

PERIPHRASTIC RENDERINGS AND THEIR ELEMENT ORDER
IN OLD ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE GOSPELS

MICHIKO OGURA

Chiba University

ABSTRACT

Interlinear glosses are expected to show one-to-one correspondence of Anglo-Saxon renderings to the Latin original, while free translation is allowed to use words, phrases and clauses of ordinary usage, even though Latin can affect Old English in the choice of words, expressions and style. This paper aims at a comparative study of Old English versions of the Gospels, i.e. Northumbrian *Lindisfarne* and *Rushworth 2*, Mercian *Rushworth 1*, and West Saxon versions in two manuscripts – MSS CCCC 140 and CUL Ii. 2.11 – in order to show a variety of renderings found in interlinear glosses as well as free translation, especially on simple/periphrastic correspondence and element order.

1. Introduction

Old English biblical texts as historical data can be used for various purposes: to trace historical development of English, to compare lexical choice dialectally and diachronically, to see the difference between glosses and free translation, etc. Here in this paper I choose versions of the Gospels in order to see a variety of renderings in glosses and free translation, especially periphrastic renderings for both simple and periphrastic forms of Latin. I use *Lindisfarne* (*Li*) and *Rushworth 2* (*Ru2*) versions of Northumbrian dialect, *Rushworth 1* (*Ru1*) of Mercian dialect, and West Saxon (WS) versions in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140 (*WSCp*) and MS Cambridge, University Library Ii. 2.11 (*WSA*). Some interlinear glosses are not completely faithful to the Latin original. *Li* often puts periphrastic renderings to Latin simple forms, or vice versa. It usually follows Latin order by giving one-to-one gloss, but at times the element order reverses, and double or multiple glosses are given, especially in *Matthew* (*Mt*), to show the possibility of alternative readings. *Ru1* and *Ru2* often show different readings, as it is said that

Ru2 follows *Li* and written in Northumbrian, in contrast with Mercian *Ru1*. A detailed investigation may clarify subtle differences between *Li* and *Ru2* and independent renderings of *Ru1* with some features common to West Saxon versions. *WSCp* and *WSA* are chosen to show variant readings of the same text; *WSCp* is about half-a-century earlier than *WSA* and seems to derive directly from the original manuscript which had been lost.¹

In this paper I exemplify various types of renderings and their element order found in these Old English versions of the Gospels: the interchangeability between *-enne* and *-ende* forms, imperatives, passive constructions, simple and phrasal verbs, simple forms and periphrastic forms, *beon/wesan* or *habban* with the past participle, “impersonal” constructions, the use of auxiliaries, or the like. The choice of these features depends on their frequent occurrence and their distinctiveness peculiar to the versions of the Gospels.

Let me start by giving typical examples. Example (1) shows a contrasting rendering between glosses and free translation. *Natus est* is rendered in the Latin element order in *Li* and *Ru1*, but in reverse order in West Saxon (only *WSCp* is cited when *WSA* has the same rendering). In example (2), however, all three versions use the same element order in the subordinate clause. Both examples are of subordinate clauses, but these examples show that even in subordinate clauses the element order may vary between the ordinary “past ptc. + *be*” and “*be* + past ptc.”.² Example (3) shows the most frequent pattern, i.e. a Latin simple form is rendered by a periphrastic form in Old English where such forms as passive, future, perfect, etc. have no morphological distinctness; this example also illustrates contrasting element orders: “past ptc. + *be*” in *Li* and *WSCp* and “*be* + past ptc.” in *Ru1* and *WSA*.³

- 1) de qua natus est iesus (*Mt* 1.16)
of ðaem gecenned 1 geboren is haelend (*Li*)
of þære akenned wæs hælend (*Ru1*)
of þære wæs acenned se hælend (*WSCp*)
‘from whom the Lord was born’
- 2) ubi est qui natus est rex iudaeorum (*Mt* 2.2)
huer Is ðe accenned is cynig. Iudeana (*Li*)
hwær is seþe akenned is kining iudeana (*Ru1*)
hwær ys se iudea cyning þe acenned ys (*WSCp*)
‘Where is the Jews’ king who is born?’

¹ For the description of West Saxon versions of manuscripts see Liuzza (1994: xvi-xlii). For quotations I use Skeat (1970), consulting Liuzza (1994) and manuscripts.

² Abbreviations of grammatical terms I use are: Past ptc. for past participle, perf. ptc. for perfect participle, V for verb, Adj. for adjective, and Aux. for auxiliary.

³ Abbreviations for the four Gospels are *Mt*, *Mk*, *Lk* and *Jn*.

- 3) ubi christus nasceretur (*Mt* 2.4)
 huer crist accenned were (*Li*)
 hwær krist wære akenned (*Ru1*)
 hwær crist accenned wære (*WSCp*)
 hwær crist wære acenned (*WSA*)
 ‘(and asked) where Christ was born’

2. Statistic results

Tables are given to show frequent occurrences of various forms and element order patterns. Table 1 shows the contrast between periphrastic forms and simple forms. Latin simple forms can be rendered by periphrastic forms, as seen in example (3), most frequently. Then Latin and the glosses use periphrases rather frequently, while West Saxon versions render them into simple verb forms. In *Mt*, *Li* uses periphrases in contrast with other versions including Latin original, while in *Mk*, *Lk* and *Jn*, *Li* and *Ru2* use periphrases in contrast with other versions. *Ru1* is characteristic of using simple forms, while Latin and other versions use periphrases. Table 2 gives contrasting element orders (that is, only periphrastic forms are taken into account); most frequent one is Latin and glosses vs. West Saxon versions, and then all versions take the same order. *Ru1* often takes the same element order as West Saxon versions. Table 3 is given for the examples in which a simple form or a lacuna is found in the corresponding part of the versions under investigation. It is *Mt* in which West Saxon element order differs from *Li*. *Ru2* often shows different orders from West Saxon ones but *Ru1* alone may follow West Saxon (Latin is abbreviated as L).

Table 1. Periphrastic vs. simple forms between Latin and Old English

periphrastic vs. simple	<i>Mt</i>	<i>Mk</i>	<i>Lk</i>	<i>Jn</i>	Total
<i>Li, Ru, WSCp, WSA</i> vs. L	106	75	124	52	357
L, <i>Li, Ru</i> vs. <i>WSCp, WSA</i>	30	25	46	26	127
<i>Li, Ru</i> vs. L, <i>WSCp, WSA</i>	5	29	43	25	102
<i>Li</i> vs. L, <i>Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	35	3	7	5	50
<i>WSCp, WSA</i> vs. L, <i>Li, Ru</i>	9	7	16	11	43
<i>Ru</i> vs. L, <i>Li, WSCp, WSA</i>	11	4	9	7	31
<i>Li, WSCp, WSA</i> vs. L, <i>Ru</i>	19	2	6	3	30
<i>Ru, WSCp, WSA</i> vs. L, <i>Li</i>	8	4	5	4	21
L, <i>Li</i> vs. <i>Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	18	1		2	21
L, <i>Li, WSCp, WSA</i> vs. <i>Ru</i>	20				20
L vs. <i>Li, Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	6	1		2	9

<i>L, Ru vs. Li, WSCp, WSA</i>	2		3	2	7
<i>L, Ru, WSCp, WSA vs. Li</i>		1		4	5
<i>L, WSCp, WSA vs. Li, Ru</i>	1			1	2

Table 2. Element order

	<i>Mt</i>	<i>Mk</i>	<i>Lk</i>	<i>Jn</i>	Total
<i>L, Li, Ru vs. WSCp, WSA</i>	71	61	101	78	311
<i>L, Li, Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	66	44	88	93	291
<i>L, Li vs. Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	22	1	1		24
<i>L, Li, WSCp, WSA vs. Ru</i>	5		1	2	8
<i>L, Li, Ru, WSCp vs. WSA</i>	1	2	1		4
<i>L vs. Li, Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>				3	3
<i>L, Ru vs. Li, WSCp, WSA</i>				2	2
<i>L, Ru vs. Li vs. WSCp, WSA</i>				1	1
<i>L, Li vs. Ru vs. WSCp, WSA</i>				1	1
<i>L, Li, Ru, WSA vs. WSCp</i>		1			1
<i>Li, Ru vs. L, WSCp, WSA</i>			1		1

Table 3. Element order, when one or more than one version uses a simple form (or has a lacuna)

	<i>Mt</i>	<i>Mk</i>	<i>Lk</i>	<i>Jn</i>	Total
<i>Li, Ru vs. WSCp, WSA</i>	20	25	66	18	129
<i>Ru vs. Li, WSCp, WSA</i>	6	13	9	7	35
<i>Li, vs. Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	27	4	2	1	34
<i>L, Li, vs. WSCp, WSA</i>	16				16
<i>Li, vs. WSCp, WSA</i>	13		2	1	16
<i>Ru, vs. WSCp, WSA</i>	3	3	3	3	12
<i>Li, vs. Ru</i>	3	3	4	1	11
<i>L, Ru vs. WSCp, WSA</i>			2	1	3
<i>L vs. WSCp, WSA</i>	3				3
<i>WSCp vs. WSA</i>			1	2	3
<i>L, Li, vs. Ru</i>	1			1	2
<i>Li, Ru, WSCp vs. WSA</i>		1			1
<i>Li, Ru, WSA vs. WSCp</i>		1			1
<i>Li, WSCp vs. Ru, WSA</i>	1				1
<i>L vs. Li</i>	1				1
<i>Li vs. Ru</i>		1			1

Two more tables are given to show morphological correspondence. Table 4 gives the numbers of the corresponding parts of verses where *-ende* forms ap-

pear in one to four versions, no matter what Latin forms are rendered. Both *Li* and *Ru* use *-ende* forms most frequently in the corresponding parts, while *Ru* may use *-ende* forms either alone or with other versions. West Saxon versions often choose *-ende* forms in *Mk* and *Lk*. Table 5 gives the result of the investigation of *-enne* forms under the same condition as *-ende* forms, including with and without *to* preceding. *Lk* is typical in choosing *-enne* forms in *Li* and *Ru*, while West Saxon versions show no particular preference in using *-enne* in all four Gospels. We shall see the variant forms and element orders in actual examples of various syntactic constructions in the next section.

Table 4. *-ende* forms found in the corresponding parts of verses

	<i>Mt</i>	<i>Mk</i>	<i>Lk</i>	<i>Jn</i>	Total
<i>Li, Ru</i>	64	81	93	57	295
<i>Ru</i>	82	16	11	21	130
<i>Li</i>	61	5	8	11	85
<i>WSCp, WSA</i>	6	35	35	7	83
<i>Li, Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	10	12	10	6	38
<i>Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	22	3		1	26
<i>Li, WSCp, WSA</i>		4	2	1	7
<i>WSA</i>			3		3
<i>WSCp</i>	1			1	2
<i>Li, Ru, WSA</i>				1	1

N. B. “*Li, Ru*” means that the two versions use *-ende* forms, while other versions choose other forms.

Table 5. *-enne* forms found in the corresponding parts of verses

	<i>Mt</i>	<i>Mk</i>	<i>Lk</i>	<i>Jn</i>	Total
<i>Li, Ru</i>	5	15	41	7	68
<i>WSCp, WSA</i>	18	11	7	7	43
<i>Li, Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	10	11	10	8	39
<i>Ru</i>	9	9	4	8	30
<i>Ru, WSCp, WSA</i>	10	2		7	19
<i>Li</i>	9		4		13
<i>Li, WSCp, WSA</i>	2				2
<i>WSA</i>	1		1		2
<i>WSCp</i>			1		1
<i>Ru, WSCp</i>			1		1
<i>Li, Ru, WSA</i>				1	1

N. B. “*Li, Ru*” means that the two versions use *-enne* forms, while other versions choose other forms.

3. Examples of various forms and element order patterns

At first two of the most frequent orders, i.e. the top two of Table 2, are given for illustration, and then various renderings and element order patterns are illustrated in turn. Examples may tell the variety, rather than conformity, of renderings in glosses as well as in free translation (Modern English translation given in examples is only for the *WSCp* version).

3.1. Where Latin and all Old English versions use the same order

- 4) quia errant uexati (*Mt* 9.36)
 forðon weron geberede (*Li*)
 þæm þe hie weron gewælde (*Ru1*)
 forþan hig wærun gedrehte (*WSCp*)
 for þam ðe hig wæron gedrehte (*WSA*)
 ‘because they were afflicted’

Though the verb in the past participle differ in each dialect, the Latin order is not violated (although we cannot say that the versions intentionally kept it), even in a subordinate clause.

3.2. Where we see the difference between glosses and free translation

- 5) quia uobis datum est nosse mysteria regni caelorum illis autem non est datum (*Mt* 13.11)

forðon iuh gesáld is 7 wæs þ ge witte 7 to uutanne clæno hryno 7 gesægdnise 7 diopnise rices heofna ðæm soðlice ne is gesáld (*Li*)

forþon þe eow sald is gecunnan geryne rice heofuna heom þonne ne is sald (*Ru1*)

forþam þe eow is geseald to witanne heofena rices gerynu. 7 him nys na geseald (*WSCp*)

‘because you are allowed to know the course of the kingdom of heaven, while they are not allowed’

Li and *Ru1* follow Latin in translating *datum est* and *est datum*, while West Saxon uses “*be* + past ptc.” order for both. The infinitive *nosse* is rendered in *Li* by the double-gloss of *þ*-clause or *to*-infinitive infinitive in *Ru1* and *to*-infinitive by *WSCp*.

3.3. Various renderings and element order patterns

This section consists of a variety of subsections, in which the choice of verb forms and constructions are compared among the four versions. *WSA* is omitted in quotations unless it demands its own choice or differs in the forms of other elements than those in question; in many instances it shows conformity with *WSCp*.

3.3.1. *To -enne*

- 6) Et cum stabitis ad orandum (*Mk* 11.25)
 7 miððy gie biðon stondende to gebiddanne (*Li*)
 7 miððy ge bioðun stondende to gibiddanne (*Ru2*)
 And þonne ge standað eow to ge-biddenne (*WSCp*)
 ‘And when you stand, to pray for yourself’

To -enne forms often appear as the rendering of Latin “*ad + gerund (accusative)*”. They are used as long as they fit into the Anglo-Saxon syntax. For the future form *stabitis*, however, the choice is divided between “*be + -ende*” in *Li* and *Ru2* and the simple present form in *WSCp*.

- 7) filius hominis tradendus est in manus hominum (*Mt* 17.22)
 sunu monnes gesald bið in hond monna (*Li*)
 sunu monnes bið sald in honda monna (*Ru1*)
 mannes sunu ys to syllyenne on manna handa (*WSCp*)
 ‘Man’s son is to be given onto the hands of men’

Here the element order differs between *Li* and *Ru1*, the former being faithful to Latin. “*Be to -enne*” is chosen in *WSCp* in contrast with the Latin-based “*be + past ptc*”, so as to tell the occurrence of the event in the future more clearly.

3.3.2. *-ende* for ‘speaking/saying’

- 8) sicut locutus est ad patres nostros abraham et semini eius in sæcula (*Lk* 1.55)
 suæ gesprecen wæs to fadores usra 7 séde his In worulde (*Li*)
 swa sprecende wæs to feder userne abrahame 7 sede his oð to weorlde (*Ru2*)
 Swa he spræc to úrum fæderum abrahame 7 hys sæde on á woruld (*WSCp*)
 swa he spræc to urum fæder habrahame 7 hys sæde on á woruld (*WSA*)
 ‘As he spoke to our father Abraham and to his seed for ever’

L locutus est is a repeated expression which usually introduces direct speech. It is regularly rendered (*ge*)*sprecen wæs* in *Li* and simple *spræc* in West Saxon versions. Here *Ru2* uses *sprecende wæs*, not following *Li*.

- 9) et dicentem sé christum regem esse (*Lk* 23.2)
 7 cuoēðende hine cristum cyning þte woere l þte sé (*Li*)
 7 cweðende hine crist cynig þte were (*Ru2*)
 7 segð þ he sí crist cyning (*WSCp*)
 ‘and says that he should be Christ the king’

Dicentem here can be translated *cweðende* grammatically, but *WSCp* uses the simple present form *segð*.⁴

3.3.3. The *-ende/-enne* interchangeability in the corresponding parts of a verse

Verses where *-ende* and *-enne* forms occur in different versions as the rendering of the same lexeme should be considered as a result of either phonological-morphological confusion between *-ende* and *-enne* or functional overlapping of the present participle and the inflected infinitive. Here I enumerate all the verses in question to illustrate a variety of glosses for the same Latin forms.

ire (*Mt* 2.22); *fara l to færenne* (*Li*); *gangan l færan* (*Ru1*); *to farende* (sic) (*WSCp*); *to faranne* (*WSA*).

uenturus és (*Mt* 11.3); *to cymende wæs l is* (*Li*); *cwome scalt* (*Ru1*); *tó cumenne eart* (*WSCp*); *to cumenne eart* (*WSA*).

uenturus est (*Mt* 16.27); *tocymmenda is* (*Li*); *cymeþ l cymende is* (*Ru1*); *ys to cumenne* (*WSCp*); *ys to cumanne* (*WSA*).

passurus est (*Mt* 17.12); *geðrowed* (MS *geðrowend* alt. to *geðrowed*) (*Li*); *þrowende bið* (*Ru1*); *to þrowigenne* (*WSCp*); *to þrowianne* (*WSA*).

bibiturus sum (*Mt* 20.22); *drincende beom l drinca willo* (*Li*); *drincande beom* (*Ru1*); *to drincenne hæbbe* (*WSCp*); *ic to drincanne hæbbe* (*WSA*).

ad seminandum (*Mk* 4.3); *to sawenne* (*Li*); *to sawend* (sic) (*Ru2*); *to sawenne* (*WSCp*); *to sawenne* (*WSA*).

⁴ *Segð* is more fitting than *cwiþ*, because, if *cweðan* should be chosen, it is Old English grammar to use *cwæð* before the direct speech.

tradentes (Mk 13.11); *sellende* (Li); *to sellanne* (Ru2); *syllende* (WSCp); *syllende* (WSA).

plectentes (Mk 15.17); *cursendo l slægendō* (Li); *slænde l cursende* (Ru2); *awundenne* (WSCp); *awundenne* (WSA).

ad sanandum (Lk 5.17); *to hælenne* (Li); *to gehælenne* (WSCp);⁵ *to gehælanne* (WSA).

praedicare (Lk 9.2); *bodia l to bodianne* (Li); *to bodiganne* (Ru2); *to bodianne* (WSCp); *bodigende* (WSA).

completurus erat (Lk 9.31); *sceald gefylled wosa l wæs* (Li); *gifylled wosa l wæs* (Ru2); *to gefyllende wæs* (WSCp); *to gefyllenne wæs* (WSA).

eart ipse uenturus (Lk 10.1); *wæs he tocymende* (Li); *wæs he to cymende* (Ru2); *he to cumenne wæs* (WSCp); *he to cumenne wæs* (WSA).

uenio quaerens (Lk 13.7); *ic cuom sohte* (Li); *ic com to soecanne* (Ru2); *ic com ... secende* (WSCp); *ic com ... secende* (WSA).

facturus esset (Lk 22.23); *doend were* (Li); *doende were* (Ru2); *to donne wære* (WSCp); *doende wære* (WSA).

esset redempturus (Lk 24.21); *were eft-lésing l* (Li); *were eft-lesing* (Ru2); *to alysenne wære* (WSCp); *alysende wære* (WSA).

uenturus est (Jn 1.15); *tocymende is* (Li); *to-cymende is* (Ru2); *to cumenne is* (WSCp); *to cumenne ys* (WSA).

baptizans (Jn 1.31); *fulguande l to fulgianne* (Li); *gifulwad wæs* (Ru2); *wære geswutelud* (WSCp); *wære geswutelod* (WSA).

interficere (Jn 7.25); *to a-cuellanne* (Li); *to acwellanne* (Ru2); *to ofsleande* (WSCp); *to ofsleanne* (WSA).

I quote a few examples which look more distinct than the others.

10) *uisi in maiestate et dicebant excessum eius quem completurus erat in hierusalem* (Lk 9.31)

⁵ This is the reading of the manuscript, though the editions emend it to *to gehælene*.

woeron gesene in ðrymm 7 cuoedon to-fær † his ðone scealde gefylled
 wosa † wæs in hierusalem (*Li*)
 werun gisene in ðrymme 7 cwedun ðætte ofer his gifylled wosa † wæs in
 hierusalem (*Ru2*)
 gesewene on mægen-þrymme. 7 sædon his gewitend-nesse þe he to ge-
 fyllende wæs on hierusalem (*WSCp*)
 gesawene on mægenþrymme. 7 sædon hys gewytnesse. þe he to gefyllenne
 wæs on hierusalem. (*WSA*)
 ‘(who were) seen in glory, and said of his departure which he was to ac-
 complish in Jerusalem’

- 11) Et ipsi coeperunt quaerere inter sé quis esset ex eis qui hoc facturus esset
 (*Lk 22.23*)
 7 ða † hia ongunnon soeca bituih him huelc were of him seðe ðis doend
 were (*Li*)
 7 ða ongunnun soeca bitwih him hwelc were of him seðe ðis doende were
 (*Ru2*)
 And hi agunnon betwux him smeagan hwylc of him þ to donne wære
 (*WSCp*)
 7 hig agunnon betweox hym smeagan hwylc of hym þ to donne wære
 (*WSA*)
 ‘and they began to think between them which of them were to do that’
- 12) nonne hic est quem querunt interficere (*Jn 7.25*)
 ahne ðes is ðone soecað to a-cuellanne (*Li*)
 ah ne ðis is ðone ge-soecað to acwellanne (*Ru2*)
 hu nis ðis se ðe hi seceaþ to ofsleande (*WSCp*) (*WSH*: ofsleanne)⁶
 hu nys þys se þe hig secað to ofsleanne (*WSA*)
 ‘Isn’t this he whom they are seeking to kill?’

It is far from the truth, as I see from the list above, that the same Latin form can always be translated into various forms. Latin perfect is often rendered by “*be + -ende*” in glosses and “*be + to -enne*” in free translation, though there are exceptions. It is either the tense of *esse* or the set of “perf. ptc + *esse*” that can be rendered in Old English; that is, the Old English translation can be in the future, present, present perfect, preterite, or preterite perfect. The perfect participle as well as gerund can also be translated in the past participle and often with a *be*-verb to make a passive construction. The confusion between the two inflectional endings bases on phonemic/phonetic resemblance, i.e. the same place of articu-

⁶ *WSH* means MS Hatton 38, a xii/xiii century manuscript (Ker 325).

lation between [n] and [d], which may cause either assimilation or dissimilation according to the phonetic sequence in each context.⁷ The preposition *to* can be an index for introducing the inflected infinitive, if not always. As long as the tense difference and its semantic distinction were not settled yet, we cannot say which form and meaning the scribe tried to hand down to us.

3.3.4. Imperative or hortative

Imperative for the first person plural can be expressed by either “V + *we*” or “*uton* + infinitive”. In example (13) the first gloss of *Li* and *Ru2*, as well as *WSCp*, use “V + *we*”, which in the second gloss “(w)*utun* + infinitive” is suggested. In (14) “V + *we*” is chosen twice in glosses, but *WSCp* uses “*uton* + infinitive ... and infinitive”. In (15) glosses show various forms: imperative plural, “(w)*uton* + infinitive”, “V + *we*” and even “*we* + V”. *WSCp* shows a constant use of “*uton* + infinitive”. These three examples may tell us the choice between “V + *we*” and “*uton* + infinitive” in all versions and a West Saxon tendency to choose the latter.

- 13) *eamus in proximos uicos et ciuitates ut et ibi praedicem (Mk 1.38)*
gæ we ƿ wutum geonga in ða néesto lónd 7 ða ceastre þ ƿc ƿer ic bodiga (Li)
gá we ƿ wutu gangan in þa nehsto lond 7 þa cæstre þte 7 ec ðær ic bodige (Ru1)
fare we on ge-hende túnas 7 ceastra. þ ic ðar bodige (WSCp)
 ‘let us go on to the nearest towns so that I may preach there’
- 14) *transeamus usque in bethleem et uideamus hoc uerbum quod factum est (Lk 2.15)*
ofer-fære we oðð in bethleem 7 ge-sea woe ðis word þ te aworden wæs (Li)
fære we oððæt in bethlem 7 gisea we ðis word ðæt aworden wæs (Ru2)
Utun faran to bethleem. 7 geseon þ wórd þe wórden is (WSCp)
 ‘Let us go to Bethlehem and see the word which is come to pass’
- 15) *hic est heres uenite occidamus eum et habebimus hereditatem eius (Mt 21.38)*
ðes is erfeweard cymmeð wutun ofsla hine 7 we habbas ƿ magon habba erfe-weardnisse his (Li)
þis is se erfe-weard cymeþ wutu ofslan þane 7 uru bið ƿ habbe we us erfe his (Ru1)

⁷ Visser (1963-1973: §1018) states “phonemic”. I should rather use the term “phonetic”, treating them as allophones.

Des ys yrfenuma uton gán 7 ofslean hyne 7 habban us hys æhta (*WSCp*)
 ‘This is heir. Let us go and kill him and take his possessions.’

3.3.5. Passive infinitive

Old English passive infinitives appear under Latin influence, and Latin passive infinitives can often be translated active in glosses.⁸ In example (16) *ueniri* is translated into active in glosses but semantically modified by choosing different lexemes from an ordinary rendering. *WSCp* uses “*beon* + past ptc”, again using *geseald* to meet the context. In (17) *uocari* is rendered into active in glosses but into “past ptc + *beon*” in *WSCp*, the element order being a subordinate one.

- 16) poterat enim unguentum istud ueniri plus quam trecentis denariis (*Mk* 14.5)
 mæhte forðon smirinis ðios begeatta forðor mara ðriim hundraðum scillingum (*Li*)
 mæhte forðon smirnisse ðios wosa mara ðonne ðrim hundredum peninga (*Ru2*)
 þeos sealf mihte beon geseald to þrim hund penegum (*WSCp*)
 ‘this ointment could be sold for three hundred pence’
- 17) innuebant autem patri eius quem uellet uocari eum (*Lk* 1.62)
 gebecnadon ðonne feder his huoelcne wælde ge-ceiga hine (*Li*)
 7 gibecnadun ðonne fæder his hwelcne walde gicegan hine (*Ru2*)
 Ða bicnodon hi to hys fæder hwæt he wolde hine genemmedne béon (*WSCp*)
 ‘Then they made signs to his father what he wanted him to be called’

3.3.6. Phrasal expression or simple verb

Saluam facere can be rendered into *hal gedon/gewyrca*, *hal beon/wesan* or *(ge)hælan*. In (18) two examples of *saluam facere/faciet* are rendered into verb phrases except the second one in West Saxon, i.e. *gehæled*. Example (19) illustrates various types of element order of the expression “to be made whole”, together with periphrastic renderings of “*nolite* + infinitive” in glosses (cf. 3.3.10).

- 18) qui enim uoluerit animam suam saluam facere perdet illam nam qui perdidit animam suam propter me saluam faciet illam (*Lk* 9.24)
 seðe forðon wælle sauel his hal gewyrca losað ðailca forðon seðe losað sawel his fore mec hal doað ðailca (*Li*)

⁸ See Callaway (1913: 194 *passim*).

seðe forðon welle sawle his halle doa losað ða ilca 7 seðe losað sawle his fore mec hale gidoað ða ilca (*Ru2*)

Se þe wyle hys sawle his hale gedon. Se hig for-spilþ. witodlice se ðe his sawle for me for-spilð he (*WSA: se*) hi gehæleð (*WSCp*)

‘He, who wishes to make his soul whole, lose it. Truly he, who loses his soul for me, shall save it’.

- 19) ecce sanus factus és iam noli peccare (*Jn 5.14*)
 heono hal auorden arð gee nælleðu syngige (*Li*)
 heono giworden wæs hall gi nelle ðu gisyngiga (*Ru2*)
 nu þu eart hal geworden. ne synga þu (*WSCp*)
 ‘Now thou art made whole. Sin no more.’

In (20) we find two examples of *gratias egit*, which can be rendered into either *ðoncunge dyde* or *þancode*. Renderings of *dixit* and *dicens* can also be compared (cf. 23). Example (21) illustrates a “come seeking”-type of expression (cf. 3.3.3.). *Li* simply juxtaposes two preterite forms, while *WSCp* represents Latin forms. Interesting is *com to soecanne* in *Ru2*; we cannot be certain if the difference between “come seeking” and “come to seek” could be morphologically as well as semantically distinct at this stage.

- 20) et accepto calice gratias egit et dixit... . Et accepto pane gratias egit et dedit eis dicens (*Lk 22.17,19*)
 7 miððy onfeng ðæm cælce ðoncungunga dyde 7 cuoeð ... 7 miððy onfeng half ðoncungunga dyde 7 gebræcg 7 salde him coeðende (*Li*)
 7 on-feng ðæm calice ðoncunge dyde 7 cwæð ... 7 onfeng hlafe ðoncunge dyde 7 bræc 7 salde him cweðende (*Ru2*)
 And onfeng calice 7 þancas dyde 7 cwæð; And he onfengc hlafe 7 þancude 7 him sealde. 7 cwæð (*WSCp*)
 ‘And took the cup and did thanks and said And he took the bread and thanked and gave them and said’
- 21) ecce anni tres sunt ex quo uenio quaerens fructum in ficulnea hac (*Lk 13.7*)
 heono géro ðrio sint of ðon ı soð ða ic cuom sohte wæstm on fic-beame ðisser (*Li*)
 heono ger ðrio sindum of ðæm ic com to soecanne wæstem in fic-beome ðissum (*Ru2*)
 nu synt þreo ger syðþan ic com wæstm secende on þissum fic-treowe (*WSCp*)
 ‘now there are three years since I came seeking fruit on this fig-tree’

3.3.7. Periphrastic forms or simple forms

Deponent verbs are not necessarily be rendered into passive, because their meanings are not passive despite their forms. In (22) *confiteor* is used twice (*confessus fuerit* and *confitebitur*); periphrases are used for both forms in glosses (*geondetað bið* can be understood as “past ptc + *be*”), while both are rendered into simple forms in *WSCp*.

- 22) dico autem uobis omnis quicumque confessus fuerit in me coram hominibus et filius hominis confitebitur in illo coram angelis dei (Lk 12.8)
 ic cuoeðo ðonne iuh eghuelc seðe suahuelc ondetende bið on mec befora monnum 7 sunu monnes geondetað bið on ðæm fore englum godes (*Li*)
 ic cweðo ðonne iow eghwelc seðe swa ondetende bið on mec fora monnum 7 sunu monnes gi-ondetað bið in him fore englum godes (*Ru2*)
 Soðlice ic eow secge swa hwylc swa me andet beforan mannum. þone mannes sunu andet beforan godes englum (*WSCp*)
 ‘Truly I say to you. Whoever shall confess me before men shall confess the Son of man before the angels of god’.

(23) has *miratus est*, which is rendered in a double gloss of periphrastic or simple form in *Li*, but *Ru1* uses “-ende + *be*”, as if it morphologically follow *audiens*. (24) has *dicens*, rendered into *cweðende* in *Ru1* and *WSCp*, though *Li* used the preterite form. *Perimus* is rendered in a double gloss of “Adj + *be*” or “*be* + past ptc” in *Li*, simple present (in the future sense) in *Ru1*, and “Aux + infinitive” in *WSCp*.

- 23) audiens autem iesus miratus est (*Mt* 8.10)
 mið ðy geherde soðlice ðe hælend gewundrad wæs 1 gewundrade (*Li*)
 geherende he þa hælend wundriende wæs (*Ru1*)
 Witodlice þa se hælend þis gehyrde þa wundrode (*WSCp*)
 ‘Truly when the Lord heard this, then he marvelled’.
- 24) et accesserunt et suscitauerunt eum dicentes domine salua nos perimus (*Mt* 8.25)
 7 to geneolecdon 1 to-cuomon 7 awehton hine ðus cuedon drihten hæl usic we deade biðon 1 we aron 1 biðon gelosad (*Li*)
 7 eodun to him discipulas his 7 wehton hine cweþende dryhten hæl usic we forsweorðað (*Ru1*)
 7 hig genealæhton 7 hý awéhton hyne þus cweðende; Drihten hæle us we moton forwurþan (*WSCp*)
 ‘and they came near and they woke him up, thus saying: Lord, save us, we (must) perish’

3.3.8. *Beon* or *habban* with the past participle

The perfect tense is expressed by “*habban* + past ptc of a verb in transitive use” but by “*beon/wesan* + past ptc of a verb in intransitive use” in Old English. In (25) Latin pluperfect is rendered into preterite in *Li*, and “*hæfdon* + past ptc” in *WSCp*, but *Ru2* shows confusion and the context could be read as ‘gave ... and ... was commanded’, instead of ‘had given an order’. In (26) *forletan* ‘to leave’ does not only denote a motion, but *Li* uses “*wesan* + past ptc” (this cannot be a passive because the subject should be *he*). The infinitive *orare* is rendered into *to*-infinitive, infinitive, or “*and* + preterite”. In (27), for *bibiturus sum*, *Li* uses “*-ende* + *be* or infinitive + *Aux*”, *Ru1* chooses the first gloss of it, and *WSCp* “*to -enne* + *habban*” (denoting not ‘have to drink’ but ‘shall have something for drinking’).

- 25) *dederant autem pontifices et pharisaei mandatum ut si quis cognouerit ubi sit indicet ut appraehendant eum (Jn 11.57)*
 saldun ƿutudlice ƿ ða biscopas 7 aelaruas be-bod ƿte gif hua ongette hine huer sie tæcne ƿte gefengo ƿ hine (*Li*)
 saldun wutudlice ðæm biscope 7 æs-larwum biden wæs ƿte gif hwelc ongetun hwer sie doemed ƿte gifengun hine (*Ru2*)
 ƿa bisceopas 7 ƿa pharisei hæfdon beboden gif hwa wiste hwar he wære ƿ he hyt cydde ƿ hig mihton hine niman (*WSCp*)
 ‘The bishops and the Pharisees had commanded: if anyone knew where he were, he should make it known so that they could take him’.
- 26) *Et dimissa turba ascendit in montem solus orare (Mt 14.23)*
 7 wæs forleten ƿ geleded here astág in mor he áne to biddanne (*Li*)
 7 ƿa forlet ƿara mengu astag on dune ane him gebiddan (*Ru1*)
 7 ƿa he hig forlæten hæfde he eode on ƿone munt 7 hyne ƿær ána gebæd (*WSCp*)
 ‘and when he had left them he went up on the hill and there prayed all by himself’
- 27) *potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum (Mt 20.22)*
 magage drinca calic ðone ic drincende beom ƿ drinca willo (*Li*)
 magon git ðene kælic drincan ƿe ic drincande beom (*Ru1*)
 mage gyt drincan ƿone calic ðe ic to drincenne hæbbe (*WSCp*)
 ‘Can you drink of the cup that I shall drink of?’

3.3.9. “Impersonal” constructions⁹

“Impersonal” constructions are often associated with particular verbs. Example (28) shows renderings of *deceat*, where *Li* uses “past ptc + *be* + dative of person + *þ*-clause”, *WSCp* “dative of person + V (3rd pers. sg.) + infinitive”, and *RuI* uses a modal auxiliary of obligation with infinitive. In (29) *misereor* is rendered into “impersonal” only by *RuI*. In (30) *uideatur* is double-glossed (*his gesegen þ geðence*) in *Li*, while *RuI* and *WSCp* use an obvious “impersonal” verb *þincð* with a dative of person. For “*licet* + passive infinitive”, constructions vary: “*is rehtlic* + infinitive” in *Li*, “*is alæfed* + *to -ane*” in *RuI*, and “*ys hyt alyfed* + *þ*-clause” in *WSCp*.

- 28) *sine modo sic enim deceat nos implere omnem iustitiam (Mt 3.15)*
 buta tua suæ forðon gedæfnad is us þ we gefylle alle soðfæs[t]nisse (*Li*)
 lét þus nu forðon ðe þus we sculon gefyllan æghwilce soþfæstnisse (*RuI*)
 Læt nu. þus unc gedafnað ealle rihtwisnesse gefyllan (*WSCp*)
 ‘Do now; thus it befits us to fulfill all righteousness’.
- 29) *misereor turbæ (Mt 15.32)*
 willic milsa ðreatas þ ðæm menigum (*Li*)
 mec hreoweþ þas mengu (*RuI*)
 Ðisse menegu ic ge-miltsige (*WSCp*)
 ‘I feel compassion for this multitude’
- 30) *dic ergo nobis quid tibi uideatur licet census dari caesari an non (Mt 22.17)*
 cueð þ sæg forðon ús huæt ðe his gesegen þ geðence is rehtlic penning-slæht
 gesella ðæm caseri þ nó (*Li*)
 sæg þonne us þæt þe ðyncæ is alæfed to sellane gæfel kasere oþþe nis
 (*RuI*)
 Sege us hwæt þincð þe. ys hyt alyfed þ man casere gaful sylle þe na
 (*WSCp*)
 ‘Tell us, what thinkest thou? Is it allowed that one should give tribute to
 Caesar or not?’

3.3.10. Auxiliary vs. finite verb

Modal auxiliary is often used in place of a simple subjunctive form, mostly in a subordinate clause. When a gloss follows a Latin verb which takes an infinitive, the finite verb may be auxiliarised. A Latin simple verb can be rendered into the

⁹ In my definition an “impersonal” expression may take a dative or an accusative of person with or without *hit* or a noun clause or an (inflected) infinitive. See Ogura (1986: 14-16).

“Aux + infinitive” construction. This means that auxiliation is a syntactic feature of Anglo-Saxon grammar. But the choice between the infinitive and the subordinate clause is another phenomenon. In (31) *coepisset ponere* is rendered as *ongann setta* in *Li*, but *Ru1* and *WSCp* use simple, finite verbs. For *debebat*, *Li* uses *ahte to geldanne*, while *Ru1* and *WSCp* choose *sceolde* as a finite verb. (32) has *oportet fieri*, which is translated as *sceal wesan/beon* in glosses, while *WSCp* uses an “impersonal” expression, *hyt gebyrað to beonne*.

- 31) et cum coepisset rationem ponere oblatus est ei unus qui debebat decem milia talenta (*Mt* 18.24)
 7 mið ðy ongann rehtnise setta gebroht wæs him enne seðe ahte to geldanne 1 tea ðusendo cræftas (*Li*)
 7 þa he ingonn gerehtes monige broht wæs him an sepe scalde ten þusende (*Ru1*)
 7 þa þe þ gerád sette. him wæs án broht se him sceolde tyn þusend punda (*WSCp*)
 ‘and when he set out on reckoning, one who owed him ten thousand pounds was brought to him’
- 32) quomodo ergo implebuntur scribturae quia sic oportet fieri (*Mt* 26.54)
 ah huu forðon biðð gefylled wuriotto forðon sua 1 ðe ðus sceal wosa (*Li*)
 ah hu þonne bioþ gefylled gewritu þe þus sceal beon (*Ru1*)
 Hu magon beon gefyllede þa halgan gewritu þe be me awritene synt. forþam þus hyt gebyrað to beonne (*WSCp*)
 ‘How can the holy script, which is written about me, be fulfilled, because it befits to be thus?’

Example (33) illustrates a recurring expression *uenturus esse*, which is rendered in the forms *to cymende wesan/beon*, *cuman sculan*, or *to cumenne beon* (cf. 3.3.3.). (34) has *uidere*, which is rendered into *to -enne* forms in glosses but into a subordinate clause with “*woldon + geseon*” in *WSCp*.

- 33) tu es qui uenturus es an alium expectamus (*Mt* 11.3)
 ðu arð 1 arð ðu seðe to cymende wæs 1 is oððæ oðer we bidas (*Li*)
 arþu sepe cwome scalt þe we oþres bideþ (*Ru1*)
 eart þú þe tó cumenne eart oððe we oþres abidan (*WSCp*)
 ‘Art thou (he) who art to come or must we wait for another?’
- 34) uenit maria magdalenæ et altera maria uidere sepulchrum (*Mt* 28.1)
 cuom ðiu magdalenisca 7 oðero to geseanne þ byrgenn (*Li*)
 cwom maria magdalenisca 7 oþer maria to sceawenne þa byrgenne (*Ru1*)

com seo magdalenisce maria 7 seo oðer maria þ hig woldon geseon þa byrgene (*WSCp*)
 ‘Maria Magdalene and the other Maria came so that they wished to see the sepulchre’

3.3.11. Differences in element order between *WSCp* and *WSA*

At first I sum up the verses where *WSCp* and *WSA* show different element order patterns as follows.

nascetur (*Mt* 2.4); *acenned wære* (*Li*); *wære akenned* (*Ru1*); *acenned wære* (*WSCp*); *wære acenned* (*WSA*).

dictum est (*Mt* 22.31); *gecueden wæs* (*Li*); *acwæden wæs* (*Ru1*); *gesæd wæs* (*WSCp*); *wæs gesæd* (*WSA*).

non licet (*Mk* 2.26); *nere lefed* (*Li*); *neron alefed* (*Ru2*); *ne alyfede næron* (*WSCp*); *næron alyfede* (*WSA*).

impleretur (*Mk* 4.37); *gefylled wæs* (*Li*); *gifylled wæs* (*Ru2*); *gefylled wæs* (*WSCp*); *wæs gefylled* (*WSA*).

factum est (*Mk* 6.14); *geworden wæs* (*Li*); *giworden wæs* (*Ru2*); *wæs ... geworden* (*WSCp*); *geworden wæs* (*WSA*).

mortuus fuerit (*Mk* 12.19); *dead sie 1 bið* (*Li*); *deod sie* (*Ru2*); *dead bið* (*WSCp*); *byð dead* (*WSA*).

baptizatus fuerit (*Mk* 16.16); *gefulwad bið 1 sie* (*Li*); *gifulwad bið* (*Ru2*); *gefulwod bið* (*WSCp*); *byð ge-fulwod* (*WSA*).

fecisset (*Lk* 8.39); *dyde* (*Li*); *dyde* (*Ru2*); *gedón hæfð* (*WSCp*); *hæfð gedon* (*WSA*).

consternatae essent (*Lk* 24.4); *gelegeno 1 forcumeno woeron* (*Li*); *forcumne 1 gelegne werun* (*Ru2*); *áfæryde wæron* (*WSCp*); *wæron afærede* (*WSA*).

ibant (*Jn* 6.21); *ðidder foerde* (*Li*); *ðider foerde* (*Ru2*); *woldon to faran* (*WSCp*); *to woldon faran* (*WSA*).

sublatum (*Jn* 20.1); *genumen 1 auæled* (*Li*); *ginumen* (*Ru2*); *aweg anumen wæs* (*WSCp*); *wæs aweg anumen* (*WSA*).

Mt 2.4 has already been explained as example (3). In most instances *WSCp* and *WSB* (MS. Bodley 441) agree; in *Mk* 4.37, however, *WSB* has the same order as

WSA. I give three examples here, which seems rather difficult to understand the content unless expanded. In (35) *WSA* changes the element order into *hæfð gedon* ‘has done (in God’s words)’, in contrast with *gedon hæfde* ‘had done (in his own behavior)’. In (36) glosses use *did(d)er* but West Saxon versions use *to* in the relative clause, meaning ‘to which’, and the order between the auxiliary *woldon*, the infinitive *faran* and the preposition *to* varied as a result. Example (37) shows that the order between *wæs*, *anumen* and *aweg* was not settled in West Saxon versions.

- 35) *redi domum tuam et narra quanta tibi fecit deus et abiit per uniuersam ciuitatem praedicans quanta illi fecisset iesus (Lk 8.39)*
 eft-fær to huse ðinum 7 sæge huu micla ðe dyde god 7 eode ðerh alle ða ceastra bodade hu micla him dyde se hælend (*Li*)
 eft-fær to huse ðinum 7 sæge hu micle ðe dyde drihten 7 eode ðerh alle ða cæstre bodade hu micle him dyde drihten (*Ru2*)
 wend to þinum huse 7 cyð hu mycel þe god gedón hæfð; Ða ferde he into eall þa ceastre. 7 cyðde hu mycel se hælend him gedón hæfde (*WSCp*)
 wend to þynum huse. 7 cyð hu mycel þe god hæfð gedon. þa ferde he into eall þa ceastre. 7 cyðde hu mycel se hælend hym gedon hæfde. (*WSA*)
 ‘Go to thy house and tell how much God has done to thee. Then he went into all (the houses of) the city and announced how much the Lord had done to him’.
- 36) *et statim fuit nauis ad terram quam ibant (Jn 6.21)*
 7 sona uæs þ scipp to ðæm eorðe þ ðe ðidder foerde (*Li*)
 7 sona wæs ðæt scip to ðær eorðo ðe he ðider foerde (*Ru2*)
 7 sona þ scyp wæs æt þam lande þe hig woldon to faran (*WSCp*)
 7 sona þ scyp wæs æt þam lande. þe hig to woldon faran (*WSA*)
 ‘and soon the ship was at the land to which they wanted to go’
- 37) *et uidet lapidem sublatum á monumento (Jn 20.1)*
 7 gesaeh I þ stán genumen I auæled of ðæm byrgenne I from ðæm (*Li*)
 7 gisæh ðone stan ginumen from ðær byrgenne (*Ru2*)
 7 heo geseah þ se stan aweg anumen wæs fram þære byrgynne. (*WSCp*)
 7 heo geseah þ se stan wæs aweg anumen. fram þære byrgene. (*WSA*)
 ‘and she saw that the stone was taken away from the sepulchre’

4. Summary

To sum up the results of my investigation on periphrastic renderings of the versions of the Gospels, each version contrives to devise multiple ways of rendering Latin forms which have no exact counterpart of a simple form in Old English,

such as the perfect, the future and the passive. To use various kinds of auxiliaries, e.g. modal auxiliaries, *utan*, *nyllan*, *beon/wesan*, *habban*, etc., with infinitives, present participles and past participles, is a typical device in all versions, including the glosses. Especially on their element order, I may report the following:

- i) As a rule, *Li* follows Latin order;
- ii) *Ru1* often uses its own order and form, and *Ru2*, though it is said to basically follow *Li*, is not always faithful to *Li*;
- iii) *WSCp* as free translation often uses its own order and form;
- iv) *WSA*, in a few instances, uses different order from *WSCp*;
- v) In a subordinate clause, the order is basically “past ptc + *be*” or “infinitive + Aux”, but the general tendency found in *WSCp* is “*be* + past ptc” or “Aux + infinitive”.

REFERENCES

- Callaway, Morgan, Jr.
1913 *The infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*. Washington: Carnegie Institute of Washington.
- Ker, Neil R.
1957 *Catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
[1990]
- Liuzza, Roy, M. (ed.)
1994 *The Old English version of the gospels*. Vol. I. (EETS, O.S. 304.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liuzza, Roy M. (ed.)
2000 *The Old English version of the gospels*. Vol. II. (EETS, O.S. 314.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogura, Michiko
1986 *Old English “impersonal” verbs and expressions*. (Anglistics 24.) Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger.
- Skeat, Walter W. (ed.)
1871-1887 *The gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[1970] [Reprinted in Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.]
- Visser, Fredericus Th.
1963-1973 *An historical syntax of the English language*. 3 Parts. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.