

71-12,203

MINKOFF, Harvey Allen, 1944-  
ÆLFRIC'S THEORY OF TRANSLATION AND THE STYLES  
OF THE HEPTATEUCH AND HOMILIES. [Portions  
of Text in old English and Latin].

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1970  
Language and Literature, linguistics

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1971

Harvey Allen Minkoff

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ÆLFRIC'S THEORY OF TRANSLATION

AND THE

STYLES OF THE HEPTATEUCH AND HOMILIES

by

Allen  
HARVEY MINKOFF

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate  
Faculty in English in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University  
of New York.

1970

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

8/31/70  
date

S R Levin  
Chairman of Examining Committee

8/31/70  
date

S R Levin  
Executive Officer

Margaret Bryant

Miroslav Rensky

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

כע"ה

לכבוד הורי היקרים

ששננום לבניהם ודכרו כם

Because they seem to be all inclusive but actually leave so much unsaid, Forewords are self-defeating: it is impossible to list all the people that I am indebted to or to properly thank those listed--though this is not apparent to the reader. Yet I cannot forgo mentioning my overwhelming debt and consequent gratitude to Professor Samuel Levin for his aid and tutelage during the four years that I have studied under him. Special thanks also go to Professor John Pope of Yale University for his kind assistance when obstacles threatened to frustrate this investigation, and to Professors Bernard Dick and Dena Justin of Iona College for enlightening insights about Greek style. Special thanks must also go to Evelyn Melamed, who for two years has been a willing though captive audience to my constant prattle on grammatical minutiae, and to Pat Aylward, whose skillful and good-natured handling of a difficult clerical assignment has made her seem more colleague than secretary. Finally there is my gratitude to my parents, whose love of learning has been the shaping force of my life.

## CONTENTS

	page
1. TRANSLATION AND BIBLE TRANSLATION.....	1
1.1. The Legacy of the Septuagint.....	2
1.2. The Ideal Translation.....	6
1.3. The Ideal Bible Translation.....	12
1.4. Ælfric as Translator.....	18
1.5. Goals of this Investigation.....	28
1.6. Method of Investigation.....	31
Notes to Chapter 1.....	42
2. SUBORDINATION.....	47
2.1. The Significance of Subordination.....	47
2.2. Methodology.....	52
2.3. The Investigation.....	59
2.31. Transitional Clauses.....	59
2.32. Subordinate Clauses.....	94
2.33. Control Texts.....	104
2.4. Summary.....	108
Notes to Chapter 2.....	111
3. PAST PARTICIPLE PLACEMENT.....	112
3.1. Methodology.....	113
3.2. The Investigation.....	124
3.21. Heptateuch-Homilies Correspondences.....	124
3.22. Other Participles.....	132
3.23. Latin Influence.....	146
3.24. Control Texts.....	157
3.3. Summary.....	161
Notes to Chapter 3.....	163
4. MISCELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTIONS.....	165
4.1. Present Participles.....	166
4.2. Marked Infinitives.....	182
4.3. "Dangling Introducers".....	192
4.4. Diction.....	201
4.5. Summary.....	205
Notes to Chapter 4.....	207
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	210
APPENDIX: THE SAMPLE TEXTS.....	213
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	215

CHARTS AND TABLES

page

Chart 2.1. Transitional Clauses.....	64-69
Table 2.1. Distribution of Transitional Clauses.....	70
Chart 2.2. Subordination by Sections.....	93
Chart 2.3. <u>And</u> -coordinated Clauses.....	95
Chart 2.4. Subordinate Clauses by Sections.....	103
Chart 2.5. Transitions and Subordinates in Prefaces.....	106
Chart 3.1. Past Participles in <u>Hept.</u> and <u>Homil.</u> .....	125
Table 3.1. Occurrences of Each Construction.....	126
Chart 3.2. Remaining <u>ppl</u> 's in <u>Heptateuch.</u> .....	133
Chart 3.3. Remaining <u>ppl</u> 's in <u>Homilies.</u> .....	135
Table 3.2. Distribution of Constructions.....	145
Chart 3.4. Correspondences in Participle Placement.....	147
Chart 3.5. Participle Placement in the Prefaces.....	158

## Chapter 1

### TRANSLATION AND BIBLE TRANSLATION

There is an ancient Jewish tradition that the act of translating the Bible from Hebrew to Greek was as grave in consequence as the act of making the Golden Calf, for just as the idol had no substance but was thought to have, so a translation has no substance but is thought to have. And, continues this tradition, as long as the Bible was in Hebrew, people had to admit that any shortcomings that they found may well have been due to their own deficient knowledge of the language of the text, thereby leading to renewed efforts at comprehension and greater study; but with the text in their own language, people assume that what they are reading is the real thing, containing all the substance and depth of the original, and feel that the text can be skimmed instead of studied. And, worst of all, they take the translation for the original with the result that they condemn the original for the shortcomings of their version without ever realizing that all they see is a shadow.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, making a translation seem to be the original is actually considered a goal by Reverend Ronald Knox, who, in defending his own version, says: "Any translation is a good one in proportion as you can forget, while reading it,

that it is a translation at all."<sup>2</sup> Yet, despite his goal, Knox admits to the same type of reaction to his translation as that experienced by Reverend Ronald Bratcher, of the American Bible Society, whose translation of the New Testament, Good News for Modern Man, was often attacked by the unsophisticated in such terms as "In your book you say so-and-so, but the Bible says..."--meaning, of course, the King James.<sup>3</sup>

In other words, the original fears of the Rabbis have been shown to be accurate, for even before our own time the unlearned gave to translations the due of the original. As Heinrich Graetz, one of the greatest authorities on ancient Jewish history, notes:

It [the Septuagint] innocently led to a mistaken view of the Judæan Law, becoming in a measure a false prophet, promulgating errors in the name of God....the Alexandrian Judæans of later generations believed so firmly in the perfection of this translation, that by degrees they deemed that the original could be dispensed with, and depended entirely upon the translation. Thus they came to look upon the mistakes which had crept into the Greek Bible either through ignorance, inability to cope with grammatical difficulties, or arbitrary additions, as the word of God, and things were taught in the name of Judaism which were entirely foreign to it or even contradictory to it.<sup>4</sup>

### 1.1. The Legacy of the Septuagint.

1.1.1. Style of the Septuagint. It is generally agreed that the Septuagint is a word for word translation of the Hebrew Bible. Given its cultural setting it could hardly have been anything else. During the

Babylonian Exile, many dispossessed Jews (or Judæens) settled in Egypt, and before long there was a large, prosperous Jewish community in Alexandria, much of which did not bother returning to Judea when permission to rebuild Jerusalem was granted by the Persian overlords. Nonetheless this Alexandrian community considered itself a loyal part of the Jewish people and adherents of Judaism. When, however, in the course of years these people no longer understood Hebrew, having adopted the Greek language of their new environment, scholars were commissioned to translate the Bible into Greek. But being totally committed to the belief that every word of Holy Scripture was God's own, they naturally wanted a translation that retained as much as possible of the Hebrew.<sup>5</sup> The possibility of rendering the sense of the original divorced from the original words was apparently never even considered. The order of the words itself was considered of divine significance.

The extent to which the Hebrew was followed may be realized by noting that in its list of about a dozen instances where the Septuagint departs from the Hebrew, the Talmud includes such syntactic observations as: In the opening verse of Genesis, where the Hebrew has Adverb-Verb-Noun (literally translated 'In the beginning created God'), the normal order for Hebrew, the Greek has Noun-Verb-Adverb apparently to avoid the possibility that

someone might take In-the-beginning as the name of the creator of God.<sup>6</sup> As B.F.C. Atkinson points out, "the Hebrew shines through the Septuagint" which is a translation "full of Hebrew idiom." Significantly, Atkinson goes on to list many expressions and constructions found in Greek only or for the first time in the Septuagint.<sup>7</sup>

1.12. Influence of the Septuagint. Just as there is no disagreement about the Septuagint's being a literal, word for word translation, there is no disagreement about its influence. It established this method of Biblical translation as both the norm and the goal until very recent times. In fact, anyone familiar with the Hebrew Bible can easily compile a list of Modern English expressions that show not only Hebrew lexical peculiarities-- e.g., "poor soul" from נפש/nefeš/ 'soul; person'<sup>8</sup>--but also Hebrew syntax. Thus a common Hebrew superlative is formed by repeating a word and its genitive (king of kings, song of songs), and this yields Modern English heart of hearts. Moreover, Hebrew coordinates opposites to mean 'everything' --e.g., Gen.6:14, "within and without" meaning everywhere; 31:24, "good or bad" meaning anything; Esther 3:13, "young and old" meaning everyone--and this gives us besides young and old and good and bad perhaps also high and low, top to bottom and others. It is significant that in these

cases a construction, not a set phrase, is borrowed.<sup>9</sup>

This practice of following literally whatever text was being translated can be explained by reference to two qualities of the Bible and its translators. First, almost all translations were done for religious purposes, and those doing them shared the reverence for divine utterance exhibited by the translators of the Septuagint. Moreover, the Bible was not only written in a foreign language, but presented foreign concepts. By definition, a concept foreign to a culture cannot be translated into the language of that culture; it must be paraphrased. Thus, for example, since the concept of some type of divinity existed in the pagan Germanic culture, Christian missionaries could merely redefine or qualify the usage of such words as god, heofon, and hel. But for those concepts totally alien to the Germanic tribes, Hebrew words have come into English, for example amen, sabbath, and jubilee. Obviously, even though amen is sometimes paraphrased verily or so be it, and sabbath as day of rest, the concepts signified by, for example, sabbath or day of rest are outside the realm of Germanic culture and can be understood-- in fact, can be presented --only through their Biblical context.

Even such descriptive paraphrases as circumcise, on the model of the Septuagint's περιτέμνω, make sense only in their Biblical setting. And this led to the belief that

the Bible in fact could not be translated. Since however, some sort of text in the new languages was desired, it followed that the best thing to do was stay as close as possible to the original, and hopefully God's truth would out.

### 1.2. The ideal translation.

It should not be thought that the style of the Septuagint and later translations of the Bible was arrived at solely by negative considerations of the type just given. While the part played by these problems should not be underestimated, one must also realize that there were, and still are, sophisticated debates about what a translation should be--in contrast to what practically it can be. Because the ancient scholars and translators seldom wrote extensively on the question of goals, their opinions must be deduced from their practice and other statements. On the other hand, modern translators seem to be obsessed with defending their work, and the literature is consequently most extensive for the modern period. For this reason it was decided to present the various positions through the discussions of the moderns and then show by deduction and analogy where the ancients stood.

1.21. Is translation possible? The fact that different cultures speak different languages, as pointed

out above, raised the question in many minds as to whether translation was even possible. Ortega y Gasset thought that the whole desire to translate was utopian: "No es traducir, sin remedio, un afan utopico?"<sup>10</sup> And the parenthetical sin remedio should certainly not be overlooked. Eugene Nida, however, having devoted many years to Bible translation, concludes that "rather than being impressed by the impossibility of translation, anyone who is involved in the realities of translation in a broad range of languages is impressed that effective interlingual communication is always possible, despite seemingly enormous differences in linguistic structures and cultural features."<sup>11</sup> Nida's view is especially noteworthy because he believes that "the analysis of a text...must not be limited to a study of the syntactic relationships between linguistic units or to the denotative (or referential) meanings of these same units. Analysis must also treat the emotive (or connotative) values of the formal structure of the communication." But he adds the very important qualification that in any aspect of translation "what counts is not the particular words which carry the componential features, but the fact that the correct componential features are lexically transported."<sup>12</sup> This last point is important because of the bearing it has on the problem of translating the style, as opposed to the words, of a text.

1.22. Translating language style. Nobody doubts that languages have different ways of doing things. It has been seen that the extent of these differences has led some qualified observers to conclude that translation is impossible, for different languages cannot even do the same things. But to consider translating impossible because it is difficult is an intellectual dead end. Obviously it follows that if translation is impossible it may as well not be tried. But adequate translation is possible, even though complete or absolute translation is not. Adequate translation may be defined as conveying as much of a communication in the first language as the second language has capacity to convey. To this extent, circumcise, for example, is an adequate rendering of Hebrew יָמַל/yamal/ because it conveys the general idea of the original, even though it cannot show the cultural importance of the concept. The Hebrew word, on the other hand, being a root, not a descriptive compound, shows this cultural importance, as does the existence of the root אָרַל/'aral/'not circumcised'.

Now, if for the sake of discussion we posit that style is the particular way something is done, in contrast to its merely being done, it follows that languages differ in two very basic ways: first, there are things that one language can do that another simply cannot; second, there are things that both languages do, but differently, that is, in different styles. To the extent that circumcision is a basic tenet of the Hebrew culture, the Hebrew language

can do something that Latin cannot: it can show this fact by having a root for this concept. In contrast to such cultural items, every language has a way of making emphatic statements, though they do this differently. To this extent they may be said to have different styles. While it is thus clear that absolute translation of culture is impossible, it is equally clear that in some other cases, some significant type of translation is possible. The important question, therefore, relates to this latter possibility: when languages differ only in style, how much of the style can be translated?

As mentioned earlier, Knox believes that a good translation is one that cannot be recognized as a translation. To do this, the translator must analyze the "emotive values," as Nida called them, of the author's style and reproduce the emotional effect with the proper stimulus in the new language. And it stands to reason that an author's personal style must be analyzed in the context of his language and its style, since as D. Enrique Aguado maintains, for a translation to have real quality

es necesario que haya una verdadera compenetración entre el autor y el traductor; es decir, éste tiene que tener un completo dominio de los dos idiomas... El traductor perfecto es aquel que consigue que el autor aparezca ante sus lectores extranjeros como si hubiese escrito el original en el idioma a que ha sido vertido. Siempre, como es natural, con las inevitables e invencibles diferencias que impone la disparidad de sintaxis y de léxico entre los idiomas.<sup>13</sup>

It is interesting that while Aguado agrees in principle

with Knox, even presenting the same goal of unrecognizable translating, he reaffirms the impossibility of absolute success--because of insurmountable differences.

The same goal is sought by Anton M. Rothbauer, who also recognizes the difficulties presented by the basic differences in various languages; thus while he sees a good translation as one "die vom Blickwinkel des Autors aus so entstanden ist, als hätte dieser Autor sein Werk nicht in der Fremdsprache, sonder in der Übersetzersprache geschaffen," he recognizes that success depends on "wieweit die sprachlichen Mittel und Möglichkeiten der Übersetzersprache dem fremdsprachigen Original und Übersetzersprache selbst angemessen verwendet wurden."<sup>14</sup>

But this goal is perhaps unattainable. True, for most straightforward communications any language will suffice. But what about an utterance that presupposes previous knowledge on the part of the audience. If this knowledge is the type that may be loosely classified as information or empirical fact, then it can be supplied and translated. But when it is stylistic, or language-oriented, this is not so. For example, a contemporary writer might parody the style of Hemingway or James, and therefore, part of his point is strictly stylistic. Can this type of communication be translated? Michael Bullock writes that it cannot:

No amount of sympathy on the translator's part will enable him to visualize how, let us say, the German novelist X would have written his stylistically highly

original novel, if he had been an English novelist writing in English. The fact is, he would not have written it at all...The style is the product not of the author's own personality, but also of the language itself, of the particular phase of evolution through which the language is currently passing, and of the literary trends prevalent in the...country of origin, which are themselves dependent upon sociological and historical factors of a general nature.<sup>15</sup>

And with this, even Nida, who was mentioned above as saying that the style or emotive values were objects of translation, agrees. The irony of trying to translate style from one language to another, according to Nida, is that "the greater the literary quality of the original message, the greater the extent of distortion and loss, for literary quality normally implies the fullest possible exploitation of the genius of the source-language structure. To be able to exploit the genius of the receptor language to a comparable degree requires quite exceptional skill."<sup>16</sup> Nida, then, also recognizes the great difference between translating word meaning and rendering stylistic tone.

1.23. Words vs. Sense. Yet even if style could be retained, there is still no consensus on whether the translator should sacrifice sense to style or vice versa when the two cannot both be retained. The question may be rephrased as whether one wants to convey a message or a feeling. (To the extent that part of a message is its feeling, this is the problem just discussed.)

E. Cary writes that though many, and perhaps most,

French translators and critics think that "la tâche du traducteur est de s'efforcer de comprendre et de transmettre ce qu'il a compris" there are still many others who would reply that "on n'a pas le droit d'introduire dans un texte plus de clarté qu'il n'y en avait au départ" and would defend this position with the declaration that "traduire n'est pas expliquer."<sup>17</sup> As Cary further points out, this disagreement is merely the modern reflex of the longstanding debate over whether translation should be word for word or sense for sense. And this debate stems from efforts to translate the Bible.

### 1.3. The ideal Bible translation.

All of the problems still bothering translators plagued Bible translators. A translator working on a novel has only to decide whether the novelist was interested more in message or technique, and then act accordingly. To be sure, the choice is not always easy or clear, but it is, in theory at least, possible. But to one totally convinced that part of God's message is in his Word, the choice does not even exist. Not only was the Bible read for its literal meaning, it was studied as allegory and analyzed etymologically.<sup>18</sup> The religious scholar was faced with the question not only of determining what God said, but also what its greater significance was. And neither what was said nor what was meant could be accom-

plished without knowing why God used this particular word, in this context, in this order--and why not anything else. This type of analysis, which permeates the Talmud, was borrowed by Christian scholars, combined with Greek rhetorical theory, and made the center of medieval Christian Biblical scholarship.

1.31. Medieval background. That this happened is not strange. It has already been mentioned that the Jewish community at Greek Alexandria quickly grew in wealth and influence. A direct consequence of such growth was the desire to show the Greeks the valuable culture of the Jews, and for this the Septuagint was certainly an important tool. Moreover, the success of this endeavor may be seen in the large number of writings in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek purporting to contain Greek wonder at Jewish accomplishments and offers of friendship.<sup>19</sup> In addition, numerous works attempted to harmonize the Bible with Greek knowledge. And considering the vast body of such material, it was only logical for Christianity to apply these works, and add its own on this model, when trying to convince prospective converts of the validity and antiquity of its doctrine. What the Jews had begun, the Christians took to new extremes--especially Hellenizing. As Ernst Curtius notes, early Christian scholars were often content to harmonize doc-

trine and pagan culture, but "Cassiodorus carefully explores the dependence of profane upon sacred learning. The former is nothing but a development of what is contained in the latter....Now the Bible no longer needs to be justified before profane literature by a demonstration that the former too employs the recognized figures of speech--no, the figures stem from the Bible, and the Bible alone gives them dignity."<sup>20</sup> And even though Cassiodorus' opinion is more extreme than their own, Augustine and Jerome had said much the same thing, the latter, for example, having written: "David Simonides noster, Pindarus, et Alcaeus, Flaccus quoque, Catullus atque Serenus."<sup>21</sup> As Curtius says: "For Jerome, the Bible is not only a witness of salvation, but also a literary corpus, which need not shrink from comparison with the thesaurus of the gentilitas."<sup>22</sup>

The effect of these pronouncements on scholarship in Anglo-Saxon England is evident in Bede's pointed remark in De schematibus et tropis that "the Greeks pride themselves on having invented the figures or tropes," and therefore in order that "all who wish to read this work may know that Holy Writ surpasses all other writings not merely in authority because it is divine, or in usefulness because it leads to eternal life, but also for its age and artistic composition, I have chosen to demonstrate by means of examples

collected from Holy Writ" that there are no "figures and tropes which did not first appear in Holy Writ."<sup>23</sup> It is thus especially noteworthy that though Bede's manual is based closely on Donatus' definitions, Bede rejects all examples taken by Donatus from pagan works, substituting instead Biblical passages and occasionally a verse from a Christian poet.

1.32. Consequences for translating. These attempts to see the Bible in terms of all possible literary and rhetorical interpretations had obvious and significant consequences for Bible translators. Any translation must be something different from, if not necessarily less than, the original. But whereas in a secular work a translator can be reconciled to the decision to lose one aspect of the original in order to maintain other more important ones, translators working in the multi-leveled textual tradition just outlined could never say for sure what was more important. It is ironic, therefore, that as the need for more Biblical translations grew because of the missionary activities of Christianity, the ability to make adequate translations lessened because of the direction Biblical scholarship had taken. Christian translators had all the problems facing those who had produced the Septuagint plus all the problems that grew out of the new analytical approaches. And, thus, whereas the Septuagint translators

could fulfill their obligations with a literal, word for word version, the later translators had to produce the same type of work, but could not feel that they had actually done what was required: if they kept the word, they lost the sense; if they kept the sense, they lost the allegory and etymology.

The problems that this paradox present for Biblical translation are illuminated by John Beekman in his many essays for the Wycliffe Bible Translators. The basic doctrinal problem is that the translator is generally committed to the position that "in many cases an exact representation of form is essential in order to convey the correct meaning....The original author of Scripture chose by inspiration those words which most effectively conveyed his message. Sometimes he chose words whose form and function are equally important. At other times... form was included only because it served as a natural vehicle carrying the functional meaning."<sup>24</sup> Obviously, the translator faced with an untranslatable form must decide whether it is essential or incidental, though the best procedures that Beekman seems to suggest for deciding are to compare different versions and to read commentaries.<sup>25</sup> In brief, then Beekman is warning the translator to respect the integrity of the text until he is forced to compromise it for fear of translating wrong. And ultimately, this approach can be traced to Jerome.

Given the conflicting needs of maintaining the sense or the word, translators needed some authoritative direction, and that given by Jerome is probably the most important--for Bible translation in general, and for this investigation in particular. As is well known, Jerome did a vast amount of translating, including several versions of the Bible besides the one that became the basis of the modern Vulgate. And as is to be expected, considering the massive problems involved in translating, his products were often attacked as faulty and therefore had to be defended. In the most famous of these defenses, his letter Ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi, he addresses himself to the public attacks made upon his work by Rufin d'Aquilée, who had accused him "verbum non expressisse de verbo, pro 'honorabili' dixisse 'carissimum'...."<sup>26</sup> He answers this by arguing that insofar as "ipsa epistula doceat nihil mutatum esse de sensu, nec res additas, nec aliquod dogma confictum," he not only confesses to the charge, "sed libera voce profiteor me in interpretatione Græcorum...non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu."<sup>27</sup>

This practice of rendering not word for word, but sense for sense, is widely quoted, and would be, for this reason alone, significant. But it gains even more significance because Jerome himself says--though many modern scholars apparently overlook this--that he does not always do this. Thus, in the preface to his translation of Job he

writes: "Hæc autem translatio nullum de veteribus sequitur interpretum: sed ex ipso Hebraico Arabicoque sermone, et interdum Syro, nunc verba, nunc sensus, nunc simul utrumque resonabit."<sup>28</sup> To translate sometimes word for word, and sometimes sense for sense, is far different from translating sense for sense; and the importance of this difference should not be missed. It is of great significance in any attempt to establish Ælfric's technique and will therefore be more fully discussed below.

#### 1.4. Ælfric as translator.

Much has been written about the general tendencies in Ælfric's method of translation. But just as there is little agreement concerning what these tendencies are, there is little agreement about just what Ælfric was trying to do. Few scholars have recognized the very different results that Ælfric produced, because almost none have attempted to establish what he wanted to do, and why.

1.41. Nec verbum ex verbo. There is a widespread habit of quoting Ælfric's introduction to the first series of Catholic Homilies as proof that he translated sometimes word for word, sometimes sense for sense. For he does say as much in this essay: "Nec ubique transtulimus verbum ex verbo, sed sensum ex sensu, cavendo tamen diligentissime

deceptivos errores, ne inveniremur aliqua hæresi seducti seu fallacia fuscati."<sup>29</sup> And if supporting evidence is needed that this is what Ælfric actually did, it is usually found by referring to his sophisticated realization in the "Preface to Genesis" that "æfre se ðe awent oððe se ðe tæcð of Ledene on Englic, æfre he sceal gefadian hit swa ðæt ðæt Englisc hæbbe his agene wisan."<sup>30</sup>

All investigations into Ælfric's use of his homiletic sources confirm that he does indeed arrange the English according to its own rules. And most have added, without however fully realizing its importance, that Ælfric treats his sources very loosely.

The first major investigation of Ælfric's sources was by Max Förster, who concluded, in "Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliæ Catholicæ," that "Ælfric, im vergleich zu anderen übersetzungen, z.b. denen könig Ælfreds und den Blickling homilien, auch wo er einer vorlage folgt, seine volle selbständigkeit und freiheit bewahrt hat; ja, nicht selten nur den stoff herüber nimmt, die einkleidung der gedanken aber selbst liefert."<sup>31</sup>

Charles Smith seems to accept this description of Ælfric's handling of his homiletic sources and adds that "the question of Latin influence does not enter into the Homilies,"<sup>32</sup> apparently because the treatment is so loose.

In more or less direct contract to Förster's opinion

is that of Rosemary Woolf, who says of the Lives of Saints that "Ælfric's direct, elegant style was achieved by a firm, sensitive resistance to the ornateness and prolixity of most of his originals,"<sup>33</sup> but who finds it necessary to add this "most curious point": "...while the manner of storytelling is so transformed, there is nevertheless in the Old English hardly a phrase which is not word for word from the Latin."<sup>34</sup>

Also agreeing that Ælfric edits for conciseness but closely translates what he retains are Gordon Gerould and Anne Middleton, who however disagree with each other on exactly what Latin source Ælfric is closely translating.<sup>35</sup> And what they say about his sources for the Homilies, Dorothy Bethurum says about the Lives. Comparing a long section of Ælfric's "Life of Saint Agnes" with a corresponding passage from Ambrose's Latin treatment, she concludes that "the translation is literal but extremely intelligent, Ælfric showing himself always alert to varieties of rhythm," with the added note that "the sentence structure is rarely changed from the regular English order."<sup>36</sup> She also makes the significant observation that "Ælfric's obligations to his sources for his own style were not very numerous."<sup>37</sup> And though she is speaking specifically about his "rhythmic" style, the remark may have wider relevance.

1.42. Ælfric's Biblical translations. Just as there is little agreement concerning Ælfric's treatment of his

homiletic material, there is little agreement about his handling of Biblical passages.

S.J. Crawford, trying to establish on stylistic grounds that Ælfric is the author of the Exameron Anglice, says of Ælfric that he "is no slavish follower of his authorities. As a rule he utilizes them freely, and translates, even in the case of the texts of scripture, the thought rather than the words."<sup>38</sup>

Charles Davis disagrees with this. Though recognizing with approval Ælfric's editing to achieve a concise, readable story, he makes the interesting observation concerning the Biblical section of Catholic Homilies I, xv that "one might be led to suspect that he was telling the story from memory, were it not for the fact that over one third of the total number of verses used have been exactly translated."<sup>39</sup>

Agreeing with this appraisal of Ælfric's Biblical translations, Smith, though previously cited as considering Ælfric free with homiletic material, believes that with scripture, especially when the Latin is first quoted, "there is a tendency to conform the word-order as closely as possible to the Latin, so as, apparently, to impress the hearer with the fact that he is listening...to the inspired thought itself, dressed as far as possible in its native garb."<sup>40</sup> Smith is quick to add, however, that despite this Ælfric "is almost entirely free from the examples of forced order so frequently occurring in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels."<sup>41</sup> Without discussing

either closeness or motivation, Bethurum goes along with the belief that Ælfric was free from Latin influence in the Biblical translations, mentioning--more or less in passing--that Ælfric's dictum that a translator must write good English "extended even to his renderings of Scripture where he felt every obligation to be true to the text."<sup>42</sup>

Ælfric's obligation to the text is noticed also by John Pope in Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection. He points out that Ælfric "tends to be scrupulously faithful to the sense if not to the verbal sequence of the original,"<sup>43</sup> but gives examples of metrical peculiarities in Ælfric's rhythmical prose that "appear to have arisen because of Ælfric's desire to preserve something of the structure as well as the meaning of the original."<sup>44</sup>

It should be noticed that while Bethurum mentions Ælfric's obligations to the text, and Pope his faithfulness to the sense, and Smith his desire to present the inspired thought in its original garb, none of the scholars cited addressed themselves to Ælfric's handling of the Heptateuch, the most obvious place to look if one is interested in establishing his attitude toward Holy Scripture. For while what they say is certainly not wrong--Pope's investigation and conclusions, for example, cannot be faulted--one would like to see a somewhat more powerful argument to explain Ælfric's treatment of scripture.

1.43. Paraphrase vs. translation. As Ann Eljenholm Nichols maintains in "A Syntactical Study of Ælfric's Translation of Genesis," scholars have given too little attention to the fact that Ælfric clearly differentiated between paraphrases and translations, and they therefore make unwarranted generalizations from the Homilies and Lives to the Heptateuch.<sup>45</sup> Unfortunately, she does not pursue this topic to its logical goal: establishing the reasons behind and practical consequences of this distinction.

As pointed out earlier, much is made of Ælfric's "nec ubique transtulimus verbum ex verbo, sed sensum ex sensu." This, of course, is much the same thing that Alfred wrote in the preface to his translation of Pastoral Care: "...hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgit of andgiete."<sup>46</sup> And as famous as this passage is, almost no one has made mention of the fact that Alfred continues: "swæ swæ ic hie geliornode æt Plegmunde minum ærcebiscepe, ond æt Assere minum biscepe, ond æt Grimbolde minum mæsseprioste, ond æt Iohanne minum mæssepreoste." What Alfred is giving here is a tradition of learning: this is not his own way of presenting the material; this is the way it is done. It would be too much to hope that he is describing the technique of translation. But it is enough if he is describing only the way he, and therefore others, had been taught to read and render Latin--sometimes word for word,

sometimes sense for sense. If this was the tradition prevalent in England at the time, it must go back to Jerome. The very words are his.

That this was indeed the tradition of translation in England then and after is apparent from other sources which seem to be aware of the same pronouncement of Jerome. Thus, it can hardly be a coincidence that in the General Prologue to his translation of the Old Testament, John Purvey wrote: "...the best translating out of Latin into English is to translate according to the meaning and not only according to the words...and to depart not far from the letter; and if the letter may not be followed in the translating, let the meaning ever be complete and open, for the words ought to bring out the intent and meaning..."<sup>47</sup> Purvey's presentation of his directions for translating shows a clear leaning in him and his audience to stay as close to the letter as possible, and to depart from it only when this was absolutely necessary. The same attitude is seen in the preface to the "Brethren of England..." which introduces the Geneva Bible:

God is our witness that we have by all meanes indeavored to set forthe the purities of the worde and right sense of the holy Gost....Now as we have chiefest observed the sense, and laboured alwaies to restore it to all integritie: so have we moste reverently kept the proprietye of the wordes...we have in many places reserved the Ebrewes phrases, notwithstanding that thei may seme somewhat hard in their eares that are not well practised and also delite in the swete sounding phrases of the holy Scriptures.<sup>48</sup>

In addition to the echoes heard in such phrases as "puritie

of the worde," the final reference to those that are and are not able to appreciate the sound of scripture suggests that the Geneva translators were familiar with a tradition that put the word first and abandoned it only when absolutely necessary.

If there was such a tradition in England that could be traced to Jerome, it would be valuable to have the exact statement. And in reality it is not hard to find. For that oft quoted passage by Jerome, cited already, has a very important parenthetical remark that is seldom quoted. In the midst of his joyous confession that he does indeed follow sometimes the word, sometimes the sense, Jerome interjects the disclaimer: "...absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est...." And while it may be true that verborum ordo may refer not (only) to the order but (also) to the "precise character" of the words,<sup>49</sup> what we are dealing with now is far different from a sometimes words, sometimes sense attitude. What Jerome is talking about, even if all he means is precise character and not syntax, is a Bible translation that retains the power of allegory, etymology, and all else that the Church Fathers found in the original. And as seen previously, there is much more to this than reproducing the "sense."

The significance that this difference has for an understanding of Ælfric is overwhelming. As Nichols realized, what Ælfric feared was translating, not paraphrasing,

and everything in the Homilies and Lives--including verses from scripture--was paraphrased. Translating could mean only one thing--retaining the mysterium of the verborum ordo. And though nobody seems to have realized this, Ælfric says just that in the Preface to Genesis.

1.44. "Deop on gastlicum andgyte." Ælfric begins the Preface by saying that he does not want to translate the Bible because "þæt weorc is swiðe pleolic me oððe ænigum men to underbeginne" in that some foolish person may read it and think "þæt he mote lybban...swa swa þa ealdan fæderas leofodon...."<sup>50</sup> He then gives several examples of people who went wrong in this way and points out that this can happen only with a translation because "seo boc is swiðe deop gastlice to understandenne, and we ne writað na mare buton þa nacedan gerecednisse. Þonne þincð þam ungelæredum þæt eall þæt andgit beo belocen on þære anfealdan gerecednisse, ac hit ys swiðe feor þam."<sup>51</sup> Now follow several instances from the Bible for which the single-fold story (the anfealdan gerecednisse) is not sufficient to convey the spiritual depth of the original (Latin). "Be ðisum lytlan," says Ælfric, "man mæg understandan, hu deop seo boc is on gastlicum andgyte, ðeah ðe heo mid leohtum wordum awriten sy."<sup>52</sup> More examples of spiritual depth and

then: "...heo is swa geendeburd, swa swa God sylf hi gedihhte ðam writere Moyse, and we ne durren na mare awriten on Englisc þonne ðæt Leden hæfð, ne ða endeburdnyse awendan, buton ðam anum, ðæt ðæt Leden and ðæt Englisc nabbað na ane wisan on ðære spræce fandunge." <sup>53</sup> It is imperative to notice that after acknowledging the spiritual depth of the syntax, the arrangement that God dictated to Moses (verborum ordo ?)--only then does he make the much quoted promise to be true to English syntax!

Given this introduction, Ælfric's belief that "æfre se ðe awent oððe se ðe tæcð of Ledene on Englisc, æfre he sceal gefadian hit swa ðæt ðæt Englisc hæbbe his agene wisan"<sup>54</sup> is not a primary goal but a secondary warning that even though the translator's primary goal is to convey and maintain the spiritual content he must also make sure to write good English, "elles hit bið swyðe gedwolsum to rædenne ðam ðe ðæs Ledenes wise ne can,"<sup>55</sup> meaning presumably those unable to comprehend the depth of the Latin presentation.

It is clear, therefore, that Ælfric's subsequent promise that "ic nelle nane boc æfter ðisre of Ledene on Englisc awendan"<sup>56</sup> pertains, as Nichols argues, only to this type of literal translation. And now the reason too is clear. Paraphrases make no claim to completeness and can therefore present the single-fold story without danger of misunderstanding; nobody would point to a character in a homily or story and claim that he had the divine right or

scriptural authority to live like that. But, as Ælfric said he knew from personal experience, just this type of claim was made with reference to Biblical narratives, and he did not want to be the vehicle of someone's error. This consideration did not apply to homilies, which were inspired perhaps but certainly not divine and therefore not multi-leveled, and it followed that Catholic Homilies and Lives of Saints could be rendered more easily--nec ubique verbum ex verbo sed sensum ex sensu.

#### 1.5. Goals of this investigation.

If it is true, as we have maintained, that Ælfric considered the Homilies and Lives paraphrases but the Hep-tateuch a translation, it should be possible to show how this affected his style and treatment of his sources. Put another way, the question becomes, is it possible to find Ælfric doing things in the Hep-tateuch that he does not do elsewhere? And if so, is it possible to trace these features to the Latin text?

1.51. Style. There is, of course, a great deal of discussion about the nature of style. It has been usual to define style as a particular way of doing something, in language as a particular way of conveying a certain piece of information. This approach is based on the necessary assumption that it is possible to isolate a "piece of information." Another definition of style sees

it as part of the information conveyed; saying something just this way and not that, according to this theory, is part of the communication. To the extent that traditional poetics believed that poetry and prose differed inherently rather than merely technically, it was based on this latter view, though more often than not used the first definition of the term style.

It is not the place here to try to give a conclusive answer to a question plaguing critics for centuries. Rather, the position taken here is a middle one. As briefly referred to in the discussion about the styles of different languages,<sup>57</sup> the position taken is that part of what is traditionally included in the concept of style must be actually excluded and called something like "language genius" (for lack of a better term). All those elements of a language that are inextricably tied to culture must be placed in this area removed from style. For, though the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis claims too much, that such culture-related elements exist cannot be seriously doubted. On the other hand, there are those communications that any language can convey in its own manner. Thus the fact that Latin regularly omits pronoun subjects, being satisfied with the subject inherent in the verb inflection, does not mean that something essentially communicative is lost by rendering such a construction by subject + verb in English. Needless to say, there are troublesome border areas--

particular in literary texts where otherwise unimportant syntactical points may be deliberately foregrounded--but the overall validity of the distinction is clear.

In terms of an individual's style, the same middle ground is available. Despite the unquestionable importance of the way a communication is presented--its style --it should be possible to extract part, perhaps most, of the communication from the presentation--enough, at least, to be able to say that two different presentations contain the same information, if different total messages.

1.52. The Heptateuch and Homilies. The Ælfric corpus contains the necessary elements for validation of the theory of style just outlined, for it contains differing treatments of what is obviously the same material.

Specifically, the Homilies includes many Biblical verses corresponding, though not generally identical, with passages in the Heptateuch. It follows, therefore, that the "information" can be determined with little difficulty, and then used to establish points about style. The Homilies was written several years before the Heptateuch and may thus have differences stemming from the natural evolution that an author's style undergoes. Nonetheless, it should still be possible to compare the styles of the two works in an effort to find differences that are not evolutionary.<sup>58</sup>

More specifically, it was maintained above that the

Heptateuch is a translation of scripture and by necessity must retain the gastlice andgyt, while the Homilies is a paraphrase that could be written as a single-fold story. If this contention is correct, the Heptateuch should treat the Biblical text in a way that the Homilies was not required to follow. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that so many scholars say that the Biblical verses contained in the Homilies are literal or very close renderings of the Latin. If our contention is correct, it should be found that even these close renderings, while much more faithful to the text than their homiletic settings are, are less literal than parallel passage in the Heptateuch. If this is found to be the case, little doubt should remain about whether Ælfric consciously maintained a difference between translating and paraphrasing. Likewise, little doubt will remain about where he stood theoretically on the matter of Biblical translation.

#### 1.6. Method of investigation.

1.61. The Texts. To be as certain as possible that the "information" being treated in the two works was the same, only passages in the Homilies that clearly correspond to verses in the Heptateuch were sought. Also, only sections certainly by Ælfric were used from the Heptateuch.

For the former quest invaluable aid was provided by Albert S. Cook's Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers

and Charles R. Davis' "Biblical Translations in Ælfric's Catholic Homilies."<sup>59</sup> Davis rejects some of Cook's verses and adds some of his own; so needless to say all inclusions and omissions in this investigation are by decision of the present writer.

The second specification is scientifically more complex, but the solution accepted is simple. There is much disagreement concerning Ælfric's responsibility for the Heptateuch, some claiming that he wrote it all, some that he wrote only parts of Genesis.<sup>60</sup> As determining Ælfric's authorship is a separate study in itself, it was decided to accept the position taken by John Pope in Homilies of Ælfric and based on the list given by Peter Clemons in "The Chronology of Ælfric's Works." According to this, Ælfric is the author of Gen.1-3, 6-9, 12-24:22; Num.13-31; Joshua (except 1:1-10 and 12); and Judges. Among the attractions of this view is its severity, which makes for greater certainty in terms of whether the texts being compared are actually by Ælfric.

Passages were sought in the Homilies that correspond in thematic content ("information") with verses from these sections of the Heptateuch. By the very nature of the investigation, correspondences had to be based on theme, since structure was the element to be determined. There is not really much difficulty in deciding whether two passages are thematically similar because, as so often noted, the

verses quoted or included in the Homilies are generally very faithful to the sense--if not the word-- of the original. What problems there were are mentioned throughout the investigation when they are relevant. In this way 478 clauses were found in the Ælfrician sections of the Heptateuch with corresponding passages in the Homilies. Not every clause in an extended narrative has a Homilies correspondence, but some sections of the Heptateuch are treated more than once in the Homilies. The Homilies sample therefore contains 372 clauses.

As is clear from the lists and citations in Cook, Davis, and others, the Biblical passages in the Homilies range from loose paraphrase to close translation. Since the object of this investigation is to determine whether close translation in the Homilies differs from close translation in the Heptateuch, the entire range is included in the data. Similarly, there are a number of verses in the Homilies that are almost identical with the corresponding verses of the Heptateuch. All such passages are included for their methodological and speculative value. For methodological reasons the clauses are important because they serve as a reminder that the Homilies were influenced by Latin just as the Heptateuch was, though apparently not to the same extent. Including these passages in the count will give a more accurate picture of the style of the Homilies; excluding them will prejudice the investigation by omitting counter-

evidence. Moreover, including them serves also to indicate what weight the statistics carry--the comparison of the two works must be colored by the innovation in the Heptateuch and the copying in the Homilies. On the speculative side, the fact that similar clauses occur in environments that are not similar to those in the Heptateuch is something to consider when analyzing how Ælfric used his sources. For example, in the Homilies, Gen.2:23 (I.14.24c) reads:

a"- þa cwæð Adam,

b"- "Heo is ban of minum banum, and flæsce of minum  
flæsc;

c"- beo hire nama Uirago,  
þæt is fæmne;

d"- forðan ðe heo is of hire were genumen."

The same verse in the Heptateuch is:

a- Adam ða cwæð:

b- "Dis is nu ban of minum banum and flæsc of minum  
flæsce;

c- beo heo geciged fæmne,

d- for ðan ðe heo is of hyre were genumen."

Since the Catholic Homilies was written before the Heptateuch, it is obvious that Ælfric changed clause (c) of the earlier translation, and the reason may very well be to bring that clause in line with the structure of the Latin hæc vocabitur virago, just as the minor differences in

clause (b) can be explained as dictated by the Latin hoc nunc. Thus, the inclusion of these almost identical verses and passages ensures that the texts are not prejudiced towards overlooking Latin influence in the Homilies. If the Heptateuch is still found to show more Latin influence, it will not be because such influence in the Homilies was ignored.<sup>61</sup>

It should be noted in passing here that, though as mentioned above Biblical passages occur in the Lives and in the homilies contained in Pope's supplementary collection, these works have not been used, because they are written in Ælfric's later, or "rhythmic," style, which would perforce make Ælfric change words and constructions for this reason alone. Obviously, differences between these texts and the Heptateuch would show motivations other than those of translation technique--the only type being considered here.

When the Heptateuch and Homilies were found to differ in any way, comparison was made to the Latin Bible in order to see whether the Heptateuch or Homilies was closer to the text. For these comparisons the Vulgate was used, though it is common knowledge that modern editions have many readings not found in Medieval ones. But the problem here is not susceptible to solution, since the exact version available in tenth century England has never been determined, though it certainly contained many Old Latin

readings. More cannot be done in this regard than check the various readings in, for example, Peter Sabatier's Vetus Latina, to see whether a more likely source exists for a certain Ælfrician verse. The obvious problem with this approach, however, is that it prejudices the findings of the investigation: if for a particular passage in which the Heptateuch differs from the Vulgate a closer Old Latin reading is used, it has ipso facto been determined that the Heptateuch will be closer than the Homilies to the Latin. In the same way, there are quotations in the Homilies for which Ælfric is most probably translating an Old Latin reading contained in his homiletic source rather than referring to the Vulgate. To find a closer Old Latin version in these cases would have an equally prejudicial effect. Moreover, this type of eclecticism would result in reconstructing a patchwork text that could not be proved to have existed.<sup>62</sup> For these reasons the course followed here was to refer to the Old Latin and note it wherever this seemed important during the investigation. However, Old Latin readings are not accounted for in the verse for verse comparison or overall statistics. Because of this drawback, all results in this investigation are limited to positive statements of the type "such and such in the Heptateuch can clearly be traced to such and such in the Vulgate" and never include statements like "such and such is excluded from the Eng-

lish because it is missing in the Vulgate." An added value of this type of conclusion is that it overcomes the limitations inherent in a small sample, as used here. Since one never knows what exists outside the sample, it is just as well not to make statements about what does not exist.

Finally, to add further verification of the results of the investigation, control texts--neither Biblical nor translation--were needed, to make sure that the style of the Heptateuch and Homilies is not totally determined by the material. For this purpose the prefaces to the Homilies and Heptateuch were chosen, because these works are certainly original with Ælfric, and should consequently represent his personal expository style.

1.62. Features considered. Style, as already seen, includes both the style of a language and that of the individual. For this reason it seems necessary to find a way of isolating language style before analyzing individual style. This is especially important to do if one is ever to establish the truth or otherwise of Ælfric's promise to maintain good English usage. The first feature considered, therefore, was subordination, a feature that is generally said to mark "sophisticated" or "cultured" languages (if, indeed, languages can be called by these names). Even without the subjective labels, Latin is said to be more

prone towards subordination than Old English; if this is so, it should appear in a comparison of an Old English translation of a Latin text. In addition, the Hebrew Bible is notoriously coordinated--the most often cited bane of modern translators--and it is thus inherently interesting to see how two translations, one Latin, one English, come to terms with this fact.<sup>63</sup>

Besides determining whether Ælfric made concessions to Latin language style, it is important to know about his personal style and how it is affected by the material dealt with and by the act of translating. Given our conception of style, a distinction has to be made between elements open to choice and those dictated by the information, for it is reasonable to assume that the "way" an author presents something is at least partially determined by what that something is. In this light, a discussion of subordination in the texts must be evaluated in terms of the fact that Ælfric is treating narrative, a subject that may be inherently susceptible to certain types of connection but not others. For this reason, the second feature considered is the placement of past participles and their auxiliaries. This feature was chosen because Old English put very few constraints on the position of past participles, and they are therefore free to show the personal preference of each author. Given this freedom, therefore, past participles are less likely to show the

style of Old English, and more likely than subordination to show Ælfric's personal style and how it influences or is influenced by translating.

Finally, in order to establish the presence or absence of attempts by Ælfric to capture the gastlice andgyt of particular Latin words or details of diction, a collection was made of miscellaneous peculiarities that occur in the Heptateuch and can be directly traced to the Vulgate.

1.63. Evaluative techniques. Two types of evaluative procedures are followed in the investigation--statistics and comparison of individual corresponding passages. At times one, at times the other predominates, but in general the discussion of subordination is in terms of overall statistical contrasts (with scattered references to particular verses), and the discussion of participles is in terms of individual comparisons. The miscellanea are, of course, in terms of particulars.

The advantage of this method is that in a small sample such as this, there is always the possibility that size itself is the cause of the nonappearance of certain features, thereby undermining the basic assumption of statistical analysis.<sup>64</sup> Moreover, for studying the particular manifestations of Ælfric's different types of translating, individual comparisons seemed more valuable.

On the other hand, statistics are included for the information they contain on general tendencies.

In addition, the texts were analyzed with the clause as the basic unit. Though there are those who feel that the basic unit in Old English is the sentence,<sup>65</sup> the sentence is not marked in Old English texts and is therefore often the product of editorial decision and dispute, as will be seen in the discussion of subordination.<sup>66</sup> The clause, however, may be defined as the structure containing one finite verb. It is thus easily isolated and dealt with, a minimum of editorial decision being necessary.

1.64. Citations. The edition of the Heptateuch used is The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, Elfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis, ed. S. J. Crawford. EETS, o.s. 160. London, 1922. Citations are by book, chapter, verse, and finite verb; thus: Gen.2:1b = Genesis, chapter 2, verse 1, second verb.

From the same text, similarly cited are all references to the Vulgate, except where apparent typographical errors are noted and corrected.

Also from this edition is the text of the "Preface to Genesis" (= PG), cited by page, line, and finite verb.

For the Homilies (CH) and "Preface" to the Homilies (PCH) the edition is The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholici,

or Homilies of Alfric, ed. Benjamin Thorpe. 2 vols. London, 1844, 1846. The former is cited by volume, page, line, and verb (e.g., I.16.30a), occasionally by volume and chapter (I,xv). The latter is cited by page, line, and verb. (Since PCH occupies pp.2-8, and PG pp.76-80, there can be no confusion in their citations.)

In all cases, a line or verse number not followed by a letter means that the reference is to the only verb in that line or verse.

Since the focus of the investigation is the Heptateuch, clauses are cited according to it when the Latin and Homilies contrast. If, for example, the order of the clauses is different in the Latin or Homilies from that in the Heptateuch, the latter is numbered consecutively, and the others are listed as having the order b-d-c-a, for example, with Latin being marked prime ('), the Homilies double prime ("), and Old Latin readings with an asterix (\*).

Finally, except in Chapter 1, where all references are numbered consecutively, citations of the page or section of a source are included in the text within parentheses, while longer digressions are numbered and appear at the end of each chapter. And throughout, charts are numbered consecutively within each chapter, while tables, when included, carry the number of the chart that they illuminate.

Notes to Chapter 1.

<sup>1</sup>See Eliyahu Ki-tov, Sefer Hatoda'ah (= Book of Tradition) (Jerusalem: Machon Lehozaat Sefarim, 1958), I, 195-196.

<sup>2</sup>Ronald Knox, The Trials of a Translator (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949), p.36.

<sup>3</sup>Televised interview on "Is The Book Still Good?" for Frontiers of Faith (1969); transcript supplied by NBC-TV and The National Council of Churches, p.8.

<sup>4</sup>Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1891, 1956), I, 513.

<sup>5</sup>Harry M. Orlinsky, Notes on the New Translation of The Torah (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1969), p.12, suggests that part of the motivation for purity was the influence of the injunction in Deut.4:2, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it."

<sup>6</sup>Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Megillah, 9b. Also see Rashi, ad loc.

<sup>7</sup>B.F.C. Atkinson, The Greek Language, second ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1933, 1952), pp.274, 286.

<sup>8</sup>So too Arabic نفس/nafs/. See further Section 4.3.

<sup>9</sup>For lists of set phrases and expressions borrowed from the Bible, almost any history of the English language will do: e.g., Otto Jespersen, Growth and Structure of the English Language §250ff.; Thomas Pyles, The Origins and Development of the English Language, p.347. Also see Mary Ellen Chase, Life and Language in The Old Testament, pp.159-160.

<sup>10</sup>Quoted by Ervino Pocar, Enquête, in Quality in Translation, ed. E. Cary and R. W. Jumpelt (New York: Macmillan, 1963), p.177.

<sup>11</sup>Eugene Nida, "Science of Translation," Language 45:3 (Sept. 1969), 483nl. See also his "Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems," Word, I (1945), 194-208, reprinted in Dell Hymes, ed., Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp.491-492.

<sup>13</sup>D. Enrique Aguado, in Enquête, in Quality in Translation, p.166.

<sup>14</sup>Anton M. Rothbauer, ibid., p.184.

<sup>15</sup>Michael Bullock, ibid., p.149.

<sup>16</sup>Language 45:3 (Sept.1969), 492.

<sup>17</sup>E. Cary, "L'indispensable débat, " in Quality in Translation, p.23.

<sup>18</sup>Etymology is used here to include a broad range of linguistic explications such as wordplay (e.g., reading Isaiah 54:13, "... and great shall be the peace of your children, i.e., בניך /banayih/, as "...great shall be the peace of your scholars, i.e. בוניך /bonayih/), history (Maimonides, Guide for the Perplexed, I, xvi, interprets a whole series of verses containing the word צור /sur/'rock', as reflecting the history of the Jews) and others. Started by the Talmudists, this study was very popular with medieval Christian scholars. Ælfric himself has several homiletic statements on the false etymology God = gōd; see Pope, Homilies, p.132.

<sup>19</sup>See, for example, Salo Wittmayer Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, second ed., I, 184 and 377n23, where the authenticity of these writings is defended; I Macc.12:21ff.; Judah Halevi, The Kuzari, II, 66.

<sup>20</sup>Ernst Robert Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. Willard R. Trask (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953), p.448.

<sup>21</sup>Quoted ibid., p.447.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p.73. On Augustine see p.74, and James J. Murphy, "Saint Augustine and the Debate about a Christian Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 46 (1960), 400-410.

<sup>23</sup>Gussie Hecht Tanenhaus, "Bede's De Schematibus et Tropis-- A Translation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 48 (1962), 240. See also Jackson J. Campbell, "Knowledge of Rhetorical Figures in Anglo-Saxon England," JEGP, 66 (1967), 1-20.

<sup>24</sup>John Beekman, ed., Notes on Translation, with Drills (Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1965), p.91.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p.31.

<sup>26</sup>Epist. LVII, in Jerome: Lettres, ed. Jérôme Labourt (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1953), III, 57.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 59.

<sup>28</sup>Migne, PL, XXVIII, 1139B.

<sup>29</sup>Introduction to Catholic Homilies, I, 1.

<sup>30</sup>Crawford, Hentateuch, p.79, 11.98-100.

<sup>31</sup>Anglia, 16 (1894), 59. An earlier, though not major, investigation of Ælfric's homiletic sources is B. Schrader, Studien zur Ælfricischen Syntax (Jena, 1887), which includes the observation that most of the time the homilies "sehr frei bearbeitet sind," as if Ælfric read the Latin homilies, "sie beisete gelegt, und dann seine bearbeitung gemacht hätte" (1-2).

<sup>32</sup>Charles A. Smith, Order of Words in Anglo-Saxon Prose (Baltimore, 1893 = PMLA, n.s. vol.I, no.2), p.10.

<sup>33</sup>Rosmary Woolf, "Saints' Lives," in Eric Gerald Stanley, ed., Continuations and Beginnings--Studies in Old English Literature (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1966), p.60.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p.64.

<sup>35</sup>Gordon H. Gerould, "Ælfric's Lives of Saint Martin of Tours," JEGP, 24 (1925), 206-210; Anne Louise Middleton, "The English Ways of Ælfric's Prose" (Harvard University Dissertation, 1966).

<sup>36</sup>Dorothy Bethurum, "The Form of Ælfric's Lives of Saints," Studies in Philology, 29:4 (1932), 515-533.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., 528.

<sup>38</sup>S. J. Crawford, Ælfric's Exameron Anglice, or The Old English Hexameron (Hamburg, 1921. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, X), p.23.

<sup>39</sup>Charles R. Davis, "Biblical Translations in Ælfric's Catholic Homilies" (New York University Dissertation, 1946), p.26.

<sup>40</sup>Smith, p.10.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p.10nl. Arthur Abel, "Ælfric and the West-Saxon Gospels" (University of Pennsylvania Dissertation, 1962) thinks Ælfric is the author; Albert Cook, Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers (London: Macmillan, 1898), agrees with Smith.

<sup>42</sup>Bethurum, p.519.

<sup>43</sup>EETS, no.259 (1967), p.152.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p.121. See also p.132nl.

<sup>45</sup>(University of Washington Dissertation, 1964), pp.21-24.

<sup>46</sup>Text in Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, ed. C.T. Onions, p.6.

<sup>47</sup>Translation in Roger S. Loomis and Rudolph Willard, ed., Medieval English Verse and Prose in Modernized Versions (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948), p.282. The date is c.1390.

<sup>48</sup>The Geneva Bible: A facsimile of the 1560 edition, intro. by Lloyd E. Berry (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), p.iiii (sic).

<sup>49</sup>Cambridge History of the Bible, II, 96.

<sup>50</sup>In Heptateuch, p.76, ll.7-10.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p.77, ll.41-45.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p.78, l.72-p.79, l.74.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., ll.94-98.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., ll.98-100.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p.79, l.100-p.80, l.101.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., ll.113-114.

<sup>57</sup>Above, Section 1.2.

<sup>58</sup>The chronology follows that presented by P. A. M. Clemoes, "The Chronology of Ælfric's Works," in The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture...., ed. Peter Clemoes (London, 1959), pp.212-247.

<sup>59</sup>Albert S. Cook, Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers (London: Macmillan, 1898); Charles R. Davis, "Biblical Translations in Ælfric's Catholic Homilies" (New York University Dissertation, 1946).

<sup>60</sup>Among the various claims: Crawford, Heptateuch, apparently believes that Ælfric is the author of the complete work; Clemoes, Chronology, and Pope, Homilies, expressly following him, are given in the text; K. Jost, "Unechte Ælfric Texte" Anglia, 51 (1927), accepts only Gen.1-24 and Num.13-26 as by Ælfric; Josef Raith, "Ælfric's Share in the Old English Pentateuch," Review of English Studies, n.s. 3 (1952), excludes Gen.4-5 and 10-11 from Jost's account; Nichols, Syntactical Study, attributes only Gen.1-24 to Ælfric.

<sup>61</sup>For other examples, see Chart 3.1, Note 1.

<sup>62</sup>See also Pope, Homilies, pp.155, 163.

<sup>63</sup>For several statements on the problems caused by Hebrew coordination, see below, Section 2.11.

<sup>64</sup>A discussion of the proper size for a sample in a statistical study will be found in Warren Cowgill, "A Search for Universals in Indo-European Diachronic Morphology," Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., Universals of Language, second ed. (MIT Press, 1966), pp.116-117.

<sup>65</sup>In this group is C. R. Carlton, "The Syntax of the Old English Charters" (unpublished dissertation), who is attacked by Ann Shannon, A Descriptive Syntax of the Parker Manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 734 to 891 (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1964 = Janua Linguarum, Series Practica XIV). This study accepts Shannon's position that "the presence of a finite verb is the essential feature of the Old English clause, which is the largest convenient unit for the description of Old English syntax." (p.8)

<sup>66</sup>Since Crawford ends every verse with a period and begins each with a capital, it is particularly difficult to know what he thinks composes individual sentences; note, for example, the punctuation of Gen.22:9-10 in both the Old English and Latin,

9g- He geband þa hys sunu.

10a- 7 hys swurd ateah....

9g!- cumque alligasset Isaac filium suum.

10a!- Arripuit gladium....

where it is quite obvious that the periods and capitals go against the syntactic units. Likewise all cases of relative se are subject to editorial interpretation, and therefore the sentence is too intangible a unit for stylistic analysis.

## Chapter 2

## SUBORDINATION

2.1. The significance of subordination.

As mentioned earlier, subordination is a feature that promises to provide valuable information about differing language styles, and the consequence of these differences upon translation. There are several qualities inherent in subordination which make this feature so promising.

First, subordination seems at even an uncritical glance to be the type of feature dictated by the particular language. Including, as it does in English, such varied purposes as conveying temporal relationships, conditions, results, concessions, causes and many others, subordination appears even superficially to be a place to find languages not entirely coinciding.

Second, the fact that this was not always so about English suggests that the reason for the change would be interesting to find. It sometimes seems almost a required ritual for writers on Old English poetry to remark that one of the basic features of this poetry is its frequent employment of parataxis, or lack of subordination. This

notice is also often followed by some sort of remark about how "primitive" languages are paratactic, and "sophisticated" ones hypotactic. Yet, while this subjective labeling of languages is misleading, and perhaps also false, the empirical statement about Old English poetry may still be true; and if it is, it differs from Modern English poetry in a way that may well be dictated by historical changes in the language.

Third, and most important, detailed investigation has proved the importance of coming to terms with the various ways that the Hebrew Bible avoids subordination.

2.11. Subordination in the Hebrew Bible. One of the most frequently cited traits of Biblical Hebrew is its use of and where other languages would demand a much wider range of words--coordinators, subordinators, adverbs, conjunctions. Thus, Orlinsky (p.19) says that "the traditional translations of the Bible might well be designated 'And' Bibles; hardly a sentence goes by without an 'and' or two, sometimes more." Similarly, Knox (p.84) notes that "there are nearly a hundred 'ands' in the first chapter of Genesis...." But whereas Knox (p.108) writes that "...the Hebrew has one word that does duty for 'and' and 'but'; and whenever the translator comes across the word in the Old Testament he must decide between them," Orlinsky (p.20) includes as possible translations of Hebrew /waw/ when, so,

then, thus, thereupon, although, yet, however, and others, adding that "traditional 'And' precisely because it was mechanical, only succeeded in suppressing the full range of meaning of Hebrew waw and in preventing the translator from making clear to the reader the true meaning of the Hebrew verse."

An example of the consequences of the conflicting translations of /waw/ may be seen by comparing Gen.31:54-5 of the King James and New Jewish Version.<sup>1</sup> The former has:

Then Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount,  
and called his brethren to eat bread:  
and they did eat bread,  
and tarried all night in the mount.  
And early in the morning Laban rose up,  
and kissed his sons and his daughters,  
and blessed them:  
and Laban departed,  
and returned unto his place.

It is interesting that though this translation renders eight instances of /waw/ as and, it felt the overwhelming obligation to render the first one then. The NJV, on the other hand, reads:

Jacob then offered up a sacrifice on the Height,  
and invited his kinsmen to partake of the meal.  
After the meal,

they spent the night on the Height.

Early in the morning,

Laban kissed his sons and daughters

and bade them good-bye;

then Laban left

on his journey homeward.

### 2.12. Subordination in the Vulgate and Heptateuch.

It is obvious that the NJV has tried to avoid the charge leveled by Orlinsky (p.19) that "the fact that English, unlike biblical Hebrew, is not coordinate in its sentence structure has been generally ignored by previous translators." Orlinsky, of course, is talking about Modern English. But if Old English was really paratactic it would be closer to the Hebrew coordinate structure than Modern English is --a fact that might have proved significant had there been an Old English translation done from the Hebrew. This speculation aside, however, the fact remains that Alfric was working from a Latin text; and Latin, it is generally believed, was hypotactic--unquestionably more so than Hebrew. But whether also more so than Old English is a question often alluded to or simply answered in the affirmative, but seldom actually analyzed.

The ubiquity of these affirmations, coupled with unfavorable comparison of Old English to Latin, may be surmised by the occasional scholars who feel called upon to

reject the charge. Thus, Andrew (p.87) accents the characterization of parataxis as "simply a lack of grammatical subordination such as we find in the language of children and some primitive peoples," but quickly adds that "it is an error to think it a characteristic of OE style at any period, either in prose or verse." In fact, one of the goals of his study is to show that much of what has been thought to be paratactic seems that only because of modern editing, and "the mere substitution of commas for other stops...is enough to make the first sentence subordinate...." (p.3). And one of his conclusions is that poor style is the fault of the individual and not inherent in Old English syntactic deficiencies (pp.90-94).

Andrew is thus arguing that the language style of Old English is not necessarily as sparing in subordination as some scholars suggest, though some individual writers of Old English may have personal styles that avoid subordination. And whereas so much is made of the greater frequency of subordination in Latin than in Old English, it is an attractive idea to see what a stylist of Alfric's stature does when confronted with a Latin text to which he feels compelled to be faithful. It is interesting to see, therefore, whether the Hentateuch and Homilies differ in their usage and types of subordination.

## 2.2. Methodology.

The general details of the approach taken in this section of the investigation have already been presented in 1.61-3. In brief, then, the basic sample texts were established for the whole study, as explained in 1.61, and by definition no changes are made in that sample. As for the features to be considered--these are explained in 2.1. However, there were a few departures from the general procedures.

2.21. Statistical Analysis. Section 1.63 outlined the techniques of evaluation for the study in general, but a word or two might be added about this part of the investigation. It was pointed out that statistics show overall tendencies and individual comparisons show the particular details of style. It was further noted that the purpose of examining subordination and subordinate clauses is to establish the presence or absence of features dictated by the language in question--language style. Because of these two factors this chapter deals almost exclusively with statistical statements, referring to individual verses only to explain statistical differences. Thus, after a particular feature has been found statistically to differ in the Heptateuch and Homilies, reference is made to individual instances of this feature to try to understand the source of the difference. This approach performs

limits this discussion to major differences in the rendering of particular verses in the two Old English texts. This was felt acceptable for several reasons.

First, initial surveys of the texts showed that in a great number of instances the Heptateuch and Homilies have toally different structures, making it extremely difficult to find the exact, corresponding clause in the Homilies for each clause in the Heptateuch. This difficulty did not arise in the establishment of the samples because then all that mattered was that a passage as a whole be thematically equivalent in the two works. Nor does this prolem arise in the next section, where past participle placement is considered, because the thematic content of the individual participle is great enough to ensure the locating of its mate (though, as well be seen, this is not always easy either).

In addition, it was found that particular clauses were not generally found in the same syntactic arrangement in the two works, and, if attention were called to each of the several hundred minor differences, a great deal of time would be spent in trivia. Moreover, any insights to be gained from verse by verse comparisons appear to be guaranteed by the following two chapters. Thus, comparison of individual clauses was not made the central consideration of this section.

On the other hand, given the several hundred clauses

in question, statistical analysis would call attention to the major tendencies and it seems clear that the particular differences in the type of connection that two thematically similar clauses show in the Heptateuch and Homilies is not as important as whether the two works as wholes contain manifestly different types of syntactic constructions. This is especially true in terms of the nature of subordination, as explained in the first part of this chapter (2.1).

2.22. Analysis by sections. These same considerations led to another departure in technique in this section. Because the object of the investigation of subordination is to determine whether this feature is influenced by the type of text, it was decided to break up the text into units in an effort to see whether theme or size is the major factor. Therefore, after the investigation was made of the whole sample, the same investigation was made on each unit in the sample. How the units were determined, and what the underlying motivation for this approach was, as well as what it showed, will be further explained in 2.314.

2.23. Discussion of Old Latin. It was explained in section 1.61 that because of the difficulty in determining the constitution of the Latin Bible in tenth century

England analysis would be limited to positive statements about the Vulgate: "This is clearly from the Vulgate." But it was noticed that in respect to rendering Hebrew /waw/ 'and' the Old Latin seemed to differ markedly from the Vulgate. Preliminary observations--by no means either thorough or very careful--left the impression that the Old Latin had many more cases of /waw/ rendered et or -que than the Vulgate; it seemed almost as though in his earlier translations Jerome had not yet come to grips with the many nuances of the Hebrew form. And if the Old Latin text did indeed use et and -que more than the Vulgate did, then it followed that many differences between the Heptateuch and Vulgate in regard to lack of subordination in the former might be traced to Ælfric's using an Old Latin text, not differing language styles. For this reason the Old Latin was referred to more often in this chapter than in the others.

Passing mention was made in 1.61 to the problem of establishing which Old Latin readings were common in Ælfric's period, but because it is relevant to this discussion a few more words must be added. Two drawbacks or difficulties were noted--the problem of establishing the exact source and the danger of producing a patchwork text. Both of these are, of course, connected; and a few examples of the problem will be instructive.

In the Heptateuch, Gen.1:14-15 reads:

14a- God cwæð ða soðlice:

b- Beo nu leoht on ðære heofenan fæstnysse,

c- and todælan dæg and nihte,

d- and beon to tacnum and to tidum and to  
dagum and to gearum,

15a- and hi scinon on ðære heofenan fæstnysse

b- and alihton ða eorðan.

Trying only to establish whether the Old English follows the Latin in respect to subordination and connection by and (the basic questions in this section), one finds the following Vulgate text:

14a'- Dixit autem Deus:

b'- Fiant luminaria in firmamento coeli

c'- et dividant diem ac noctem

d'- et sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos,

15a'- ut luceant in firmamento coeli

b'- et illuminent terram.

It is immediately seen that all the verbs after dixit in the Vulgate are subjunctives: 'let lights be...let them divide....' But only one, luceant (15a), is introduced by ut, making the others independent and-coordinated and this one subordinated. The Heptateuch, however, introduces all the verbs with and; in addition, unless one maintains that Ælfric did not always distinguish -on from -en, scinon and alihton are indicative: 'And they will shine...and will light.' Thus, 15, at least, does not follow the Vulgate

verbatim. Moreover, alighton being and-coordinated like illuminent, but not subjunctive--how should it be classified? And what about todælan (14c)--is it supposed to be todælen or todælon? (The infinitive, todælan, is the one thing it cannot be.) All of this forces one to look for an Old Latin reading that may be closer to the Old English. The best one finds is:

14a\*- Et dixit Deus:

b\*- Fiant luminaria in firmamento coeli ita  
ut luceant super terram

c\*- ut dividant diem ac noctem

d\*- et sint in signis et temporibus et diebus  
et annis,

15a\*- et sint in splendorem in firmamento coeli ita

b\*- ut luceant super terram.

The et dixit of 14a is a more likely source of Ælfric's ða than is the autem of the Vulgate; but neither source accounts for the soðlice. The Old Latin is and-coordinated at 15a, making it equivalent to and scinon in this respect; but the verb is not as probable as that in the Vulgate. In addition, 14c and 15b are subordinate in the Old Latin, but not in the Heptateuch or Vulgate. In sum, then, it seems that the Vulgate is the probable source; but all the questions raised remain unanswered.

In many cases it is not even possible to establish the most likely source. For example, for Gen.7:20-21, the

Heptateuch has:

20- And ðæt wæter wæs fyftigne fæðma deop ofer  
 ða heahstan duna.

21a- Wearð ða fornumen eal flæsc....

The Vulgate for this passage,

20'- Quindecim cubitis altio fuit aqua super  
montes  
quos operverat.

21a'- Consumpta est omnis caro....

provides a good source for wæs deop ofer in fuit altior super, and for wearð fornumen in consumpti est (as contrasted with adyd and mortua in the next verse). On the other hand, the Vulgate has a clause, quos operverat, missing in the Heptateuch, and merely montes where the Old English has heahstan duna. These differences are not found in the Old Latin, which reads:

20\*- quindecim cubitis superavit aqua super  
excelsos montes.

21a\*- et mortua est omnis caro....

The Old Latin lacks the relative clause as the Heptateuch does; and excelsos montes is a perfect source for heahstan duna. However, mortua is not as likely as consumpta for fornumen, and superavit is less likely than fuit altior for wæs deop. Here, then, is an instance where it is impossible to choose one reading over the other.

Many more examples of this type can be given, but

the point to be made is already clear: Alfric's source is not known and cannot be readily--perhaps ever--determined with anything approaching certainty. For this reason, as noted earlier, this investigation will make reference to the Old Latin whenever this seems relevant, but conclusions will be drawn only from those passages where Alfric is obviously reacting to something in the Vulgate.

### 2.3. The Investigation.

2.31. Transitional clauses. In this stage of the investigation a list was made of all transitional clauses, that is, of all clauses that begin a new construction. A construction is here defined as all the clauses dominated by a single syntactic determiner of independence or subordination. In other words, a series of clauses of the type then V and V and V is a single independence construction containing three coordinated clauses; one of the type then he said that V and V is a single independence construction followed by a single subordination construction containing two coordinated clauses. Since what we are concerned with here is the ratio of constructions, not the number of clauses, all and-coordinated clauses, whether independent or subordinate are set aside for discussion in section 2.32.

Completely omitted from this discussion are cases of correlation with swa, ne, etc., e.g., Gen.2:19ef, "...swa Adam hit gecygdē, swa is his nama" or 22:12bc, "Ne acwel ðu þæt cild, ne þine hand ne astrece ofer hys swuran," since in these cases one clause cannot be said to be subordinate to the other. However, because normally the first clause is subordinate to the second in the ða (ðā)...ða...construction, this type is included in the present stage of the investigation. Also omitted are appositives, such as Gen.3:20b, "Ða gesceop Adam naman his wif, Eva, ðæt is lif,...." and the first clause of all direct quotations, e.g., Gen.1:3b, "God cwæð ða: Gewurðe leoht," even though it may be argued that the second clause is subordinate; the major consideration in rejecting this latter type is that there is no other way of introducing direct quotation, and counting the clause as subordinate would falsify the stylistic evidence.

A few examples of classificatory decisions will help show exactly how the technique was applied. Gen. 15:13-14 reads:

- 13a- Him wæs ða gesæd swutelice ðurh God:
- b- Wite ðu
- c- þæt ðin ofspring sceal wunian ælðeodig on  
        oðrum earde,
- d- and hi hi yfele geswencað
- e- and on þeowte gebringað feower hund geara.

14a- Ic deme swa ðeah þa ðeoda

b- ðe hi on ðeowte gebringað,

c- and hi cumað syððan ongean mid swyðlicum æhtum.

13a is obviously independent, the ða being an adverb of time, 'at that time'. 13b begins a direct quotation and is therefore omitted from consideration. 13c is subordinate to 13b, wite ðu, as the þæt shows. But (d) and (e), which are also dominated by þæt of (c), are set aside for the moment because they are coordinated by and and represent more subordinate clauses, but not a new subordination structure. 14a is obviously independent and parallel to wite ðu; that it is not subordinate to it is clear from the lack of and or another þæt ('Know that your offspring shall live as strangers...and that I will judge the people....' as opposed to the present reading, '.... I, however, will judge the people....'). 14b is a relative clause, as ðe shows, and subordinate to (a). 14c is independent and parallel to 14a, but being and-coordinated is set aside.

However, since, as pointed out in 2.11, the Hebrew Bible uses and for many purposes that Old English would not, it seems significant to note when Ælfric uses and as something other than a coordinator. Thus, when he uses and as a temporal connective, it is counted as an independent clause introduction and included in this discussion. Such is the case, for example, in Gen.3:1c:

a- Eac swylce seo næddre wæs geopre ðonne ealle  
 ða oðre nytenu

b- ðe God worhte ofer eorðan.

c- And seo næddre cwæð to ðam wife....

The and here cannot possibly be construed as a coordinator, and is, on the contrary, clearly equivalent to then in semantic content, or to so used as an unemphatic connective.<sup>2</sup>

It should be pointed out, however, that there are cases for which it is difficult to determine whether and is a connective or a coordinator, as, e.g., 17:6a and 7a:

5b- ...ðu byst gehaten Abraham,

c- for þam ðe ic þe gesette manegra þeoda fæder.

6a- And ic gedo

b- þæt ðu wyxt,....

7a- and ic sette min wed betwux me and ðe....

It is possible that 6a is a continuation of the subordination of 5c, or that it is a new element of the promise, with and standing for something like moreover. As reference to the Hebrew makes clear, the explanation of the name Abraham is contained only in 5c, which gives the meaning of the name--a play on words in Hebrew,<sup>3</sup> and 6a is therefore taken as independent and obviously not coordinate. 7a, however, may well be coordinated to 6a: 'And I will make you increase....and I will set my pledge between me and you.' It is thus not included in the present count. As a rule, it may be noted, all cases of similar ambiguity were con-

sidered coordinate and omitted, in order to make the evidence for independent constructions as strict as possible. Moreover, because there are these problems requiring editorial decisions, Chart 2.1 lists all the verses used in this part of the investigation so that there is no question as to inclusions and exclusions.

Chart 2.1: Transitional clauses.

2.11. The Heptateuch.

2.111. Independent.

		<u>ða</u>		
<u>clause</u>	<u>Vulgate</u>		<u>clause</u>	<u>Vulgate</u>
Gen.1:3a	-que		Gen.7:19b	-que
6a	quoque		21a	-que
7e	et		8:13a	<u>ppl</u>
13a	autem		21a	-que
15c	et		9:28a	autem
21c	et		15:13a	-que
24c	-que		17:3a	NC
25b	et		17a	NC
27a	et		18a	-que
31d	et		22:1a	AP
2:1a	igitur		3a	<u>ppl</u>
15a	ergo		4a	<u>LR</u>
21a	ergo		6a	NC
23a	-que		7a	NC
3:4a	autem		9a	et
6a	igitur		9g	<u>cumque</u>
6f	<u>qui</u>		11b	et
20a	et		13a	NC
6:5a	<u>ppl</u>		19a	-que
6a	NC		24:1a	autem
6c	NL		Num.17:7a	LR
11a	autem		21:4a	et
12a	<u>cumque</u>		7f	-que
7:5a	ergo		9a	ergo
7a	et		Judg.16:2b	NC
10c	<u>cumque</u>		3a	LR
11a	AP		19a	LR
17a	-que		19d	NL
<hr/>				
<u>and</u>				
Gen.1:7a	et		Gen.17:6a	-que
16a	-que		24a	NC
31a	-que		27b	et
2:3a	et		21:4a	et
3:1c	<u>qui</u>		5a	<u>cum</u>
6:19a	et		24:2a	-que
7:1a	-que		Num.17:1a	et
3a	<u>ut</u>		5a	NC
6a	-que		21:7a	LR
19a	et		8a	et
20a	NC		Judg.16:2a	<u>cum</u>
<hr/>				
<u>and ða</u>				
Gen.1:21a	-que		Gen.2:20a	-que
23a	et		6:13a	NC
25a	et		7:12a	et
2:2a	-que		9:29a	et
<hr/>				
NC = no connective			AP = adverb phrase	
NL = no Latin source			LR = loose rendering	
(Latin subordinates are underlined.)				

Chart 2.1: Transitional clauses (cont.).2.11. The Pentateuch (cont.).2.111. Independent (cont.).other connectives

<u>clause</u>	<u>connective</u>	<u>Vulgate</u>
Gen.1:20a	eac swylce	etiam
24a	eac swylce	<b>quoque</b>
2:7a	eornostlice	<b>igitur</b>
17a	soðlice	autem
18a	eac swylce	quoque
19a	soðlice	igitur
19e	soðlice	enim
20b	soðlice	vero
3:1a	eac swylce	sed
21a	eac	quoque
6:7d	soðlice	enim
8a	soðlice	vero
14a	nu	NC
17a	efne	ecce
20a	eac	NC
21a	witodlice	igitur
22a	soðlice	igitur
7:1c	soðlice	enim
4a	soðlice	enim
8	eac swylce	quoque
18c	witolice	porro
8:21e	eornostlice	igitur
9:8a	eft	quoque
16a	ðonne	-que
15:14a	swa ðeah	veruntamen
15a	soðlice	autem
17:1a	eft	NC
15a	eac	quoque
23a	soðlice	autem
22:11c	sona	<u>qui</u>
15a	eft	autem
24:4a	ac	sed
Num.17:5b	ðonne	NC
21:6a	for ðam ðingon	quamobrem
7d	ac	NC
Judg.16:1a	after ðisum	quoque

no connective (+ Vulgate if present)

Gen.1:27b	Gen.6:9a	Gen.9:12a	Gen.17:16a (et)
27c	9b	13a	16d (-que)
2:17b	9c	14a	17e (et)
18c	13c	17a	19a (et)
23c	15b	15:16a (autem)	22:5c
25a (autem)	16a	16b (enim)	7d
3:2a ( <u>qui</u> )	16c	17:1c	8a (autem)
17a (vero)	17e	5c	12a (-que)
17g	18a (-que)	10a	17c
18a	7:2a (sed)	11b	Num.21:5e
19a	8:21d	12a	Judg.16:2d ( <u>ut</u> )
23a (et)	9:11b	14b	

## 2.11. The Heptateuch (cont.).

## 2.112. Subordinate.

clause	type		clause	type	
	Hept.	Vulg.		Hept.	Vulg.
Gen.1:7c	rel	rel	Gen.7:23a	rel	<u>and</u>
7d	rel	rel	8:13d	that	that
21b	rel	rel	21f	as	as
21d	that	that	9:10a	rel	rel
25c	that	that	11a	that	<u>and</u>
26d	rel	rel	12b	rel	rel
31b	rel	rel	13b	that	<u>indep</u>
2:2b	rel	rel	14a	temp	temp
2d	rel	rel	15b	that	<u>and</u>
3c	cause	cause	16d	rel	rel
3d	rel	rel	16e	rel	rel
15c	that	that	17b	rel	rel
17b	temp	temp	12:3b	rel	prpl
19b	rel	prpl	3d	rel	prpl
19c	that	that	15:13c	that	that
19d	misc	misc	14b	rel(S)	rel(O)
21b	temp	temp	15b	temp	NL
21e	rel	NP	17:1a	temp	temp
22b	rel	rel	5c	cause	cause
23d	cause	cause	6b	that	SA
3:1b	rel	rel	7b	that	that
1e	that	that	10b	rel	rel
2b	rel	rel	10c	that	<u>indep</u>
3a	rel	rel	12c	though	<u>et</u>
3c	that	that	14a	rel(S)	rel(O)
3e	lest	lest	14c	cause	cause
4c	though	NL	16c	rel	rel
5b	that	that	17d	that	that
5c	temp	temp	18c	that	that
6b	that	that	23b	as	as
6c	misc	NL	24b	temp	<u>indep</u>
17b	cause	cause	27a	rel	NL
17d	rel	rel	21:4b	as	as
17e	that	that	22:2c	rel	rel
19b	temp	temp	4a	temp	AP
19c	rel	rel	4b	rel	NL
19d	cause	cause	9b	rel	rel
20c	cause	cause	9e	as	NL
23b	that	that	9f	temp	NL
23d	rel	rel	10b	that	that
6:5b	that	that	11a	misc	NL
6b	that	that	12e	that	that
7c	rel	rel	18b	cause	cause
7e	that	SA	24:2b	rel	rel
12b	that	SA	3b	that	that
12c	cause	parens	3c	rel	rel
17b	that	that	4b	rel	NL
17c	rel	rel	Num.17:4b	rel	rel
17d	rel	rel	5a	rel	rel
19b	that	that	7b	as	NL
20b	that	that	21:5d	that	that
21b	rel	rel	7c	cause	cause
21c	that	<u>and</u>	7e	that	that
22b	rel	rel	8d	rel	ppl
7:4c	rel	rel	8g	misc	NL
5b	rel	rel	9c	rel	ppl
6b	temp	temp	Judg.16:2c	rel	NL
9a	as	as	2e	misc	prpl
10a	temp	NL	3e	as	NP
21b	rel	rel	19a	temp	<u>indep</u>
22a	rel(S)	rel(O)			

rel = relative clause  
temp = temporal clause  
misc = miscellaneous type  
ppl = past participle  
prpl = present participle

NP = noun phrase  
NL = no Latin source  
SA = subject accusative  
AP = adverb phrase  
(Latin independents are underlined.)

Chart 2.1: Transitional clauses.2.12. The Catholic Homilies.2.121. Independent.

<u>section</u>	<u>CH clause</u>	đa	<u>section</u>	<u>CH clause</u>
Gen.1:31	II.206.6a		Gen.7:1-5	I.22.5a
2:15-17	I.12.32		"	I.22.6
2:18-25	I.14.17b		"	I.22.8a
"	I.14.22c		15:12-16	II.190.16b
"	I.14.25		22.1-13	II.60.20c
2:20-22	II.58.20b		"	II.60.26a
3:1-6	I.16.32		"	II.60.27
"	I.16.34b		"	II.60.31b
"	I.18.1c		"	II.60.33
"	I.18.10b		"	II.62.2a
"	I.18.12b		"	II.62.4a
3:6	I.176.23a		"	II.62.13
3:17-21	I.18.19a		Num.17:1-8	II.18.14b
3:19	I.300.7b		21:6-9	II.238.11a
6:5-15	I.20.21a		"	II.238.12b
"	I.20.23		"	II.238.15a
"	I.20.26a		Judg.16:1-3	I.226.24b
"	I.20.27a		"	I.226.25c
7:1-5	I.22.1a			
-----				
		and		
Gen.2:7	I.20.17b		Gen.17:10-16	I.92.2b
2:15-17	I.12.31a		"	I.92.6a
2:18-25	I.14.16b		Num.17:1-8	II.8.13
17:1-7	I.90.22b			
-----				
		and	đa	
Gen.1:3ff	I.16.4b		Gen.2:18-25	I.14.13
1:25-27	I.12.28		"	I.14.20a
1:26-27	I.288.14		3:1-6	I.18.11
1:31-2:3	I.14.32b		3:6	I.176.21b
-----				

2.12. The Catholic Homilies (cont.).

2.121. Independent (cont.).

other connectives

<u>section</u>	<u>CH clause</u>	<u>connective</u>
Gen.1:3ff	I.16.1a	eft
"	I.16.3b	eft
"	I.16.6b	ealswa eft
"	I.16.8	ac
"	I.16.9a	ac
2:7	I.20.15	ac
2:18-25	I.14.8c	ac
3:1-6	I.18.2c	ac
"	I.18.6a	ac
"	I.18.8	ðeah
3:6	II.220.1	witodlice
6:5-15	I.20.28	ac
"	I.20.31	nu
15:12-16	II.190.20	soðlice
17:10-16	I.92.9a	and æfter ðære spræce
"	I.92.9b	on ðam ylcan dæge
22:1-13	II.60.18	on ðære þridan ylde
"	II.60.23a	efne
"	II.60.35b	nu
"	II.62.5	æfter ðissum
"	II.62.10	soðlice
Judg.16:1-3:	I.226.27a	ac

no connective

<u>section</u>	<u>CH clause</u>	<u>section</u>	<u>CH clause</u>
Gen.1:3ff	I.14.35a	Gen.6:5-15	I.20.34
"	I.16.10	"	I.20.36
1:14-16	I.100.9	7:1-5	I.22.11b
1:26-27	I.288.13a	"	I.22.12b
1:31-2:3	I.14.29a	"	I.22.14
"	I.14.34	8:13	II.58.32
2:15-17	I.14.1a	12:3	II.12.23
2:18-25	I.14.24a	17:1-7	I.90.18
2:20-22	II.58.20a	"	I.90.19
"	II.58.24	"	I.90.21c
2:21-23	II.8.22	"	I.90.24a
"	II.8.23	"	I.90.26
"	II.8.24b	"	I.90.28
3:1-6	I.18.3b	"	I.90.31
"	I.18.5b	17:10-16	I.92.1b
3:6	I.176.17a	"	I.92.3b
"	I.176.18	17:14a	I.94.14a
"	I.176.23b	21:5	I.92.20
3:17-18	II.254.7b	22:1-13	II.60.24b
3:17-21	I.18.17a	"	II.60.29
"	I.18.18a	24:1-4	II.234.24b
3:18	II.406.5	Num.17:1-8	II.8.10
3:19	I.300.7a	21:6-9	II.238.10
"	I.300.8c	"	II.238.14
3:23	I.118.24	"	II.238.20a
6:5-15	I.20.32	"	II.238.20b
		Judg.16:19	I.488.7

## Chart 2.1: Transitional clauses (cont.).

## 2.12. The Catholic Homilies (cont.).

## 2.122. Subordinate.

section	CH clause	type	section	CH clauses	type
Gen.1:3ff	I.16.3a	as	Gen.6:5-15	I.20.25c	that
"	I.16.4a	that	"	I.20.26b	rel
"	I.16.6a	rel	"	I.20.30	cause
"	I.16.10	temp	"	I.20.35	that
1:14-16	I.100.10b	that	7:1-5	I.22.1b	as
1:31-2:3	I.14.32a	cause	"	I.22.7a	rel
"	I.14.33a	rel	"	I.22.7b	rel
2:7	I.20.14	rel	"	I.22.8b	that
"	I.20.16	rel	"	I.22.11b	temp
"	I.20.18	temp	"	I.22.13	that
2:15-17	I.12.34a	rel	8:13	II.58.35	rel
"	I.12.35	rel	12:3	II.12.24	temp
"	I.14.1a	cause	15:12-16	II.190.18	that
"	I.14.2a	if	17:1-7	I.90.25	that
2:18-25	I.14.14	that	"	I.90.29	that
"	I.14.15	temp	"	I.90.30	that
"	I.14.18a	that	17:10-16	I.92.1a	temp
"	I.14.20a	temp	"	I.92.2a	rel
"	I.14.22b	misc	"	I.92.3a	cause
"	I.14.24c	cause	"	I.92.4	cause
"	I.14.26b	cause	"	I.92.6c	rel
2:20-22	II.58.21	that	17:14	I.94.13	rel
"	II.58.25	rel	"	I.94.14b	cause
2:21-23	II.8.24c	that	21:5	I.92.21	temp
3:1-6	I.16.34a	rel	22:1-13	II.60.19b	that
"	I.18.1a	that	"	II.60.22	rel
"	I.18.1b	if	"	II.60.23a	temp
"	I.18.2b	as	"	II.60.25	rel
"	I.18.3a	if	"	II.60.31a	temp
"	I.18.12d	misc	"	II.60.32b	that
3:6	I.176.17b	temp	"	II.62.1b	that
"	I.176.19a	temp	"	II.62.7	cause
"	I.176.19b	temp	"	II.62.12	cause
"	I.176.21a	if	24:1-4	II.234.24b	temp
"	I.176.22	temp	"	II.234.27	that
"	I.176.24a	temp	"	II.234.28	that
"	II.220.2	temp	"	II.234.29	rel
"	II.330.32b	misc	Num.17:1-8	II.8.11	that
"	II.330.33	rel	"	II.8.14a	rel
3:17-18	II.254.8	cause	21:6-9	II.238.9b	temp
"	II.406.6a	temp	"	II.238.11b	rel
"	II.406.6b	rel	"	II.238.15a	that
3:17-21	I.18.14	cause	"	II.238.16b	that
"	I.18.16a	rel	"	II.238.17b	that
3:19	I.300.7a	temp	"	II.238.18a	rel
3:23	I.118.26	temp	"	II.238.18b	that
"	I.118.27	temp	Judg.16:1-3	I.226.25a	that
6:5-15	I.20.25a	that	"	I.226.25b	rel
"	I.20.25b	that			

rel = relative clause  
temp = temporal clause

misc = miscellaneous type

2.311. Heptateuch vs. Homilies. The distribution of transitional clauses listed in Chart 2.1 is systematically presented in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Distribution of Transitional Clauses.

	Heptateuch	Homilies
independent		
<u>ða</u>	56	37
and	22	7
and <u>ða</u>	8	8
other	36	22
parataxis	47	53
total	169	127
subordinate	121	97
total	290	224

As seen in Table 2.1 the Heptateuch contains 290 relevant clauses, of which 121, or 41.7%, are subordinate; the Homilies has 224 relevant clauses, with 97, or 43.3%, subordinate. The similarity is certainly striking.

When further subdivisions are made, however, certain interesting differences are seen. The 169 independent clauses in the Heptateuch sample are composed of 86 occurrences of ða, and, and and ða, 36 of other connectives, and 47 with no overt connectives; that is, 50.8%, 21.3%, and 27.8%, respectively. The Homilies, on the other hand, contains 127 independent clauses, composed of 52 cases introduced by ða, and and and ða, 22 by other connectives, and 53 with no overt manifestation, or 40.9%, 17.3%, and 41.7%, respectively. The great discrepancy in the two

works in relation to the number of clauses lacking overt connectives seems significant--especially when it is remembered that one often mentioned characteristic of Old English is parataxis. Whether the increased use of connectives in the Heptateuch is due to Latin influence will be discussed in the next section.

Similarly interesting results are found when the subordinate clauses are subdivided. Of the 121 subordinate clauses in the Heptateuch, 50, or 41.3%, are relative clauses, while 25 of 97, or only 25.8%, are such in the Homilies. Subordinates introduced by ðæt (e.g., 'said that....') occur 33 times in the Heptateuch, for 27.3%, and in the Homilies 29 times, for 29.9%. Likewise, the two works are more or less the same in occurrences of clauses introduced by because, 10 in the Heptateuch (8.3%) against 12 in the Homilies (12.4%); and as, 7 (5.8%) against 3 (3.1%), respectively. On the other hand, there is a considerable difference in the occurrence of temporal clauses, with 13 (10.7%) in the Heptateuch and 21 (21.6%) in the Homilies. A final, though minor, difference is that the Heptateuch has two concessives introduced by ðeah and one conditional with ði læs ðe (2.5%), while the Homilies has none of these, but does have four conditionals with gif (4.1%), a type lacking in the Heptateuch. Obviously, the numbers involved in these latter cases are too small to be significant by themselves, but these and the

more impressive differences suggest that some outside force is influencing Ælfric's choices in one work as opposed to the other. Whether the Latin text is influencing the style of the Heptateuch in these matters will now be explored.

2.312. Latin influence in the Heptateuch. In order to determine to what extent, if at all, the Heptateuch was influenced by the Latin text, two comparisons were made: first, between usage in the two works in respect to subordination or its absence; second, regarding the details of the relevant clauses.

In respect to the first consideration it was found that 14 independent clauses in the Heptateuch answer to subordinates in the Vulgate, and 9 subordinates to independents. In addition, 2 independents and 13 subordinates have no direct source in the Vulgate, though it should be mentioned that with some of these, as with some of the previously noted differences, the departure from the Latin is easily explained. Thus, of the 290 relevant clauses in the Heptateuch, all but 38, or 13.1%, follow the Vulgate in regard to Ælfric's choice of making them independent or subordinate.

Of the 251 remaining clauses--those following the Vulgate--46 (29 independent, 17 subordinate) depart from the Vulgate in some matter of phrasing, making another

15.9% that does not follow the Latin exactly. Again it must be noted that many of these differences are minor and easily explained and are being included here for the express purpose of making the comparison as strict as possible. Thus, taking both of these groups of differences, there still remains 71.0% of the relevant clauses in the Heptateuch that follow the Vulgate even in matters of phrasing and syntax.

Exactly what is meant by following the Vulgate in phrasing and syntax can be understood from a survey of those clauses that are considered different from their Latin source but easily explained. These fall into two groups: those that depart slightly from the Vulgate and those that are probably based on a variant Old Latin text.

2.3121. Vulgate. Among the subordinate clauses listed as dissimilar from their Vulgate sources, three (Gen. 6:7e, 6:12b, 17:6b) are introduced by ðæt and answer to the subject accusative construction in the Vulgate:

6:7d- me ofðingð soðlice

e- ðæt ic hi worhte.

d'- poenitet enim me

e'- fecisse eos.

6:12a- Da geseah God

b- ðæt seo eorðe was gewemmed.

a'- ...vidisset Deus  
 b'- terram esse corruptam.

17:6a- And ic gedo  
 b- þæt ðu wyxt.  
 a'- Faciamque  
 b'- te crescere vehementissime.

Though it was possible in Old English, as in Modern, to say, for example, "I will make you grow," it was much more common to do what Ælfric has done here. Therefore, whereas we must admit that Ælfric could have followed the Vulgate verbatim, there is no difficulty in seeing why he did not.

An additional five subordinate clauses render Latin participles that would have been very awkward, though possible, in Old English. The passages are Gen.12:3b and d, Num.21:8d and 9c, and Judg.16:2e:

12:3a- Ic gebletsige ða  
 b- þe ðe bletsiað.  
 a'- Benedicam  
 b'- benedicentibus tibi.  
 12:3c- and ic awyrige ða  
 d- þe ðe wyriað.  
 c'- et maledicam  
 d'- maledicentibus tibi.  
 21:8d- and se ðe tosliten beo....

d'- qui percussus....

21:9c- ...and þa ðe toslitene wæron....

e'- ...quem cum percussi....

16:2d- ...woldon hine geniman,

e- mid þam þe he ut eode on ærne mergen,

f- and hine ofslean.

d'- ut facto

e'- mane exeuntem

f'- occiderent.

It is obvious that rendering these participles into Old English would severely strain the syntax of that language, though again it is possible. Further analysis of Num. 21:8 and 9 will be found below, Section 3.21; how far Ælfric was willing to strain Old English syntax to render past participles will be seen in Chapter 3; the same for present participles is in Section 4.1.

Further, three dissimilar subordinates and two independents are the result of the contrast in flexibility between Latin qui and Old English ðe.

The three subordinate clauses show the tendency of English--from the earliest period and still gaining in popularity--to avoid preposed inflected relative pronouns, e.g., "in/for/to whom." Faced with this construction in the Latin, Ælfric has in each case rearranged the clause to make the Latin oblique forms into the subject of the English rendering:

Gen.7:22a- and ælc ðinge

ðe lif hæfde

b- wearð adyd....

a'- et cuncta,

in quibus spiraculum vitæ est in terra,

b'- mortua sunt.

15:14a- Ic deme swa ðeah þa ðeoda

b- ðe hi on ðeowte gebringað.

a'- ...gentem,

b'- cui servituri sunt,

ego iudicabo.

17:14a- Se werhades man

þe ne byð emsniden on þam

flæsce hys fylmenes,

b- hys sawul byð adylegod....

a'- Masculus,

cuius præputii caro circumcisa

non fuerit,

b'- delebitur anima illa....

Clearly, the changes that Alfric made in these verses must be considered very minor in light of the wrenched syntax that would have resulted from a verbatim translation. (On the change in subject between the beginning of 17:14 and the end, in both Latin and English, see

Section 4.4.)

The difference in syntactic occurrence between qui and ðe accounts for two instances of Latin subordinates being translated as independents (Gen. 3:1c and 6f):

3:1a- Eac swylce seo næddre wæs geapre ðone

ealle ða oðre nytenu....

c- And seo naddre cwæð to ðam wife:

a'- Sed et serpens erat callidor cunctis

animantibus terræ...

c'- qui dixit ad mulierem:

6a- Da geseah ðæt wif...

e- and sealde hyre were:

f- he æt ða.

a'- Vidit igitur mulier...

e'- deditque viro suo,

f'- qui comedit.

While Modern English could render the latter verse according to the Latin, 'she gave her husband, who ate', this possibility does not seem to have been available in Old English; moreover, even Modern English cannot render the first verse verbatim. Thus, these two instances of Ælfric's departure from the structure of the Latin show again his awareness of "ðære spræce fandunge."

Two more cases of this type must be mentioned, though in these it is not at all certain that the Latin is itself

subordinate, since in one (Gen.3:2a) cui follows a quotation and refers back to the speaker, and in the other (22:11c) qui follows a quotation and refers to a person named therein. In both cases, the structure can hardly be called a relative clause and may actually be an independent usage of qui:

1c- And seo naddre cwæð to ðam wife:

d- Hwi forbead God eow

e- ðæt ge ne æton of ælcon treowe binnan Paradisum?

2a- Þæt wif andwyrde....

1c'- Qui dixit ad mulierem....

2a'- Cui respondit mulier....

22:11b- ða clypode Godes engel..., Abraham!

c- He andwyrde sona.

b'- Et ecce Angelus Domini...clamavit, dicens:  
Abraham, Abraham.

c'- Qui respondit....

These two verses were listed as departures from the Latin only because the strictest possible criteria were desired for considering a particular verse influenced by the Latin.

Also considered as departures because of the desire for strict criteria were two instances (Gen.8:13a and 22:3a) where a Latin present participle used temporally is rendered ða, independent, whereas a verbatim translation might have used ða ða...ða:

8:13a- Ða geopenode Noe ðæs arces hrof,

b- and behold ut

c- and geseah....

a'- Igitur aperiens Noe tectum arcæ

b'- aspexit

c'- viditque....

22:3a- Abraham ða aras on þære ylcan nihte

b- and ferde ....

a'- Igitur Abraham de nocte consurgens...

b'- abiit....

It must be admitted, however, that the latter verse has several other departures from the Latin. (See Section 4.1.)

Finally, there are certain cases in which Ælfric seems to have tried to render a Latin sense that might have been lost in a verbatim translation. It will be remembered that one of the things this investigation is trying to determine is how often, if at all, Ælfric sacrificed clarity to the requirement of retaining the "gastlice andgyt." Thus, it is well to note several minor changes Ælfric makes and see if the reason for them is easily found.

At Gen.6:12c Ælfric turns a parenthetic remark (considered subordinate in the present computations) into a marked subordinate clause by adding the words that show the obvious intent of the parenthesis:

- a- Ða geseah God  
 b- Ðæt seo eorðe wæs gewemmed,  
 c- for ðan ðe ælc flæsc gewemde his weg ofer  
 eorðan.
- a'- ...vidisset Deus  
 b'- terram esse corruptam  
 c'- (omnis quippe caro corrupuerat viam suam  
 super terram)....

Likewise, at Gen. 9:13b Ælfric explains the connection between two verses that may be mistaken as temporally continuous, when actually the second is an elaboration of the first:

- 12a- Ðis bið Ðæt tacn mines weddes  
 b- Ðæt ic do betwux me and eow and eallum  
 libbendum nytenum on ecum mægðum,
- 13a- Ðæt is,  
 b- Ðæt ic sette minne renbogan on wolcnum.
- 12a'- Hoc signum foederis  
 b'- quod do inter me et vos, et ad omnem animam  
 viventem, quæ est vobiscum in generationes  
 sempiternas:
- 13b'- Arcum meum ponam in nubibus.

It should be noticed that for the sake of argument both 13a and 6 are listed as differing from the Latin, the first because it has no manifest source in the Latin, the second because the Latin is considered independent, not having a hypotactic connection to the previous verse; nonetheless,

it is obvious how little the Old English departs from the Latin.

A second type of revision that *Alfric* sometimes made, though not nearly as often as some scholars have suggested, was shortening a passage by omitting phrases that had appeared immediately before. Any reader of the Bible is aware of the stylistic device whereby a list of people, for example, is repeated every time they are referred to, instead of substituted for with a pronoun. In this type, and similar types, *Alfric* sometimes shortened the sentence. Thus, in Gen.7:23, after having just said that all men, women, birds, animals, insects, and living things were destroyed by the flood, the Vulgate goes on to say:

Et delevit omnem substantiam,  
 quæ erat super terram,  
     ab homine usque ad pecus,  
     tam reptile quam volucres coeli:  
 et deleta sunt de terra:  
 remansit autem solus Noe,  
 et qui cum eo erant in arca.

For this *Alfric* has only the last clause, which he connects to the previous sentence:

22a- And ælc ðinge ðe lif hæfde  
     b- wearð adyð on ðam deopan flode,  
 23- buton ðam anum ðe binnan ðam arce wæron.

Similarly, *Alfric* shortens Gen.9:10 because the same list

is a more integral part of the next verse:

- 9- Efne nu ic sette min wed...
- 10- ...to eallum libbendum nytenum....
- 9'- Ecce ego statuum pactum meum...
- 10'- ...ad omnem animam viventem,  
 quæ est vobiscum,  
 tam in volucris quam in iumentis,  
 et pecudibus terræ cunctis,  
 ...et universis bestiis terræ.

It remains to be said that, of the remaining cases in which the Old English differs from the Latin, most are cases in which the Latin or Old English has an introductory adverb or connector not appearing in the other. This type of difference cannot be lightly dismissed in view of our attempt to see how the two languages compare in regard to paratactic and hypotactic constructions, but it is necessary to stress that because this investigation is concerned with such a particular detail one must not lose sight of what is meant by difference: for the purposes of this computation two clauses are different if one has a manifest connective and the other does not--even if every other detail in the two is the same. It should be noted, therefore, that of the total of 49 differences between the Latin and Old English among the independent clauses, 29 are differences in connectives: 16 cases in which the Old English has a connective where the Latin does not; 13 where

the Old English does not and the Latin does. The complete significance of the difference--both major and minor--will be discussed after the comparison of the Vulgate to the Old Latin readings.

2.3122. Old Latin Readings. The problems and uncertainty involved in any attempt at establishing which Old Latin readings Ælfric may have had available have already been discussed (Section 2.2), and, as explained, the basis of the investigation will remain the Vulgate. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to take brief notice of some old Latin readings which, if available to Ælfric, would explain a number of differences between the Heptateuch and Vulgate, though it must be remembered that no attempt is being made here to prove that Ælfric did indeed have these variants.

Therefore, keeping in mind the warning against constructing a patchwork text, it may be pointed out that five of the subordinate clauses listed as differing from the Vulgate closely resemble Old Latin verses. Gen.9:15b was given as an instance in which the Heptateuch was subordinate and the Vulgate independent:

a- And ic beo gemyndig mines weddes wið eow,

b- ðæt henonforð ne byð flod to adyldienne  
eall flæsc.

a'- Et recordabor foederis mei vobiscum:

b'- et non erunt ultra aquæ diluvii ad delendum  
universam carnem.

But there is an Old Latin version that has the second clause subordinate:

a\*- et memorero testamenti mei...

b\*- ut non perdam aquis diluvii omnen carnem.

The obvious drawback of this verse, however, is that in other ways--e.g., the lack of infinitive of purpose, and the differing subject--it is less similar than the Vulgate to the Heptateuch.

Three examples that are much more likely to have been based on Old Latin readings are ones in which the Heptateuch has more than appears in the Vulgate. In two of these (Gen. 2:19b and 21e) the Heptateuch has a clause and the Vulgate only a phrase; in one (Gen.6:12c) the Heptateuch has a subordinator not in the Vulgate. In all three cases Old Latin readings come very close to the Heptateuch:

19a- God soþlice gelædde ða nytenu,

b- ðe he of eorðan gesceop, and ðære lyfte  
fugelas to Adame,

c- ðæt he foresceawode

d- hu he hi gecygde.

b'- Formatis igitur, Dominus Deus, de humo cunctis  
animantibus terras, et universis volatilibus  
coeli,

a'- adduxit ea ad Adam,

c'- ut videret

d'- quid vocaret ea.

- b\*- et quæcumque finixit deus adhuc de terra  
 omnes bestias agri et omnia volatilia  
 cæli
- a\*- et adduxit illa ad Adam
- c\*- ut ~~videret~~
- d\*- quid vocaret illa.

- 21c- ða genam he an rib of his sidan  
 d- and gefylde mid flæsce  
 e- ðær ðæt rib wæs.
- c'- tulit unam de costis eius
- d'- et replevit carnem
- e'- pro ea.
- c\*- et sumsit deus unam de costis eius
- d\*- et supplevit carnem
- e\*- in locum ipsius.

In both of these it seems clear that the clause in the Heptateuch is more easily traced to the Old Latin verse than to the Vulgate, though, as already mentioned, each version has something to make it attractive as a source.

Gen.6:12c, as explained in Section 2.3121, includes a subordinator not found in the Vulgate; and, while it is possible to reconcile this with Ælfric's general practice (as was done above), it is worth noting that he may have been following an Old Latin version:

- a\*- et vidit dominus deus terram

b\*- quia corrupta erat

c\*- valde quia corruperat omnis caro viam eius  
super terram.

It should also be noted that this reading accounts likewise for the subordinate clause in clause (b) in the Heptateuch in contrast to the subject accusative in the Vulgate (though this difference too may be easily explained, as in 2.3121):

a- Ða geseah God

b- Ðæt seo eorðe was gewenmed....

a'- ...vidisset Deus

b'- terram esse corruptam....

A final example where the Old Latin may account for a difference between subordinate clauses in the Heptateuch and Vulgate is 17:12c:

b- ...geboht þeowa beo ymsniden,

c- þeah he ne beo eowres cynnes.

b'- ...emptitius circumcidetur,

c'- et quicumque non fuerit de stirpe vestra.

c\*- ...ab omni filio alterius qui non est ex  
semine tuo.

It seems fair to say that the þeah of the Heptateuch conveys the sense of the Old Latin subordinate clause, as opposed to the coordinate clause in the Vulgate: viz., both the Heptateuch and Old Latin have 'not of your family' modifying 'bought slave' of the previous clause; the Vulgate introduces 'not of your family' as an additional

group of people, coordinate with 'bought slave'. But in this case too, though the Old Latin seems a more probable source of the Old English, a drawback exists in that the Old Latin is a relative clause and the Old English, while subordinate, is not relative.

As for the fourteen independent clauses in the Heptateuch answering to subordinates in the Vulgate, two seem very probably to be based on Old Latin while another two may be Gen.6:12, a verse which was already shown to have a probable source in the Old Latin for two differences between the Heptateuch and Vulgate, reads in the Old English:

- a- Ða geseah God
- b- ðæt seo eorðe was gewemmed....

The Vulgate for this is

- a'- Cumque vidisset Deus
- b'- terram esse corruptam....

But the Old Latin has a much closer reading:

- a\*- et vidit dominus deus terram
- b\*- quia corrupta erat....

Likewise probably from the Old Latin is the independent clause at 17:11b:

- a- And ge emsniðað þæt flæsc eowres fylmenes;
- b- þæt beo tacn mines weddes betwux me and eow.

(Þæt is being taken as the demonstrative pronoun.) The Vulgate for this verse has a subordinate clause of pur-

pose; but one Old Latin version has a coordinate clause that may be the source of Ælfric's þæt:

- a'- Et circumcidetis carnem præputii vestri,
- b'- ut sit in signum foederis inter me et vos.
- b\*- ...et erit in signum testament....

Of the two clauses that may be following Old Latin readings, one (Gen.21:5a) is problematic because it has aspects other than its subordination that seem closer to the Vulgate, and the other (22:9g) because the whole passage is not close enough to any one text to answer for all its details:

- 4a- And on þam eahtedan dæge hyne eac ymsnað,
- b- swa swa God him bebead.
- 5a- And he sylf was ða hundwintre.
- 4a'- Et circumcidit eum octavo die,
- b'- Cum centum esset annorum hæc quippe ætate patris natus est Isaac.
- 4a\*- et tunc circumcidit Abraham puerum die octava.
- 5a\*- Abraham autem erat annorum centum quand genuit Isaac.

It is obvious that, though the Old Latin will account for 5a, it will not account for the subordinate clause in 4b. As for 22:9g, the three versions are:

- g- He geband þa hys sunu.
- g'- cumque alligasset Isaac filium suum....
- g\*- ...et alligavit pedes Isaac filio suo....

To avoid extended comment, suffice to say that many other difficulties prevent one from a firm conclusion that this Old Latin verse--as close as it is to the Heptateuch--is definitely the source Alfric was following. At this point it might also be remarked that just this type of uncertainty was given earlier as the reason that establishing Alfric's source would not be a goal of this investigation.

2.313. Analysis of Latin Influence. The question was raised in Section 2.311 as to whether the difference between the Heptateuch and Homilies could be attributed to Latin influence. Using the material presented in Section 2.312, an answer to that question may be attempted.

In the initial comparison of the subordinate clauses in the two Old English versions it was found that overall the two had an equal percentage of the total number of relevant clauses subordinate (41.7 for the Heptateuch; 43.3 for the Homilies), but that they differed considerably in regard to relative and temporal clauses, with 41.3% of all subordinates being relatives in the Heptateuch against only 25.8% in the Homilies, and 21.6% temporals in the Homilies contrasted with only 10.7% in the Heptateuch. Comparison of the Heptateuch to the Vulgate shows that of the 50 relative clauses in the Old English only 35 answer to relatives in the Vulgate. But it will then be noticed that 11 of the 15 not clearly following the Vulgate were

explained in the preceding section as either easily accounted for in terms of the Vulgate or as probably following the various Old Latin readings. Thus, in reality, 46 of the 50 relative clauses in the Heptateuch can be shown to have either definite (35 cases) or probable (11 cases) sources in Alfric's Latin text, making the difference in regard to relatives in the Heptateuch and Homilies strong evidence for our contention that the former is a translation, and therefore close to the Latin, while the latter is a paraphrase, therefore showing certain liberties with the text.

This contention finds further support from the difference in temporal clauses. As noted before, the Heptateuch has considerably fewer temporals than the Homilies, with only 13, or 10.7%. Yet it is to be noticed that six of these do not answer to temporals in the Vulgate or Old Latin and do not lend themselves to easy explanations. Thus, it may be argued that in his personal style Alfric uses more temporals than he uses in the Heptateuch, and, though he tried to follow his source and limit himself, found it necessary to abandon his text six times to add temporals or change existing ones to fit his style. While it may seem to contradict our contention to claim that Alfric abandoned the Latin source, it does not; it shows that the Latin is what kept the number of temporals to a minimum. The number would have been even less if Alfric

had not felt uncomfortable with so few (to his understanding) indications of the temporal continuity of the story.

As to the contrast between the Heptateuch and Homilies regarding the number of independent clauses having no manifest connective, no satisfying analysis presents itself. As pointed out, the Homilies has 41.7% of its independent clauses without connectives while the Heptateuch has only 27.8%. Moreover, it was noted that the Heptateuch has 16 connectives where the Vulgate has none and lacks connectives 13 times when the Vulgate has them. Insofar as the additions and subtractions seem to cancel each other out, it would be hard to say anything convincing about how closely Ælfric followed the Latin in his choice of connectives. But it may be fair to say that considering the remainder of the independent clauses the percentage of clauses lacking manifest connectives would have been higher in the Old English if it had been higher in the Vulgate.

Finally it must be noted that of the 14 independent clauses answering to subordinates in the Vulgate, 7 are accounted for in Section 2.312, and likewise 4 of the 9 subordinates answering to independents. Thus, using the strictest possible criteria we find that of the 272 clauses in the Heptateuch with identifiable sources in the Latin all but 23, or 91.5% follow the Latin in being independent or subordinate; using the more lenient criteria of Section 2.312, all but 12, or 95.6% follow the Latin

in this respect. These figures become very interesting and seminal when it is remembered that in regard to amounts of subordination both the Heptateuch and Homilies were substantially the same--yet the Heptateuch is clearly following the Latin at least 92% of the time that there is a Latin source. Moreover, of the 265 Latin clauses listed in Chart 2.1 (counting participial verbals and subject accusatives, but excluding noun phrases, adjective phrases and loose renderings), 155, or 58.5%, are independent, and 110, or 41.5%, are subordinate--almost exactly the same as the 58.3% and 41.7%, respectively, for the Heptateuch. This raises the very strong possibility, suggested in Sections 1.51 and 1.62, that there is such a thing as language style, and, even more fascinating, text style: it may well be that the requirements of narrative predetermined the amounts of subordination.

2.314. Analysis by sections. To further investigate the possibility of the existence of text style it seemed advisable to analyze the material in terms of each episode--to see if the same results occur in any narrative, no matter what size it is or what topic it is handling. For this purpose the samples from both Old English works were divided according to topic, with certain thematically unclear sentences joined to the episode closest in nature; for example, the one sentence about Isaac's birth and cir-

cumcision (Gen. 21:4-5) was joined to the larger discussion of circumcision (Gen.17). The basic criteria used for determining when a story began or ended were chapter divisions, Alfric's handling of the material in the Homilies, and, because the issue was not felt to be central to the question of the validity of the assumption about style, the subjective feeling the story seemed to be finished. In this way the material was subdivided into nine episodes varying in length from 5 clauses to 108 and from one sentence (Gen.24:1-4) to four chapters: the story of creation and the fall; the flood; Abraham's blessing; the covenant of circumcision; the binding of Isaac; the servant's oath to Abraham; the miracle of Aaron's rod; the fiery serpents; Samson.

Chart 2.2: Subordination by sections.

Section		Number of Clauses					
title	chapter	Heptateuch			Homilies		
		total	sub.	%sub.	total	sub.	%sub.
creation	1,2,3	90	40	44.4	108	47	43.5
flood	6-9	87	33	37.9	30	13	43.3
Abraham	12,15	10	5	50.0	5	2	40.0
covenant	17,21	37	16	43.2	27	11	40.7
Isaac	22	27	10	37.0	24	9	37.5
oath	24	7	4	57.1	5	4	80.0
Aaron	Num.17	7	3	42.9	5	2	40.0
serpents	Num.21	14	6	42.9	14	7	50.0
Samson	Judg.16	11	4	36.3	6	2	40.0
TOTAL		290	121		224	97	

As improbable as the suggestion of text style may have sounded initially, Chart 2.2 shows that it is to be

taken as a serious possibility, for except for one instance each of 80% and 57.1% the percentage of subordination in the eighteen treatments of the nine topics always falls between 36 and 50%, a spread of less than 15% in sixteen texts varying in theme, size, and purpose (eight being translations, eight paraphrases). Moreover, it is possible to explain away the instances of 80% and 57.1% by pointing out that they both occur in the oath that Abraham makes his servant take--and this is not technically a narrative, being one sentence of admonition.

This latter argument is admittedly something of an excuse, but it calls attention to a very interesting fact about Chart 2.2. When the episodes are taken separately, it will be found that the percentages in the Heptateuch and Homilies for the individual episodes vary no more than 10% (ignoring the servant episode); in fact, a difference of more than 8% occurs only twice, with the usual spread being closer to 4%. What this suggests is that something about the topic of each section in particular, and about narrative in general, determined the choice of subordination, making subordination, therefore, an aspect of text style.

2.32. Number of Subordinate clauses. In the previous section, as pointed out in 2.31, we were concerned only with the number of subordination structures. In this sec-

tion attention will turn to the percentage of subordinate clauses to the total, meaning that now all clauses coordinated by and will be considered. The reason for this division is not that there was any predisposition to finding a particular result; nor was there any thought that a different result would be obtained. Rather the motivation was to avoid unnecessary complexity in the initial stages of the investigation. To the extent that the number of clauses dominated by a particular connective or subordinator did not seem as important as the percentage of independent and subordinate constructions, and did seem an added complexity, clauses coordinated by and were omitted. Because, therefore, the analysis in the previous section was made on a simplified sample, in this section we will limit analysis to either verification or disproof of the initial suggestions. And for this reason the discussion here will follow the pattern of the previous one, only this time including those clauses omitted from Chart 2.1. The number of independent and subordinate and-coordinated clauses is given in Chart 2.3.

Chart 2.3. And-coordinated clauses.

	Heptateuch	Homilies
independent	120	88
subordinate	9	15
TOTAL	129	103

2.321. Heptateuch vs. Homilies. As Chart 2.3 shows, 129 and-coordinated clauses appear in the Heptateuch sample, 120 of them in independent constructions and 9 in subordinate, and 103 in the Homilies, 88 independent and 15 subordinate. When added to the number of clauses dealt with in the previous section, this makes 419 in all for the Heptateuch, with 289 independent and 130 subordinate, and 327 for the Homilies, 215 independent and 112 subordinate. Thus, subordinate clauses make up 31.0% of the Heptateuch total and 34.3% of the Homilies. On the other hand, subordinates compose 14.6% of the and-coordinated clauses in the Homilies, but only 7.0% in the Heptateuch. As in the previous investigation the question now arises as to whether the difference in subdivision is due to Latin influence.

2.322. Latin influence. Of the nine and-coordinate subordinates in the Heptateuch, seven (Gen.3:5d, 3:17c, 3:19e, 6:5c, 15:13d, 15:13e, 24:4c) answer to Latin subordinate clauses with and-coordination. Of the two that do not, one, Gen.7:10b, seems to be the result of Ælfric's omitting the next few sentences from his translated text:

a- þa on ðam eahtoðan dæge, ða ða hi inne wæron  
 b- and God hi belocen hæfde wiðutan,  
 c- ða yðode ðæt flod ofer eorðan.

a'- Cumque transissent septem dies,  
 c'- aque diluvii inundaverunt super terram.

It will be seen that clause (b) does not answer to anything in this Latin verse; but it may answer to Verse 16, otherwise omitted from the Heptateuch (along with 13-15):

et inclusit eum Dominus de foris.

There is a strong possibility, therefore, that Ælfric left out a passage that he considered repetitive or otherwise unnecessary, but took the one clause that he considered important and attached it somewhere else.

The second subordinate verse for which there is no apparent Latin source is Gen. 3:23c:

a- Adræfde hine ða of neorxnawange,

b- ðæt he ða eorðan worhte

c- and him ðæron tilode,

d- of ðære ðe he genumen wæs.

a'- Et emisit eum Dominus Deus de Paradiso voluptatis

b'- ut operaretur terram

d'- de qua sumptus est.

In this case it must be admitted that there does not seem to be any Biblical source for this addition. Why Ælfric inserted this clause remains a mystery.

In any event, it would appear justified to say that the Heptateuch has fewer and-coordinated subordinate clauses than the Homilies because the Vulgate does, and this is, therefore, another instance in which Ælfric may be shown to have been stylistically influenced by the Latin. Whether this aversion to and-coordinated subordinate clauses in

the Latin is a feature of the language style may be considered by analyzing the departures from the Latin appearing in the independent and-coordinated clauses, since there are too few subordinates to validly discuss.

Comparing the 120 independents of the Heptateuch to those in the Vulgate will show that between 20% and 25% of the clauses differ, though the exact figure depends on how one chooses to count differences, as will be shown.

The most frequent type of divergence from the Latin is the rendering of a Latin participle + verb as an Old English verb and verb. This occurs six times (Gen.6:6d-7a; 8:13ab; 22:3ab; 22:13cd; Num.17:8ab; 21:5ab), and one example (Gen.8:13) will suffice to show how Ælfric treated this type:

- a- Ða geopenode Noe ðæs arces hrof,  
 b- and beheold ut....  
 a'- Igitur aperiens Noe tectum arcæ  
 b'- aspexit....

A variation of this occurs at Gen.22:15ab:

- a- Eft clypode se engel Abraham,  
 b- and cwæð:  
 a'- Vocavit autem Angelus Domini Abraham secundo  
 b'- dicens:

Having the participle following the verb seems to be significant, since this construction is usually handled in a different manner (on which see Section 4.1). It may be mentioned

in passing at this point that the problem in counting the differences arises from the question of whether each of the foregoing examples involves one difference--the construction --or two--both clauses. Though the choice may seem trivial, in terms of numbers seven departures are statistically very different from fourteen; and for this reason statistics are not employed in this discussion.

Another type of departure from the Latin involves the translation of qui, already noted in 2.3121 as troublesome, as at Gen.22:9c:

- a- Hi comon ða to ðære stowe
- b- þe him geswutelode God,
- c- and ðær weofod arærde....
- a'- Et venerunt ad locum
- b'- quem ostenderit ei Deus,
- c'- in quo ædificavit altare....

Here, as above, two coordinated independent clauses answer to an independent and subordinate in the Latin. (But it should be noted that in this particular verse Ælfric's source may have been the Old Latin reading: "et construxit ibi aram.")

It should be obvious from these examples that Latin has methods of subordination not readily available in Old English. These must therefore be rendered by coordination, a fact that may well account for the greater frequency of and-coordinated subordinate clauses in the Homilies than in the Hentateuch:

having fewer avenues open to him, Ælfric seems to have been forced into developing a personal style in which many subordination structures had to carry more than just one clause. To recall the figures on subordination structures presented in 2.3111, it will be noticed that of the 121 subordinators in the Heptateuch only 9 (7.4%) dominate more than one clause, but of the 97 in the Homilies 15 (15.5%) do so. The consequences, and thus the proof, of this contrast between Old English and Latin may be seen anew when both types of subordination just shown are united in a Latin sentence. This problem faced Ælfric three times in the sample (Gen.22:13cd; Num.21:8df and 9ce):

13b- ...and geseah ðær ænne ram...

c- and he ahefde ðone ram to ðære offrunge

d- and hýne ðær ofsnað Gode to lace for hys  
sunu Isaac.

b'- ...viditque...arietem...

c'- quem assumens

d'- obtulit holocaustum pro filio.

In this case may be observed how Ælfric was forced to create two coordinate clauses where none appeared in the Latin--one for the quem and the other for the participle + verb. In the two following examples the Latin adds a third method of subordination to these two--subjunctive verbs:

Num.21:8c- ...sete upp to tacne,

d- and se ðe tosliten beo

- e- beseo upp to ðære næddran,  
 f- and he leofod̄...  
 c'- ...pone eum pro signo:  
 d'- qui percussus  
 e'- aspexerit eum  
 f'- vivit.

- 9b- ...sette to tacne;  
 c- and þa ðe toslitene wæron  
 d- beheoldon to ðære næddran  
 e- and wurdon gehælede.  
 b'- ...posuit eum pro signo:  
 c'- quem cum percussi  
 d'- aspicerent  
 e'- sanabantur.

In several other types of construction Ælfric turns a Latin subordinate into a coordinated independent. Twice he renders Latin temporal subordinate clauses as independent coordinates (Gen.22:5c and 10a):

- 5c- ic and þæt cild gað unc to gebiddenne,  
 d- and we syððan cumað sona eft to eow.  
 c'- ego et puer illuc...postquam adoraverimus,  
 d'- revertemur ad vos.

- 9g- He geband þa hys sunu.  
 10a- And hys swurd ateah....

9g'- cumque alligasset Isaac filium suum.

10a'- Arripuit gladium....

(Notice that in the latter verse the punctuation and capitalization are the editor's; 9g is obviously not the end of the verse.)

At Gen.1:15a and 24:3a ut is rendered by and with independent coordination instead of subordination (though in the former instance there is an Old Latin reading et). There are also five places where Ælfric has and but the Latin has no connective and two places where Ælfric's clause has no apparent source in the Latin.

In summary, then, we have found fifteen cases of Latin subordination that Ælfric has rendered as independents with and-coordination. This tends to substantiate the popular claim that Latin is more hypotactic than Old English, though it does not support the claim that Old English is paratactic, unless coordination is accepted as a type of parataxis. In other words, given the strict definition of parataxis--stringing clauses together without manifest connectives--there is not much proof that Old English is paratactic; but given the looser usage--not showing the logical subordination of ideas--it is clear that Old English, with its greater use of and-coordination is more paratactic than Latin.

2.323. Subordinate clauses by sections. Using the criteria explained in 2.314, the number and percentage of

subordinate clauses, as opposed to subordination structures, were tabulated, and are presented in Chart 2.4. It should be remembered that subordinate clauses comprise 31.0% of the total in the Heptateuch and 34.3% in the Homilies.

Chart 2.4: Subordinate clauses by sections.

Section		Number of Claueses					
		Heptateuch			Homilies		
title	chapter	total	sub.	%sub.	total	sub.	%sub.
creation	1,2,3,	126	44	34.1	157	52	33.1
flood	6-9	115	35	30.4	42	13	31.0
Abraham	12,15	15	7	46.7	10	4	40.0
covenant	17,21	54	16	29.6	36	11	30.6
Isaac	22	44	10	22.7	38	13	34.2
oath	24	11	5	45.5	7	5	71.4
Aaron	Num.17	13	3	23.1	6	3	50.0
serpents	Num.21	25	6	24.0	20	9	45.0
Samson	Judg.16	16	4	25.0	11	2	18.2
TOTAL		419	130		327	112	

It would seem to verify the analysis of Alfric's method presented in 2.322 that, while Chart 2.2 showed eight of the nine episodes to have substantially the same percentage of subordination structures in both the Heptateuch and Homilies, Chart 2.4 shows only five (six, if 10% is insubstantial) with substantially the same percentage of subordinate clauses. It further verifies the analysis that differences of 11.5% and 21.05 are found in the episodes of "The Binding of Isaac" and "The Fiery Serpents," respectively, which were seen in the previous discussion to have

more than their share of difficult Latin subordinate clauses. There can be little doubt, therefore, that both subordination structures and subordinate clauses are to a large degree elements of language style--as shown by the contrasts between the Heptateuch and Homilies when the former is translating a complicated Latin passage--and to a lesser degree of text style--as shown by the overwhelming similarities in the Old English texts even when one is very clearly following a Latin original.

2.33. Analysis of control texts. In the previous section it was shown that to a large degree the Heptateuch follows the Latin--whether the Vulgate or Old Latin--almost verbatim, yet both the Heptateuch and Homilies are amazingly similar in terms of percentages of subordinations and subordinate clauses. This situation suggested the possibility that both Old English texts and the Latin source were either predetermined or highly influenced in regard to these aspects by the fact that they were narratives, further suggesting the existence of text style. Had the Old English texts been similar to each other but different from the Latin the conclusion to be drawn would have been that what was shown by the similarity was Alfric's personal narrative style. As it stands, however, the Latin too is similar and cannot be accounted for in terms of Alfric's own style. Those elements of the text--e.g., the many Latin participle + verb constructions, for which the Heptateuch does

not follow the Latin but does look like the Homilies--are, on the other hand, either aspects of Old English narrative style, or, more probably, aspects of Ælfric's personal narrative style.

In this section brief notice will be taken of the prefaces to Genesis (PG) and to the Homilies (PCH), two texts which do not fall into the same category of translation or Biblical narrative as the Heptateuch and Homilies, in an effort to determine whether Ælfric's presently noted practice regarding subordination is limited to narrative. To ensure that the comparison is valid, the few Biblical quotations in PG and PCH are omitted from consideration.

Because the methodology is the same for these texts as for the previous, and because these texts are secondary in importance, little will be said about individual problems of classification; but it should be mentioned that whenever a clear drift of any sort became apparent all questionable clauses were classified in such a way as to counteract that drift, thereby making its occurrence conform to the strictest possible criteria. Thus, when it became apparent that the Prefaces had considerably more subordination than the Heptateuch and Homilies, all cases of and that may have been either connectives or coordinators were classified as connectives to try to counterbalance the drift toward subordination. When, therefore, a statement is made about subor-

dination in the Prefaces differing from that in the narratives, it is in the context of conscious efforts to bring the Prefaces into line with the narratives.

Chart 2.5. lists the number of independence and subordination constructions occurring at transitions, and the total number of independent and subordinate clauses in PG and PCH.

Chart 2.5: Transitions and Subordinate Clauses in Prefaces.

	Transitions			Subordinate Clauses		
	clauses		%sub.	clauses		%sub.
	total	sub.		total	sub.	
PG	144	82	56.9	167	93	55.7
PCH	105	66	62.8	121	73	60.3

At first glance the two Prefaces do not seem to be strikingly similar, PG having subordination structures at 56.9% of its transitions, and PCH 62.8%. But when one compares these figures to those obtained for the Heptateuch (41.7%) and Homilies (43.3%), the contrast between the Prefaces on the one hand and the narratives on the other is indeed striking. While the Prefaces are not as close to each other as the narratives are to each other, they are different enough from the narratives for the contrast to be significant. The closer of the two, PG, has more than 13% more subordination structures than the more subordinated of the narra-

tives, the Homilies.

Moreover, the differences are even greater and more significant when the percentages of subordinate clauses are considered. It will be recalled that when and-coordinated clauses were included in the figures for the narratives the vast number of independents contrasted to the small number of subordinates among such clauses made the percentage of subordination in the narratives drop sharply, to 31.0% in the Heptateuch and 34.4% in the Homilies. With the Prefaces, however, this is not the case: PG drops only 1.2%, and PCH 2.5%. As reference to the chart shows, the amount of independent and-coordination is only a trifle greater than the amount of subordinate and-coordination.

This contrast between the Prefaces on one side and the narratives on the other may have something to do with two previously noted contrasts between the Heptateuch and Homilies: one, the difference in amounts of temporal clauses; two, the difference in and-coordinated subordinate clauses. As pointed out in 2.311, temporals make up 21.6% of the subordinations in the Homilies, but only 10.7% in the Heptateuch. It was further seen, in 2.321, that 14.6% of the coordinated clauses in the Homilies, but only 7.0% in the Heptateuch, were subordinate. In respect to this latter contrast it was shown that in ten cases the Heptateuch uses independent coordinate clauses to render Latin temporal subordination, a fact that suggests that this may be

part of the explanation for the lesser number of subordinate temporal clauses in this work as compared to the Homilies. Though it is certainly not possible to know why Alfric felt that this was a better approach, it seems clear that his approach was this: given a Latin temporal construction that he could not easily render into English, he translated it by and-coordinated independent clauses, instead of his more usual (as in the Homilies) subordinate temporal clause. Thus, there are more such subordinate temporals in the Homilies, but more independent and-coordinates in the Heptateuch, since the two constructions are in something of a complementary distribution relationship.

Now, when one looks at the Prefaces, he finds that only two temporals (2.4%) occur in PG and three (4.5%) in PCH. This paucity of temporals would therefore seem to be tied in some way to the contrast in and-coordination in the Prefaces and narratives. However, this accounts for only part of the great contrast; the complete answer is elusive.

Nonetheless, the comparison of the Heptateuch and Homilies to PG and PCH shows that the figures arrived at in the analysis of the narratives are not accidental: as a unit the narratives have a definite style, different from Alfric's exposition at least in the matter of number of subordination structures and number of subordinate clauses.

#### 2.4. Summary.

This chapter investigated the percentage of subordi-

nation structures (2.31) and subordinate clauses (2.32) in the Heptateuch and Homilies. It was found that in both of these features the two Old English works are very similar. Yet it was also found (2.312 and 2.322) that the Heptateuch follows the Latin very closely in respect to making particular transitional clauses independence or subordination structures and particular clauses independent or subordinate. Moreover, it was found (2.314 and 2.323) that the versions of the individual stories in the Heptateuch and Homilies are remarkably similar to each other and to the works as wholes in regard to subordination structures and subordinate clauses.

Because of the great similarity between the two old English Biblical narrative texts, and because one of them, the Heptateuch, so clearly follows the Latin, the possibility arose that the amount of subordination in a text is determined more by the material than by the author. This possibility is supported by the fact that individual stories in the Heptateuch and Homilies are similar to each other and to the whole, and by the fact that the non-narrative control texts (2.33) are similar to each other in subordination, but different from the two narratives.

This chapter, then, proves two points: first, that Alfric follows the Latin very closely for the Heptateuch, a translation, but takes stylistic liberties with it in the Homilies, a paraphrase (thereby confirming the initial

suggestion of this investigation); and second, that the similarities in the Hentateuch and Homilies may be an aspect of text style.

Notes to Chapter 2.

<sup>1</sup> 31:54-32:1 in NJV, as Orlinsky points out, p.20, for reason given, pp.20-22.

<sup>2</sup> The distinction between and as a coordinator and as a connective is similar to, but not exactly the same as, the distinction between symmetric and asymmetric conjunction presented in Robin Lakoff, "If's And's and But's about Conjunction" (forthcoming). The major similarity, and the essential consideration for this investigation, is that and as connective shares with Lakoff's asymmetric conjunction the semantic force of temporal or causal relationship, in contrast to and as coordinator, which shares with symmetric conjunction the property that "the members may change their respective order without changing either the grammaticality or the meaning of the sentence."

<sup>3</sup> אברהם /'avraham/ 'Abraham' is explained as /'av hamōn/ 'a father of many people' (= manegra peoda faeder). The exact nature of the wordplay is not clear: see Knox Bible, Gen. 17:5 Note 4; NJV Note b; and especially Rashi ad loc.

## Chapter 3

## PAST PARTICIPLE PLACEMENT

The evidence in the previous chapter showed that the amount and types of subordination in the Heptateuch and Homilies, though containing some significant differences, are surprisingly similar, despite the close adherence of the Heptateuch to the Latin original. But the point was raised that the theme of the material may have accounted for this similarity: perhaps the exigencies of producing Old English narrative predetermined the nature of the subordination in these narratives. It thus seemed advisable to investigate a feature that was free of thematic determinism. The placement of past participles in the past participle + auxiliary construction is a particularly good feature in this respect, for, beside being an unlikely place for thematic contamination, past participles in Old English may occur anywhere in a clause except initially--leaving the author free to indulge his own style. The implications of this freedom for our comparison of the Heptateuch and Homilies are obvious, since our object is to compare Ælfric's personal style to his style when influenced by the text being translated.

### 3.1. Methodology.

#### 3.11. Participles in the Heptateuch and Homilies.

Because the Heptateuch is the focus of this investigation, the procedure here, as in the next chapter, was primarily an item to item comparison: first an occurrence of a particular feature--in this case a past participle--was found in the Heptateuch; then the thematically corresponding passage in the Homilies was found and the structures of the two were compared; finally, the Heptateuch and Homilies were compared to the Latin to see if either showed Latin influence in its participle placement. Unlike that in Chapter 2, the approach here was not initially statistical because the number of occurrences involved seemed too small to yield valid statistical analysis (see above 1.63 and note) and to overcome the problem of significant occurrences canceling each other out, as would happen, for example, if Elfric followed his source in writing S ppl V in the Heptateuch for a clause that appeared as S V ppl in the Homilies, and then still following his source wrote S V ppl in the Heptateuch but S ppl V in the Homilies. In such a case the statistics would show that both the Heptateuch and Homilies have one instance each of S V ppl and S ppl V, incorrectly suggesting that there was no influence from the original in the Heptateuch. As true of this possibility is for subordination also, such cancellations were less significant in Chapter 2 because of the vastly greater numbers

involved. In addition, the approach taken here can show two important things: first, that Ælfric was indeed influenced by the original; and second, that this influence did not lead him to write anything that he did not consider acceptable English since the construction occurs in the Homilies where the Latin influence is presumably lacking.

As a second step in the same investigation all clauses in the Homilies containing participles were noted and then compared to the thematically corresponding passage in the Heptateuch, if neither had already been considered in the first part. This technique accomplished the same thing as the first: it supplied examples of past participle placement that may not have appeared in the first simply by chance; and it could show the Latin influencing the Heptateuch in not containing a participle where the Homilies did. The element of chance should always be kept in mind in this type of study. The mere fact that a feature does not occur in the sample does not mean that Ælfric does not use it elsewhere. And for this reason the additional instances of participles supplied by the the Homilies are important in supporting the strong possibility that a construction not occurring in the Homilies in a correspondence with a thematically similar passage in the Heptateuch may well be in Ælfric's repertory for use elsewhere. And of course even with these added examples there is no proof

short of an exhaustive search of Ælfric's writings that a certain suspect construction does not occur at all.

3.12. Problems in identifying participles. While every effort was made to minimize subjective decisions, several had to be made. In particular, decisions had to be made as to whether a participle or adjective was under consideration; many participles had, after all, taken on a separate life as adjectives. The rule followed here was to count as a participle any word that Bosworth-Toller named as such, even when the word was listed under its own heading apart from the verb, and to count as an adjective any word so listed, even when its verb stem was clear. Thus, Gen.17:1f, "gang ðu ætforan me and beo fulfremed," is considered participial, despite the independent existence of the underlying adjective stem fulfremed in fulfremedlice and fulfremednys. (It is certainly worth noting here in respect to Ælfric's close adherence to the Latin that he uses fulfremed to translate perfectus, itself a past participle so commonly used as an adjective that little thought is ever given to its source, the verb perficio 'to complete'.) So too, gewemmed, in Gen.6:11, "ða wæs eall seo eorðe gewemmed," and in 6:12b, "ða geseah God ðæt seo eorðe wæs gewemmed," is counted as a participle despite gewemmednys in CH I.76.15. On the other hand, forðhealde, of Gen.8:21d, "andgyt and geðoht menniscra heortan syndon forðhealde to

yfele," is not listed as related to the verb forðhealdan 'to follow' and is therefore treated as an adjective and not included in the discussion in this chapter. Likewise, nacode, though certainly from nacian 'to strip', must have been felt to be an adjective in Gen.2:25, "hi wæron ða būta, Adam and his wif, nacode," and thus Bosworth-Toller lists it as an independent adjective, which is what it is considered here.

Nonetheless, in some cases Bosworth-Toller could not mediate the difficulty. Gen.6:6d has "he wolde ða warnian on ær and wæs gehreped mid heortan sarnysse wiðinnan," which is obviously not translating the Vulgate which has no clause equivalent to the first, though the clause with gehreped is a literal rendering of the phrase with tactus: "poenituit eum...et tactus dolore cordis intrinsecus, Delebo, inquit...." The problem here is that Bosworth-Toller lists gehreped as an adjective form from the past participle but gives only this sentence to document such usage; yet this sentence is ambiguous since the relevant phrase in the Latin may be adjectival, modifying the subject inherent in inquit (as the comma suggests), or it may be clausal, lacking est (with a period instead of the comma after intrinsecus) and coordinated with poenituit eum. In both cases, however, Old English would have required a verb, and therefore gehreped may just as easily be an adjective as a participle. For the purpose of this study it is being taken as a participle

because that apparently is what Bosworth-Toller thinks is its most common usage.

Also troublesome were several instances of unusual spellings--especially past tense spellings where participles were certainly called for. Such, for example, is aōryt in Num.21:4, "ōæt folc wearō ða aōryt and ðearle geswenct mid ðam siðfest." According to Bosworth-Toller aþreotan, though usually impersonal, is sometimes personal; but in these cases the past participle is aþroten. Aþryt is the preterite. Nevertheless, the present study takes it to be a participle because 1) the verb in the clause is clearly wearō, and 2) aōryt is coordinated with geswenct, the past participle of geswencan. In all similar instances, if the sense requires a participle the word is so treated, despite its spelling.

3.13. The data. When subjected to the procedures just outlined, the sample yielded fifty-five (55) npl + aux constructions in the Heptateuch. These were then sorted as to position of principle constituents and glossed as either independent or subordinate. The constituents considered were subject, finite verb, direct object, indirect object, and participle; only morphologically marked objects were counted, thereby excluding those introduced by to, for or other function words. Any difference in placement counted as a separate construction. Thus, V npl is a structure without any subject, while (S) V npl has a subject in a

different clause (e.g., coordinated verbs) or has a relative clause as subject, and the relative pronoun is listed with the subordinate verb.

Because of the abbreviated nature of Biblical passages in the Homilies no exact correspondence was found for twenty-one of the clauses; thirteen thematically corresponding clauses lacking participles were also found. This leaves twenty-one clauses for which the Heptateuch and Homilies had participles in thematically corresponding clauses. An additional thirty-two participles were found in the Homilies in clauses for which the correspondence in the Heptateuch lacked a participle. Some themes were treated a number of times in the Homilies, and therefore the numbers of relevant clauses in both texts differ. Chart 3.1 lists the twenty-one clauses for which the Heptateuch and Homilies both have participles in corresponding positions. Chart 3.2 gives the remaining thirty-four participles of the Heptateuch, and Chart 3.3 the remaining thirty-two of the Homilies.

3.131. Problems in assigning correspondences. Deciding the exact correspondences between clauses in the Heptateuch and Homilies is not always a light matter, and there are therefore some questionable inclusions and exclusions in Chart 3.1. Gen.3:19 in the Heptateuch reads:

- a- On swate ðines andwlitan ðu brycst ðines hlafes
- b- oð ðæt ðu gewende to eorðan

- c- of ðære ðe ðu genumen wære,
- d- for ðan ðe ðu eart dust
- e- and to dust gewyrst.

But in the Homilies the closest parallel is I.18.15b-18b:

- a"- ...þu scealt mid earfoðnyssum þe metes tilian,
- ....
- b"- þu eart of eorðan genumen,
- c"- and þu awenst to eorðan.
- d"- þu eart dust,
- e"- and þu awenst to duste.

Since the participle in the Homilies is equivalent to 9d of the Heptateuch, 9c of the Heptateuch, which has the participle, is considered as having no corresponding clause in the Homilies, even though the two passages correspond when taken as unified wholes. This clause is therefore not included in Chart 3.1. On the other hand, Gen.6:5,

- a- Ða geseah God
- b- ðæt micel yfelnys manna was ofer eorðan,
- c- and eal geðanc manna heortena was awend on  
yfel on callum timan,

is considered as corresponding with CH I.20.21-22,

- þa wearð þa hrædlice micel mennisc geweaxen,
- c"- and wæron swiðe manega on yfel awende,  
and gegremoden God mid mislicum leahtrum.....,

even though the two passages are not nearly as similar as the two for Gen.3:19. The deciding factor here is that

the meanings of the clauses marked (c) and (c'') are analogous, containing the same contextual signification conveyed by identical verbs (awendan) and adverb phrases (on yfel). Likewise, 3:6d is taken as the correspondence of I.20.23, though the two sentences are of totally different structure--the Homilies subordinating the main clause of the Heptateuch and introducing a coordination not in the Heptateuch. The verse in the Heptateuch is:

- a- Gode oföuhete ða
- b- ðæt he mann geworhte ofer eorðan:
- c- he wolde ða warnian on ær,
- d- and was gehreped mid heortan sarnysse wiðinnan.

The version in the Homilies is:

- d''- Ða wearð God to þan swiðe gegremod þurh manna  
mandæda  
þæt he cwæð
- a''- þæt him oföuhete
- b''- þæt he æfre mancynn gesceop.

The evidence for correspondence is not as obvious here as in 3:5, but it seems sufficient: the two sentences are clearly telling the same story and have enough in common to suggest that what remains should be considered thematically similar.

A related problem of assigning correspondences is found in Gen.7:21-22:

- 21a- Wearð ða fornumen eal flæsc

b- ðe ofer eorðan styrode, manna and fugela,  
nytena and creonendra.

22a- And ælc ðingc ðe lif hæfde

b- wearð adyd on ðam deopan flode....

In these two sentences are two past participles, both saying practically the same thing, but having different structures --V ppl S and S V ppl, respectively. But only one participle appears in the Homilies (I.22.6)--"wearð þa ælc þing cuces adrenct"--dissimilar to both in structure. The problem was which one of the participles in the Heptateuch to consider paralleled. It was decided to assign the correspondence to 21a since the clause in the Homilies opens the same way, an important factor in light of the possible interference from the relative clause in 22, and since as a rule in the Bible the second part of a parallel construction illuminates the first and may therefore be thought of as psychologically, though certainly not grammatically, subordinate. Nonetheless, this choice is undermined by the fact that the noun phrase in the Homilies is identical with the one in Verse 22, and cuces might be said to translate þe lif hæfde, as wearð...adrenct might translate wearð adyd on ðam deopan flode. Obviously this choice was made with strong reservations.

It should be noted in passing that the problem of past participles spelled like preterites, discussed previously concerning the Heptateuch, arose in the Homilies too. For example, in the passage just cited adrenct is obviously a

participle, even though spelled like the preterite--the participle being spelled adrenced. This discrepancy has been ignored because a participle is clearly called for and by Ælfric's time many synconated participles had merged with preterites in spelling.

Another methodological decision in assigning correspondences, already alluded to but requiring special mention, is that thematic correspondence always took precedence over grammatical or sequential considerations. Ælfric was not against juggling the order of Biblical passages in the Homilies when his purpose necessitated this. For this reason any two clauses that appear to correspond according to the criteria already discussed were accepted as such despite their occurring out of sequence. Thus reference to Gen.3:6 above will show that the clause order in the Homilies is d-x-a-b, where (x) represents a clause not found in the Hentateuch.

The problems are particularly acute and the decisions less firm when all of these troublesome characteristics appear in one passage, as usually happens when Ælfric is condensing a story for use as a brief example in another context. Such is Gen.7:1-20 as given in CH II.58.32-35:

On ðære oðre ylde þissere worulde wearð eal  
middaneard mid flodes yðum adylegod, for  
synna micelnysse,

buton ðan rihtwisan Noe anum, and his seofon

hiwon þe on ðam arce belocene wæron to  
anes geares fyrste....

As can be seen from Chart 3.1, wearð...adylegod is taken as corresponding to Gen.7:19b, "wurdon ða behelede ealle ða heahstan duna under ealre heofonum," and belocene wæron with 7:10b, "and God hi belocen hæfde wiðutan," even though both the problem of thematic correspondence and that of clause order had to be solved first. (See Chart 3.1, Note 5.)

3.132. Translations in the Homilies. Finally it should be pointed out that certain sections of the Homilies, even when not identical to the Heptateuch, are almost without doubt translations from the Bible or a source quoting the Bible. The story of Gen.22:1-19 as presented in CH II.60.18-II.62.13 follows the order of the Biblical story very closely and also contains many echoes of Biblical phrasing. Yet it has very few exact correspondences to the version in the Heptateuch, as may be seen by comparing the passages with the relevant participles. In the Heptateuch Gen.22:17-18 is:

17a- Ic ðe nu bletsige

b- and ðinne ofspringe gemenigfylde swa swa steorran  
on heofonum and swa swa sandceosel on sæ;

c- þin ofspring sceal agan heora feonda gatu.

18a- And on þinum sæde beoð ealle ðeoda gebletsode,

b- for þan ðe þu gehyrsumodest minre hæse ðus.

In the Homilies this is:

17a"- ...ic gebletsige ðe,

b"- and þinne ofspring ic gemenigfylde swa swa  
steorran on heofenan, and swa swa sand-  
ceosol on sælicum strande.

c"- Þin sæd soðlice geagnað his feoda gatu,

18a"- and on ðinum sæde beoð gebletsode ealle eorð-  
lice mægða;

b"- forðan ðe ðu gehyrsumedest minre stemne.

Obviously the version in the Homilies is a translation, though the differences from the Heptateuch suggest the possibility of a different text. It is thus important to keep in mind when comparing the Heptateuch and Homilies that the latter is not devoid of Latin influence. (For an explanation of the inclusion of translations from the Homilies see above, Section 1.6.)

### 3.2. The Investigation.

3.21. Heptateuch-Homilies correspondences. The twenty-one clauses for which the Heptateuch and Homilies both have past participle + auxiliary verb (pp1 + aux) are listed in Chart 3.1, along with a schematic representation of the clause structure of these two texts and the Vulgate. Direct and indirect objects (O and IO) include only morphologically marked nominals in construction with verbs, and do not include objects in construction with adverbs or prepositions. Clauses are marked either independent (i) or subordinate (s).

Chart 3.1: Past Participles in the Heptateuch and Homilies.

clause	Latin		Heptateuch		Homilies		
	type	i/s	type	i/s	type	i/s	in CH
Gen.1:3	ppl V S	i	S V ppl	i	V S ppl	i	I.14.35
7e	ppl Vim	i	S V ppl	i	V S ppl	i	I.16.2
2:7c	ppl V S	i	S V ppl	i	S V C ppl	i	I.12.30 <sup>1</sup>
23d	ppl V	s	S V ppl	s	S V ppl	s	I.14.24b <sup>1</sup>
3:5b	Vp S	s	S V ppl	s	V S ppl	s	I.18.3a <sup>2</sup>
17f	ppl S	i	V S ppl	i	S V ppl	s	I.18.16a <sup>2</sup>
6:5c	S ppl V	s <sup>3</sup>	S V ppl	s	V S ppl	i <sup>4</sup>	I.20.21b
6d	ppl <sup>5</sup>	- <sup>3</sup>	(S) V ppl	i	V S ppl	i <sup>4</sup>	I.20.23
7:10	---	-	S O ppl V	s	S ppl V	s	II.58.3 <sup>5</sup>
19b	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i	V S ppl	i	II.58.32
21a	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i	V S ppl	i	I.22.6
12:3e	Vp S	i	V ppl S	i	V S ppl	s	II.12.24 <sup>1</sup>
17:1f	V ppl	i	V ppl	i	V ppl	i	I.90.22d <sup>1</sup>
5a	Vp S C	i	S V ppl C	i <sup>6</sup>	V S ppl C	i	I.92.3b <sup>1</sup>
10c	Vp S	i	S V ppl	s <sup>6</sup>	S V ppl	i	I.90.30 <sup>1</sup>
12a	S Vp	i	S V ppl	i	S V ppl	i	I.92.1b
14a	S ppl V	s	S V ppl	s	S V ppl	s	I.94.13
24	V O	s	S V ppl	i	V S ppl	i	I.92.9
22:18a	Vp S	i	V S ppl	i	V ppl S	i	II.62.11
Num.21:8d	S ppl	s	S ppl V	s	S ppl V	s	II.238.19
9e	Vp	i	(S) V ppl	i	S V ppl	i	II.238.21

i = independent clause

s = subordinate clause

Vp = **passive** verb

Vim = impersonal verb

## Notes to Chart 3.1.

<sup>1</sup>Three of the twenty-one clauses in question (2:23d, 17:1f, and 17:10c) are identical in the Heptateuch and Homilies. This proves that either the passage in the Heptateuch was taken from the earlier Homilies, or that at least Elfric was translating from a text when writing these sections of the Homilies. See also above, Sections 1.61 and 3.132.

<sup>2</sup>The same sentence occurs in CH II.406.6b

<sup>3</sup>The problems presented by this clause are discussed above (3.12).

<sup>4</sup>Though considered independent for the sake of this part of the investigation, this participle actually introduces a correlative relationship to the next clause: "Ða wearð God to þan swiðe gegremod þurh manna mandæda þæt he cwæð þæt him ofouhte þæt he æfre manncynn gesceop." Being correlative, these clauses were not considered in the statistics of Chapter 2 on subordination.

<sup>5</sup>The information contained in this clause of the Heptateuch is contained in the last clause of Verse 16 in the Latin, where it is independent and emphatically concludes the section. Elfric omits all of 13-16 except this clause, apparently because the passage repeats the previous sentences. (See above, 2.322.)

<sup>6</sup>This clause has been listed as subordinate, but not without some hesitation. The entire verse is:

a- þis is ðæt wed,

b- ðe ge healdan sceolon betwux me and eow and ðin ofspring,

c- þæt ælc hyscild betwux eow beo emsniden.

Apparently the comma after ofspring represents a pause equivalent to what would now be considered a colon--'this is my covenant: that all children be circumcised'. This translation, which preserves the force of the subjunctive beo, does not construe the þæt as introducing a subordinate clause, but takes the colon plus þæt as equivalent to subordination in order to maintain strict criteria for determining independence. (See above, Section 2.31.)

---

The differences between the Heptateuch and Homilies are striking. To begin, eight different constructions appear in the Heptateuch, but only five of these occur in the Homilies, which has an additional two lacking in the Heptateuch. The eight constructions of the Heptateuch and seven of the Homilies, together with the number of occurrences of each, are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Occurrences of Each Construction.

type	Heptateuch	Homilies
S V ppl	10	6
S V ppl C	1	0
S V C ppl	0	1
S ppl V	1	2
S O ppl V	1	0
(S) V ppl	2	0
V S ppl	2	9
V ppl S	3	1
V ppl	1	1
V S ppl C	0	1

Reference to the table shows that only one construction,

V ppl, occurs the same number of times in both works; and reference to Chart 3.1 will show that this is one instance of the three where the texts are identical. Aside from this one case, the Heptateuch and Homilies exhibit different preferences, with two--for S V ppl and V S ppl--being especially noticeable. The dissimilarity in the two texts is further emphasized when it is pointed out that only six clauses of the Heptateuch have the same construction as the thematically corresponding clauses in the Homilies, and that of these six three are identical in both works, suggesting copying or paraphrasing (see Chart 3.1, Note 1). This leaves only three similar constructions in eighteen clauses.

It would thus seem fairly clear from even this small sample that the Heptateuch and Homilies had little structural influence on each other, which is to say that, though he could have, Ælfric did not simply insert into the Heptateuch sections previously translated for the Homilies; even the six similar clauses are not found in totally similar environments. This fact, of course, supports the premise of this investigation--that the Heptateuch, being a translation, is much closer to the Latin text than the Homilies, a paraphrase. Given Ælfric's commitment to the sanctity of the text in a translation, he could not very well insert passages of a paraphrase into a translation.

The other side of this premise--the extent to which differences between the Heptateuch and Homilies are the re-

sult of Latin influence--is illuminated by a few comparisons. For example, in both the Heptateuch and Vulgate Gen.17:5a is correlative with 5b:

a- Ne ðin nama ne byð geciged heononforð Abram,

b- ac ðu byst gehaten Abraham....

a'- Nec ultra vocabitur nomen tuum Abram,

b'- sed appellaberis Abraham....

The Heptateuch is obviously a close rendering of the Latin; and, though it cannot be said to be word for word, it follows the Latin even in the shift of subjects from the first clause to the second and certainly in the 'not...but...' correlation. The verse in the Homilies, on the other hand, edits out the correlative and makes a neater parallel by changing the subject of the reconstructed sentence:

a"- Ne beo ðu geciged heonon-forð Abram,

b"- ac Abraham....

This change is consistent with Elfric's widely noted practice of condensation, but, while it would be attractive to make a sweeping statement about his handling of unnecessary repetition, there is sufficient counter-evidence to warn against pronouncements. In this same section, for example, Gen.17:15 in the Latin is:

a'- Dixit quoque Deus ad Abraham:

b'- Sarai uxorem tuam non vocabis Sarai,

c'- sed Saram.

The Heptateuch follows the diction, but adds a finite verb

and its object:

- a- God cwæð eac to Abraham:
- b- ðin wif Sarai, ne hat ðu hi heononforð Sarai,
- c- ac hat hi Sarra.

Likewise the verse in the Homilies adds a clause:

- b"- Ne ðin wif ne beo gehaten Sarai,
- c"- ac beo gehaten Sarra.

The alteration of the structure in the Homilies is easy to explain. Since the clause comes right after the one relating to Abraham, Ælfric cast this too in the passive, making them parallel. When it came to the Heptateuch, however, where Ælfric felt constrained to adhere to the Latin (and where ten verses separate the passages concerning Abraham and Sarah), he left the clause in the active in order to conform to the Latin syntax. In both the Heptateuch and Homilies, however, the unanswered question is why he added an extra clause instead of leaving the terse Latin.

Another instance which shows Ælfric's adherence to the original when translating the Heptateuch is Num.21:8-9, which unlike Gen.17:5ff, though, cannot be rendered into English without at least some modification. The problem lies in the two verbless relatives which must be given verbs:

- 8a'- Et locutus est Dominus ad eum:
- b'- Fac serpentem æneum
- c'- et pone eum pro signo:
- d'- qui percussus

e'- aspexerit

f'- vivit.

9a'- Fecit ergo Moyses serpentem æneum,

b'- et posuit eum pro signo:

c'- quem cum percussi

d'- aspicerent,

e'- sanabantur.

In 8d there is a relative construction in which qui stands as the subject of the next verb, while the past participle percussus functions as a modifying phrase in apposition to qui. The whole construction qui percussus aspexerit eum is then the subject of vivit: 'whoever, having been bitten, looked at it, lived'. Even with the addition of auxiliaries the sentence is awkward English; without them it is impossible. Ælfric was forced to ignore the whole Latin syntactic exercise and render the sentence with one relative clause (with a verb) as subject, as opposed to two embedded relatives in the Latin, and one coordination:

b- Wyrð ane ærene næddran

c- and sete upp to tacne,

d- and se ðe tosliten beo

e- beseo upp to ðære næddran

f- and he leofað

g- sona swa he besyhð hi.

Verse 9 is even more difficult to translate into English. Quem refers to serpentem, but then ceases to function in

its own clause, as the subject is percussi, and the clause, far from being a relative, becomes a temporal. The closest English translation would have to be something like: '...at which, when the bitten looked, they were healed'. Ælfric's sentence is a worthy accomplishment:

- c- and þa ðe tosliten wæron
- d- beheoldon to ðære næddran
- e- and wurdon gehælede.

The treatment of this passage in the Homilies shows the difference between Ælfric's conception of translation and paraphrase. As accurately as the Homilies presents all the information of the Latin, it is clearly not a translation because of the change to indirect quotation and all the consequences that this entails:

- 8a"- ...and God þærrihte bebead Moyse
- b"- þæt he geworhte ane ærene næddran,
- c"- and sette up to tacne,  
and þæt he manode þæt folc,
- d"- þæt swa hwa swa fram ðam næddran abiten wære,
- e"- besawe up to ðære ærenan næddran,
- f"- and hi wurde gehæled.
- 9a"- Hit wearð swa gedon.
- c"- Da næddran hi totæron,
- d"- and hi besawon to ðære ærenan næddran
- e"- and hi wurdon gehælede fram ðam deadbærum attre ðære  
fyrenra næddryna.

In this comparison too, then, Ælfric's adherence to the Latin for the syntax of the Heptateuch accounts for the difference between this work and the Homilies.

3.22. Other participles. Chart 3.1 shows that there are basic structural differences in participle placement in the two works, the most striking being the presence of certain constructions in each not appearing in the other, and the suggestion that the cause of the difference is the Latin original. Since the sample yielded only twenty-one thematic correspondences containing participles in both works, it is advisable to present all occurrences of participles in both texts before discussing the full significance of the contrasts. Chart 3.2 lists all participles in the Heptateuch sample not corresponding to participles in the Homilies; also included are the relevant Latin constructions and a notation indicating whether the Homilies has a thematically corresponding clause lacking a participle or no clause at all that can be considered thematically corresponding to the one in the Heptateuch. Chart 3.3 lists all participles appearing in the Homilies not already discussed under Chart 3.1.

Chart 3.2: Remaining Participles of the Heptateuch.

clause	Latin		Heptateuch		Homilies	
	type	i/s	type	i/s	no ppl	no clause
Gen.1:15c	ppl Vim	i	S V ppl	i		x
22c	Vp	i	V ppl	i	I.16.3-7	
22e	S Vp	i	S V ppl	i		x
23	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i		x
24c	ppl Vim	i	S V ppl	i	I.16.4b	
31d	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i		x
2:1a	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i	I.14.27-30	
23c	S Vp C	i	V S ppl C	i	I.14.24a	
3:19c	ppl V	s	S ppl V	s		x <sup>1</sup>
23d	ppl V	s	S ppl V	s		x
6:11	ppl V S <sub>2</sub>	i	V S ppl	i		x
12b	S V ppl <sup>2</sup>	s	S V ppl	s		x
17e	S Vp	i	S V ppl	i	I.20.27	
7:3	V S	s	S V ppl	i		x
11b	S ppl V	i	S V ppl	i	I.22.3	
17a	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i	I.22.5a	
17b	ppl V S	i	S V ppl	i		x
18	S Vp	i	S V ppl	i	I.22.5b	
22b	S ppl V	i	S V ppl	i		x <sup>3</sup>
8:13d	ppl V S	s	S V ppl	s		x
9:16d	ppl V	s	S ppl V	s		x
29a	ppl V S C	i	V ppl S C	i		x
15:13a	ppl V IO	i	IO V ppl	i	II.190.16b	
16b	ppl V S	i	V ppl S	i		x <sup>4</sup>
17:5b	Vp C	i	S V ppl C	i		x <sup>4</sup>
12b	S Vp	i	S V ppl	i		x
14a	S ppl V	s	S V ppl	s	I.92.2a	
14b	S Vp	i	S V ppl	i	I.92.2b	
17d	IO Vp S	s	S V ppl IO	s		x
27	S ppl V	i	S V ppl	i		x
22:14c	Vp	i	Vim ppl	i		x
Num.21:4	Vim Inf C	i	S V ppl	i	II.238.10 <sup>5</sup>	
9c	ppl <sub>6</sub>	s	S ppl V	s	II.238.20b	
Judg.16:3e	---	-	S ppl V	s		x

i = independent clause

Vp = passive verb

s = subordinate clause

Vim = impersonal verb

## Notes to Chart 3.2.

<sup>1</sup>As pointed out previously (3.131), Gen.3:19c is a relative clause modifying the final word in 19b,

b- ...đu gewende to eorđan

c- of đare đe đu genunen were,

and for this reason is considered as having no correspondence in the Homilies, even though I.18.17a-b is very similar otherwise:

17a- þu eart of eorðan genumen,  
 b- and þu awenst to eorðan.

The decision is not an entirely satisfying one.

<sup>2</sup>The Latin here, though given as S V pml, the unique instance in the sample, is really a subject accusative: "...vidisset Deus terram esse corruptam...."

<sup>3</sup>Reference to Chart 3.1 will show that CH I.22.6, "wearð þa ælc þing cuces adreht," is taken as the correspondence of Gen. 7:21a, "wearð ða fornumen eal flæsc," leaving nothing to correspond with 7:22b, "and ælc ðinge ðe lif hæfde wearð adyð on ðam deopan flode."

<sup>4</sup>Though marked independent, 17:5b is actually correlative to 5a:

a- Me ðin nama ne byð geciged heononforð Abram,  
 b- ac ðu byst gehaten Abraham.

Though 5b has no correspondence in the Homilies, 5a does (see Chart 3.1), for Ælfric has neatly abridged this passage in CH I.92.3b:

a"- Me beo ðu geciged heonon-forð Abram,  
 b"- ac Abram....

See also above, Section 3.212.

<sup>5</sup>It is quite possible that the Vulgate is not Ælfric's source for this passage, but it would be very difficult to know in any case since the Vulgate has a construction completely impossible in Old English and Ælfric might not have even attempted a close rendering. The Vulgate has an impersonal verb dominating an impersonal infinitive that requires an accusative of person and genitive of thing: "Et tædere coepit populum itineris ac laboris." The Heptateuch has a fundamentally different sentence: "Þæt folc wearð ða aðryt and ðearle geswenct mid ðam siðfæst." Whereas the Latin coordinates two sources of trouble, "itineris ac laboris," the Heptateuch coordinates two reactions to the journey (itineris), "aðryt and...geswenct." The rest of this section reads like a close translation of the Vulgate, and the possibility remains that the Vulgate is the source of this sentence also. The closest passage in the Homilies (II.238.9b-10) is unlike both the Vulgate and Heptateuch:

9b- Þæt Israhela folc, ðaða hit ferde fram Egypta-lande,  
 10- wearð on ðam westene wiðerræde on ðean God.

Following Bosworth-Toller, wiðerræde is taken to be an adjective.

<sup>6</sup>Whether Ælfric is here translating the Vulgate is not clear. If he is, he is being uncommonly loose. The clause in question is a clause only in the Heptateuch, corresponding to part of a prepositional phrase in the Latin, which is therefore listed in the chart as lacking. The Vulgate is:

...apprehendit ambas portas fores  
 cum postibus suis et sera.

But the Heptateuch has:

...and genam ða burhgratu  
 ...swa swa hi belocene wæron.

Chart 3.3: Remaining Participles of the Homilies.

clause in Hept. =	clause in Hom.	type	i/s
Gen.2:16	I.12.34c	S V IO ppl	i
19	I.14.15	S O ppl V	i
"	I.14.17	S V ppl	i
20	II.58.21	S V ppl	s
"	II.260.17	V S ppl	i
21	II.8.23	S V ppl	i
3:6	I.176.17a <sup>1</sup>	S V ppl	i
"	I.176.18	S V ppl	i
"	I.176.21c	S ppl V	s
"	I.176.23b	S V ppl	i
"	II.220.1 <sup>2</sup>	V S ppl	s
19d	I.18.17a <sup>2</sup>	S V ppl	i
21b	I.18.19b	S V ppl	i
23	I.118.24	S V ppl	i
6:5	I.20.21a	V S ppl	i <sup>3</sup>
8	I.20.26b	S V C ppl	s <sup>3</sup>
9:14b	I.22.12a	V ppl S	i <sup>4</sup>
17:5b	I.92.5a	S V ppl C	i <sup>4</sup>
5c	I.92.5b	(S) V ppl C	i <sup>5</sup>
24:4	II.234.29	S ppl V	s <sup>5</sup>
Num.17:5	II.8.14a	O S ppl V	s
21:8f	II.238.19	S V ppl	s
9	II.238.20a	S V ppl	i
Judg.16:1	I.226.25b	S V C ppl	s
Not	I.16.9	V S ppl	i
Biblical	I.16.11	V S ppl	i
"	I.18.56	V S ppl	i
"	I.18.8	V S ppl	i
"	I.20.10a	IO ppl Vim	s
"	I.20.18	S ppl V	s <sup>6</sup>
"	I.22.7b	V ppl S	s <sup>6</sup>
"	II.190.28a	S ppl V	s

i = independent clause      s = subordinate clause  
Vim = impersonal verb

#### Notes to Chart 3.3.

<sup>1</sup>This passage reads: "And hi...woldon mid idelum gylbe beon beteran þonne hi gesceapene wæron." The same theme is given in active construction in CH I.118.27: "...he wolde beon betera þonne hine se Ælmihtiga Scyppend gesceop." The two passages differ in number because one ascribes the sin to Adam alone, while the other includes Eve.

<sup>2</sup>As pointed out in 3.131, this clause, "þu eart of eorðan genumen," and its immediate context are considered thematically equivalent to Gen.3:19d-e,

d- for ðan ðe ðu eart dust

e- and to dust gewyrst,

which are active. Because of this correspondence, the participle in 19c,

b- oð ðæt ðu gewende to eorðan

c- of ðære ðe ðu genumen wære,

is considered without correspondence in the Homilies. See also Chart 3.2, note to Gen.3:19c.

<sup>3</sup>The question of how to classify "relative" se is not a simple one. CH I.20.26a-b reads:

Da wæs hwæþere an man rihtwis ætforan Gode,

se wæs Noe gehaten.

Thorpe clearly took se as a relative pronoun, as the comma attests, and the clause may therefore be translated '...one righteous man, who was named Noah'. But there is nothing to stop another editor from changing the comma to a period, rendering the clause 'He was named Noah'. Following Andrew's (p.41) conclusion that "no part of the demonstrative pronoun se seo þæt other than the neuter nominative can stand at the head of a sentence except as antecedent, and any supposed instance to the contrary is really a relative pronoun," se is here taken as a relative, and the clause is therefore subordinate.

<sup>4</sup>CH I.92.5a-b are listed as independent, though they are actually correlative:

a- Ne ðin wif ne beo gehaten Sarai,

b- ac beo gehaten Sarra.

The latter clause is schematically represented as (S) V ppl C; but there is some reason to consider it V ppl C, that is, subject-less rather than a coordinate predicate of the preceding subject. As it stands, this clause is the only one in the present sample containing a **subjunctive** verb but lacking its own subject. However, if Ælfric thought of this as an imperative of sorts, the lack of subject would be explained. Since, however, there is not sufficient evidence to posit a third person imperative for Old English, the clause is listed as a unique subject-less subjunctive.

<sup>5</sup>Two aspects of this passage should be remarked upon. It is:

27- ...he wæfre geðafode

28- þæt his sunu Isaac on hæðenne mægðe wifian sceolde,

29- ac of ðam gelcaffullum folce þe Abraham on afedd wæs.

First, the form afedd is here assumed to be a syncopated form; the normal past participle is afeded. Second, though the clause is listed as S ppl V, some explanation is required. The antecedent of þe is folce, and the clause is adjectival: '...the active one, whom Abraham was raised'. This being so, on ðam

seems called for. Possibly Ælfric avoided that construction because he did not want two adjacent ðam phrases ("...of ðam folce on ðam..."), though this reason is highly conjectural. Of greater importance here is the question of how to classify þe, and subsequently the clause. Since as it now stands þe is the object of on--equivalent to Modern English 'the nation (which) he was raised in'--and since it was decided to count only morphologically marked components, it was therefore decided to classify the clause as a simple S ppl V, ignoring the admittedly important syntactic connection to the previous phrase. (See above, 3.21.)

<sup>6</sup>As discussed in Note 3, relative se is problematic. The present passage is:

6- Wearð þa ælc þing cuces adreht,

7a- buton þam ðe binnon þam arce wearon;

b- of þam wearð eft ge-edstaðelod eall middangeard.

There is no overwhelming syntactic reason for not translating 7b as an independent clause: 'of these....' However, accenting Andrew's contention (see Note 3) requires taking þam as a relative, and the clause as subordinate. It should be noted that this approach results in the one subordinate V ppl S in the sample, as against ten independents.

3.221. Condensation in the Homilies. It is particularly apparent from Chart 3.2 that the Homilies greatly condenses its version of many Biblical stories, thereby precluding the finding of corresponding participles and in many cases even thematically corresponding clauses. When compared to the treatment of the same material in the Heptateuch, these sections give a clear picture of the distinction Ælfric maintained between paraphrases and translations.

Ælfric's practice of condensation is readily seen in his handling of Gen.1:22-24 and accounts for the fact there are relatively few correspondences between the versions in the Heptateuch and Homilies. Note, for example, the phrase for phrase correspondence between the Heptateuch and Vulgate:

21- ...God geseah...

22a- and bletsode hi,

    þus cweðende:

b- Weaxað

c- and beoð gemænifylde,

d- and gefyllað ðære sæ wæteru,

e- and ða fugelas beon gemænifylde ofer eorðan.

21'- ...vidit Deus...

22a'- benedixitque eis

    dicens:

b'- Crescite

c'- et multiplicamini

d'- et replete aquas maris,

e'- avesque multiplicentur super terram.

23- And ða wæs geworden æfen and merigen se fifta dæg.

23'- Et factum est vespere et mane dies quintus.

24a- God cwæð eac swilce:

b- Iæde seo eorðe forð cuce nytens on heora cynne

    and creopende cyn

    and deor æfter heora hivum.

c- Hit wæs ða swa gedon.

24a'- Dixit quoque Deus:

b'- Producat terra animam viventem in genere suo,  
 iumenta  
 et reptilia  
 et bestias terræ secundum species suas.

c'- Factumque est ita.

It will be noticed that except for the omission of iumenta 'beast of burden' in 24b, Alfric has translated every phrase of the Latin, following the Latin order at all times, and often following the Latin morphology and vocabulary (e.g., dicens:cweðende; aquas maris:sæ wæteru; animam viventem in genere suo:cuce nytenu on heora cynne); On the other hand, now note the treatment of the same theme in the Homilies (I.16.3b-7):

3b- He cwæð eft,

c- and het ða eorðan

4a- þæt heo sceolde forðlædan cuce nytenu;

b- and he ða gesceop of ðære eorðan eall nytencynn  
 and deorcynn,

6a- ealle ða ðe on feower fotum gað;

b- ealswa eft of wætere he gesceop fixas and fugelas,

7- and sealde ðam fixum sund, and ðam fugelum fliht.

While there are clear similarities between this version and the one in the Heptateuch, the Homilies shows great condensation, despite the fact that it also adds material from other sources (e.g., clauses 6a and 7).

Again in Gen.17:12 Alfric abridges the version in the Homilies. The Heptateuch, following the Latin phrase for phrase, has three clauses:

- 12a- Ælc hysecild betwux eow beo ymsniden on þam  
 eahteoðan dæge hys acennednyse,  
 b- and ælc werhodes man on eowrum mægþum  
 and inbyrdling  
 and geboht þeowa beo ymsniden,  
 c- þeah he ne beo eowres cynnes.

- 12a'- Infans octo dierum circumcidetur in vobis,  
 b'- omne masculinum in generationibus vestris:  
 tam vernaculus,  
 quam emptitius circumcidetur,  
 c'- et quicumque non fuerit de stirpe vestra.

In contrast, CH I.92.31-I.93.1b edits out all the repetition and recasts the sentence:

- 1a- Ælc hyse-cild, þonne hit eahta nihta eald bið,  
 b- sy ymsniden,  
 ægðer ge æpelboren  
 ge þeowetling.

Alfric gives virtually the same treatment to Gen.17:27, which therefore also appears in Chart 3.2 without correspondence in the Homilies. In the Heptateuch he omits Verses 25-26, but stays close to the Latin for 24 and 27:

24a- And he self wearð ymbsnað

b- þa ða he wæs nygan and hundnygantig geara.

27a- And ealle werhades men hys hiredes,

ægðer ge inbyrdlingas ge gebohte ðeowan

and ælðeodige men,

þe him mid wæron;

b- ealle wurden þæs dæges ymsnidene.

In CH I.92.9 this reads:

On þam ylcan dæge wæs Abraham ymsniden,

and eal his hyred....

Finally, Elfric's editing is seen again in 17:14 where, after explaining the covenant of circumcision (17:10-13),

God continues, in the Heptateuch:

14a- Se werhades man þe ne byð emsniden on þam flæsce  
hys fylmenes,

b- hys sawul byð adylegod of hys folce,

c- for þan þe he aidlode min wed.

As in the previous cases, this phrasing is very close to the Latin. The Homilies, however, has:

a"- ...and seðe þis forgæið

b"- his sawul losað,

c"- forðan þe he min wed aydlode.

In this version both (a) and (b) are shortened into (a") and (b").

In all of these instances, it should be noticed, while the Heptateuch is manifestly influenced by the Latin, it con-

tains nothing that is not perfectly acceptable Old English --and this says a great deal about Alfric's skill and technique as a translator. (A more complete discussion of this type of phrase for phrase influence from the Latin will be found in Chapter 4.)

Condensation, of course, is not the only characteristic of the Homilies, and it is therefore necessary to balance the picture by calling attention to an instance where Alfric expands the version in the Homilies for stylistic reasons. In CH I.92.5a-b, Gen.17:15b-c appears as:

- b"- Ne ðin wif ne beo gehaten Sarai,  
c"- ac beo gehaten Sarra.

The corresponding passage in the Heptateuch is:

- b- ðin wif Sarai, ne hat ðu hi heononforð Sarai,  
c- ac hat hi Sarra.

It will be immediately seen that the Homilies and Heptateuch have different subjects for both clauses, and the Heptateuch has in addition what may be called a "dangling introducer" (see below, 4.3) which is not syntactically part of the sentence and serves only to introduce the tonic: 'as for your wife Sarai,....' The explanation of the presence of both differences is found in the Latin:

- b'- Sarai uxorem tuam non vocabis Sarai,  
c'- sed Saran.

Obviously, the ne hat ðu of the Heptateuch mirrors the non vocabis of the Latin; ðin wif Sarai likewise answers to

Sarai uxorem tuam, though this latter phrase is actually the object of the following verb. As for the difference between the Heptateuch and Homilies regarding the subjects and choice of verb, it was previously pointed out (3.21) that Alfric is probably introducing a passive construction into the Homilies to make this sentence parallel to the one before it, though this precludes the ability to condense. And as for the dangling introducer in the Heptateuch, it can be shown to be the closest Old English construction to the Latin initial object. To copy the Latin exactly would have required Alfric to write O V S C, which if not impossible in Old English (see Quirk, pp.92-94) is at least unlikely. Add to this Alfric's apparent dislike of initial objects, and it is clear why he inserts the new object hi: the Old English is now almost a mirror copy of the Latin, but does not begin with an object. (It might be mentioned in passing that the three charts in this section of the investigation list only three initial objects--two indirect and one direct. All three are pronominal objects or relatives. In Old English these two classes had a tendency to be preposed--and still there are only three such in this chapter.)

3.22. Contrasts in participle placement. We have just seen some of the practical implications of Alfric's distinction between paraphrase and translation: the Homilies and

Heptateuch both handle the same material, but are still very different stylistically--the latter mirroring the Latin in many respects. In view of this it is not surprising that Charts 3.2 and 3.3 support the initial suggestion, raised in regard to Chart 3.1, that the Heptateuch has constructions that the Homilies does not, and vice versa. In addition to the eight structures listed in Table 3.1, the Heptateuch has five others appearing once each in Chart 3.2:

S V ppl IO

V S ppl C

V ppl S C

IO V ppl

Vim ppl

Likewise, Chart 3.3 contains six structures, once each, not appearing for the Homilies in Chart 3.1:

S V ppl C

S V IO ppl

S O ppl V

(S) V ppl C

O S ppl V

IO ppl Vim

It will be immediately seen that the distribution of the constructions is now different from that in Table 3.1, and this is presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Distribution of Constructions.

type	Heptateuch			Homilies		
	ind.	sub.	total	ind.	sub.	total
S V ppl	18	8	26	12	5	17
S V ppl C	2	0	2	1	0	1
S V ppl IO	0	1	1	0	0	0
S V C ppl	0	0	0	2	1	3
S V IO ppl	0	0	0	1	0	1
S ppl V	0	6	6	0	6	6
S O ppl V	0	1	1	1	0	1
(S) V ppl	2	0	2	0	0	0
(S) V ppl C	0	0	0	1	0	1
V ppl	2	0	2	1	0	1
Vim ppl	1	0	1	0	0	0
V S ppl	3	0	3	13	3	16
V S ppl C	1	0	1	1	0	1
V ppl S	8	0	8	2	1	3
V ppl S C	1	0	1	0	0	0
O S ppl V	0	0	0	0	1	1
IO V ppl	1	0	1	0	0	0
IO ppl Vim	0	0	0	0	1	1
total	39	16	55	35	18	53

As Table 3.2 shows, the Heptateuch and Homilies each **have** five constructions not appearing in the other. Because of the small numbers involved, however, it seems highly inadvisable to give too much weight to this--especially when it is noticed that S V ppl C, for example, occurs under the Homilies for Table 3.2 but not for Table 3.1 for which the sample was smaller. Since there are several other instances of this type on the two charts, the dangers inherent in the small samples under discussion are continually apparent. Notwithstanding this, however, some of the differences are interesting, and perhaps significant. For example, the two works are quite at odds in relation to

verb-initial constructions. Sixteen cases of V S ppl appear in the Homilies, but only three in the Heptateuch. On the other hand, only three cases of V ppl S occur in the Homilies as opposed to eight in the Heptateuch.

3.23. Latin influence on participle placement. The contrast takes on special interest when considered in terms of the essential question of whether Alfric's technique of translation was in any way mechanical. This question is important because even if Alfric does not grossly distort English syntax, it is still possible that he came to terms with the Latin text by creating correspondences between Latin and English structures--automatically using the same English construction whenever a certain Latin one appeared. If this were done in order to reconstruct in the translation the impact of the original, it would be very much in keeping with the theories of translation presented by Nida, for example (above, 1.21), that a translator must find the proper structure in the receptor language to retain not only the referential meaning but also the emotive power of the original. And if Alfric did this, it is certainly worth knowing about. Chart 3.4 therefore presents the Heptateuch:Vulgate correspondences (3.41) and Vulgate:Heptateuch correspondences (3.42) in order to establish the probability that a certain construction in the Old English answers to a certain one in the Latin, and the predictability that a certain Latin structure will yield a certain English one.

Chart 3.4: Correspondences in Participle Placement.

3.41. Heptateuch:Vulgate Correspondences.

Heptateuch			Vulgate		
type	total	i s	type	i	s
S V ppl	26	18 8	S Vp	6	
			S ppl V	3	3
			ppl V S	3	1
			ppl Vim	3	
			Vp S		2*
			S V ppl		1**
			ppl V		1
			V S	1***	
			V O	1***	
			Vim Inf O	1	
S V ppl C	2	2	Vp S C	1	
			Vp C	1	
S V ppl IO	1	1	IO Vp S		1
S ppl V	6	6	ppl V		3
			S ppl		1
			ppl		1
			-- (1 time)		
S O ppl V	1	1	-- (1 time)		
(S) V ppl	2	2	ppl	1	
			Vp	1	
V ppl	2	2	Vp	1	
			V ppl	1	
Vim ppl	1	1	Vp	1	
V S ppl	3	3	ppl V S	1	
			Vp S	1	
			ppl S	1	
V S ppl C	1	1	S Vp C	1	
V ppl S	8	8	ppl V S	7	
			Vp S	1	
V ppl S C	1	1	ppl V S C	1	
IO V ppl	1	1	ppl V IO	1	
total	55	39 16		39	14

\*One is subordinate in Hept., but independent in Vulg. See Chrt.3.1.

\*\*Actually subject accusative in the Latin. See Chart 3.2, n.2.

\*\*\*Independent in the Heptateuch; subordinate in the Vulgate.

## Chart 3.4: Correspondences in Participle Placement.

## 3.42. Vulgate:Heptateuch Correspondences.

Vulgate				Heptateuch			
type	total	i	s	type	i	s	
ppl V S	12	11	1	V ppl S	7		
				S V ppl	3	1	
				V S ppl	1		
S Vp	6	6		S V ppl	6		
S ppl V	6	3	3	S V ppl	3	3	
Vp S	4	3	1	S V ppl			2*
				V ppl S	1		
				V S ppl	1		
Vp	3	3		V ppl	1		
				Vim ppl	1		
				(S) V ppl	1		
ppl V	4		4	S ppl V			3
				S V ppl			1
ppl	2	1**	1	(S) V ppl	1		
				S ppl V			1
ppl Vim	3	3		S V ppl	3		
ppl V S C	1	1		V ppl S C			1
S V ppl	1***		1	S V ppl			1
V ppl	1	1		V ppl	1		
ppl S	1	1		V S ppl			1
S ppl	1		1	S ppl V			1
S Vp C	1	1		V S ppl C			1
Vp C	1	1		S V ppl C			1
Vp S C	1	1		S V ppl C			1
IO Vp S	1		1	S V ppl IO			1
ppl V IO	1	1		IO V ppl			1
V S	1		1	S V ppl			1****
V O	1		1	S V ppl			1****
Vim Inf O	1	1		S V ppl			1
total	53	38	15				

\*One is subordinate in the Heptateuch, independent in the Vulgate.  
 \*\*See above, 3.12, for the problems in classifying this participle.  
 \*\*\*Actually subject accusative. See Chart 3.2, Note 2.  
 \*\*\*\*Subordinate in the Vulgate; independent in the Heptateuch.

Among the first things to realize in considering Chart 3.4 is that the Latin shows twenty-one different constructions for its fifty-three clauses, while the Heptateuch shows only thirteen for its fifty-five; the most common Latin structure, ppl V S, occurs only twelve times, while S V ppl in the Heptateuch occurs twenty-six times. Further it should be noticed that at least thirty-seven of the Latin clauses are constructions which could not occur in Old English: fifteen of the seventeen passives<sup>1</sup> and twenty-two clauses beginning with the participle. Since the passive verbs of Latin had to become periphrastics and the initial participles had to be moved, Ælfric could not readily fall into an uncritical imitation of the Latin as many glossers did if he was going to keep his promise not to violate English syntax. Given this situation, a one to one correspondence between Latin and Old English constructions cannot be expected. Nonetheless, certain subsystems appear.

No Latin structure is rendered into more than three English ones, and two of the three Latin items having this maximum number of English correspondences, ppl V S and Vp S, have the same renderings: S V ppl, V ppl S, V S ppl. What would seem to be an equation that Ælfric made between Vp and ppl V is further suggested by the rendering of both S Vp and S ppl V as Old English S V ppl, accounting for twelve instances of this construction. This suggestion of how Ælfric deals with an unacceptable construction gains

force when it is remembered that Ælfric was very aware of the Latin word-order and specifically mentions in the Preface to Genesis that he will adhere to it so long as it does not go against the requirements of English syntax. Thus it seems likely that he had some method in mind--even if not always successfully applied--for reconstructing the Latin as closely as possible.

Despite the tenuousness of the suggestion as to how Ælfric combined twenty-one Latin structures into thirteen English ones, there can be no question about how he treated syntactically unacceptable material. Of the seventeen passive verbs in the Latin (now including the two cases that could have been translated by hatan; see Note 1) Ælfric turned fourteen into the obvious English equivalent--V ppl. For the remaining three, he interposed the S between the V and ppl in two and used an impersonal verb in one. Further, of the twenty-one clauses with clause-initial participles, all but three were rearranged to have the participle follow the verb in the English, seventeen of these having it follow immediately, and one having S interposed. In addition, all six instances of S ppl V--viz., of ppl beginning the predicate but not the clause--were rendered as S V ppl, by transposing V and ppl. Thus in an overwhelming percentage of cases, Ælfric rejected the possibility of having V follow ppl, or of something interposing between them.

To return now to the contrast of eight cases of V ppl S in the Heptateuch to only three in the Homilies, it seems significant, in terms of Ælfric's fairly consistent handling of Latin ppl V, that seven of the eight V ppl S in the Heptateuch answer to Latin ppl V and the remaining one to Vp S. Thus the eight occurrences of this construction in the Heptateuch can be explained as an almost mechanical--if so strong a word may be used with respect to a writer of Ælfric's sophistication--transposition of ppl V into V ppl, and periphrase of Vp as V ppl. In contrast, the Homilies did not demand the same close rendering, since the audience knew that it was not dealing with divine scripture, and Ælfric was therefore free to give less literal syntax; hence, only three cases of V ppl S, a construction that he apparently did not like. It is certainly worth noting also that one of the three cases in the Homilies is CH II.62.11, previously pointed out (Section 3.132) as being a translation, though different from the same passage in the Heptateuch; and while in the Heptateuch this verse is one of the few for which Latin Vp S is not rendered V ppl S (being instead V S ppl), this Latin source is a probable explanation for the V ppl S in the Homilies. And finally, additional support for the present interpretation of the contrast between the two works in respect to V ppl S comes from the fact that, as Chart 3.1 shows, the three cases of this structure occurring in the Heptateuch in

verses with corresponding participles in the Homilies appear in the latter as V S ppl

This last contrast is very significant because it is all that is needed to account for the occurrence of sixteen V S ppl in the Homilies as against only three in the Heptateuch. Clearly, Ælfric's personal preference was for V S ppl; but this structure separates V from ppl, and, as reference to Chart 3.42 will indicate, all the Latin predicates that have both V and ppl, whether as V ppl or ppl V, have the two units adjacent. Add to this the obvious unity of Vp, and the result is a text with a marked bond or "tightness" in its verbs. In all likelihood here is a situation in which Ælfric was attempting to reconstruct the Latin syntax that he could not imitate: putting S between V and ppl, as was his personal preference, would have detracted from the effect that Ælfric thought the Latin conveyed and which he was trying to reproduce. In summary, then, the two major contrasts--eight V ppl S in the Heptateuch to three in the Homilies and sixteen V S ppl in the Homilies to three in the Heptateuch--when taken together show Ælfric working out a conflict between his personal style on the one hand and on the other his ~~stated~~ desire to be true to his text. And, of course, since the necessity of conforming to the text applied only to the translation, the Heptateuch, only this work shows the influence of the unity of Latin verbs, in this instance by having the ppl immediately follow clause-initial verbs.

The suggestion that Ælfric liked to separate the V from the ppl helps explain some further contrasts. Only four of the fifty-five clauses with participles in the Heptateuch have non-adjacent V and ppl. On the other hand, of the fifty-three such clauses in the Homilies, twenty-one have non-adjacent V and ppl. Moreover, two of the constructions occurring in the Homilies but not in the Heptateuch are of this type--S V C ppl (three times) and S V IO ppl (once).

Likewise, the suggestion that Ælfric had mechanical or automatic correspondences between Latin and Old English syntactic constructions proves helpful in other considerations also. It has already been pointed out that seven of the eight V ppl S in the Heptateuch answer to Latin ppl V S, and, even though it is difficult to say why the other five occurrences of this Latin construction were rendered differently, the fact remains that Ælfric had a strong tendency to turn Latin ppl V S into English V ppl S--i.e., merely shift V to the front. And because of this tendency he may have mechanically rendered a Latin ppl V S C into V ppl S C--producing the unique instance in the sample texts of two units following the ppl.

Gen.15:13a seems at first glance to contradict the suggestions that Ælfric changed as little as possible in the Heptateuch and that he had mechanical correspondences. Dictumque est ad eum is translated as Him wæs ða gesæd

swutelice ðurh God, viz., ppl V IO becomes IO V ppl. According to our previous suggestions V ppl IO is expected, since this is both the mechanical fronting of the V and the least change from the Latin. That Ælfric did not use this possibility is of considerable interest. Reference to the verse in question will show that IO is a pronoun; and pronouns regularly stand before the verb. Granting this, the simplest change would have been to move IO to the front, thereby avoiding an initial ppl and getting the pronoun into the right position. But, as Chart 3.4 shows, this clause is independent, and all seven clauses with final V are subordinate. This leaves the present order, IO V ppl, as the only one which Ælfric found acceptable, and proves again that though he is trying to reconstruct the Latin and though he often goes against his personal style in such efforts Ælfric does not use constructions felt to be contrary to good English usage.<sup>2</sup>

V-final clauses being subordinate is without exception in the sample. In the Heptateuch there are six S ppl V and one S O ppl V, all subordinate. Six more occurrences in the Homilies of S ppl V and two apiece in each of the Prefaces (see Chart 3.5) are subordinate. In addition, the Homilies has one case each of O S ppl V and IO ppl Vim, subordinate.

Of the seven V-final participial clauses in the Heptateuch, five are relative clauses and two temporal adver-

bials. There are also two V-non-final adverbial clauses, and it may therefore be significant that the two V-final ones, as opposed to these two, are perfects. Unfortunately, however, it is not possible to make any meaningful statement about perfects on the basis of the sample under consideration here, for of the 137 clauses with participles (55 in the Heptateuch, 53 in the Homilies, 16 in PG, and 13 in PCH) only five are perfects--an interesting aside, perhaps, about Ælfric's style.

The five V-final relatives answer to Latin ppl V (three times), S ppl (once), and ppl (once). In addition to these five, all S ppl V, the Heptateuch has a sixth relative, S V ppl, answering to Latin S ppl V. There is no apparent system to these correspondences, and this is unfortunate, since the practice of the Heptateuch in regard to relatives is quite different from that of the Homilies, where only three of seven relatives are V-final. And in this respect the Homilies is supported by the Prefaces which have seven relatives between them--none V-final. Obviously the Heptateuch departs from Ælfric's normal style, but the reason is not clear.<sup>3</sup>

A minor contrast that bears mentioning because it is so clearly due to Latin influence is the occurrence of two (S) V ppl in the Heptateuch. Though there are no instances of this structure in the Homilies, there is one case of (S) V ppl C, and this structure is what accounts for the con-

trast being considered only minor. Nevertheless, it is interesting. It will be remembered that (S) signifies a subject carried over from another clause. For the 137 clauses being discussed in this chapter, Ælfric regularly repeats the subject or substitutes a pronoun, generally avoiding the subject-less clause so common in Latin (see Chart 3.4), and (S) thus appears only three times. Indeed, as Chart 3.4 indicates, Ælfric introduced a subject in the Heptateuch for the vast majority of Latin subject-less clauses. However, in two instances he did not--and both can be directly attributed to his attempt to maintain important features of the Latin text. Gen.6:5 reads:

- a- Gode ofðuhte ða
- b- ðæt he mann geworhte ofer eorðan:
- c- he wolde ða warnian on ær,
- d- and wæs gehreþod mid heortan sarnysse wiðinnan.
- a'- Poenituit eum
- b'- quod hominem fecisset in terra
- d'- et tactus dolore cordis intrinsecus (...inquit....)
- d"- Ða wearð God to þan swiðe gegremod....

Num.21:9 is:

- a- Moyses ða worhte ða ærenan næddran,
- b- and sette to tacne;
- c- and þa ðe tosliten wæron
- d- beheoldon to ðære naddran
- e- and wurdon gehælede.

- a'- Fecit ergo Moyses serpentem æneum,  
 b'- et posuit eum pro signo:  
 c'- quem cum percussi  
 d'- aspicerent,  
 e'- sanabantur.  
 e''- ...and hi wurdon gehælede fram ðam attre ðære  
 fyrenra næddryna.

Gen.6:5d" in the Homilies begins a sentence and is therefore not capable of lacking a subject; though one could argue that here Ælfric is reordering the clauses to create a more pleasing English arrangement, this could not be proved. The example from Numbers, however, clearly shows Ælfric avoiding the subject-less construction in the Homilies. And in both cases the structure of the Heptateuch is obviously following the Latin. In each case the Latin lacks a subject in the relevant clause and, in addition, the Latin participles lack finite verbs--in the first instance being adjectival ('... touched with pain, he said....') and in the second subjunctive ('...when the bitten looked....'), as explained above, Sections 3.12 and 3.21. Apparently Ælfric is reconstructing this syntax with what he felt was the closest acceptable English structure: coordinated predicates.<sup>4</sup>

3.24. The control texts. To briefly summarize, then, we have clearly seen that Ælfric's skill with his language prevented him from doing anything that is not completely acceptable grammatically, as proven by the pervasive con-

sistency between the two works in matters of participle usage and placement. But on the other hand, because of the few very significant contrasts it is still possible to see how closely Ælfric followed the Latin text when translating the Heptateuch, since the Latin determined when to use a participle and very often what word-order to use.

Given these differences between the Heptateuch and Homilies it becomes important to examine Ælfric's practice in another type of text to determine whether the two Biblical narratives differ from each other more or less than they differ from non-narratives. If as a unit they differ from non-narrative it will mean that even participle placement may be dictated by thematic content, as Section 2.3 showed the percentage of subordination to be; if the Homilies differs more from the Heptateuch than from non-narrative it will prove that the differences in the Heptateuch are caused by the Latin source and not by the theme. Therefore, participle placement for the Prefaces is presented and tabulated in Chart 3.5.

Chart 3.5. Participle Placement in the Prefaces.

type	PG		PCH		Total		Total
	i	s	i	s	i	s	
S V ppl	3	4	1	6	4	10	14
V S ppl	4	0	0	0	4	0	4
S ppl V	0	2	0	2	0	4	4
S V ppl C	1	0	0	2	1	2	3
S V C ppl	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
V ppl	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
S O V ppl	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
V IO ppl	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
total	9	7	2	11	11	18	29

As the chart shows, PG contains sixteen participles arranged in six different constructions, PCH thirteen in five constructions, totalling, once overlap is accounted for, eight different constructions. Of these eight, two, each occurring once, do not appear in the Heptateuch or Homilies.<sup>5</sup>

Ælfric's consistency is seen again. The four V S ppl, all of which occur in the Preface to Genesis, are independent, following the usage seen in the two previous works. Moreover, all four S ppl V, two in each Preface, are subordinate, as were the ones in the Biblical narratives. And the one V ppl is independent, like the three in the Heptateuch and Homilies.

It is probably significant that the Prefaces use S V ppl C in both independent and subordinate clauses, whereas the Heptateuch limits this structure to independent clauses, since this contrast seems due to the fact that all the complements in the Latin happen to occur in independent clauses --though there is certainly no such constraint in Latin syntax. Thus, while the contrast does not show Ælfric doing anything very strange in using this construction as independent, it does show that he followed the syntax of the Latin even as far as imitating its choices concerning what to make subordinate, thus further supporting the conclusions drawn in Chapter 2.

The most common construction in the Prefaces is S V ppl, appearing seven times in each, and this is consistent with

the preponderance of this arrangement in both the Heptateuch and Homilies. Subdividing further, we find that, whereas eighteen of twenty-six in the Heptateuch and twelve of seventeen in the Homilies are independent, here only four of fourteen are independent. Even more striking, and fully supporting the implications of the investigation in Chapter 2, is that only one of the seven in PCH is independent, making this text very different from the other Preface, and making these two as a unit different from the narratives that they have been seen to resemble in other points. It is also significant that the Homilies stands more or less between the other works in respect to the ratios of independents and subordinates in this structure. For if the Prefaces reflect Alfric's style when free from interference, and the Heptateuch his style influenced by a Latin Biblical narrative, the Homilies should fall in between, being a Biblical narrative without a commitment to a text.

Further supporting this is the fact that PG and PCH both lack constructions with (S), viz., subject-less but coordinated predicates, previously shown to occur in the Heptateuch because of Latin influence. On the other hand, taken as a unit they lack none of the constructions considered significant to the Homilies, though PCH alone lacks the important arrangement V S ppl. And it is worth mentioning that this latter piece of embarrassing evidence

again forces us to remember that when dealing with samples it is always possible that the counter-evidence is in an omitted passage; this thought is the source of much of the tentative tone of the conclusions drawn.

### 3.3. Summary.

In this discussion of the placement of past participles in the Heptateuch and Homilies it was found that, true to his stated aim, Ælfric retained the quality of the Latin original so long as this could be done without violence to English syntax. His stylistic choices concerning such things as when to include a participle, whether to make it independent or subordinate, and even what verb to use were seen to reflect strong Latin influence on the Heptateuch. Nonetheless, comparison to the same material in the Homilies indicated that this adherence to the Latin text did not induce Ælfric to write things that he considered poor English usage. Though there are structures in the Heptateuch that do not appear in the Homilies--e.g., (S) V ppl--they seldom are radically different from what does occur in the Homilies--in this case, (S) V ppl C. Where the Latin really shows its influence is in those constructions that Ælfric accepts as good usage but chooses not to use. Of this type we may mention V ppl S, which occurs in the Homilies much less frequently than in the Heptateuch and whose occurrence in the latter can usually be shown to be due to Latin. More-

over, the Latin influence in this construction was seen to be particularly significant, since V ppl S of the Heptateuch--so obviously based on the Latin--seems to be the substitute in this work for V S ppl of the Homilies.

These conclusions about the Latin influence on the translation, the Heptateuch, are confirmed by comparison to the Prefaces, texts neither Biblical narrative nor translation, that approximate the Homilies more closely than does the Heptateuch in certain respects. As was seen, the Prefaces lack those constructions of the Heptateuch postulated as due to Latin influence, but not those of the Homilies thought to be significant--thereby reinforcing the belief that the Heptateuch, because it is a translation, represents a style not Ælfric's own.

On the other hand, the difference in the percentage of subordinate clauses between the Heptateuch and Homilies on one side and PG and PCH on the other reinforces the possibility that in respect to this feature the two former represent a narrative style that contrasts with Ælfric's expository style. (This is discussed fully in Chapter 2.)

Finally, our initial decision not to limit the discussion in this chapter to quantitative or statistical evidence is vindicated. For statistics would not have shown that such constructions as S V ppl, which are equally predominant in the Heptateuch and Homilies, are chosen in specific instances in the Heptateuch because of some feature in the Latin source.

Notes to Chapter 3.

<sup>1</sup>There are seventeen passive verbs in the Latin corresponding to participle periphrastics in the Heptateuch, but two might possibly have been rendered by hatan, the only verb in Old English with a passive: Gen.2:23c, "beo heo geciged fæmne" for "bæc vocabitur virago" and Gen.17:5b, "ac ðu byst gehaten Abraham" for "sed appellaberis Abraham." The first of these has been disqualified from consideration as evidence only by applying the strictest possible criterion, for hatan does not seem to have occurred in the subjunctive, as beo is used here. In contrast to these two, Gen.17:5a has been counted as evidence because hatan does not seem applicable:

a- Ne ðin nama ne byð geciged heononforth Abram....

a'- Nec ultra vocabitur nomen tuum Abram....

Hatan is apparently limited to the person or thing named, e.g., se hatte, but not to the name itself, e.g., \*ðin nama hatte.

<sup>2</sup>Two indirect objects occur in the Heptateuch sample, at Gen.15:13a and 17:17d. The first is a pronoun preceding the verb; the second is a noun phrase following it. One occurs in CH I.20.10a. a pronoun preceding the verb. A pronoun following a verb occurs in PCH 6.34a: "...wearð me geðuht...." One might speculate that this has something to do with the particular verb here, þyncan, which has other peculiarities; but this is only speculation.

<sup>3</sup>The relative clauses are:

Hp: Gen.3:19c, 3:23d, 9:16d, 17:14a; Num.21:8d, 21:9c. (Gen.17:14a is not V-final.)

CH: I.18.16a (same clause at II.406.6b), I.20.26b, I.22.7b, I.226.25b, II.8.14a, II.58.35, II.234.29. (The last three are V-final.)

PG: lines 55, 74b, 76a.

PCH: 2.4, 2.5, 4.21. 4.22a.

Two of the relatives in the Homilies (I.20.26b and I.22.7b) and one in PCH (2.5) are of the se declension; the problems involved in classifying these forms are discussed in Notes 3 and 6 to Chart 3.3. All three are not V-final.

That all three cases of V-final relatives in the Homilies are found in volume II may point to a change in Ælfric's style. Confirming this would require a study of all the participles in the two volumes and a determination of the chronology of the homilies within each volume--an undertaking far outside the limits of this investigation.

<sup>4</sup>The three other subject-less constructions (V ppl, IO V ppl, IO ppl Vim) are not applicable to this discussion, because all contain imperatives or impersonals--regularly subject-less in Old English. It must be admitted, though, that the one coordinated predicate occurring in CH I.92.5,

(S) V ppl C, is troublesome because it is more accurately not an imperative but a subjunctive:

Ne ðin wif ne beo gehaten Sarai,  
ac beo gehaten Sarra.

Nevertheless, the fact that beo is both the subjunctive and imperative may be responsible for Ælfric's omission of the subject here. This possibility becomes especially attractive when it is noticed that beo as an imperative occurs in the preceding sentence--one to which the present sentence is completely parallel thematically, and considerably so syntactically. As pointed out in Section 3.21, this parallelism may be the reason that Ælfric rendered the passage in the passive here, but in the active, following the Latin, in the Heptateuch:

15b- ðin wif Sarai, ne hat ðu hi heonon-forð Sarai,  
c- ac hat hi Sarra.

It should further be noticed that the parallel clause in the preceding sentence in the Homilies (I.92.3b),

ne beo ðu geciged heonon-forð Abram,  
ac Abraham...

contains a subject with a clearly imperative beo. Though it is, of course, impossible to know why Ælfric chose to break the parallelism with "ac hat hi Sarra" as opposed to "ac Abraham," it does seem indisputable that he was trying for a deliberate artistic effect with the thematic and syntactic echoes in the second sentence. On the other hand, it is less clear whether the parallel usage of subjunctive and imperative beo is symptomatic of a significant element in Ælfric's grammar, as, for example, the partial merging of the two moods.

Thus, to return to the question of the (S) V ppl in the Heptateuch, this structure is unique in the samples in that both occurrences are with indicative verbs, while the four analogous constructions occur with either imperatives, impersonals, or subjunctives which seem to account for their lacking subjects. Nevertheless, that only two (S) V ppl occur in the Heptateuch is sufficient cause for not giving too much weight to this contrast.

<sup>5</sup>The fact that the Heptateuch and Homilies contain thirteen constructions apiece, some shared, some not, as compared with only eight for the Prefaces taken together may be a reflection of the larger samples used for the former. While there is obviously a limit to the number of new forms to be found by increasing the size of the sample--doubling it may yield twenty-six constructions for the Heptateuch, but increasing it ten-fold will certainly not yield 130--the present numbers are small enough to have been determined by the size. For example, the first twenty-nine participles in the Heptateuch sample (the combined number of PG and PCH) fall into eight different groups, as do those in the Prefaces.

## Chapter 4

## MISCELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTIONS

The object of this investigation is to discover whether Ælfric's concern with retaining the integrity of his Biblical source had stylistic consequences on the Heptateuch. Such consequences would be shown to exist if the Heptateuch was found to differ significantly from the Homilies when handling the same material. Thus, Chapter 2 examined the types and amounts of subordination in the two, and Chapter 3 the details of past participle placement. In both cases it was found that the Heptateuch follows the Latin quite carefully, resulting in many differences in particulars between it and the Homilies. But it was also found that the Heptateuch abandoned the Latin when following it would have produced unacceptable English.

In this chapter investigation will be made of several constructions which, though acceptable in Old English, are rare in the Heptateuch and Homilies and can be shown to occur in the former because of adherence to the Latin original. The constructions are those containing present participles, marked infinitives, and "dangling introducers."

In addition, this chapter includes as its final section a brief list of phrases whose appearance in the Hep-tateuch can be traced to some peculiarity in the Latin and whose absence from the corresponding passage in the Homilies is clearly deliberate.

#### 4.1. Present Participles.

A comparison of the usage of the few present participles that occur in the sample texts provides another insight into Ælfric's dependence on the Latin for his style in the Hep-tateuch. That this verb form is so rare in his work is at once an advantage and a drawback to the study: an advantage because the presence of a present participle is immediately significant; a drawback because there are too few examples to warrant firm generalizations.

A second drawback in this investigation is the similarity in form of the present participle and the agent-nouns in -end. As will be seen, it is not always possible to decide which of the two is being used; and in some cases the very act of deciding prejudices the evidence. Nevertheless, the comparison results in significant discoveries about Ælfric's translation technique.

Present participles occur in the samples as predicates, substantives, and adjectivals.

4.11. Predicatives. Predicatives appear in three functions: 1) equivalent to Modern English verbal usage;

2) complementing beon; and 3) complementing a noun. These will now be explored in order.

4.111. Verbally. This classification is the one most common in Modern English and is marked by the absence of a finite verb from a phrase whose underlying structure is a coordinated finite verb phrase. For example, Modern English "he blessed them and said" could become "he blessed them saying" as is the case in Old English where "God... bletsode hi, ðus cweðende" (Heptateuch, Gen.1:22) can alternate with "eft clypode se engel...and cwæð" (Gen.22:15).

In the Heptateuch there are four instances of the present participle falling into this group, all in Genesis:

1:22a- God...bletsode hi, ðus cweðende....

a'- ...benedixitque eis dicens....

2:16a- And behead him, ðus cweðende....

a'- Præcepitque ei dicens....

17:17b- ...Abraham...hloh, cweðende on hys heortan....

b'- ...Abraham...risit, dicens in cordo suo....

22:3b- Abraham...ferde...and Isaac samod, on assum ridende.

b'- ...Abraham...ducens...Isaac...abiit.

It is obvious that in the first three cases the present participle in the Heptateuch is translating one in the Latin, the entire phrase in 17:17 being a perfect example of how

closely Ælfric will sometimes follow the Latin. Comparison to the Homilies is limited to Gen.2:16 (CH I.12.33b), "God þa hine gebrohte on neorxnā-wange...and him to cwæð," which lacks the repetitious participle, but is really too free a paraphrase for valid comparison. The other two cases are totally omitted from the loose paraphrases in CH I.16.3-7 and I.92.4-8, respectively.

The fourth case, 22:3, is clearly not due to influence from the Vulgate; but whether the Vulgate is Ælfric's source here is an entirely different question, difficult to answer. While Ælfric's version of this chapter tells the same story as the Vulgate point by point, there are many slight differences in syntax and arrangement that contrast sharply with the way Ælfric has already been shown to translate. Taking just the one verse in question here, we easily see how much Ælfric differs from the Vulgate:

3a- Abraham ða aras on þære ylcan nihte

b- and ferde mid twam cnapum to þam fyrrenum lande,  
and Isaac samod,  
on assum ridende.

a'- Igitur Abraham de nocte consurgens  
stravit asinum suum:

ducens secum duos juvenes, et Isaac filium suum:  
cumque concidisset ligna in holocaustum,

b'- abiit ad locum  
quem præceperat ei Deus.

It is possible, of course, that Ælfric's source for Gen. 22:1ff. is an Old Latin text, as suggested in 2.3122.

The identification of Ælfric's text is further complicated by the version in the Homilies (II.60.20c-22), which differs from both the Heptateuch and Vulgate and from the apparent homiletic source, Bede's Homily XIII. (The problems involved in determining the homiletic source are implicit in the belief, noted in 1.41, that Ælfric treats his source loosely.) CH II.60.20c-22 reads:

20c- ƿa wæs Abraham buton elgunge gearo to Godes hæse,

21- and siðode arodlice to ðære dune

22- ðe him God gewissode, and his sunu samod.

Establishing Ælfric's source in this instance presents almost insurmountable problems. But for our purpose it suffices to say that this fourth occurrence of a present participle in the Heptateuch does not seem due to Latin influence, making this occurrence contrast in that respect with the other three.

Similar participle usage appears once in the Homilies and once in PCH; no present participles of any kind occur in PG.<sup>1</sup> The one case in the Homilies sample is II.62.5 (Gen.22:15):

After ðisum clypode eft Godes engel of heofonum

to Abrahame,

þus cweðende....

This particular example is interesting because the corre-

sponding verse in the Heptateuch was previously cited as an instance in which Ælfric coordinated two finite verbs instead of using a participle. It is certainly important to note that this verse in the Vulgate has a participle:

Eft clypode se engel Abraham, and cwæð....

Vocavit autem Angelus Domini Abraham secundo dicens....

The one case in PCH (2.15) is most similar to the present participle usage in Gen.22:3, the one not following the Latin, since these two are more parenthetical than the other examples:

For þisum antimbre ic gedyrstlæhte,

on Gode truwende....

To summarize what we have seen about present participles in verbal constructions, ~~that~~ Ælfric uses participles in two places where Latin influence is unlikely and that Visser (§§1011, 1013) gives examples of similar usage in Old English proves that Ælfric was not breaking any rules of syntax by including these constructions in the Heptateuch. But that three of the four occurrences in the Heptateuch are obviously imitative of the Latin proves that Ælfric was influenced by his source in the inclusion of the participle.

4.112. Complementing beon. Present participles complementing beon are most commonly adjectives in Old English, though this construction gave rise in late Old English to

what became the progressive forms in Modern English. While only this latter form will concern us in this section, it must be pointed out that the same ambiguity that exists in Modern English between the two, as "the masses are revolting," existed to a greater extent in Old English, where the indefinite article was seldom used. Thus, hit is fleodende means both 'it is flying' and 'it is a flying creature', since the final -e marks the verbal usage as well as the neuter nominative singular of the participial adjective.

There is one certain occurrence of this verbal construction in the Heptateuch, Num.17:18b:

- a- (Moyses...) eode on ærne merien in to ðam getelde,
- b- and efne ða wæs growende Aarones gyrd on blostmum  
and on leafum on hnutbeames wisan.

This case cannot be traced to the Vulgate, which reads:

- a'- (Moyse...) sequenti die regressus  
invenit
- b'- germinasse virgam Aaron:  
et eruperant flores,  
qui, foliis dilatatis, in amygdalas deformati sunt.

The Homilies has a series of present participles in this verse, but rendered very differently from either the Heptateuch or Vulgate; this will be discussed in the next section.

The only case of this construction in the Homilies (I.12.31b) suffers from the ambiguity mentioned previously: "and he wæs þa sume hwile ānstandende." Now, Bosworth-Toller

lists ānstandende as a participle meaning 'one standing alone', giving Ælfric's Glossary as the source. This meaning would be very awkward for our sentence, though the simple adjective 'alone' would fit in well and is not farfetched. On the other hand, standan in Old English had the same meaning of 'exist' that it has in Modern English stand corrected or thus the matter stands for which Bosworth-Toller quotes "ðus hit stod on ðam dægum mid Englum," in addition to "se port stent betuh Winedum and Seaxum and Anglum." Thus, ānstandan (the verb used here, differentiated only by ā from anstandan 'to stand against'), though not cited in Bosworth-Toller, would mean 'be alone'. And this too fits into our example. Since, as already pointed out, final -e marks the verbal function of the participle as well as the masculine nominative singular indefinite adjective, it is impossible to determine the exact nature of ānstandende. (Visser, §1011, attests to the word's having a verbal usage for Ælfric; but his example, CH II.162.6, is ill-chosen: in "fleah he anstandende to anre dune" the adjective 'alone' makes better sense than does the participle 'standing alone'.)

If this were the only -ende form used by Ælfric in the Homilies it would be impossible to say whether he made use of the verbal ancestor of the progressive. For this reason it is necessary to include here an example

not from the regular sample, though still contained in De initio creature, the most often quoted homily in this study. CH I.20.6, corresponding to the non-Ælfrician Gen. 5:4-5, reads: "Adam þa wæs wunigende on þisum life mid geswince." Though there is a word wunigend 'inhabitant', the form with final -e cannot be attributed to it in the nominative, and the construction here is therefore the progressive sought.

There are no occurrences of this function of the present participle in the Prefaces, making this construction very rare in our sample of Ælfric's writings, and also making it--in conjunction with the evidence previously given in this section--impossible to trace Ælfric's use of the progressive to his Latin source.

4.113. As a noun complement. Present participles occur in the sample as noun complements in two positions: immediately following the noun (sometimes called appositive adjective position), and following a form of beon (viz., predicate adjective). Two instances of the former occur in the Heptateuch; none in the Homilies. One complex example of the latter occurs in the Homilies; none in the Heptateuch. No examples of either occur in the Prefaces, but both are cited in Visser.

4.1131. Following the noun. This construction is superficially similar to the type discussed in 4.111, ver-

bal usage, because of positioning, but whereas verbal usage has underlying it coordinated finite verbs, noun complementation has underlying it a relative clause. For this reason it was referred to in the previous paragraph as filling the appositive adjective position--since relative clauses are regularly adjectival. On the other hand, the construction is difficult to distinguish from an appositive adjective, since just as it is acceptable to say "fire burning the city" but not \*"burning the city fire" (verbals), it is acceptable to say "books interesting to the public" but not \*"interesting to the public books" (adjectivals). However, because generally adjectives precede their nouns in Old English, and because, perhaps significantly, both cases in question here are clearly of the verbal type, it was decided to include this structure in the section discussing predicatives. (But the classification is for convenience at this point; wider significance can be imputed only after considerably more research into the subject.)

The two occurrences of the construction are Gen.3:5d:

d- and ge beoð ðonne englum gelice,  
witende ægðer ge god ge yfel.

d'- et eritis sicut dii  
scientes bonum et malum.

and Gen.9:11b:

b- ne heononforð ne bið flod  
tosencende ðe eorðan.

b'- neque erit deinceps diluuium  
dissipans terram.

It should be immediately obvious that the present participles in the Old English are mirroring a similar construction in the Latin, even the objects being the same. This influence from the Vulgate is further highlighted when it is noticed that for the first example the corresponding passage in the Homilies (I.18.4) has the much more common auxiliary + infinitive construction:

3b- þonne beoð eowere eagan geopenode,

4- and ge magon geseon and tofnawan ægðer ge god  
ge yfel,

5- and ge beoð englum gelice;

and this despite the other strong echoes of the original. The participle is likewise missing from the corresponding version in the Homilies (I.22.13) to the second example, though in this case the paraphrase is somewhat looser:

12a- þonne bið æteowod min renboga betwux þam wolcnum,

12b- þonne beo ic gemyndig mines weddes,

13- þæt ic nelle heonan-forð mancynn mid wætere adrencan.

Visser (§1010b) gives examples of this construction in other Old English works (though not by Ælfric), proving that the construction existed in Ælfric's period; but its infrequency in the sample would suggest that Ælfric did not find it attractive and included it here because of its presence in his text.

4.1132. Following beon. This is something of an ad hoc classification, containing as it does only one example, CH II.8.14b:

pa...was Aarones gyrd gemett  
growende mid bogum  
 and blowende  
 and berende hnyte.

As pointed out in Section 4.112, this construction is different from that, since the previous section dealt with the ancestor of Modern English progressive constructions, and this example is clearly something else. What it does approximate is the structure that Visser terms "indirect consecution of two verbs of the type 'Ic geseah hine wepende' (§1015). The very obvious difference, however, is that our example is in the passive periphrastic, and the participles are therefore complementing the subject of the verb, not the object. The construction under investigation here would seem to be a type of linking predicate, and the participles would thus stand in a relation to the subject somewhere between that in the progressive with beon, which is not a linking verb in this instance, and that in a predicate adjective construction, which is not the case here since the participles dominate objects.

While it would be desirable to be able to arrive at a more satisfying description of the construction, it is not essential to our purpose, since the structure is in the Hom-

ilies and therefore assumed to be good usage in any event.

4.12 Substantives. The use of a present participle as a substantive is often difficult to distinguish from agent nouns in -end, most of the inflections being the same. Both examples in the Heptateuch are subject to this ambiguity, as is one of the two in the Homilies, the second perhaps not even being a substantive. The three ambiguous instances are defined as substantivals by their not being attributive to any other substantive, and, in one case, actually being coordinated with another substantive.

All the members of this class may be considered, as in Visser §1012, adjectives being used substantivally; but this would seem to be nothing more than adding an unnecessary middle term, since Visser himself recognizes that the adjectives in question are merely adjectival uses of present participles. Therefore, rather than saying that participles are used adjectivally and adjectives include substantival usage, it was decided to say simply that present participles may be used substantivally. On the other hand, the construction under discussion is equivalent to the substantival use of adjectives in Modern English, e.g., "the poor shall inherit the earth."

The two examples in the Heptateuch are Gen.3:20c,

c- ...heo is ealra libbendra modor

c'- eo...mater cunctorum viventium

and 6:7c

b- Ic adylgie ðone man,

c- ðe ic geseop...

fram ðam men oð ða nytenu,

fram ðam slincendum oð ða fugelas.

b'- Delebo...hominem

c'- quem creavi...

ab homine usque ad animantia,

a reptili usque ad volucres coeli.

As noted before, both libbendra and slincendum can, by their inflections, be either participles or agent nouns, and in fact Bosworth-Toller cites this instance of the latter under the entry for slincend, a noun, though the other two citations, slincende and slincendu are subject to the same ambiguity.

The classification of libbendra is more complicated, and no more certain. Bosworth-Toller gives many cases of libbende as an attributive adjective, and there are even several in our sample (see 4.13). However, there are no clear examples of the form as a substantive. The closest instance given is from the Secular Laws of King Cnut: "nan man nan þing ne bycge ofer feower peninga weorð ne libbende ne ligende." But insofar as there is an adjective unlibbende, this occurrence may well be an object complement, not a substantive. The use of libbendra in the Heptateuch would therefore seem significant.

Though it is impossible to prove that the forms in

question here are present participles, their presence is significant even if they are nouns. For as nouns libbend, though not cited, would mean 'living thing' and slicend, as Bosworth-Toller says, 'crawling thing', both of which are conspicuously participial in contrast to the more common manncynn and deorcynn occurring in CH I.20.27-34, and corresponding to Gen.6:lff. This contrast between the two versions of the Noah story in the Heptateuch and Homilies is reinforced by the realization of the close similarity between the Heptateuch and Vulgate versions quoted above; for ealra libbendra is clearly mirroring the present participle in cunctorum viventium, and slicendum may have been used to bring out the participial force of reptili. This latter hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that the three examples under slicend in Bosworth-Toller are all Biblical renderings of reptile.<sup>2</sup>

As for the two cases of present participles in the Homilies used substantivally, one, I.14.26, is the passage corresponding to Gen.3:20, and contains the phrase ealra lybbendra modor, the whole passage being very similar to the Heptateuch. The second case, I.12.31b, "he was anstand-ende," has already been discussed as a predicative complementing beon, at which time the possibility was raised that it is a substantive or predicate adjective (see 4.112).

While it is obvious that the exact classification of the forms in this section is difficult, we have nevertheless

shown that their very presence is probably due to Elfric's reconstructing the diction of his Latin source.

4.13 Adjectivals. There is considerable evidence for the use of present participles as adjectivals--including their occurrence with the entire range of adjective inflections. It is significant, therefore, that participles occur as attributive adjectivals only in the Heptateuch sample (though they also appear in the Homilies outside of the sample). The significance of their occurrence in the Heptateuch is heightened by the fact that every such instance can be shown to be by virtue of Latin influence, though admittedly not every occurrence of a Latin participle as an adjectival is thus rendered in the Heptateuch.

The cases in the Heptateuch fall into two main groups: those that translate Latin adjectival + noun; and those that translate participles standing as substantives, usually rendered into Old English with the addition of cynn. Since the same phrases appear repeatedly, only a single example of each will be given.

The first group includes:

Gen.1:21- lybbende fiscocyn and styrigendlic

animam viventem et motabilem

2:7- on libbendre sawle

in animam viventem

19- lybbende nyten

animæ viventis

9:16- eallum libbendum flæsc

omnem animam viventem universæ carnis

The second group includes:

Gen.1:20- swymmende cynn...fleogende cynn

reptile...volatile

24- creopende cyn

reptile

Clearly, the participles in these examples translate participles in the Latin, though as mentioned before not every Latin participle is rendered by an English one. Notable instances of this are Gen.1:24 where cuce nytena translates animam viventem; 2:20, where nytena and fugelas render animantia and volatilia; and the rather mixed group at 7:21 where "volucrum, animantium, bestiarum, omniumque reptilium" is rendered "manna and fugela, nytena and creopendra."

Again, the significance of these correspondences is highlighted by the absence of similar circumlocutions in the relevant passages in the Homilies, where on sawle and on lichaman (I.12.30) is equivalent to on libbendre sawle (2:7); nytencynn, deorcynn, fixas, and fugelas (I.16.5-6) appear instead of the Latinate lybbende nyten, libbendum flæsc, swymmende cynn, and fleogende cynn; and ælc þing cuces (I.22.6) replaces the whole list of creatures in Gen.7:21 (see previous paragraph).

Here, then, as with the other uses that Ælfric makes

of present participles--ranging from those thoroughly common in Old English to those exceedingly rare--his stylistic choices are clearly influenced by a desire to reconstruct the diction of the Latin original.

#### 4.2. Marked Infinitives.

This group is easy to identify, consisting of all, and only, verb forms preceded by to and having the inflectional ending -enne or -ne. As with all the constructions in this chapter, marked infinitives are infrequent, this being both an advantage and disadvantage. And as with present participles, this verb form is often difficult to divide into subcategories, the two major ones being occurrence with a finite verb and occurrence with a noun or adjective (what Quirk and Wrenn, §136f, call "specificatory").

4.21. With a finite verb. There are three cases of this in the Heptateuch sample, and one in PG. There is also one in the Homilies, not in our sample, very similar to a fourth in the Heptateuch at Gen.11:6, a questionable, and thus omitted, Alfrician passage.

The example in PG is the easiest to describe. In "Crist...began to bodienne his halige godspel" (1.33b), the infinitive is in construction with a verb of inception, a very common construction.

Somewhat similar to this is an infinitive in construc-

tion with a verb of motion, as in the Heptateuch, Gen.22:5c, "ic and þæt cild gað unc to gebiddenne." This construction cannot be attributed to Latin influence, since the Vulgate reads: "ego et puer illuc usque properantes, postquam adoraverims, (revertemur)," a much different, and much more complicated, structure.

An instance that is obviously due to the Latin is the questionable passage, "and hi begunnon ðis to wyrceenne," which translates "coeperuntque hoc facere." As mentioned, the same construction appears in the Homilies, I.22.21, in a paraphrase of the same passage: "and begunnon þa to wyrceenne." (It is certainly worth noting that the exact correspondences in this and several other parts of the story as contained in the Heptateuch and Homilies raise the strong possibility that Ælfric was indeed the author of Chapter 11 in Genesis, though, following Clemons and Pope, this chapter has been omitted from this investigation.)

The two other examples from the Heptateuch are more difficult to describe, one, Gen.22:4b, reads:

...hi ða dune gesawon,

ðær ðær hi to sceoldon to ofsleane Isaac.

The problem here is accounting for the first to and then the infinitive in relation to sceoldon. The only explanation seems to be that sceoldon is here used, as in many other places in the Old English corpus, to denote obligation, with the verb omitted. If this is the case, then to

is an adverb of motion towards something, its only possible destination being ðær. And this would mean that the infinitive is in construction with an omitted verb of motion! In other words, the only apparent explanation of this sentence is that it is an elliptical form of '...ðær ðær hi to gangan sceoldon to ofsleane...', and a possible meaning would be 'then they saw the hill, (there) to which they had to go to sacrifice...'.

The difficulties in this verse cannot be traced to the Vulgate, which reads: "...elevatis oculis, vidit locum procul." When it is noticed that the previously quoted "gað to gebiddenne" is from the same passage, it becomes obvious that the problems in Gen.22, at least, are not all attributable to Latin influence.

A difficult verse that is attributable to Latin influence is Gen.2:3d:

- a- And God gebletsode ðone sefoðan dæg
- b- and hine gehalgode
- c- for ðan ðe he on ðone dæg geswac his weorces,
- d- ðe he gesceop to wyrcene.
- a'- Et benedixit diei septimo
- b'- et sanctificavit illum
- c'- quia in ipso cessaverat ab omni opere suo
- d'- quod creavit Deus ut faceret.

As in so many other cases, the close correspondence of the Heptateuch to the Vulgate is highlighted by comparing Alfric's

rendering of the same passage in the Homilies (I.14.30-32a):

30- and on ðam sefoðan dæge he geendode his weorc,

31a- and geswac ða

b- and gehalgode ðone sefoðan dæg,

32a- forðan ðe he on ðam dæge his weorc geendode.

Having established the debt owed by the Heptateuch version to the Vulgate, it is easy to see that the infinitive in this verse is reconstructing the Latin subjunctive of purpose introduced by ut. But while this is a valid function in Old English of the infinitive, it is a strange usage of the verb gesceop. Significantly, the same untidiness exists in the Latin; for the verse must be translated '...he finished his works that he had proposed to make', but neither creavit nor gesceop really has this meaning. The Vulgate is apparently doing the best it can with the Hebrew phrase לעשות כרא /bara' la'asot/, taking /bara'/ in its usual denotation 'created' and therefore rendering it creavit, even though this does not make good sense in Latin. It is interesting to note, in this context, that Jerome seems to have had "translation stock" or automatic equivalences, since the formula /bara'/ = creavit is responsible for that most famous of mis-translations: "In the beginning God created." Most Hebrew grammarians on the other hand, are now agreed that /bara'/ is a noun in this verse which is then taken as an adverb clause with verse 3: "In the beginning of God's

creation of heaven....he said 'Let there be light.' " Similarly, Alfric, faced with a Latin phrase that must have been unintelligible to him and fearing lest he break his word "na mare awritan on Englisc þonne ðæt Leden hæfð," did exactly what Jerome had done to produce that Latin-- he translated word for word, producing the strange locution gesceop to wyrcente.<sup>3</sup>

A final construction, occurring once in each sample, in which the infinitive is in construction with a verb is the one variously labeled subject-accusative and dependent infinitival nexus. As the construction is well attested in Old English, appearing for example in Beowulf 48b, "leton holm beran", and 68-70, "...heall-reced hatan wolde/ medu-ærn micel, menn gewyrcean/ þanne ielda bearn æfre gefrugnon", and as the one example in the Heptateuch is clearly not a case of Latin influence, the examples will be only briefly mentioned. It should also be noted that the examples in the Heptateuch and Homilies are not marked infinitives. But since those in PG and PCH are, the construction is included here for all four samples.

The instance in the Heptateuch is Gen.22:6a, in a chapter already shown to be fairly free from direct Latin influence in respect to the use of infinitives:

- a- Abraham het Isaac beran þone wudu
- a'- ligna holocausti imposuit super Isaac
- a"- Isaac þa ber wudu to forberenne ða offrunge.

Obviously, neither the Heptateuch nor Homilies is dependent on the Vulgate for this verse. (The infinitive in the Homilies, in construction with the noun, will be discussed in the following section.)

For Gen.24:2 the Heptateuch follows the Latin, though loosely, and has:

- a- ...he clypode him to hys yldestan gerefan,
- b- þe ealle hys ðing bewiste,
- c- and cwæð to him:
- d- Sete þine hand under min ðeoh.
- 3a- And swera me aþas....

But the Homilies reports this speech indirectly and thus produces (II.234.25b-26):

- ...þa clypode he his yldestan cniht him to,
- and het hine settan his hand under his ðeoh,
- and swerian....

The two cases in the Prefaces are PG 1.104b, "...Crist sylf and his apostolas us tæhton ægðer to healdenne," and PCH 4.30, "...God geðafað þam arleasan Antecriste to wyr-cenne tacna."

In light of these examples there seems little doubt that the subject-accusative construction does not show Latin influence in Ælfric's usage. As pointed out earlier, the infinitives in the Heptateuch and Homilies are not marked, while those in PG and PCH are; it is unclear whether this is significant.

4.22. With a noun or adjective. The relationships between the infinitive and noun or adjective in this group are of various kinds, and because of the problems involved in describing their differences without giving examples of the constructions, the approach here adopted will be to list the constructions and discuss them simultaneously.

Gen.2:18b reads:

Nis na god ðisum men ana to wunigenne.

As explained by Visser (§903) this construction is identified by the infinitive standing as complement to the impersonal phrase, in this case nis na god. Thus ana is in construction with the infinitive which in turn could have been the subject of the sentence, just as in Modern English 'It is not good for this man to be alone' is virtually interchangeable with 'For this man to be alone is not good'. The construction is widely recorded in Visser, but despite this its occurrence in this verse is clearly due to the Latin: "Non est bonum esse hominem solum." The Homilies, significantly, renders this passage "Nis na gedafenlic þæt þes man ana beo" (I.14.17c-18a), with a relative clause in place of the infinitive.

Gen.3:6b is:

Da geseah ðæt wif ðæt ðæt treow wæs god to etenne....

The major characteristic of this structure is that the subject of the verb wæs is the object of the infinitive phrase god to etenne, tantamount in this respect to Chomsky's "He

is easy to please." Visser (§940), whose analysis of the structure is the one just given, has many examples of this also, but again its presence in this verse is directly traceable to the Latin: "Vidit igitur mulier, quod bonum esset lignum ad vescendum," though in this instance the Latin construction is a periphrastic rather than a simple infinitive, probably in order to capture the passive nature of 'good to (be) eat(en)' which is lost in the normal Old English equivalent. The version in the Homilies (I.18.8-9b) is too free a paraphrase for valid comparison, for it totally rewrites this verse: "Wearð þeah þæt wif ða forspanen þurh ðæs deofles lare, and genam of ðæs treowes wæstme, and geat."

As further proof of the acceptability of this construction to Ælfric is the fact that it occurs three times in PG:

7- ...þæt weorc is swiðe pleolic me oððe ænigum  
men to underbeginne.

42- ...seo boc is swiþe deop gastlice to understandenne.

101b- ...hit bið swyðe gedwolsun to rædenne ðam ðe ðæs  
Ledenes wise ne can.

Gen.9:15b reads:

Ne byð flod to adylgienne eall flæsc.

In this construction the infinitive is what Visser (§905) calls an adjunct to the noun and has underlying it a normal subject-predicated relationship between flod and adylgian. The construction is not listed as such in Visser, for in the

type that he cites, "a man to soweyn kokyl betoknith euelis and stryf," the noun and its infinitive stand as subject to a linking verb followed by a predicate noun, equivalent to Modern English "for a man to sow cockle betokens evil and strife." In the Heptateuch verse, however, the noun phrase is subject of beon, with nothing else in the predicate, and must be translated as 'there will not be a flood to drown all flesh'. Moreover, the semantic relationship between flod and to adylgienne is similar to that in "a figure of things to come," in which "the infinitive has a clear connotation of futurity, and semantically approximates to an attributive clause opening with that or which" (Visser §927). But in both cases, Visser cites no examples earlier than Middle English. Nonetheless it does not seem fair to say that the present construction is not normal Old English, since all of its parts are perfectly acceptable--ne byð as the complete predicate, and the infinitive as the adjunct to a noun.

In any event, this particular construction does not occur in any of the other samples and in this case is clearly translates the Latin: "non erunt aquæ diluvii ad delendum universam carnem." The debt to the Latin is again shown by the absence of the construction in the Homilies (I.22.13): "ic nelle heonon-forð manncynn mid wætere adrencan."

These are the infinitives occurring in the Heptateuch.

As can be seen from the fact that examples are also found in the other sample texts, these constructions are acceptable Old English. Nonetheless, the influence exerted by the Latin source is clear in most instances.

For the sake of completeness, the infinitive found in the other samples, but having no correspondence to constructions in the Heptateuch, are briefly noted.

CH II.60.26a has:

Isaac bæc wudu to forbærnenne ða offrunge.

Visser (§929) explains that "here the infinitive specifies the use that is made or can be made of the thing denoted by the noun it modifies," and lists several examples of this construction in Old English.

PG 76.3 reads:

ða þuhte me hefigtime þe to tīþienne þæs.

This construction is a fusion of the one in which, as characterized by Visser (§939), "the person or thing performing the action denoted by the infinitive is identical with the person or thing referred to by the subject of the sentence" and the one in which "the to-infinitive functions as the complement to 'impersonal' phrases" (Visser, §903), since me is the logical or conceptual subject, but is the object of both "ða þuhte me" and "hefigtime (is) me."

A final example of the use of the marked infinitive occurs twice, at PG 80.101b and PCH 2.14b:

PG- Is eac to witene ðæt....

PCH- (...buton þam bocum...) þa synd to hræbbene.

This construction is unusual for several reasons, and investigation has failed to discover a significant discussion of it. First of all, the infinitives carry passive force: 'this is to be known'; 'books to be had'. Visser gives two constructions in Old English in which this passive force is rendered by the infinitive: §940 where the infinitive complements an adjective, as in the previously cited Heptateuch verse "god to etanne," and §947 where it complements a noun, as in "he bore his sword to the cutler's to grinde." However, neither of these is similar to our examples, which have no adjective or noun. Moreover, these examples from the Prefaces do not fit into the category of impersonals since the verb is beon and the subject is either the relative ða or understood it. Suffice it to say therefore that the construction occurs in the Preface samples but not in the Heptateuch, and, though difficult to analyze, at least can be assumed to be good usage.

One final infinitive occurs in PCH, but in a passage (2.20.b-4.6b) obviously composed of scattered verses of Mark 13 or Matthew 24, and therefore, as explained (Section 2.33), not included in the investigation.

#### 4.3. "Dangling Introducers".

A final syntactic peculiarity is the construction previously described as a "dangling introducer." Nichols (p. 211) sets up two contrasting classes--duplicated subject and

duplicated object. But this classification is not adequate to the valid description of the syntax of the Heptateuch. Apparently Nichols is motivated by a desire to fit these constructions into normal Old English syntax, a desire supported by the analyses of Visser and Jespersen, who show that the structure has been and still is common in standard English. Thus Visser (§76) cites examples from Old English--though not from the earliest texts--of what he calls the "anacoluthic subject" and Jespersen, discussing the construction as a kind of extraposition, gives many examples in Modern English. But whereas Jespersen's class includes too much, Nichols' two classes are not sufficiently differentiated; nor do they account for all the relevant verses in our sample. And most important, Nichols fails to see that Ælfric uses this construction here because it is in the Latin, and the Latin has it in the first place because it is in the Hebrew or Greek (which is following the Hebrew), where it is emphatic. For these reasons it was decided to recommend the new label "dangling introducer" which is, however, identical in composition to Visser's category: "In this type the sentence begins with what appears to be the subject, but before the verb is reached something else is substituted in word or thought, so that the supposed subject is left in the air." The main reason for rejecting Visser's use of the term "subject" is that the dangling unit really functions as a topic introducer, as reference to the Latin and Hebrew

makes clear. For this same reason it is proposed that these units be translated something like: 'As for....'

There are three instances of this construction in the Heptateuch and two in the Homilies, one from each text almost certainly due to Latin influence, the other three very probably due to it. The absence of examples from the Prefaces reinforces the likelihood of Latin influence in the latter cases.

Gen.17:14 reads:

a- Se werhades man

þe ne byð emsniden on þam flæsc hys fylmenes,

b- hys sawul byð adyledgod of hys folce.

To follow Visser's definition: the sentence begins as if se werhades man is the subject, but after the perfectly normal relative clause there appears no verb for this group of words, and instead a new subject, hys sawul, is introduced, followed by its own verb, byð adyledgod. The only logical way to translate this sentence therefore is: 'As for the male human that is not circumcised on the flesh of his foreskin, his soul will be erased from his nation'. The influence of the Latin is obvious:

a'- Masculus,

cuius præputii caro circumcisa non fuerit,

b'- delebitur anima illa de populo suo.

An interesting sidelight is the rendering of anima illa as hys sawul, which actually translates anima illius. When it here translates the Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ/nefeš/ as 'soul',

the Vulgate is following its usual practice that was carried over into the King James version and accounts for Modern English expressions like "poor soul"; but the Hebrew term actually means also 'person, body, self'--the first being the correct choice for this verse. Ælfric, apparently was unable to make sense out of 'that soul will be erased' and therefore changed it to 'his soul'. This change is particularly interesting since Ælfric follows the Latin so closely for the diction of the rest of the sentence, as in masculus: werhades man (instead of just wer) and caro præputii: flæsc hys fylmenes.

The version of this passage in the Homilies contains this sentence twice, once when the story is told, and a second time when Ælfric explains its significance. The second occurrence, though not a quotation, seems to rely closely on a text. CH I.92.13-14a reads:

Swa hwylc hyse-cild swa ne bið ymbsniden on þam  
 fylmene his flæsces  
 his sawul losað.

The changes that exist in this rendering are obvious, e.g., hyse-cild instead of werhades man, losað instead of the passive periphrastic byð adylegod (=delebitur), and the introduction of the indefinite swa swa. Nonetheless, the similarities are also marked, most noticeable being the loose relationship between the opening clause, swa hwylc hyse-cild...flæsc, and the final one, his sawul losað--i.e., the dangling introducer.

The other occurrence of this verse (I.92.2a-b) also has a dangling introducer, but the looseness of the phrase makes it difficult to suggest that Ælfric was working closely from a text:

seðe þis forðgæið

his sawul losað.

Though Ælfric is being very free, that he had a text is clear from the recurrence of his sawul losað, and from the fact that the following clause in both passages in the Homilies and the one in the Heptateuch is almost identical:

17:14c- for þan þe he aidlode min wed

I.94- forðan þe he aydlode min wed

I.92- forðan þe he min wed aydlode.

Latin influence is harder to be sure about, but still very likely, in the two remaining cases in the Heptateuch. 17:15a-b is:

a- ðin wif Sarai,

ne hat ðu hi heononforð Sarai,

b- ac hat hi Sarra.

This must be translated, according to the method proposed: 'As for your wife Sarai, don't call her Sarai henceforth; call her Sarah'. The Latin, however, does not have this construction:

a'- Sarai uxorem tuam non vocabis Sarai,

b'- sed Saram.

Here, the opening phrase Sarai uxorem tuam is in emphatic

position, but is clearly the object of vocabis, as the accusative inflections show--unlike the Heptateuch in which the object of hat is hi. On the other hand, it is very possible that Ælfric began his version with ðin wif Sarai to mirror the Latin construction, and inserted the hi because he felt an initial object was awkward (See 3.221). This possibility is strengthened by the fact that in the Homilies (I.92.9a) this verse is arranged in such a way that Sarai is not the second of two objects, but is the predicate nominative:

a"- Ne ðin wif **ne** beo gehaten Sarai

(The contrast of sed Saram to ac hat hi Sarra is discussed above, 3.21.)

The final instance in the Heptateuch also shows signs of being the result of an attempt to mirror the Latin and a subsequent decision that the opening phrase was too long. 17:27 reads:

a- And ealle werhades men hys hiredes,  
 ægðer ge inbyrdlingas ge gebote ðeowan  
 and ælðeodige men,  
 þe him mid wæron;

b- ealle wurdon þæs dages ymsnidene.

This verse too lends itself to the rendering: 'And as for all the males of his household... all were circumcised that day.' And it seems fair to say that the extensive opening phrase is due to the Latin, which, however, does not bother

inserting another subject, being content with the one inherent in the verb:

a'- Et omnes viri domus illius,  
       tam vernaculi, quam emptitii  
       et alienigenæ,

b'- pariter circumcisi sunt.

It is certainly worth mentioned in this discussion of Ælfric's awe-inspired treatment of the Latin that, though we are maintaining that he attempted to stay as close as English allowed to the Latin, his liberties with the text must also be acknowledged, as in this chapter which contains Ælfric's own comment, following this verse: "Nu secge we betwux þisum þæt nan Cristen man mot nu swa don."

But to return to 17:27, it should be noticed that the introducer differs from that in the other examples in that it is almost the antecedent of the inserted subject ealle, unlike the others which are actually dangling syntactically. This case therefore fits more properly into Visser's class "Subject Repeated" (§§67-75), and thus is also the one case that fits Nichols' category "duplicated subject." Among the obvious faults in Nichols' classification--e.g., it does not account for any of the se werhades...hys sawul-type; nor does it sufficiently expose the emphatic nature of the construction--may now be added her failure to realize the extent to which the Latin influenced Ælfric's style. Thus, in her analysis of the duplication in Gen.24:7 (not in our sample) she seems to recognize that

Se hefanlice God

þe me het faron þanon

and minum ofspringe behet me þisne eard to agenne,

he asent his engel ætforan þe

is based on the Latin

Dominum Deus coeli...

ipse mittet angelum suum....,

but then goes on to say that in the Old English "the lengthy clause...may account for the duplication." Now, while it is probably true, as pointed out above, that the length of an initial clause may have caused Ælfric to insert a pronoun or change the subject, Nichols makes a basic error by suggesting that that is what Ælfric is doing in this verse. Here it is almost beyond question that the source of he in the second clause is ipse in the second clause in the Latin-- and this is not dependent upon the length of the clause.

Finally, the emphatic nature of this dangling introducer may be seen by realizing that the Latin has it in imitation of the Hebrew, which, having no present tense forms of הוה/hoveh/ 'be', used the pronoun for emphasis with predicate nouns and adjectives and subsequently for emphatic purposes. Thus, הוא/hu/ 'he' placed before the predicate noun turns /david meleh/ 'David is king' into /david hu' meleh/ 'David is king'. And likewise in 24:7, the insertion of /hu/, translated ipse, turns 'the heavenly God... will send his angel' into 'the heavenly God...will send his

angel' or, more in keeping with Modern English emphatic usage, 'the heavenly God...he (is the one who) will send'.

And it is this same construction in Gen.17:14 that the Vulgate tries to copy by including the strange locution "masculus...delebitur anima illa," for what in the Hebrew is a simple repetition of a new subject in apposition to the first:

וערל זכר

אשר לא ימול את כשר ערלתו

ונכרתה הנפש ההיא מעמיה

/v'arel zaḥor

ašer lo yimol et bsar 'orlato

vniḥretah hanefeš hahi' me'ameha/

(and the uncircumcised male

who does not circumcise the flesh of his foreskin

that person will be erased from his nation)

It can be seen therefore that the inclusion of this construction in the Heptateuch and Homilies is a clear case of borrowing Biblical Hebraisms--even when Elfric does not use them conciously or correctly.<sup>4</sup>

#### 4.4. Diction.

It is the premise of this investigation that in the Heptateuch Ælfric felt that he was translating, while in the Homilies he was paraphrasing, and that the practical consequence of this theoretical difference is that the Heptateuch attempts to retain the mysterium verborum ordo by being almost verbatim of the Latin source. Throughout the study to this point, therefore, comparisons have been made between the Heptateuch and Homilies showing that when they differ the reason may often be found in the Heptateuch's closer rendering of the Latin. Moreover, to make the case as strong as possible, we have been concerned almost exclusively with syntax--features of subordination, participle placement--and morphology--the distribution and composition of nominal phrases. In this section will be presented a brief list of lexical choices obviously influenced by the Latin. It goes without saying that a translation will generally attempt to follow the source as carefully as possible --particularly in terms of vocabulary, which is perhaps the easiest aspect to follow. For this reason it did not seem necessary to belabor the similarities between the Heptateuch and Latin in vocabulary. On the other hand, the importance of lexical equivalences cannot be ignored in establishing whether a rendering is a translation or paraphrase. Thus, in this final section brief notice will be taken of these instances where the lexical choices in the Heptateuch are clearly Latin influenced in contrast to the Homilies.

It should be readily understood that this list is something of a miscellany, containing as it does many, but certainly not all, otherwise unrelated cases where the Heptateuch follows the Latin very closely in vocabulary. Likewise, the items require little comment and are therefore simply listed:

Gen.1:14- heofenan fæstnysse/ firmamento coeli

CH- heofon (I.14 and passim)

1:20- swymmende cynn / reptile (see 4.1)

CH- fixas (I.16)

cucu on life / animo viventis

CH- cuce nytenu (I.16)

fleogende cyn / volatile

CH- fugelas

1:22- weaxað and beoð gemænifylde / crescite

et multiplicamini

CH- sealde ðam fixum sund and ðam fugelum fliht (I.16.7)

sæ wateru / aquas maris

CH- watere (I.16 and passim)

and fugelas beon gemænifylde ofer ecrðan /

avesque multiplicentur super terram

(cf. fugelas/aves to fleogende cyn/volatile)

CH- omitted

(It should be noted in passing that, as striking as the correspondence is between particular unusual phrases, the similarity is even more striking when the phrase for phrase

correspondence of the passage taken as a whole is contrasted to the summarized paraphrase of the Homilies.)

- 2:7 - anbleow on his ansyne lifes orðunge /  
           inspirit in faciem eius spiraculum vitæ  
 CH- him on ableow sawle (I.16.13)
- 2:16- treowe ðises orcedes / ligno paradisi  
 CH- þinga þe on neorxna-wange sindon (I.12.34)
- 2:17- treowe ingehydes godes and yfeles /  
           ligno scienti boni et mali  
 CH- treow þe stent on middan neorxna-wange (I.12.35)
- 2:19- þære lyfte fugelas / volatibus coeli  
 CH- fugelcynn (I.14.15)
- 3:21- fellene reaf / tunicas belliceas  
 CH- reaf of fellum (I.18.19)
- 6:5 - yfelnyss manna / malitia hominem  
 CH- yfel (I.20.22)  
           geðanc manna heortena / cogitatio cordis  
 CH- omitted
- 6:7 - eorðan ansyne / facie terræ  
 CH- middangeard (passim)
- 6:19- eallum nytenum ealles flæscas / cunctis  
           animantibus universæ carnis  
 CH- ælc þing cuces (I.22.6)
- 6:15- on lenge, on bræde, on heahnysse /  
           longitudo, latitudo, altitudo  
 CH- lang, wid, heah (I.20.31-32)

- 7:4 - eorðan bradnyss / superficie terræ  
 (cf. eorðan ansyne / facie terræ)  
 CH- middangeard (passim)
- 7:7 - flodes wæterum / aquas diluvii  
 CH- flod (I.20.36 and passim)
- 7:11- wyllspringas ðære miclan nywelnyssse  
 and þære heofenan wæterðeotan /  
 fontes abyssi magnæ  
 et cataractæ coeli  
 CH- wyllspringa  
 and wæter-þeotan of þære miclan niwelnyssse.  
 (I.22.3-4)
- 8:21- andgyt and geþoht menniscere heortan /  
 sensus et cogitatio humani cordis  
 CH- manna mandæda (I.20.23)
- 17:7 - (ic sette min wed...) ecum wedde /  
 (statuam pactum meum...) foedere sempiterno  
 CH- (ic sette min wed...) omitted (I.90.24)
- 17:14- flæsc his fylmene / caro præputii (also 17:11)  
 CH- omitted (see I.90-92)
- 17:27- ealle werhades men hys hiredes / omnes viri  
 domus illius  
 CH- eal his hyred (I.92.10)

There are many more examples of the Heptateuch following the Latin closely in respect to lexicon. These few examples were chosen because they show unusual locutions in the Heptateuch that are lacking in the Homilies. It is of course not possible to say what exists outside of the sample; the label "omitted" means, therefore, that the locution in question does not appear anywhere in the Homilies sample, not merely that it does not appear in the particular corresponding verse. It is thus fair to conclude that the occurrence of these phrases in the Heptateuch is something more than the usual effort to find the right word in the target language: it is almost tantamount to a neologism. Though the words are all standard Old English, Alfric's arrangement and juxtaposition of them may be novel (though proving this is beyond the limits of this investigation) and are certainly strange for him. The only explanation for this strangeness, as the comparison to the Latin shows, is his effort to retain what he could of "ðam gastlican andgyte."

#### 4.5. Summary.

This chapter explored several different types of construction to establish whether their inclusion in the Heptateuch was due to Latin influence. It was found that there could be little doubt that Alfric's use of present participles and marked infinitives in the Heptateuch, though seldom breaking the rules of good usage in Old English, very often

reflects an attempt to mirror or capture the effect of present participles and marked infinitives in the Latin. Moreover, his inclusion of "dangling introducers" provides insight into the workings of translation and the long-range consequences of a particular choice in a particular translation: in these occurrences of the introducer, **Ælfric**, without knowing Hebrew, is reconstructing in Old English a Hebrew structure that he found reconstructed in the Latin.

This latter fact, in conjunction with such strange infinitive constructions as gesceop to wyrce, and the list of unusual lexical items, can provide strong support for our argument that **Ælfric** believed that the Heptateuch, as a translation, had to adhere to the original. For in many of these cases **Ælfric** seems to be mechanically rendering locutions that cannot possibly have been meaningful to him --e.g., gesceop to wyrce--in the hope that if he retained the Word, the Truth would ultimately emerge from it.

Notes to Chapter 4.

<sup>1</sup>For a clearer understanding of the problems involved in adequately and accurately defining the subclasses in present participles following the verb, see Visser, §§1010b and 1015. But the thrust of our discussion is not so much definition as the establishment of Latin influence. And for this it is enough to show the dependence of the Heptateuch on the Vulgate for the occurrence of particular constructions, even if it is difficult to define the construction.

<sup>2</sup>While slicend could be an adjective used substantivally, two things suggest that Ælfric considered it a real substantive: first, it translates reptili, a noun; second, it is coordinated with fugal, a noun. The nominal nature of reptili is proved by its translating Hebrew /remes/ 'rodent', and by its being coordinated with avis. The validity of using acknowledged nouns like reptile and motabile to prove Latin influence in Old English present participle use may be defended on the grounds that in Vulgar Latin the forms in -ile had replaced the gerund and had taken over the feeling of activity and agency originally contained in the gerunds. For their part, gerunds became the normal present participles, replacing the Classical -en(t)- forms. See, for example, Palmer, Latin Language, pp.167-8. For an analogous shift in Old English from participle to agent-noun, see Wright, Old English Grammar, on nouns in -nd (Secs.416, 601).

<sup>3</sup>The term "translation stock" is discussed in Quality in Translation, p.142.

The exact meaning of כרא לעשוה is still not agreed upon; but it is significant that almost every Medieval Hebrew grammarian and Jewish exegete rejected the interpretation 'created to make'--creavit ut faceret. Among the simplest alternatives is that of Nahmanides, who believed that there are sufficient supporting instances to interpret the phrase as if the verbal noun לעשוה /la'asot/ complemented the main verb שבה /šabat/ 'rested', and not the verb of the relative clause כרא /bara'/ 'created'; viz., as if it read כי בו שבה מלעשוה כל מלאכה אשר כרא /ki bo šabat mela'asot kol mlahto ašer bara'/ 'for on it he rested from making all the things he (had) created'. In addition there are those who believe that when כרא /bara'/ and עשה /'asah/ occur in the same verse, then /bara'/ means 'creatio ex nihilo' and /'asah/ 'construction from substance' or 'reproduction'. Thus the Klei Yaqar says that the verse is contrasting the end of the miracle of creation ex nihilo (כריאה יש מאין) to the beginning of the natural order of reproduction. He therefore translates the phrase as if it were כרא כדי לעשוה יש מיש '(he rested from the things) which he created to reproduce', where the infinitive does not complement the finite verb, but stands in the same relationship to it as in "...the candidate he wants to win." An analogous distinction is made by Kimchi in his commentary on Isa.43:7, where a third

verb, יצר /yāsar/, usually translated 'created' is coordinated with /bara'/ and /'asah/. Kimchi translates /bara'/'created ex nihilo', /yasar/'formed (the limbs)', and /'asah/'prepared food'. Finally my own translation of /bara' la'asot/'proposed to make' is based on the Mishnaic use of the word. (All references to Jewish exegetes will be found, ad loc., in the comprehensive Rabbinic Bible, Mikra'ot Gdolot.)

<sup>4</sup>The comparisons made in this section between the Latin and Hebrew are not fortuitous. For while there is considerable disagreement about how much the Vulgate follows the Hebrew, as Jerome claims to have done, or merely revises the older Latin translations of the Greek, it is clear that in these instances at least Jerome is true to the Hebrew when it differs from the Septuagint. For example, the immediate source for Gen.17:14 is equally likely to be the one as the other, for the anacoluthic subject of the Latin appears in the Greek

καὶ ἀπερίτμητος ἔσται...  
ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς.

and Hebrew

וערל זכר  
אשר לא ימול את כשר ערלהו  
ונכרתה הנפש ההיא מעמיה

On the other hand, the structure of Gen.17:15 in the Latin,  
Sarai uxorem tuam

non vocabis Sarai  
sed Saram,

can be traced only to the Hebrew

שרי אשתך  
לא תקרא את שמה שרי  
כי שרה שמה

but not to the Greek, which has Σάρα as the subject of the verb. Σάρα ἡ γυνή σου οὐ ἀληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Σάρα.... Similarly, for Gen:17:27, the inclusion of a final verb in the Vulgate

Et omnes viri domus illius,  
tam vernaculi, quam emptitii  
et alienigenæ,  
pariter circumcisi sunt,

can be attributed only to the following Hebrew:

וכל אנשי כיהו  
יליד כיהו  
ומקנה כסף מאת כן ככר  
במלו אחר.

The Greek, as can be seen, makes the noun phrase of Verse 27 part of the subject of the verb in Verse 26:

(26) ἐν δὲ τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκαίνης περιετιμήθη Ἀβραάμ  
καὶ Ἰσμαῆλ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ

(27) καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ  
καὶ οἱ οἰκογενεῖς αὐτοῦ

καὶ οἱ ἀργυρώνητοι ἐξ ἄλλογενῶν ἔθνων.

A final and particularly interesting example is Gen.17:4, הנה כריתי אני /'ani hineh briti 'itah/ 'as for me, behold my covenant is with you', which is in emphatic contrast to 17:9, אח כריתי ואתה /v'atah et briti tišmor/ 'and as for you, you must observe my covenant'. It is clear that Jerome is working from the Hebrew--and misunderstanding it--for he has "ego sum, et pactum meum tecum." It is also clear that this rendering cannot be traced to the Septuagint which correctly translated the Hebrew emphatic introducer as καὶ ἐγώ, a construction that Jerome would not have rendered ego sum. In line with what we have already seen Alfric do when the Latin has a strange construction, he translates this verbatim: "ic eom and min wed mid ðe." Thus, these few examples show that Jerome did indeed use the Hebrew text at least here, and prove again that Alfric kept the Word even--or perhaps especially--when he was not sure of the sense.

## Chapter 5

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The object of this study has been to see what stylistic consequences, if any, arose from Ælfric's distinction between translation and paraphrase.

As shown in Chapter 1, Ælfric intellectually distinguished translation from paraphrase, considering the Heptateuch the former and the Catholic Homilies the latter. It was also shown that when in the "Preface to Genesis" he swore never to translate again his motivation was the rather sophisticated realization that no translation can capture the many levels and nuances of a carefully wrought original, and Ælfric was convinced that the Bible, being God's word, was carefully wrought. It was then pointed out that any stylistic consequences of Ælfric's distinction between translation and paraphrase should be discoverable from a comparison of the Heptateuch and Homilies, since the two works were written within a few years of each other and in many sections treat the same thematic material. Thus if they differed in style, the Latin source of the Heptateuch would be the first place to look for the cause.

Chapter 2 compared the types and amounts of subordination in the two Old English works. It was found that in

overall distribution of subordination structures at transitional points and of subordinate clauses the two were extremely similar. This was particularly interesting because the Heptateuch was also found to be following the Latin quite consistently. However, in certain details, for example the amounts of paratactic independent transitions and temporal subordinate ones, the Heptateuch and Homilies differed. Again, the Heptateuch was shown to be following the Latin. The conclusions drawn from the material in this chapter were that the Heptateuch indeed adheres to the Latin, as evidenced by the contrasts to the Homilies, and that there was reason to believe that the amount of subordination in a text may be a function of language style or text style, as evidenced by the overwhelming similarities between the three texts.

In order to avoid the possibility that further similarities might be traced to text style, Chapter 3 investigated the details of past participle placement, since this feature is not likely to be influenced by the theme of a work. Another attraction of this feature was that Latin leans toward clause-initial participles, the one position not acceptable in Old English, and therefore something Alfric would have to alter. The study of participle placement proved especially rewarding, for it was shown that the Heptateuch and Homilies have clearly different preferences, and in most cases the difference could be attributed to Alfric's attempting in the

Heptateuch to reconstruct in an acceptable way an unacceptable Latin arrangement. Past participle placement was thus proved to be an area that unquestionably shows the stylistic consequences of Alfric's considering the Heptateuch a translation and the Homilies a paraphrase.

Chapter 4 analyzed three more syntactic items whose presence in the Heptateuch were directly traceable to the Latin. Particular uses of present participles and marked infinitives, and the occurrences of "dangling introducers" were all shown to stem from Latin influence on the Heptateuch. In addition, this chapter presented a list of words and phrases that do not occur in the Homilies sample, and whose every occurrence in the Heptateuch can be traced to the Latin.

It therefore seems beyond doubt that our original premise is correct: Alfric considered the Heptateuch a translation and the Homilies a paraphrase, and the practical consequence of this is that when writing the Heptateuch he abandoned his personal style in an attempt to have this work retain as much as possible of the Latin style, which he considered divinely inspired.

## Appendix

## THE SAMPLE TEXTS

To ensure that the conclusions of this study may be properly evaluated, this Appendix presents all the verses of the Heptateuch analyzed and the corresponding passages of the Homilies. Because the Homilies condenses and summarizes, the correspondences are given for units instead of verses.

<u>Heptateuch</u>	=	<u>Homilies</u>
Gen. 1:3, 6-7, 14-17 20-27, 31.		I.14.27-I.16.17 I.12.28-30 I.100.9-10 I.288.13-14
2:1-3, 7, 15-25,		I.12.31-I.14.24 I.20.14-18 II.206.4-6 II.8.22-24 II.58.20-25 II.260.17
3:1-6, 17-23.		I.14.25-26 I.16.31-I.18.20 I.176.17-24 II.220.1-2 II.330.32-33 II.254.7-8 II.406.5-7 I.300.7-9 I.118.24-27
6:5-22.		I.20.21-36
<del>7:1-23.</del>		<del>I.22.1-16</del>
8:13.		II.58.32-II.60.1
9:8-17, 28-29.		
12:3.		II.12.23-25
15:13-16.		II.190.16-24

<u>Heptateuch</u>	=	<u>Homilies</u>
Gen.17:1-7, 10-17, 19 23-27.		I.90.18-I.92.9 I.94.13-14
21:4-5.		I.92.9-11 I.92.20-21
22:1-13, 15-19.		II.60.18-II.62.13
24:1-4.		II.234.24-29
Num.17:1-8.		II.8.10-14
21:4-9.		II.238.9-21
Judg.16:1-3, 19.		I.226.23-28 I.488.7-10

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Texts.

The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholici, or Homilies of Ælfric, ed. Benjamin Thorpe. 2 vol. London, 1844, 1846.

The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, Ælfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis, ed. S. J. Crawford. EETS, o.s.160. London, 1922.

2. Bibles.

Ben Isaiah, Abraham and Benjamin Sharfman. The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English. New York: S.S. and R. Publishing Co., 1949.

The Geneva Bible: A facsimile of the 1560 edition, introduced by Lloyd E. Berry. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Good News for Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English. Second Ed. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha: Authorized King James Version. London: Oxford University Press, n.d.

The Holy Scripture According to the Masoretic Text. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1917.

Knox, Ronald. The Holy Bible: A Translation from the Latin Vulgate in the Light of the Hebrew and Greek Originals. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944, 1956.

The Torah: The New Jewish Version. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1962.

3. Critical Studies.

Anderson, George K. The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Andrew, S. O. Syntax and Style in Old English. New York, 1940, 1966.

Atkinson, B.F.C. The Greek Language. Second Ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1933, 1952.

Bailey, Richard W. "Current Trends in the Analysis of Style," Style, 1:1 (1967), 1-14.

- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. A Social and Religious History of the Jews. 8 vols. and index. Second Ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Barrett, Charles R. Studies in the Word-Order of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies and Lives of Saints. Cambridge, Occasional Papers, No.III, 1953.
- Beekman, John. ed. Notes on Translation, with Drills. Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1965.
- Bethurum, Dorothy. "The Form of Ælfric's Lives of Saints," Studies in Philology, 29:4 (1932), 515-533.
- Brown, Roger. Words and Things: An Introduction to Language. 1958. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Campbell, Jackson J. "Knowledge of Rhetorical Figures in Anglo-Saxon England," JEGP, 66:1 (1967), 1-20.
- "Learned Rhetoric in Old English Poetry," Modern Philology, 63:3 (1966), 189-201.
- Carlton, Charles. "Word Order of Noun Modifiers in Old English Prose," JEGP, 62 (1963), 778-783.
- Cary, E. and R.W. Jumpelt, ed. Quality in Translation (= La Qualité in Métier de Traduction: Actes du IIIème Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs, 1959). New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Chase, Mary Ellen. Life and Language in the Old Testament. New York: W.W.Norton, 1962.
- Chatman, Seymour. "Stylistics: Quantitative and Qualitative," Style, 1:1 (1967), 29-43.
- Clemons, Peter. "Ælfric," in Eric Gerald Stanley, ed., Continuations and Beginnings... (London, 1966), pp.176-209.
- "The Chronology of Ælfric's Works," in Peter Clemons, ed., The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins (London, 1959), pp.212-247.
- "The Old English Benedictine Office... and the Relations between Ælfric and Wulfstan," Anglia 78 (1960).
- Cook, Albert S. Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers. London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Craddock, Patricia. "An Approach to the Distinction of Similar Styles: Two English Historians," Style, 2:2 (1968), 105-127.

- Crawford, S.J. ed. Ælfric's Exameron Anglice, or The Old English Hexameron. Hamburg, 1921 (Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, X).
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. 1948. Trans. Willard R. Trask, London, 1953.
- Davis, Charles R. "Biblical Translations in Ælfric's Catholic Homilies and Lives of Saints!" New York University Dissertation, 1946.
- Di Pietro, Robert J. "A Transformational Note on a Few Types of Joycean Sentences," Style, 3:2 (1969), 156-167.
- Förster, Max. "Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliae Catholicae," Anglia, 16 (1894), 1-61.
- Review of Cook, Biblical Quotations, Englische Studien, 28 (1900), 419-430.
- Fowler, Roger. "Some Stylistic Features of the Sermo Lupi," JEGP, 65:1 (1966), 1-18.
- Fries, Charles C. "On the Development of the Structural Use of Word-Order in Modern English," Language, 16 (1940), 199-208.
- Gerould, Gordon H. "Abbot Ælfric's Rhythmic Prose," Modern Philology, 22 (1925), 353-366.
- "Ælfric's Lives of Saint Martin of Tours," JEGP, 24 (1925), 206-210.
- Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. 6 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1891, 1956.
- Grandgent, C. H. An Introduction to Vulgar Latin. New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1934, 1962.
- Harrison, Thomas P. "The Separable Prefixes in Anglo-Saxon," Johns Hopkins Dissertation, 1892.
- Saint Jérôme: Lettres, établi et traduit par Jérôme Labourt. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1953.
- Jespersen, Otto. Analytic Syntax. 1937. New York: Holt, 1969.
- Growth and Structure of the English Language. 1938. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Jost, K. "Unechte Ælfric Texte," Anglia, 51 (1927), 177-219.
- Ki-tov, Eliyahu. Sefer Hatoda'ah. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Machon Lehozaat Sefarim, 1958.

- Knox, Ronald. The Trials of a Translator. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949.
- Lakoff, Robin. "If's And's and But's about Conjunction," forthcoming.
- Loomis, Roger S. and Rudolph Willard. Medieval English Verse and Prose in Modernized Versions. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948.
- Malinowski, B. "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages," in C.K.Ogden and I.A.Richards, The Meaning of Meaning (New York: Harcourt, n.d.)
- Middleton, Anne Louise. "The English Ways of Ælfric's Prose." Harvard University Dissertation, 1966.
- Migne, J. P. Patrologia Latina. Paris, various years.
- Murphy, James J. "Saint Augustine and the Debate about a Christian Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 46 (1960), 400-410.
- Nichols, Ann Eljenholm. "A Syntactical Study of Ælfric's Translation of Genesis." University of Washington Dissertation, 1964.
- "Awendan: A Note on Ælfric's Vocabulary," JEGP, 63:1 (1964), 7-13.
- Nida, Eugene. "Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems," Word, I (1945), 194-208. Reprinted in Dell Hymes, ed., Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp.90-97.
- "Science of Translation," Language, 45:3 (1969), 483-498.
- Nowicki, Robert L. "'Subordination' in Germanic," Paper delivered to the Linguistic Society of America, Dec. 1968.
- Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism. 1923. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, n.d.
- Onions, C. T. Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse. Fourteenth Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Orlinski, Harry M. ed. Notes on the New Translation of The Torah. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1969.

- Palmer, L. R. The Latin Language. London: Faber and Faber, 1954, 1964.
- Pope, John C. Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection. 2 vols. EETS, 259 (1967-8).
- Pyles, Thomas. The Origins and Development of the English Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- Quirk, Randolph and C. L. Wrenn. An Old English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, n.d.
- Raith, Josef. "Ælfric's Share in the Old English Pentateuch," Review of English Studies, n.s. 3 (1952), 305-314.
- Raynes, Enid. "MS Boulogne-sur-Mer 63 and Ælfric," Medium Ævum, 26 (1957), 65-73.
- Rosen, Harold. "Old High German Prepositional Compounds in Relation to their Latin Originals," University of Pennsylvania Dissertation. = Language Dissertations, no. XVI, March, 1934. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1934.
- Sastri, Madugula I. "Kernel Sentence Types in Wulfstan's Homilies." Western Reserve University Dissertation, 1962.
- Schrader, B. Studien zur Ælfricischen Syntax. Jena, 1887.
- Shannon, Ann. A Descriptive Syntax of the Parker Manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles from 734 to 891. Mouton and Co., 1964 = Janua Linguarum, series practica XIV.
- Sisam, Celia and Kenneth Sisam. The Salisbury Psalter. EETS, 242 (1959).
- Sisam, Kenneth. Studies in the History of Old English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Smetana, Cyril L. "Ælfric and the Homiliary of Haymo of Halberstadt," Traditio, 17 (1961), 457-469.
- Smith, Charles A. "Order of Words in Anglo-Saxon Prose." Baltimore, 1893 = PMLA, n.s. vol. I, no. 2.
- Stanley, Eric Gerald. Continuations and Beginnings--Studies in Old English Literature. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1966.
- Tanenhaus, Gussie Hecht. "Bede's De Schematibus et Tropis-- A Translation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 48:3 (1962), 237-253.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. "Diachronic Syntax and Generative Grammar," Language, 41 (1965), 402-415. Reprinted in Roger Lass, ed., Approaches to English Historical Linguistics (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969).

----- Review of Paul W. Pillsbury, Descriptive Analysis of Discourse in Late West Saxon Texts (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1967) in Language, 45 (1969), 138-140.

Whitbread, L. "The Old English Poem Judgement Day II and Its Latin Source," Philol. Quarterly, 45:4 (1966), 635-656.

Woolf, Rosmary. "Saints' Lives," in Eric G. Stanley, ed., Continuations and Beginnings (London, 1966), pp.37-66.

Wrenn, C. L. A Study of Old English Literature. New York: W.W.Norton, 1967.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth Mary Wright. Old English Grammar. Third Ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Harvey Minkoff was born April 9, 1944, the third of four children to Mildred and Michael Minkoff. He went to school in New York City, and graduated Phi Beta Kappa from City College in June 1965, having majored in English, minored in Romance Languages, and done Honors Research in Linguistics. In September 1966, he received his M.A. from City College, having written his thesis on the political evolution of American journalism from its Colonial beginnings to the founding of the New York Times in 1851. He entered the City University doctoral program in September 1966, and began teaching at Hunter College and City College in February 1967. He is now Asst. Professor of English and Linguistics at Iona College, where he is responsible for the graduate program in Linguistics.