE Matthew only renders eleven of these with OE present participles. However, when the OE does use the OE participle in this category, it tends to preserve the position of the original. It does shift the position in two cases where the syntax is particularly complex and benefits from clarification, as will be discussed shortly. Where the OE Matthew tends to avoid the OE participle (it renders only 11 of 145 pre-positive nominatives with OE participles – 7.6%) and uses verbs and other forms, the OE Mark and Luke translations are far more receptive of the Latin pre-positive present participle: the OE Mark renders 29 of 111 (26.1%) pre-positive nominative participles with OE participles, and the OE Luke renders 22 of 111 (19.8%) pre-positive nominative participles with OE participles. This accommodation, however, comes at a significant cost, because the OE Mark and Luke both strongly tend to shift the position of the pre-positive participle. In other words, they far more frequently preserve the present participle in the
translation of a pre-positive nominative, but they usually transform them into post-positive nominatives, something the OE Matthew only does twice, and only in situations where the Latin stacks other modifiers and phrases in ways perhaps challenging to a reader. The Latin John presents only one OE-participial rendering of a pre-positive nominative. It does not shift the position of the Latin participle, but one example is not enough to extrapolate any practice of translation.

**Nominative pre-position shift in the OE Matthew**

The first re-assignment of a pre-positive nominative present participle in Matthew occurs at 4.9, where the Latin presents an ambiguity that is eventually resolved by the syntax, but which the translation opts to refine. In the Latin, the first clause contains the subject “temptator” (temptor/devil), represented by the pronoun “I”, and the direct object “Haec” (these things). The second clause is a conditional that places the participle “cadens” (falling) after the conjunction “si” (if): “et dixit illi haec omnia tibi dabo si cadens adoraveris me” (and said to him, these things to you I will give, if, falling [to your knees], you will worship me). This syntax is problematic, because the participle “cadens” requires the context of a subject to explain who is falling. The actual contextual subject is “tu” (you, which signifies Jesus), but this context is not available in the first clause, in which the only referent capable of acting as the subject of this participle is “temptator”, the devil. Only after the text presents the verb “adoraveris” does the verbal inflection reveal the actual agent of “cadens”. The OE Matthew employs two strategies used to refine this passage: the creation of the explicit subject pronoun “þu” to clarify the subject, and the re-assignment of the participle “feallende” to a post-positive position:

4.9 et dixit illi haec omnia tibi dabo si **cadens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom)** adoraveris me.
(DR) And said to him: All these will I give thee, if falling down thou wilt adore me.
The result is that the participle “feallende” is clearly post-positive to the agent “þu” of the verb “geeadmetst” (worship), and cannot be construed as a post-positive to the earlier agent “ic” (I) of the verb “sylle” (will give). The translation demonstrates further evidence of struggling to clarify the Latin syntax and meaning by adding the prepositional phrase “to me”. By doing so, the OE responds to the potential ambiguity of the original Latin verb “cadere” (to fall), which only in context means to fall to one’s knees in worship. The OE Matthew clearly then responds to linguistic challenges in the Latin, and re-assigns the position of the OE-participial rending deliberately, rather than out of a disregard for the position of the Latin original.

The second incident in which the OE Matthew re-assigns nominative pre-position occurs at 11.25, and again the syntactic conditions surrounding this incident are somewhat unique. The Latin presents a complex pre-modifying construction, with an adverbial prepositional phrase followed by a pre-positive nominative present participle: “In illo tempore respondens Jesus dixit” (In that time responding, Jesus said). This is the only syntactic environment in the OE Matthew in which a Latin pre-positive nominative present participle is combined with an adverbial prepositional phrase. The context of this verse is that Jesus has been delivering a lecture about doing penitence since 11.21, and the lecture remains unbroken. However, the Latin explains that Jesus’s comments in 11.25 occur “in illo tempore” (at that time), even though Jesus is the agent of speech in the preceding verses. The Latin adds that Jesus is “respondens” (responding) apparently to his own previous locution; however, the sense may be that Jesus is actually
responding to God: Jesus confesses to have revealed these warnings after God has hidden them from the wise and the prudent, and revealed them to children.

These verses in the Latin contextualize the ways in which the OE Matthew translation adjusts the Latin in the OE rendering. The translation excises the temporal phrase, which may have seemed superfluous in light of the unbroken agency of speech in the previous verses. The OE translation then shifts the participle “andswariende” to a post-positive position after the speech verb: “Se Hælynd cwæð andswariende” (The Healer said, answering):

11.25 In illo tempore respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesu s dixit confiteor tibi Pater Domine caeli et terrae quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et revelasti ea parvulis
(DR) At that time Jesus answered and said: I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to the little ones.
(OE) Se Hælynd cwæð andswariende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), Ic andytte þe, Drihten heofenes & eorþan, þu þe behyddyst þas þing fram wisun & gleawun & onwruge þa lyttingun.

The translation adjusts pre-position here only as part of a larger initiative to pare away apparently unnecessary narrative detail, and to break up an unusually heavy pre-modifying cluster that is uncharacteristic in the Latin source. This re-adjustment may also represent the translation’s attempt to address the challenging issue of Jesus’s responding to his own speech: although he speaks to “the Lord” (God) and may therefore be responding to God, God has not spoken in the previous verses. Placing the participle “andswariende” after the verb “cwæð” allows the translation to juxtapose it with “Drihten” as closely as possible; this in turn may prompt the reader to interpret that Jesus’s response is to “Drihten” (Lord).

In both instances in which the OE Matthew re-assigns the position of pre-positive nominative present participles, the syntax of the Latin presents considerable linguistic challenges that the translation strives to clarify. This is, however, the exception: the translation otherwise
preserves the position of pre-positive nominative present participles when rendering a Latin participle of this type with an OE participle.

**Nominative pre-position shift in the OE Mark**

While the OE Matthew generally preserves the position of pre-positive nominative participles and only shifts position when the Latin syntax is challenging or ambiguous, the OE Mark and Luke shift the position of pre-positive nominatives a significant majority of the time, even in relatively simple and unambiguous Latin contexts. As reported in the graph above, the OE Mark shifts pre-positive nominatives to post-positives 75% of the time, and the OE Luke 65% of the time. This is already a 40-50% difference from the OE Matthew, but it would be less surprising if these Latin exempla generally provided complex syntactic arrangements that the translation needed to clarify. However, the Latin structures are generally simple, as this study will briefly survey. Of the 22 nominative pre-position shifts in the OE Mark, 17 shift very simple pre-positive structures that are unambiguous and not stacked or entangled with other complicating pre-modifiers. These occur at 1.26, 3.6, 3.34, 7.33, 7.34, 8.12, 8.13, 9.14, 9.25, 10.16, 10.23, 11.22, 13.5, 14.48, and 15.39. Mark 1.26 and 3.6 are representative examples:

1.26 et **discerpens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom)** eum spiritus immundus et **exclamans (LPrt) (Pre-Nom)** voce magna exivit ab eo
(DR) And the unclean spirit tearing him, and crying out with a loud voice, went out of him.
(OE) & se unclæna gast hine **slitende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)** & mycelre stefne **clypiende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)** him of eode.

3.6 **Exeuntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom)** autem statim Pharisaei cum Herodianis consilium faciebant adversus eum quomodo eum perderent
(DR) And the Pharisees going out, immediately made a consultation with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him.
(OE) Þa Pharisei mid Herodianiscum **utgangende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom)** þeahtedon ongen hine, hu hi hine fordon mihton.
The remaining five instances contain pre-positive nominative present participles stacked with at least one other pre-modifying structure that could, conceivably, motivate a translator to re-organize the syntax for clarity. However, despite the more complex syntax, there appears to be little ambiguity in Mark 3.5, because the Latin noun cases and numbers do not overlap. The pre-positive present-participial phrase is followed in parallel by another pre-positive passive-participial phrase, but there is no ambiguity because the only eligible subject is the third-person singular subject of the Latin verb “dicit”. However, the OE Mark shifts the position to place the “hi”, the direct object of “besceawende” first:

3.5 et circumspiciens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) eos cum ira contristatus super caecitatem cordis eorum dicit homini extende manum tuam et extendit et restituta est manus illi
(DR) And looking round about on them with anger, being grieved for the blindness of their hearts, he saith to the man: Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth: and his hand was restored unto him.
(OE) & hi besceawiende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) mid yrre ofer hyra heortan blindnesse geunret (unrightness) , cwæð to þam men, Aþene þine hand; & he aþenede hi, þa wearð his hand gehæled sona.

In the remaining four cases of pre-positive nominative position shift, of which two occur in the same passage, the OE Mark attempts to clarify complex Latin syntax. The Latin in Mark 4.12 is not as complex but does present two pre-positive participles in front of two respective verbs. Because both Latin “videre” and “audire” are transitive and expect a direct object, this passage could be potentially more ambiguous to an Old English reader. The Latin communicates that “those who are seeing shall see, and yet not see; and those who are hearing shall hear, and yet not understand.” Without an explicit object to express what the agent in context sees or hears, it is possible (however unlikely) that a reader or listener might interpret that “they should see the seeing ones, and not see; and they should hear the hearing ones, and not understand.” The OE Mark may mitigate this potential for confusion by shifting the present participle to a post-positive positive, so that it clearly modifies the subject “hi”: 
4.12 ut videntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) videant et non videant et audientes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) audiant et non intelligent nequando convertantur et dimittantur eis peccata (DR) That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand: lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them.

(OE) þæt hi gesonde (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) geseon & na ne geseon & gehyrende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) gehyren & ne ongyten þe læs hi hwænne syn gescyrede, & him sin hyra synna forgyfene.

The instance in 11.24 presents some complexity with a pre-positive nominative present participle modifying the subject of a relative clause, which modifies the fronted object of a noun clause. Jesus instructs, “On that account I say to you, believe that you will receive all those things that, praying, you seek, and they will happen to you.” Perhaps a translator may anticipate some difficulty for the audience in discerning who is “orantes” (praying), which must be nominative or accusative, when the previous pronoun “quaecumque” is neuter, and the previous human pronoun “vobis” is dative. The OE Mark clarifies this complexity again with post-positioning the present participle “gyrnende” so that it clearly modifies the subject of Latin “petitis” and OE “biddað”:

11.24 Propterea dico vobis omnia quaecumque orantes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) petitis credite quia accipietis et veniet vobis.

(DR) Therefore I say unto you, all things, whatsoever you ask when ye pray, believe that you shall receive; and they shall come unto you.

(OE) Forþam ic eow secge, swa hwæt swa ge gynende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) biddað gelyfað þæt ge hit onfoð, & hit eow becymð.

The Latin in Mark 14.22 first presents an unambiguous ablative-absolute present participle, which the translation also shifts in position, followed by a main clause. In the following coordinate clause “et benedicens fregit”, the translation technically shifts the position with the OE present participle “bletsiende” after the subject “se Hælend”. However, this is a practical solution that arranges the three coordinate clauses as parallel verb phrases rather than as full clauses:
Et manducantibus (LPrt) (Abl) illis accepit Iesu panem et benedicens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) fregit et dedit eis et ait sumite hoc est corpus meum (DR) And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave to them, and said: Take ye. This is my body. (OE) Him þa etendum (OEPrt) (OE Dat) afeng se Hælend hlaf & hine bletsiende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) bræc & sealde him & þus cwæð, nimað; ðis ys min lichama.

Although the four instances of position shift of pre-positive nominative participles in 4.12 (2), 11.24, and 14.22 clarify potentially challenging Latin syntax, the remaining eighteen position shifts only re-arrange simple and unambiguous pre-modifiers. This is a considerable difference in practice from that of the OE Matthew, but consistent with a similar practice in the OE Luke.

**Nominative pre-position shift in the OE Luke**

As does the OE Mark translation, the OE Luke shifts the position of a considerable number of OE present participles used to render Latin pre-positive nominative participles: 15 of 22. Consistent with the OE Matthew and Mark, the OE Luke sometimes shifts position either to create practical and concise verbal parallelism or to clarify a relatively difficult Latin passage. However, also consistent with the majority practice in the OE Mark, 13 of the OE Luke’s 15 position shifts re-arrange simple and unambiguous Latin pre-modifiers, which are not stacked or entangled with other complex modifiers; these are found at 4.12, 4.39, 5.3, 5.5, 7.40, 8.16, 10.30, 13.2, 14.5, 17.17, 22.65, and 23.46. Luke 4.12 and 5.5 are representative examples of such participles in relatively simple pre-positive participial phrases, but that the translation post-positions:

4.12 et respondens (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) Iesu ait illi dictum est: Non temptabis Dominum Deum tuum (DR) And Jesus answering, said to him: It is said: Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. (OE) Đa cwæð se hælend him andswariende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), Hyt is gecweden, ne costa þu Drihten þinne god.
5.5 et **respondens (LPr)** (Pre-Nom) Simon dixit illi praeeceptor per totam noctem **laborantes (LPr)** (Pre-Nom) nihil cepimus in verbo autem tuo laxabo rete (DR) And Simon answering said to him: Master, we have labored all the night, and have taken nothing: but at thy word I will let down the net.

(OE) þa cwæþ Simon him **answariende (Pos)** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), Eala bebeodend ealle niht **swincende (OEPrt)** (OE Pre-Nom) we naht ne gefengon; soðlice on þinum worde ic min nett utlæte.

The OE Luke does execute position shift of a pre-positive nominative where the opportunity to develop verbal parallelism is available. In Luke 8.28, the Latin presents a pre-positive participle that pre-modifies the inflected subject of the verb “*dixit*”, but this pronoun “*he*” is drawn from the earlier Latin pronoun “*Is*” at the beginning of the verse. The Latin is therefore ambiguous about whether “*dixit*” is in verbal parallel with earlier “*vidit*” and “*procidit*”, or begins a separate coordinate clause. To clarify the ambiguity and develop some explicit verbal parallelism, the OE Luke shifts the position of “*hrymende*” to post-positive position, very similarly to the technique applied in OE Mark 14.22:

8.28 Is, ut vidit Iesum procidit ante illum et **exclamans (LPr)** (Pre-Nom) voce magna dixit quid mihi et tibi est Jesu Fili Dei altissimi obseco te, ne me torqueas (DR) And when he saw Jesus, he fell down before him; and crying out with a loud voice, he said: What have I to do with thee, Jesus, Son of the most high God? I beseech thee, do not torment me.

(OE) þa he geseah þæne Hælend he astrehte hyne toforan him, & cwæþ mycelre stefne **hrymende (Pos)** (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom), Hwæt is me and þe, la Hælend þæs hehstan Godes sunu, Ic halsige þe þæt ðu ne ðreage me.

The OE Matthew not only does not use the OE participle in these situations, but also does not create verb parallelism. For example, Matthew 2.22 presents a similar syntactic context in which a Latin coordinate *et*-clause could be rendered with an OE parallel participle or verb phrase. However, the OE Matthew does not use the participle and restates the subject “*he*”, even though the verse already states it twice beforehand:

Mt 2.22 **audiens (LPr)** (Pre-Nom) autem quod Archelaus regnaret in Iudaea pro Herode patre suo timuit illo ire et admonitus in somnis secessit in partes Galilaeae (DR) But hearing that Archelaus reigned in Judea in the room of Herod his father, he was afraid to go thither: and being warned in sleep retired into the quarters of Galilee.
The OE Luke tackles 8.10 with the same pattern of position shift as the OE Mark uses in 4.12; both use the formula “seeing, they should not see; and, hearing, they should not understand.” As is the case in Mark 4.12, the transitive quality of Latin “videre” and “audire” could potentially mislead the reader or listener into perceiving these pre-positive nominative participles as substantive accusatives – objects of the main verbs. The OE Luke addresses this potential confusion by shifting the position of “geseonde” and “gehyrende” to post-position, so that they clearly post-modify the subject “hi”:

8.10 quibus ipse dixit vobis datum est nosse mysterium regni Dei Ceteris autem in parabolis ut videntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non videant et audientes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non intelligant

(DR) To whom he said: To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but to the rest in parables, that seeing they may not see, and hearing may not understand.

(OE) Þa cwæð he, eow is geseald þæt ge witun Godes rices geryne & oðrum on bigspellum, þæt hi geseonde (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) ne geseon, & gehyrende (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) ne ongyton.

The OE Matthew also presents a similar passage in 13.13 and 13.14, in which the present participles of “videre” and “audire” pre-modify the inflected pronoun subjects of the main verbs “vident”, “audiunt” and “videbitis”. This passage is quite significant because the OE Matthew renders all three such pre-positive participles with OE participles, something it very rarely does at all throughout the Matthew translation. This passage is quite stylized in the Latin gospels, which may explain why the OE Matthew preserves the OE participles in a category that it nearly always renders with OE main verbs. However, the passage is also quite remarkable because the OE Matthew translation does not shift the position of the participles, even though the passage in Matthew 13.13 and 13.14 presents the same syntactic ambiguities as the similar passages in Mark 4.12 and Luke 8.10:
Mt 13.13 Ideo in parabolis loquor eis quia videntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non vident et audientes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) non audiunt neque intelligunt (DR) Therefore do I speak to them in parables: because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.
( OE) Forðam ic spece to him mid bigspellum forþam þe lociende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hig ne geseoþ & gehyrende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) hig ne gehyraþ ne ne ongytaþ.

Mt 13.14 et adimpletur eis prophetia Esaiæ dicens (LPr) (Post-Nom) auditu audietis et non intelligetis et videntes (LPrt) (Pre-Nom) videbitis et non videbitis (DR) And the prophecy of Isaias is fulfilled in them, who saith: By hearing you shall hear, and shall not understand: and seeing you shall see, and shall not perceive.
( OE) Þæt on him si gefylle d Esaias witegung (non) (Omitted) (non Post-Nom), Of gehyrnysse ge gehyrα & ge ne ongytα, & lociende (OEPrt) (OE Pre-Nom) ge geseoþ & ne geseοð.

The difference between the rendering in the OE Matthew and that of both the OE Mark and OE Luke highlights the difference in the translations’ rendering of the pre-positive nominative present participle: the OE Matthew almost never uses the OE participle to render this structure, but, when it does so, it preserves the position of the OE participle unless the Latin is strongly ambiguous. In contrast, the OE Mark and OE Luke use the OE participle to render this structure far more often, although still a minority of the time; however, when these translations do so, they usually shift the position of the OE participle even when the Latin is simple and unambiguous. Although these gospel translations do not present “absolute” opposition, which can hardly be expected in a task as sophisticated as translation, these Old English texts do display stark contrast in their approach to the position of the pre-positive nominative present participle.

**Accusative position shift in the four translations**

While there is considerable difference between the way in which the OE Matthew preserves the position of pre-positive nominative participles and the way in which OE Mark and
Luke do so, the four Old English gospel translations accommodate the position of accusative present participles at much the same rate. As the earlier table explains, the OE Matthew engages in accusative-participle position shift 6.5% of the time, the OE Mark 7.1%, the Luke 5%, and the John 6.3%. This total range of just over 2% is diminutive, compared to the roughly 50% range present in the position of OE pre-positive nominatives. These numbers are generally consistent with similar rates of position shift among post-positive nominatives. This, in turn, supports this dissertation’s hypothesis that different gospel translations have different responses not only to different cases, but also to the position of the participle in that case. Because accusative participles are almost always post-positive in the Latin gospels, and because aforementioned findings on the nominative participle show that the translations rarely shift the position of post-positive nominatives, it is not surprising that the translations also rarely shift the position of accusative present participles. In fact, they appear to do so only when it is necessary to clarify the original Latin text.

Accusative position shift in the OE Matthew

The OE Matthew shifts the position of two post-positive accusative participles; in each case, the Latin syntax and the resulting OE version present substantial challenges that these position shifts appear to resolve. In 9.23, the Latin “vidisset” takes a compound object: “tibicines” (flutists) and “turbam” (crowd):

9.23 et cum venisset Iesu in domum principis et vidisset tibicines et turbam
tumultuantem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) dicebat
(DR) And when Jesus was come into the house of the ruler, and saw the minstrels and the multitude making a rout,
(OE) And þa se Hælend com into þæs ealdres healle & geseah hwistleras & hlydende
(OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) menigeo.
The singular direct object “turbam” takes a post-positive participle in clear number agreement, “tumultuantem” (making a tumult). The OE Matthew responds with two changes in the passage. First, it reverses the V S order of the first Latin clause. Second, it renders the Latin post-positive participle pre-positively: “And ā se Hælend com āto þæs ealdres healle & geseah hwistleras & hlydende menigeo.” It does not appear advantageous in the Latin to do so for clarity, because the inflection of the Latin participle clearly directs its modification solely to the singular “turbam” and not “tibicines”. However, the Latin word order may present challenges to an OE translation. Were the OE translation to preserve the exact Latin word order, the participle “hlydende” could appear to refer to both the “hwistleras” (flutists) and menigeo (crowd), but this is not the meaning of the Latin source. This re-assignment of position solves the problem by causing the OE participle to work forward and apply only to “menigeo”, just as the Latin “tumultuantem” applies only to “turbam”. The translation here is not simply varying practice, but rather adjusting practice to accommodate linguistic difference between the source and target languages.

In 12.20, the OE Matthew also reassigns a post-positive participle pre-positively, rendering the Latin noun phrase “linum fumigans” (flax smouldering) as “smeocende flex” (smoking flax):

12.20 harundinem quassatam non confringet et linum fumigans (LPrt) (Post-Acc) non extinguet donec eiciat ad victoriam iudicum (DR) The bruised reed he shall not break: and smoking flax he shall not extinguish: till he send forth judgment unto victory.
(OE) Tocwysed hreod he ne forbyræt & smeocende (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) flex he ne adwæsep ærþam þe he aworpe dom to sige.

The problems of inflection and clear number agreement are not at work in this case; rather, the translation has opted to re-align position in the whole passage. The Latin comprises two clauses in parallel structure, each with a noun phrase and a post-positive participle. The OE Matthew responds by preserving the aspect of the participles but placing them pre-positively: “Tocwysed
hreod he ne forbrytt & smeocende flex he ne adwæscþ” (The broken reed he will not break and the smoking flax he will not extinguish). There does not appear to be any highly proximate noun phrase in the Latin or the OE translation that deploys pre-positive modification. As a result, this deviation from preserving the position of these participles appears to be a reaction to the specific Latin syntax. The OE preserves the parallelism and the parataxis using “&”; the translation may adjust the position in this case to facilitate these other syntactic features in the translation.

Because the translation preserves the position of participles generally, and specifically that of post-positive accusatives, unless there is an issue of clarity as in 9.23, the translation is likely struggling with a syntactic issue in the Latin word order that becomes problematic in the OE.

One possible such problem may arise from inversion. Were the translation to preserve only the position of the participles, the OE would read, “hreod tocwysed he ne forbrytt & flex smeocende he ne adwæscþ”. This may present a problem in both clauses, because the nouns “hreod” and “flex” are neuters, and therefore have the same inflections in the nominative and the accusative.

Although the real clause subject “he” is clearly inflected, the translation may have found such initially ambiguous syntax undesirable. Repositioning the participle “tocwysed” pre-positively would ensure that it is clearly adjectival, and this would juxtapose “hreod” and “flex” to the clear clause subject, “he”.

**Accusative position shift in the OE Mark**

Although the OE present participle’s weak inflections can create some potential ambiguities in translation, as discussed above, the Latin Mark does not appear to generate significant potential for ambiguity in 4.8, where the OE Mark shifts the position of two
accusative participles. These participles post-modify the same noun, the direct object of the first of two coordinate clauses:

4.8 et aliud cecidit in terram bonam et dabat fructum **ascendem** (LPrt) (Post-Acc) et **crescentem** (LPrt) (Post-Acc) et adferebat unum triginta et unum sexaginta et unum centum
(DR) And some fell upon good ground; and brought forth fruit that grew up, and increased and yielded, one thirty, another sixty, and another a hundred.
(OE) & sum feoll on god land & hit sealde **uppstigende** (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) & **wexende** (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) wæstm; & an brohte þritigfealdne, sum syxtigfealdne, sum hundfealdne.

The OE Mark translation re-positions the two present participles “**uppstigende**” and “**wexende**” in front of the direct object “**wæstm**”. The translation preserves the Latin coordinate *et*-clauses as OE coordinate *&*-clauses, which raises an interesting question: why might a reader have trouble understanding which noun is modified by “**uppstigende**” and “**wexende**” in post-position if these participles are followed by an explicit coordinate clause with an explicit subject? Even if there were no punctuation at all, the new *&*-clause should be clear. However, the answer may lie in the punctuation, or potential lack thereof, because there are two levels of coordination occurring in this passage: the coordination of the two Latin present participles and the coordination of two Latin clauses, both with “*et*”. If the punctuation in a manuscript were absent, or if one were to listen to this passage read aloud without position shift, the result would read “…& **hit sealde wæstm uppstigende & wexende & an brohte þritigfealdne …**” Such different levels of coordination are confusing; pre-position of the accusative participles make certain that “**uppstigende & wexende wæstm**” is the end of the first coordinate clause, and that the subsequent “&” is a clause-coordinator, with or without the benefit of punctuation. Still, as in the examples in the OE Matthew, the OE Mark rarely engages in position shift of the accusative present participle.
Accusative position shift in the OE Luke

The single accusative position shift in the OE Luke occurs in a passage containing two accusative present participles in parallel structure; however, only the first undergoes position shift in all manuscripts (Liuzza, *Old English Version*, Vol 1, 138). In the Latin passage, there is only one direct object, post-modified by the two present participles:

17.7 *Quis autem vestrum* habens (LPrt) (Post-Nom) servum arantem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) aut pascentem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) qui regresso de agro dicet illi statim transi recumbe

(DR) But which of you having a servant ploughing, or feeding cattle, will say to him, when he is come from the field: Immediately go, sit down to meat:

(OE) Hwylc eower hæfp (non) (V) (non Post-Nom) eregendne (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) þeow, oððe sceþ læsgendne (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) þam of þam æcere gehworfenum, he him sona segð ga & site.

However, the OE Luke interprets and modifies the passage slightly by adding a second direct object, “*scep*”. This modification appears to arise from the translator’s reading of the Latin verb “*pascere*” to mean only “to eat”, when it can also mean “to feed livestock”. Although it makes much sense for a servant to plant in a field, it makes less sense for the same servant also to eat in the field. The translator, perhaps reading “*pascentem*” only to mean feeding or eating as livestock does in a field, adds some livestock to do this, in the form of “*scep*” (sheep). The translation then shifts the position of the Latin “*arantem*” as OE “*eregendne*” in front of OE noun “*þeow*”, creating a chiastic structure that reads “planting servant or sheep eating”. Although this pre-positioning may not be necessary for understanding, it further separates the participles to avoid the confusion that would arise if the translator understood “*pascere*” to mean only “to eat”.

As in the OE Matthew and Mark, this rare position shift of the accusative participle in the OE Luke appears to address potentially problematic or difficult Latin.
Accusative position shift in the OE John

The Old English John engages in the position shift of one post-positive accusative present participle, in a situation somewhat similar to that in Luke 17.7, illustrating that the position shift of accusatives in the OE Gospels may be a last resort to clarify a difficult Latin text, and a stark contrast with the practice of position shift of pre-positive nominatives in the OE Mark and Luke. The Latin John 1.33 presents one direct object, post-modified by two accusative present participles in parallel structure:

1.33 et ego nesciebam eum sed qui misit me baptizare in aqua ille mihi dixit super quem videris Spiritum descendentem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) et manentem (LPrt) (Post-Acc) super eum hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu Sancto.

(DR) And I knew him not; but he who sent me to baptize with water, said to me: He upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

(OE) & ic hine ne cuđe ac se þe me sende to fullianne on wætere he cwæð to me, ofer ðæne þe ðu gesyhst nyðerstigendne (Pos) (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) gast & ofer hine wuniendne (OEPrt) (OE Post-Acc) þæt is se ðe fyllað on halgum gaste.

The Latin passage “super quem videris Spiritum descendentem et manentem super eum” is quite complex: it is a relative clause pre-modifying “hic”, the subsequent main-clause subject. It contains two adverbial prepositional phrases: “super quem” and “super eum”, with each modifying the closest present participle in a chiastic or mirrored structure. The OE John simplifies this unusually stylistic structure by rearranging the prepositional phrases to be in the same pre-position for each participle: “of er ðæne þe” pre-modifies “nyðerstigendne”, and “of er hine” pre-modifies “wuniendne”. However, the OE Luke further adjusts the passage to shift the position of “nyðerstigendne” to lie before “gast”. One effect of this is to remove “nyðerstigendne”, which is modified by “of er ðæne þe”, further away from the second adverbial, “of er hine”, which pre-modifies “wuniendne”. In this way, the OE Luke engages in position shift of the first accusative participle to compensate for its re-arrangement of two adverbials in the
passage. Once again, the OE John resembles the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke in the rare position shift of accusative present participles in order to clarify potentially difficult Latin.

This analysis of position shift in the Old English Gospels has found that the gospel translations substantially differ in their practice of preserving the position of a Latin present participle in rendering it with an OE present participle. First, as earlier discussion has demonstrated, the OE Mark and OE Luke translations are far more likely to use an OE present participle to render a Latin pre-positive nominative present participle than are the OE Matthew or OE John. However, when these translations do use an OE present participle, they diverge in practice once again: when the OE Matthew uses an OE present participle, it retains the position of that participle, unless the Latin presents substantial complications that require clarification; however, when the OE Mark or Luke use the present participle, they tend to shift the position of the participle even when the Latin presents only simple and unambiguous text. This variance in practice in translating the pre-positive nominative participle is a strong contrast with the four gospels’ rendering of post-positive nominative and accusative participles. The four Old English Gospels very rarely shift the position of a post-positive participle; the study of accusative position shift shows that all four translations only do so when the Latin text presents very considerable syntactic challenges or ambiguities. The difference in range of practice is truly dramatic, as well: the range of position shift of accusative participles among the four Old English Gospels is a mere 2%, but the range of position shift of pre-positive nominative participles in the OE Matthew, Mark and Luke (John has an insufficient sample size) is roughly a 50% difference. The OE Mark and Luke, however, range in their practice by only 10%. This composite result clearly demonstrates a substantial, almost opposing practice of translation between the OE

2.5k. Correlations with lexical shifts

The earlier discussion of omissions uncovered a shift in practice in the OE Matthew, where omissions start in chapter 13 and trail off by chapter 23, suggesting that the practice of translation abruptly and substantially shifts in the OE Matthew. In the course of this study, a correlating lexical shift came to light, coinciding with this shift: the translation of the Latin “phariseus” (Pharisee)\textsuperscript{92}. The OE Matthew translates the Latin noun with the OE noun “sundorhalga” without exception, starting at 3.7, where the first incidence occurs, to 12.38, after which the Latin noun does not occur until 15.1. However, starting at 15.1 and continuing to 23.29, the OE Matthew translates Latin “phariseus” only with the Latin borrowing “farise-” in various forms and spellings. This translation too undergoes a clear shift, in which the OE Matthew spells the borrowing with an initial [f-] seven times in 15.1, 15.12, 16.1, 16.6, 16.11, 16.12, and 19.3, then shifts to an initial [ph-] spelling for the remaining twelve occurrences in 21.45, 22.15, 22.34, 22.41, 23.2, 23.13, 23.15, 23.23, 23.25, 23.26, 23.27, and 23.29. This shift in the spelling of the OE borrowing adds further support to Roy Liuzza’s claim that a shift in the translation of the OE Matthew occurs somewhere around chapter 21. The Latin at 23.14 also presents the Latin “pharisaei”, but the OE Matthew omits this verse entirely\textsuperscript{93}. The Latin “phariseus” does not occur again until Matthew 27.62, where the OE Matthew once again

\textsuperscript{92} Although I only name the nominative singular declension of these words in the OE, the examples cited refer to these noun in every case and number occurring in the Old English Gospels.
\textsuperscript{93} The Stuttgart edition does not include 23.14 in the edition, but notes that this line existed in some MSS. The OE translator may not have had access to a MS with this line. However, this variation has little effect here, because it occurs right beside the previous usage at 23.13, after which point the Latin “phariseus” does not occur again until 27.62.
returns to the use of OE “sundorhalga”. This shift is surprising by itself, but it is far more conspicuous because it coincides with the clear shift in the practice of omission of present participles and with the rendering of the post-positive nominative present participle of “dicere”\textsuperscript{94}.

This lexical shift in the OE Matthew is not consistent with the treatment of Latin “phariseus” in the other three translations, although there is some mixing of the two OE terms in the texts. The OE Mark simply does not use the OE “sundorhalga” at all in the translation of any Latin word, even though Latin “phariseus” occurs thirteen times, which the OE Mark consistently translates with the Latin borrowing. The OE Mark uses the $f$-initial form at 2.5, but switches to the $ph$-initial form at 2.18 and continues this usage for the rest of the translation\textsuperscript{95}. The OE John also almost entirely prefers the Latin borrowing and uses only the $ph$-initial form “pharise-” nineteen times in the translation. However, the OE John uncharacteristically uses OE “sundorhalga” at 1.24, a detail that warrants further investigation and may coincide with syntactic shifts in the OE John.


\textsuperscript{94} See Section 2.5b, “The post-positive nominative participle” for this discussion.

\textsuperscript{95} This shift begs the question of whether the translation of Matthew after chapter 13 and the OE Mark share some authorship, but there is not enough evidence here to assert such shared authorship confidently. We do not know why a translator may switch from one spelling to another. The translator may have been corrected by a colleague, but the translator may be a different person. Here, the difference itself suggests a possible course of future study in which the later part of Matthew may be compared to the OE Mark translation, rather similar to the kinds of shared-authorship attribution study performed by Richard Marsden on the Old English Hexateuch. See Marsden’s article “Translation by Committee?”. 
this better illustrated than in Luke 7.36, where the translation actually uses both the OE and Latin-borrowed forms in the very same verse:

7.36 Rogabat autem illum quidam de Pharisaieis ut manducaret cum illo et ingressus domum Pharisaei discubuit.
(DR) And one of the Pharisees desired him to eat with him. And he went into the house of the Pharisee, and sat down to meat.
(OE) Þa bæd hine sum of þam sundorhalgum þæt he mid him æte, ða eode he into þæs Fariseiscan huse & gesæt.

The consistency with which the OE Mark only uses the Latin borrowing “f/pharise-”, and with which the OE Matthew uses only one or the other, in conjunction with other clear shifts in practice, sharply distinguishes the OE Luke’s rendering of the Latin “phariseus”. It is a stark difference from the practice of translation in the other two synoptic gospels, and re-iterates earlier questions about how textual studies should define units of text. With so much interest in the difference between gospel translations, this particular finding reinforces the importance of looking inside the translations themselves for difference, and suggests again the possibility that these translations were shared works, perhaps handed from one translator to another.

This internal evidence is compelling, but the question remains whether OE writers generally used one or both terms, and how they mixed them in their writing. With the tremendous assistance of the University of Toronto’s Dictionary of Old English and its Web Corpus, this dissertation has searched for both OE “sundorhalga” and the Latin-borrowed “f/pharise-”, in order to assess how these words are used in extant OE writings. The noun “sundorhalga” occurs 62 times in the OE corpus. Of particular value are results from large biblical translations or paraphrases produced by known single authors. The results show that OE “sundorhalga” is present in Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies (I and II), the Liber scintillarum, “James the Greater” from Early English Homilies from the Twelfth-Century MS. Vespasian D.XIV, Invention of the Cross from Legends of the Holy Rood, and “The Healing of the Blind Man”
from *Old English Homilies from MS. Bodley 343*. However, it is most numerous in the Old English Gospels\(^96\). The results also demonstrate that Ælfric also uses the Latin borrowing “\(f/pharise\)-”, using the ph-initial form in the Homilies I and II. Ælfric mixes his use of OE “\(sundorhalga\)” and the Latin-borrowed “\(f/pharise\)-”, less frequently than does the OE Luke translation but with similar intermittence; he does not sharply terminate one use and commence another\(^97\), as does the OE Matthew. The only other OE texts to translate the Latin “phariseus” with much frequency are the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels, which translate the term extensively. However, neither the Lindisfarne nor the Rushworth ever uses the OE noun “\(sundorhalga\)” to translate the Latin “phariseus”. As a result, this analysis of the rendering of Latin “phariseus” contributes additional support for the findings of this study, and Roy Liuzza’s assertion, that a break in practice occurs around the boundary between chapters 13 and 14 in the OE Matthew.

### 2.6. Limitations, conclusions, and future work

Although this study has undertaken many different approaches to examine rendering of the Latin present participle and the authorship of the Old English Gospels, I gladly concede certain limitations and unmet objectives. The first is that this study analyzes the larger question of authorship by focusing on one particular feature, the present participle. As Joseph Rudman cautions in his 1998 review of authorship-attribution studies, the use of particular words or features may not be representative enough to reflect on authorship, but “in conjunction with all of the other quantifiable indicators that make up style, they become important” (360). The Latin

---

\(^96\) This survey was obtained only with the help of the University of Toronto Dictionary of Old English’s “Variant Word/Phrase Search” tool at [http://tir.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/tools/varphrase.html](http://tir.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/tools/varphrase.html). I would also like to extend my gratitude to Prof. Healey from the Dictionary for her directions to find and use this tool and information.

\(^97\) Future work could address this distribution in a more detailed examination of Ælfric’s rendering of this term.
present participle is a significant feature in the Old English Gospels, but it is only one piece of the authorship puzzle. The second limitation of this study is that it relies on the proportion test for its statistical and quantitative evidence. The proportion test is highly appropriate to this study, but many other statistical methods and techniques are available that deserve further exploration, especially when future work incorporates other quantifiable features. This study’s third limitation is that it can only do so much to reflect on the pattern of authorship in the Old English Gospels. For one, I cannot clearly assert a certain and specific number of translators; there simply is not enough information, but as more studies emerge, future work with more features and statistical methods may be able to zero in on a probable number of translators and even begin to link the translators of different parts of the Old English Gospels.

Despite these limitations, this dissertation was not designed to confirm existing theories; on the contrary, it was designed to gather data, analyze it according to a standard methodology, and elicit more information about how the Old English gospel translations rendered the Latin present participle. The results suggest clear evidence of systemic difference in the practice of translation among the gospels. Some differences have been limited by small sample sizes or statistically small differences. However, several differences have proven to be statistically significant, and some differences are absolutely stark. Two primary outcomes suggest that the Old English Gospels are a product of multiple inter-textual and intra-textual authorship.

---

98 Jack Grieve discusses in detail the problem that a very large number of quantitative methods of authorship attribution are in use. Grieve’s 2007 article reviews many of the recent techniques and discusses that the field of authorship attribution must strive towards finding some consensus on how to use statistical methods to investigate authorship. See his article “Quantitative Authorship Attribution: An Evaluation of Techniques” in *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 22.3 (2007): 251-70.

99 I discuss the statistical limitations of my methodology at length in the conclusion of the Genesis study, where I propose a number of statistical methods by which future work could enhance the quantitative aspects of this study. I will not review them here in detail, for the sake of avoiding redundancy. However, my comments in the conclusion of the Genesis study are germane to the limitations of the study of the Old English Gospels as they are to the study of Genesis.
First, it is unlikely that the entire Old English Gospels are a product of unified authorship, as far as the rendering of the Latin present participle can reflect. A work of such size would surely take time, and individual authors would likely vary their practice a great deal. However, there is a body of evidence in this study to suggest that the four translations are not unified in the rendering of the Latin present participle. Specifically, the OE Mark and Luke appear to share features that distinguish them from the OE Matthew and John; further, the OE Matthew and John share commonalities, but the OE John also presents uniquely different practices of translation that distinguish it from the OE Matthew. The evidence is as follows:

1. The proportion tests of the overall rate of rendering the Latin present participle show that all four Old English translations barely fall within of the range of similarity. However, the OE Matthew and John are statistically very similar in one grouping, and the OE Mark and Luke are very similar in another grouping.

2. The sliding proportion test produces compelling results that all four translations undergo a statistically significant internal change in the rate of translating the Latin participle.

3. The proportion tests of the portions on either side of the proposed break in each text show that the first portions of the Matthew, Mark, Luke, John are just inside the statistical threshold of similarity, but the second portions (and third as well in the OE Mark) are not statistically similar. The proportion tests on the rendering of pre- and post-positive nominative participles in each portion of Matthew, and the rendering of the post-positive nominative participle in Luke, support this finding as well. These statistical tests suggest that the OE Matthew breaks around the end of chapter 13 and that Luke breaks around 8.27. Further, the proportion test shows that the renderings of pre- and post-positive
nominative participles in the first portions of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are statistically similar, but other portions do not demonstrate statistical similarity.

4. Qualitative analysis shows that the OE Matthew renders the pre-positive nominative participle at a very different rate from the post-positive nominative, the OE Mark and Luke render the pre-positive nominative at roughly the same rate as the post-positive nominative, and the OE John resembles the rate of rendering in the OE Matthew, but the Latin participles it preserves differ from those in Matthew.

5. By contrast, the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke all render the post-positive nominative at very similar rates (although the OE John preserves fewer Latin participles in this category), suggesting that different translators took different approaches to the pre-positive-nominaive participle. The OE Matthew renders the post-positive nominative present participle of “dicere” with the OE present participle in chapters 1-13 much more frequently than do the OE Mark or Luke.

6. The analysis of accusative participles also indicates that the rendering of accusative participles of “dicere”, further indicates difference between the OE Matthew and the OE Mark and Luke. The OE John again shows some evidence of difference from the other three texts because it almost entirely stops rendering the Latin accusative present participle with the OE participle after chapter 7.

7. The rendering of the present participles in ablative absolutes also varies, with Matthew and John rendering very few indeed with OE participles, while the OE Mark and Luke use the OE participle at much higher rates.

8. The renderings of certain parallel passages, many of which involve substantives, suggest that the OE Mark and Luke share commonalities not found in the OE Matthew or John.
For one, the rendering of building verbs, discussed in the study of oblique participles shows that the only diversions from rendering Latin “aedifica-” with OE “timbrian” occur in Mark and Luke, when the OE Matthew and John do not divert from this pairing. Also, passages of the “voice calling in the desert”, “overturning the tables of the vendors”, and “the stone that the builders reproach” show features that connect the OE Mark and Luke and differentiate both from the OE Matthew.

9. A study of present participles in the genitive, dative and ablative cases, excluding ablative absolutes, shows that the OE Matthew generally avoids translating these with OE present participles, whereas the OE Mark and Luke are far more likely to do so. A close word study of the Latin “aedifica-”, OE verb “timbrian”, and OE noun “wyrhta” shows that the Old English gospel translations are all tremendously consistent in rendering the Latin verb with the OE counterpart, but only the OE Mark and Luke ever break from this consistency to use the OE noun “wyrhta” instead in a parallel passage where the OE Matthew uses the verb “timbrian”.

10. The analysis of the predicative participle shows that the OE Matthew only uses non-participial renderings for participles expressing states, such as “habens” (having) or “potens” (being potent). The OE Mark and Luke do overlap with Matthew in many ways, but they differ because they render the predicative participles of many other verbs, including action verbs, with non-participial renderings. The OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke all render the Latin predicative participle with an OE present participle the majority of the time, but the OE John does not render a single Latin predicative present participle with an OE present participle, a sharp difference from the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke.
11. The analysis of unattested participles shows that only the OE Mark and Luke use the unattested OE present participle “gangende” to render the Latin passive participles “ingressus” and “egressus”, even though both the OE John and especially the OE Matthew have opportunities to do so.

12. Studies of omissions create a complex picture in which the OE Mark and Luke share significantly more omissions with each other than they share with either the OE Matthew or John. Matthew also does not omit any pre-positive nominative dialogue verbs as present participles, whereas the Mark and Luke do so regularly. The OE Matthew is far more likely to omit an accusative present participle than are the Mark and Luke, which almost never do so. A word study of all omitted present participles also reveals that the Mark and Luke omit more verbs in more semantic fields than do the Matthew or John, and that the Mark and Luke have more features of omission in common with each other than either does with the other two gospels.

13. Studies of position shifts demonstrate that the OE Matthew rarely renders the Latin pre-positive nominative present participle, but when it does, it retains the position of the Latin participle except only in circumstances where the Latin presents significant challenges. By contrast, although the OE Mark and Luke render the Latin pre-positive nominative participle with OE participles more often, they also shift the position of the participle a majority of the time, including many contexts where the Latin is relatively simple.

14. The analysis of the rendering of Latin “phariseus” also reveals that the four translations use different approaches. The OE Matthew uses only OE “sundorhalga” until 12.38, at which time “sundorhalga” disappears and is replaced by the Latin borrowing “farisei” or
“pharisei” at 15.1. By contrast, the OE Mark relies heavily on the Latin borrowing, while the OE Luke and John use both terms in more mixed fashion.

15. At the intertextual level, this study finds quantitative evidence that the OE Mark and Luke are much more closely linked than either is to the OE Matthew or John. However, qualitative studies find further evidence that the OE John differs considerably from the OE Matthew, Mark, and Luke. These findings support Drake’s original assertion that the OE Mark and Luke are of shared authorship with each other and not with the OE Matthew or John, a hypothesis shared by Liuzza, Segura and Gallardo, Miranda-García and Calle-Martín, and Ogura. Conclusions by Horiguchi and Kozuka more generally support this assertion, although not with reference to specific pairings of gospel translations.

Second, it is unlikely that the translations of the Old English Gospels were only divided at the boundaries between gospels, as most studies except Liuzza’s have assumed. Rather, it is extremely likely that the Old English Gospels show evidence of intra-textual shift. It appears that at all four translations may be joint efforts, and that scholars should re-examine the assumption that translators would only divide authorship between texts, not within them. Certainly, the previous study of Genesis adds support to the critical consensus that one translator, Ælfric, translated Genesis up to around 24.22, at which time he completed his work and submitted it for addition to another translator’s work from 24.61 to the end. In the Old English Gospels, proportion tests suggest that all four texts may be of split authorship, but it is most likely that Matthew is of divided authorship, and John may be, as well:

1. The sliding proportion test found very statistically significant difference in the rate of rendering Latin present participles at around Matthew 13.17. This finding is supported by
several other outcomes in this study. The sliding proportion test found strong indications of difference in Mark at 5.21 and 9.40, and in Luke at 8.27, although qualitative results did not detect strong indications of these breaks. However, the sliding proportion test also suggested a break in the practice of the Latin John at 7.4, a finding generally supported by the tests of subcategories across the breaks in Section 2.4h, and strongly supported by the qualitative analysis of accusative participles in John: before chapter 8, the OE John renders 15 of 18 accusatives with OE participles, but only 1 of 9 thereafter. A supplementary proportion test showed that rates were statistically different. Quantitative analyses showed that the first portions of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were statistically similar, but only barely so. However, quantitative findings that the OE Mark and Luke show intra-textual shift could not be verified by the qualitative analysis. The differences may be there, but this study was not able to add support for the quantitative analysis. As a result, it was not possible to argue confidently about exactly how many translators there were, nor which portions of texts showed evidence of shared authorship.

2. The qualitative analysis of post-positive nominative participles also determined that the OE Matthew translates the post-positive participle of “dicere” at a very significantly higher rate in chapters 1-13 than it does after the beginning of chapter 14. These findings support those of Roy Liuzza, who argues that the rendering of appositive participles in chapters 8-13 of Matthew differs from the rendering in chapters 14-18. The analysis of accusative participles of “dicere” also supports this pattern.

3. The analysis of oblique participles shows that Matthew translates 2 of 7 with OE participles, both before chapter 14, but none thereafter.
4. The study finds that omissions of present participles increase dramatically around chapter 14 in the OE Matthew. These include pre- and post-positive nominatives, and accusatives. These omissions trail off around chapter 22, where Liuzza also suggests a possible change in the practice of translation.

5. The study of the renderings of Latin “phariseus” finds that the OE Matthew only uses OE “sundorhalga” up until 12.38, the last attestation of the Latin noun until Matthew 15.1, where the translation only uses the Latin borrowing for “phariseus”. Although this break does not occur right at the proposed boundary between chapters 13 and 14, the many incidents of Latin “phariseus” before 12.38 and after 15.1 support this finding approximately.

6. These findings together strongly support Roy Liuzza’s assertion that a significant change in the rendering of the Latin present participle occurs somewhere between chapters 13 and 14. Liuzza’s observation of difference is quite precise, and this study has added new evidence to support his argument.

The findings of this study have important implications for the emerging understanding of the authorship of the Old English Gospels in particular, and on the fields of authorship-attribution and translation studies in general. Much past scholarship has focused on the potential for inter-textual difference in the Old English Gospels; however, as Roy Liuzza has suggested and as this study has further demonstrated, the assumption that the boundaries of authorship would naturally occur only between gospels may be an untenable assumption. This study finds not only that the Old English Gospels are likely a product of multiple authorship between texts, but they are also likely a result of multiple authorship within at least Matthew, and quite possibly John, although there is statistical evidence of intra-textually split authorship in all four. While
this study may not be able to identify with confidence just how many translators there were, or fully account for which tracts of which texts are of shared authorship, this study can argue plausibly that the texts show significant quantitative and qualitative evidence of divided authorship, and that there appear to be at least three separate practices of translation: the OE Mark and Luke, the first thirteen chapters of the OE Matthew, and the OE John on its own. Such a finding invites a re-consideration of how medieval scholars perceived the acts of translation and authorship, and challenges notions that such scholars engaged in lone efforts to translate such large texts.

Beyond this study’s conclusions about the Old English Gospels, however, this study and the previous study of Genesis have implications for how scholars approach authorship attribution. This study includes a challenging foray into statistical science to enhance how scholars can evaluate difference in a text. This is not to say that past scholars have been deficient by not applying statistical tests; rather, this study has shown that quantitative instruments like the proportion test can help search for changes that may not be clear even to the careful observer. In this study, the sliding proportion test detected potential breaks that allowed closer, qualitative analysis to explore those breaks more specifically. In turn, those qualitative analyses uncovered features that could be subjected to supplementary statistical tests, which shored up more evidence of breaks in the practice of translation. Merging such diverse fields as philology, grammar, linguistics, and statistics can be a tremendous challenge, and it may require a more inter-disciplinary approach that includes linguists, medievalists, statisticians, and computer programmers; after all, a considerable amount of highly relevant research on the Old English Gospels has come from the University of Málaga, where access to the *Old English*
Concordancer software\textsuperscript{100} has enabled several projects on the syntactic structure of the Old English Gospels translation. This study also has implications for authorship-attribution studies because it tackles the structure of the present participle, a syntactic feature that can be difficult for computers to distinguish from similar-looking forms, but a feature that offers an author another option by which to form and connect ideas. The participle is a powerful syntactic unit that can work at the broad level of the clause, or can function at the minute level of the single word, such as an adjective or a noun. Its versatility is a testament both to its potential to signify style, and to the effort required to discern its exact function and mechanism in connecting large ideas. Although the participle, like its verbal cousins the gerund and infinitive, is still poorly represented in authorship-attribution studies, this study has shown that it can reflect robustly on the style of an author or a translator. As such, the findings of this study can contribute to current directions in research of the development of the progressive aspect in Old English and its grammaticalization in later forms of English\textsuperscript{101}.

Still, there is much work to be done on the Old English Gospels and on almost any authorship-attribution undertaking, which will benefit by collecting multiple features into more complex analytical models and using interdisciplinary approaches that make the most of linguistics, statistics, and computer technology. Further, the field of authorship attribution must advance its knowledge of how much an individual author is likely to vary; scholars still cannot

\textsuperscript{100} Segura and Gallardo describe some of the technological methods they use in their project on the absolute construction in the Old English Gospels. These methods have facilitated much of the outstanding computational research that has been performed on the transition by Antonio Miranda-García and Javier Calle-Martín.

\textsuperscript{101} Laurel Brinton argues, for example, in her book \textit{The Development of English Aspectual Systems}, that “within English, and Germanic as a whole, aspectualizers develop by means of an indigenous process of grammaticalization” (161). Brinton believes that “Old English had several independent elements” among auxiliary structures, “certainly the passive and the perfect auxiliary, and possibly the progressive auxiliary” (105), and that “in English this may be the ancestor of the modern progressive” (109). Mitchell also admits that distinguishing which constructions of “beon/wesan” + the present participle, many of which occur in the Old English Gospels, are adjectival and which are verbal is difficult (\textit{OES} § 480) and debates Nickel’s assessment of how progressive some structures were (Nickel 272). The findings of this study could reflect at greater length on the processes that Brinton and other scholars are exploring in the development of the fully progressive aspect of verbs in English.
easily answer this question. Last, we must remember that authorship attribution is very much a kind of detective work, an attempt to collect a body of evidence that can be persuasive beyond a reasonable doubt. Authorship attribution is about probability and a preponderance of evidence. Without a time machine, scholars will probably never be able to establish authorship beyond a shadow of a doubt; however, as this field evolves, synthesizing different disciplines and approaches will build a methodology that will allow scholars to argue confidently about unknown authorship. In my attempt to break new ground by analyzing present participles in more depth and by using statistics to evaluate my findings, I have tried to move our scholarly understanding of authorship attribution one significant step closer to that level.
Conclusion

This dissertation began by using the Old English Genesis as a kind of control experiment to test the efficacy of the Old English present participle as a marker of authorship, and it has offered compelling evidence that the Old English Gospel translations are products of multiple authorship. The first part of this dissertation has demonstrated that Ælfric rendered Latin present participles in the first twenty-four chapters of Genesis in ways at times starkly different from the approach used by the anonymous translator of Genesis 24.61 to the end. The first part has revealed that the rendering of the Latin present participle into OE is not a single process, but a collection of significantly different sub-processes that further differentiate Genesis 1-24.22 from Genesis 24.61-50.25. This part has also found notable similarity between Ælfric’s rendering of the post-positive nominative present participle and Ælfric’s own original writing in his Libellus de veteri testamento et novo. Overall, this phase of the dissertation has shown that the rendering of the Latin present participle is an illuminating marker that reflects the break in authorship asserted by Ælfric and argued by E. Dietrich, Karl Jost, Peter Clemoes and Richard Marsden. Rather interestingly, this part has also revealed that the rendering of the pre-positive nominative present participle in all the Genesis translation, which never renders this feature with an OE present participle, is significantly different from the renderings of this feature in the Old English Gospels, especially the OE Mark and Luke, which preserve roughly one-quarter of these Latin participles as OE present participles.

With the efficacy of using the present participle as a marker of stylistic variation established in the study of the Old English Genesis, part 2 of this dissertation has applied the same methodology, with necessary additions to address the lack of critical consensus about where intra-textual differences may occur, save for Roy Liuzza’s insightful observations. Using
the sliding proportion test, this part has revealed that complex problems of authorship attribution rarely lead to findings of absolutely stark and indisputable difference; nonetheless, it has also provided a preponderance of evidence to indicate that the OE Mark and Luke share quantitative and qualitative features, while both differ from the OE Matthew and John, which share some common features, but which also present some contradictory practices of rendering the Latin present participle. As such, part 2 has added considerable weight to arguments by Allison Drake, Roy Liuzza, Antonio Miranda-Garcia and Javier Calle-Martin, Laura Esteban Segura and Nadia Obegi Gallardo, Kazuhisa Horiguchi and Michiko Ogura that the OE Mark and Luke are of shared authorship, whereas the OE Matthew and John are of different authorship, both from the OE Mark and Luke, and perhaps also from each other. Part 2 has indicated that Old English translators do not necessarily treat all types of present participles equally: the position of a nominative present participle in the OE Matthew and John correlates with a significant variation in the rates at which the translation preserves the Latin participle. Part 2 has further indicated that, when a translation preserves a pre-positive nominative present participle as an OE present participle, different translations handle that position with divergent approaches: the OE Matthew tends to preserve the position of such a participle when it does use the OE present participle, whereas the OE Mark and Luke are far more likely to use the OE present participle, but far less likely to preserve the position of that participle.

Both parts of this dissertation have reflected on some of the larger concerns about translation raised in the introduction. The Latin gospels, particularly the Latin Matthew, Mark, and Luke, share a great deal in common not only in the events they narrate but also in the Latin language used to convey them. However, these studies have revealed that the Old English Gospels are far from a mechanical gloss, by no means merely converting Latin words into
English equivalents verbatim. Rather, these texts engage in significant re-arrangement of both the word order and the larger syntactic structures used to execute the translation. Old English clearly possessed the present participle, and the study of predicatives reveals that the Old English Matthew, Mark and Luke generally use the OE present participle to render the Latin present participle after “esse”. However, in other contexts, the translators decided to explore other options. These studies have also shown that the difference between the Latin sources and the Old English translations go beyond mere choices of syntax and construction, but extend to interpretation in cases where the Latin may be challenging, or where the lexical fields of certain verbs and the syntactic demands of using present participles differ between Latin and Old English. These variations point to deliberate action on the part of authors who, like Jerome, were both translators of a known work and authors of something new. Their difference indicates the presence of personal styles, which has made a study of authorship attribution more feasible and plausible.

Despite these contributions, and the preponderance of evidence of multiple authorship of these texts, these studies and their limitations have perhaps raised as many questions as they have answered. To begin this list, I note that two small questions remain unanswered in this dissertation, but they deserve reconsideration and further exploration. The first relates to block size, since I made only an informed estimate of the best segment sizes to apply to the analysis, after I calculated the ratio of Latin present participles to overall Latin words. It was an informed guess, but still a guess that segment sizes of 500, 600, and 800 words would be large enough to include Latin present participles in each segment, and yet small enough to generate enough segments to show trends, facilitate experiments, and slide the hypothetical break point along
each text to search for internal breaks in the rate of translating the Latin present participle⁠¹. Perhaps a reliable method by which to compare the frequency of a feature to the size of the text will help generate a more reliable method to create segment sizes; an optimal segment size might improve the resolution of the sliding proportion test or other tests that rely on segmenting. A second question involves the potential correlation between the presence of a Latin present participle in the Vulgate Genesis and the tendency of the anonymous translator to omit the entire verse in which it occurs. Part 1 of this study detected nearly 100 Latin verses containing present participles after Genesis 24.61 that the anonymous translator simply omits altogether. It was my impression that verses containing Latin present participles were disproportionately represented among these omissions; however, a statistical study of correlation could test this hypothesis, which is really no more than a general observation at this point. However, to perform such a study, a researcher will need to consider whether other factors unrelated to the present participle may contribute to or even determine whether such verse-omission occurs.

Beyond these smaller questions of block size and the correlation between a Latin present participle and verse omission in the OE Genesis, two larger questions relate to both the validity and the overall value of these findings. The first of these concerns the fact that the study of Genesis examines only three principal texts: the Genesis translation itself, Ælfric’s preface to Genesis, in which he explains the extent of his work on the project, and his Libellus de veteri testamento et novo. However, for the findings of this study to be fully persuasive, a larger examination of all of Ælfric’s writings is clearly needed. It is possible that Ælfric diverges from the uses of the OE present participle that he displays in these texts. Such a study will need to consider at greater length the potential for an individual author to vary his or her style. Jonathan

¹ Readers are advised to re-revisit the methodology section of the study of the OE Genesis to review some of my concerns here, and review the ratios of Latin present participles to the total number of Latin words.
Wilcox argues in his article “A Reluctant Translator in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Maccabees” that Ælfric engages in interpretation openly in his translation of Maccabees (6), an examination of which may allow a closer comparison of how Ælfric responds to the Latin present participle in his own idiom. Quite simply, Ælfric’s entire writings must be examined with respect to the rendering of the Latin present participle and the use of the OE present participle, in order to place the findings of this study in a fully clear context. This would involve analyzing each text for the presence of participles, tagging them according to the categories identified in this study in order to preserve consistency, and then performing proportion tests inter-textually to determine whether Ælfric uses the OE present participle at different rates in translation. In those texts in which Ælfric is not translating, two types of analysis should be performed: first, whether Ælfric’s use of the OE present participle matches the relative rates found in this study; second, how the rates of using present participles compare to the rate of using finite verbs. The results of such a study could then further illuminate the debate about Byrhtferth’s potential involvement in the authorship of the Old English Heptateuch and add to the scholarship of Clemoes and Baker in this vein.

The second larger question concerns the Old English Gospels, since this study cannot isolate just how many translators may have produced the translation. The difference between the OE Matthew chapters 1-13 and 14-28 suggests one break in practice, the similarities of the OE Mark and Luke to each other and their differences from the OE Matthew and John suggest another, and the differences between the OE Matthew and the OE John suggest a third. However, somewhat inconclusive attempts to compare portions in each text with portions in others leave me wondering how many people participated in the project. Did one translator start each text and hand it off? The overall decline in the use of the OE present participle in each translation
suggests such a possibility, and the sudden termination of OE present participles used to translate Latin accusative participles after chapter 7 in the OE John challenges an interpretation that the OE Matthew and John are of shared authorship. Further studies should take up the question of the OE Matthew and John in greater detail.

Still, there are several even larger questions that this dissertation has raised, some of which interrogate the very fundamentals of authorship-attribution studies: the limitations of using just one feature, the limitations of the proportion test, application of this dissertation’s methods to other texts, application of these methods to known authors, and the matter of how much a single author can even vary his or her style. First, this dissertation has focused on the rendering of the present participle because it is under-represented in scholarship and because its complexity suggests the potential for variation between authors. However, it is just one feature. As I note in both studies, Joseph Rudman expresses concern that studies of particular words or types of words “may not in themselves be an indicator of a unique style, but when used in conjunction with all of the other quantifiable indicators that make up style, they become important” (“Some Problems” 1998, 360). This study adds its findings to the many findings of previous scholars such as Roy Liuzza; Antonio Miranda-García, Javier Calle-Martín, and Teresa Marqués-Aguado; Kazuhisa Horiguchi, and Michiko Ogura. However, there are many syntactic and lexical features in the Old English that could be measured across the breaks proposed in this study, and the same expansion of techniques could be applied to the Old English Genesis, as well. The present participle is only one piece of the puzzle².

---

² In his 2012 article, for example, Rudman counts over 1,000 individual features that have been used in various authorship-attribution studies. A standard set of markers is by no means widely accepted. Rudman admits, “If authors have a verifiably unique style, it stands to reason that in most cases this will be evidenced by a different set of style markers” (267).
Second, this dissertation has relied heavily upon the proportion test as its statistical test of difference in the rendering of the present participle. Although it is a highly appropriate test, there is a vast array of statistical techniques in current statistical science available to consider. Gerald McMenamin alone lists seven general statistical approaches to forensic assessments of authorship attribution: (1) frequency distributions, (2) t-tests (considered and dismissed in this dissertation)\(^3\), (3) anova f-tests (also considered and dismissed), (4) z proportion tests, (5) chi-square tests (on which the proportion test used in this study is based), (6) coefficient of correlation, and (7) frequency estimates with P. Olkin's likelihood ratio “lambda” (138-9). The reliance upon the proportion test in this study does not indicate that my method used is flawed, but it raises questions about what other techniques are available. Indeed, Rudman again expresses some frustration with the reality that non-traditional authorship-attribution scholars continue to generate new tests without developing much consensus: “Now, it is over forty-five years and over fifteen hundred publications and still there is no consensus as to the correct methodology or technique – if anything, the methodology has become even more diverse” (“Some problems” 2012, 263). The proportion test is certainly not the only test that could reflect on the data generated in this study.

Third, this dissertation has only examined two large translations, but it is unclear what will happen when this kind of method is applied more broadly across the Old English corpus. How clearly does this method suggest patterns of translation practice in the rest of the Old English Hexateuch? How are present participles used in the Old English Apollonius of Tyre? Such questions transcended the scope of this dissertation, but deserve consideration in future scholarship. This in turn recommends a fourth question: do known authors apply a consistent

---

\(^3\) Please see the methodology section of the first chapter, the Genesis study, for my discussion of this decision.
practice⁴ of using the present participle? Future studies should explore how authors whose works are of undisputed authorship vary in their use of the present participle. Is it possible for some authors to vary their use of the present participle so much that a proportion test or other instrument might indicate difference when there is none? If the reader will forgive a little personal introspection here, I do not know how regularly I use present participles in my own writing. Perhaps I ought to find out. Future studies should examine known single-author variation to learn more about how reliable a marker of personal style the present participle is.

Such a question leads to the fifth and final research question I wish to raise about how this study has reflected on authorship-attribution studies: how much do authors vary their style? Rudman has already admitted that scholars do not know. As I explain further in the conclusion to my study of the Old English Genesis, researchers investigating the effects of Alzheimer’s disease on authorial style may be able to generate a tentative answer, but their results are still inconclusive. We simply do not know how much authors vary their style. Although statistical science draws thresholds across which researchers can infer difference, those thresholds are based on the assumption that a human author’s mind operates within those thresholds. That is one reason why I chose to use the 99% confidence interval as a parameter in my studies: I wanted to err on the side of caution, but future studies will need to address this question further.

⁴ Koppel et al. remark in their 2012 article “The ‘Fundamental Problem’ of Authorship Attribution” that the most desirable approach to authorship-attribution questions is to examine a disputed text and compare it to very substantial samples of candidate authors’ known writings. However, the authors concede that “in the real world, we often encounter situations in which our list of candidates might be very large and in which there is no guarantee that the true author of an anonymous text is even among the candidates. Furthermore, the amount of writing we have by each candidate might be very limited, and the anonymous text itself might be very short” (284). The concerns of Koppel et al. are very relevant here, since the study of the Old English examines a large text, but no list of candidate authors except for Ælfric. Future work will have to investigate the Old English corpus on a larger level in order to compare the features studied in this dissertation to those found in other texts. These comments also contextualize the need to perform more studies on authors who have produced a lot of writings, in order to assess how much such authors vary their use of stylistic features. Such a study would need to consider also the genres, registers, and intended audiences of these samples in order to minimize the risk that the context of a writing, and not the authorship, would be responsible for any variation detected.
There is another line of inquiry upon which this dissertation has touched and to which it may make a modest contribution: the more specific question of how the rendering of the present participle in these translations sheds light on the development of the OE present participle and the progressive aspects as grammaticalized features in historical English. The feature remains in Present-Day English a highly grammaticalized and relatively stable modifier and component of the progressive aspect, but scholars disagree about whether the progressive aspect arose in Old English at all, or whether it was simply a structure used to translate Latin “esse” + the present participle. Barbara Strang, in her study of the Modern English progressive, admits that “the origins of the construction are a matter of controversy” (429). David Denison warns that the Modern English progressive may have evolved from the Middle English structure including a preposition and gerund, such as “He was on hunting” (371), and joins other scholars in considering the possibility that OE progressives may have been a reaction to Latin influence in translation (Denison 397, Mitchell, *Old English Syntax* § 689), a context certainly germane to this study of the Old English translation of the Latin gospels. Elizabeth Traugott’s brief discussion of the OE progressive aspect identifies some of the conflicting notions currently debated by scholars. Traugott argues that “typically this aspect has no overt form in OE” and claims that many examples of the overt progressive in OE “may have been influenced by a foreign language, this time Latin, since it occurs most extensively in translations of Latin; it does, however, also occur in a poem as old as Beowulf and on occasion in the Ohthere and Wulfstan passage of Orosius … and in the Chronicle” (90). Traugott then acknowledges, as Mitchell does, that the overt OE progressive form “may have been a genuine OE construction, though it undoubtedly owed much for the expansion of its use to Latin models” (90). Traugott cites Mossé’s study, which finds that overt OE progressive forms tend to occur with “verbs
denoting movement, especially those associated with warfare, for instance, *winn-* ‘fight’, *feoht-*
‘fight’, *herg-* ‘harry’, *slea-* ‘slay’, *far-* ‘go’, *ieren-* ‘run’. Right from the start, then, it has been
primarily associated with action verbs” (90), an association not applied consistently in the OE
Mark and Luke, but much more consistently in the OE Matthew. However, Traugott’s
commentary on the OE progressive aspect does not draw directly on the use of the present
participle and the overt progressive in the Old English. This study has shown that the OE
structure “*beon/wesan*” + the OE present participle in the Old English receives significant use
outside of verbs of movement and warfare, although to translate the Latin, and that it sometimes
occurs on its own, not only as a translation of a Latin present participle.

In fact, not all scholars agree that the OE progressive arose from foreign influence in
translation. Laurel Brinton’s comprehensive 1988 study, *The Development of English Aspectual
Systems*, argues that “within English, and Germanic as a whole, aspectualizers develop by means
of an indigenous process of grammaticalization” (161). Brinton believes that “Old English had
several independent elements” among auxiliary structures, “certainly the passive and the perfect
auxiliary, and possibly the progressive auxiliary” (105), and that “in English this may be the
ancestor of the modern progressive” (109). This study finds 1,511 Latin present participles in the
four gospels, and 453 Old English present participles used to render them in the Old English,
including those in the predicative (also known as progressive, expanded or periphrastic form)
that may pre-figure the modern progressive aspect and illuminate existing scholarship that tends
to draw on other OE texts for data. This study also finds that the translators of both the OE
Genesis and the Old English Gospels use Old English present participles even when the Latin
does not. There is always the possibility that the Latin exemplar(s) differed from the extant
versions of the Vulgate, but it also appears possible that the OE present participle was somewhat
idiomatic for the translators of both parts of Genesis and all four Old English Gospels. This finding is supported by the fact that Ælfric uses the OE present participle in his own original writing in his Libellus, and does so at rates comparable to his translation of Genesis 1-24.22. While scholars have argued that the OE present participle and progressive developed as reactions to Latin, they do not appear to observe that these unattested participles in the translations suggest more than a reaction to Latin, but perhaps a native idiom, albeit in late Old English.

Finally, I would like to relate the outcomes of these studies to one particularly stimulating area of authorship attribution: forensic linguistics and forensic authorship attribution. In the throes of marking participles in gigantic documents and working through dense, statistical writings on authorship attribution, I often found myself thinking about the potential stakes involved with authorship-attribution studies. As I remarked in the introduction, traditional and non-traditional methods of authorship attribution have been applied in heart-wrenching criminal cases, such as the Jon Benét Ramsay case⁵. I am also reminded of another case that McMenamin describes in his chapter, “Forensic Linguistics”. In a Canadian criminal case entitled “Regina vs. Gurtler” in 1995, a woman was found dead “of numerous stab wounds”, but three computer-printed suicide notes were found at the scene. The Crown, suspecting that the suicide notes were forged by the husband as part of a murder, enlisted a forensic linguist, who compared the notes to the husband’s and the wife’s known writings, and contextualized them in a large American corpus. Comparing fifteen and focusing on four stylistic markers in the suicide notes, which included grammar errors and misspellings, the linguist’s testimony identified the husband as the

⁵ Paulo Varela, Edson Justino, and Luiz Oliveira in their 2011 study note that “practical applications for authorship attribution have grown in several different areas” including “criminal law (identifying writers of ransom notes and harassing letters)” (167). Scholars in attribution studies are becoming increasingly aware of the implications that their work may have for questions outside academia.
author, and the jury convicted the husband of murder. The outcome and the restoration of justice in that case has reminded me that, while sometimes the work of authorship-attribution may seem theoretical and highly academic, and for that matter unresolved and inconclusive, it has tremendous potential to make a very real contribution to our understanding of authorship and even to the administration of our laws, the protection of our values of social respect, and even to the fabric of our society. This is the ultimate significance of this study that I wish to leave for the reader’s final consideration: this study helped add weight to the emerging consensus of the multiple authorship of a text whose authors are unknown, and may never be known. However, the approach of this study and the lessons learned from it are transferable, adaptable, and highly relevant to a wide variety of problems, from simply disputed authorship to plagiarism, theft of intellectual property, and even violent crime. This dissertation has been my attempt to contribute an innovative approach, using an under-represented feature and daring to attempt statistical analysis when it is not my specialty, to our shared scholarly understanding of how to investigate and intervene in such profoundly important matters.

6 McMenamin recounts this case in detail on pages 152-6. McMenamin’s approach combines the kinds of philological analysis required to analyze the grammar and syntax of the suicide note, and then the husband’s and the wife’s known writings. Then, McMenamin discusses how “Olkin’s lambda”, a test of joint probability that all these markers could occur in the same text, indicates that the four most significant indicators would have only a 1 in 224.4 million chance of occurring together. As McMenamin notes on page 156, the defence successfully objected to the forensic linguist’s quantitative testimony not because it was flawed, but only because the forensic linguist was not a statistician by qualification. Even so, the judge admitted the qualitative evidence because such was the linguist’s training. The jury’s decision to convict highlights the power of such qualitative evidence, and demonstrates that formal training in statistics will play a valuable part in future research into authorship attribution.
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Appendix A:  
500-word segment data including participles in omitted lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Latin Prt</th>
<th>OE Prt</th>
<th>% OE Prt</th>
<th>Total Latin - Prt in omitted verses</th>
<th>% OE Prt</th>
<th>Total Latin - Prt in omitted verses % OE Prt</th>
<th>% Non - Prt</th>
<th>% Non - Prt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.61538</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.61538</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.55556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.55556</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.44444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.33333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.66667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.66667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.42857</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.07692</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.92308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.44444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.44444</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.55556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.52941</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.52941</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.47059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.28571</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18182</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.666667</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11111</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.88889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.28571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.38462</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.61538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>6.666667</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>7.692308</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.30769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.333333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.333333</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.66667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 500-50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 239-51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>443</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>351</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**
OE: Old English
Prt: Participle(s)
Non-prt: Non-participal renderings