

THE ADJECTIVAL AND VERBAL PARTICIPLE WITH *BĒON* IN OLD ENGLISH. A MORPHO-SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS¹

Javier Martín Arista
javier.martin@unirioja.es
Departamento de Filologías Modernas
Universidad de La Rioja

Ana Elvira Ojanguren López
ana-elvira.ojanguren@unirioja.es
Departamento de Filologías Modernas
Universidad de La Rioja

Abstract: This article analyses the inflectional morphology of the present and the past participle of Old English, in adjectival function as well as in verbal function with *bēon* ‘to be’. The aim of the analysis is to determine whether or not the attachment of adjectival inflection depends on the function performed by the participle. The study is based on the evidence provided by the *York Corpus of Old English*. The role of Latin in the growing importance of the participle in Old English may be confirmed by the fact that in a selection of texts on the grounds of the absolute number of participles, four, out of ten, are translations from Latin. On the other hand, the results of the analysis indicate that translations from Latin present the lowest frequency of inflected participles, while the highest is found in Ælfrician texts. The main conclusion of this article is that the frequency of full inflection depends on the function of the participle. Whereas practically all adjectival participles are inflected for adjectival morphology, only one third of verbal participles receive adjectival inflection.

1. Introduction

As Lass (1992: 144) remarks, the non-finite forms of the verb in Old English are the uninflected infinitive (*writan* ‘to write’), the inflected infinitive (*to writanne* ‘to write’), the present participle (*writende* ‘writing’) and the past participle (*gewritten* ‘written’), in such a way that in Old English the infinitive and the participle can be inflected or not. The following example illustrates the topic of this research, which focuses on the inflected and uninflected participles, both with adjectival and verbal function.

- (1) (from Wedel 1978: 395-396)
 - a. Apol. (2, 8)
Ða gyrnde hyre maenig maere man micle maerða *beodende*.
‘Then, many a famous man desired her, offering many wonderful things.’
 - b. Apol. (10, 16)
Swa hwilc man swa me Apollonium *lifigendne* to gebringð...
‘Whoever brings Apollonius to me alive...’
 - c. Apol. (8, 4-5)
...se waes Thaliarcus *gehaten*.
‘...who was called Thaliarcus.’
 - d. Apol. (18, 6)
Gemiltsa me, þu ealda man, sy þæt þu sy; gemildsa me nacodum, forlidenum,
naes na of earmlicum birdum *geborenum*.
‘Have pity on me, old man, whoever you may be; have pity on me, naked,
shipwrecked, and not born from poor origins.’

¹ This research has been funded through the grant FFI2014-59110, which is thankfully acknowledged. We would like to thank Susan Pintzuk for her assistance with the searches on the *York Corpus of Old English*.

As is shown in (1), the participle can perform an adjectival function, as in *micele maerða beodende* ‘offering many things, who offered many things’ and a verbal function, as a lexical verb with *bēon* ‘to be’ in both active and passive constructions, like *se waes Thaliarcus gehaten* ‘who was called Thaliarcus’. At the same time, the participle gets both verbal and adjectival inflection in instances like *lifigendne* ‘living’ and *geborenum* ‘born’, so that the present participle agrees in case, number and gender with the noun in apposition (*Apollonium lifigendne* ‘Apollonius alive’) or with the nominal antecedent (*man micele maerða beodende* ‘men who offered many wonderful things’). The participle presents verbal inflection only in instances like *beodende* ‘offering’ and *gehaten* ‘was called’, which show exclusively the canonical inflectional endings for the present and the past participle, respectively *-ende* and *-en* (strong verbs).

The starting point of this research is Mitchell’s (1985: 409) remark that *there is no work which gives a complete treatment of the Old English participles*. In general, previous research attributes the increase of the use of the participles during the Old English period to Latin influence (Callaway 1901; Wedel 1978; Mitchell 1985; Ogura 2009). The distinction made in this article between the two main functions of the participle draws on authors like Callaway, Mitchell, and Visser. Callaway (1901) concentrates on the appositive participle, which he defines as *the participle that is equivalent to an adjectival clause as well as that which is equal to an adverbial clause. The uses of the appositive participle correspond closely to those of the subordinate adverbial clause* (1901:149). Mitchell (1985) also deals with the functions of the participle and distinguishes between its adjectival and verbal uses, which he relates to syntactic behaviour. For Visser, who pays heed to the different functions of the participle too, *in Old English the past participle appears with flexional endings; these gradually disappear in Middle English, so that subsequently the zero form is the normal one* (Visser 1966: 1280).

On the diachronic axis, the adjectival segment of the inflection of the participle disappeared during the generalised loss of inflectional endings, whereas the verbal part has been kept. For example, in (1d) the inflected participle *geborenum* would eventually yield way to *geboren*, so that the former shows verbal (*-en*) and adjectival (*-um*) endings, whereas the latter presents the verbal part only (*-en*). This is related to the fact that, as Closs Traugott (1992: 190) explains, the origin of the syntactic passive is to be found in adjectival predications with a copulative verb and a fully inflected adjectival form of the participle. This can be seen in (2), in which the first instance presents an inflected participle and the second an uninflected one. On this question, Closs Traugott (1992: 190) points out that *the number of inflected constructions became less frequent during the Old English period*, although the *-e* plural inflection (as in *afliemde* ‘banished’ in (2) a. is frequent in this period.

(2) (from Closs Traugott 1992: 199)

a. <Or 1 10 44.24>

On ðære ilcan tide wurdon twegen æðelingas *afliemde* of Sciððian.
‘At that same time two noblemen were banished from Scythia.’

b. <Or Head 64.10>

& hu II aðelingas wurdon *afliemed* of Sciððium.
‘And how two noblemen were banished from Scythia.’

Wojtyś (2009: 48) dates the loss of the past participle suffixes *-n* and *-d* to the 13th century and points out that *the suffixal marking in Old English needs to be regarded as regular*. Fischer (1992) holds in this respect that in the Late Old English

and Early Middle English period, the inflectional endings of some forms, including the present participle, began to be confused, which also led to syntactic confusion. Ogura (2009), in the same line, finds that, due to their phonemic resemblance, the endings *-ende* and *-enne* became interchangeable as variant forms in late Old English (11th century).

Overall, the works reviewed in Section 1 agree on the loss of the inflection of the participle and the approximate dating of the change, while proposing several causes for the change. However, the loss of the adjectival morphology has not been quantified so far, neither has it been related to the functions of the participle. The remainder of this article deals with these questions, with a view to determining whether or not the function performed by the participle plays any role in the attachment of adjectival inflection.

The scope of the article is restricted to non-verbal (adjectival) uses and verbal (with *bēon* ‘to be’) uses of the participle. The reasons for restricting the scope in this way are both empirical and descriptive. For empirical reasons, the amount of data of the non-verbal and verbal participle with *bēon* ‘to be’ advises to put aside the participles with *habban* ‘to have’. For descriptive reasons, the adjectival participle and the verbal participle with *bēon* ‘to be’ constitute a relatively unified phenomenon from a diachronic point of view. As Closs Traugott (1992: 192-193) explains, the development of the auxiliaries may be related to the disappearance of the inflected participles, as the participles were reanalysed from adjectives into verbs:

The inflected participial construction with BE was probably truly adjectival in PrOE. By Old English, however, it appears to have been reanalyzed as a verbal complex (as happened to *habban* during the Old English period), or at least to have been partially reanalyzed. The evidence for reanalysis is that the participle is typically uninflected.

Within the scope of the adjectival participle and the verbal participle with *bēon* ‘to be’, present and past participles are taken into account, including their uninflected forms as well as the various inflections for case (nominative, accusative, genitive, dative and instrumental), gender (masculine, feminine and neuter) and number (singular and plural).

This article is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the methodology of research, which is applied to the corpus in section 3 (morphological analysis) and section 4 (syntactic and textual analysis). Then, section 5 draws the main conclusions of this study.

2. Method

This study in the participle of Old English is based on the textual evidence available from the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* and *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*. The *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* is a 1.5 million word syntactically-annotated corpus. On its part, the *York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry* is a selection of poetic texts from the Old English Section of the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* that contains 71,490 words. As in its prose counterpart, the texts are syntactically and morphologically annotated. The prose and the poetry corpus together are referred to in the remainder of this paper as *YCOE*.

Figure 1 presents the tags that have been searched for on the YCOE in order to analyse the form and the function of the Old English participles. These include the

present and the past participle of all verbs and the special verbs *bēon* ‘to be’ and *habban* ‘to have’.

The verb BE
BAG present participle
BEN perfect participle

The verb HAVE
HAG present participle
HVN perfect participle

All other verbs
VAG present participle
VBN perfect participle

Figure 1. The initial set of YCOE morphological tags for the participle.

The verbal and adjectival uses of the present and past participles are not distinguished in the YCOE morphological analysis, both being tagged as VAN or VAG, as can be seen in figure 1. The YCOE parsing makes no distinction in the tag for the auxiliary and the main verb use of *bēon* ‘to be’. In the parsing, the auxiliary forms of *bēon* can be distinguished from main verb forms by the presence of a present or a past participle. At the syntactic level, therefore, it is necessary to define the search with respect to the nodes IP (inflectional phrase) and PTP (participle phrase) and specify the following conditions: that the copulative verb and the past participle are immediately dominated by an inflectional phrase or that the past participle is immediately dominated by a participle phrase, in such a way that the copula is shared with the verb phrase and immediately dominated by an inflectional phrase. This can be seen in figure 2.²

```
node: IP*|PTP*  
query: ((IP* idoms BED*|BEP*)  
AND (IP* idoms *VBN^*|*HVN^*|*BEN^*))  
OR (PTP* idoms *VBN^*|*HVN^*|*BEN^*))
```

Figure 2. The query string for the past participle with *bēon* ‘to be’.

As is shown in figure 3, the adjectival function of the participle holds when there is agreement in case, gender and number with the head of the noun phrase in which the participle functions as modifier. In the query language of the YCOE, a noun phrase immediately dominates a present or a past participle. This is the case with *lyfiendan gast* ‘living spirit’ in figure 3.³

² Susan Pintzuk, personal communication. The usual disclaimers apply.

³ Clauses in the YCOE are labelled IP with an additional label to indicate type, such as IP-MAT for declarative matrix IPs. The tags in figures 2 and 3 stand for the following categories and features: syntactic categories: NP (noun phrase); lexical categories: N (noun), NR (proper name), ADJ (adjective), VB (verb), BE (the verb *beon* ‘to be’), ADV (adverb), D (determiner), NUM (numeral), P (preposition), CONJ (conjunction); morphological case at word level: ^N (nominative), ^A (accusative), ^G (genitive), ^D (dative); morphological case at phrase level: -NOM (nominative), -ACC (accusative), -GEN (genitive), -DAT (dative); tense: P (present); mode: I (indicative), S (subjunctive); non-finite forms: N (past participle).

```

(IP-MAT (CONJ &
  (NP-NOM (PRO^N hi) (Q^N ealle))
  (VBD geliff+aste)
  (PP (P +turh)
    (NP-ACC (D^A +tone) (VAG^A lyfiendan) (N^A Gast)))
  (. :))
(ID coaelhom,+AHom_1:70.49))

```

Figure 3. The syntactic parsing of the participle as adjective in the YCOE.

The verbal function of the participle is the case when there is agreement in person and number with *bēon* ‘to be’, while the agreement in case, gender and number with the subject is not necessarily explicit. This is shown in figure 4, in which the nominative plural subject *heofonas* ‘heavens’ agrees in number with the copulative verb *synd* ‘are’, and in case, gender and number with the nominative plural *gefæstnode* ‘fastened’.

```

(IP-MAT (NP-NOM (N^N Heofonas))
  (BEPI synd)
  (VBN^N gef+astnode)
  (PP (P +turh)
    (NP-ACC (D^A ++at)
      (ADJ^A halige)
      (NP-GEN (NR^G Godes)
        (N^A word)))
  (. ,))
(ID coaelhom,+AHom_1:79.54))

```

Figure 4. The syntactic parsing of the participle as verb in the YCOE: IP.

As is shown in figure 4, when the participle functions as a verb, the query language of the YCOE indicates that an inflectional phrase (a clause) immediately dominates a present or a past participle. There are other instances, however, in which more than one participle is immediately dominated by the same inflectional phrase. In these cases, the second participle is analysed as giving rise to a participle phrase. In other words, the second copulative verb is considered to be omitted in the YCOE syntactic parsing. Consider a fragment like *Ic fram cildhade wæs Apollonius genemnod*, on Tirum *geboren* ‘I was called Apollonius from my childhood, [I was] born in Tirum’. The parsing in terms of a participle NP is presented in figure 5.

```

(IP-MAT-SPE (NP-NOM (PRO^N Ic))
  (PP (P fram)
    (NP-DAT (N^D cildhade)))
  (BEDI w+as)
  (NP-NOM-PRD (NR^N Apollonius))
  (VBN genemnod)
  (, ,)
  (PTP-NOM (PP (P on)
    (NP (NR Tirum)))
    (VBN^N geboren)))

```

Figure 5. The syntactic parsing of the participle as verb in the YCOE: PTP.

As can be seen in figure 5, the past participle *genemnod* ‘named’ belongs, along with the copulative verb, in the verb phrase *wæs genemnod* ‘was called’ and, therefore, constitutes an instance of participle with verbal function. The same applies to *geboren* ‘born’. Even though it is not sister-dominated along with a form of *bēon* ‘to be’ by an inflectional phase, the parsing involves a coordinated construction that omits the second copula. This is done on the basis of a participle phrase which avoids ambiguity with participles that cannot be linked to a verb phrase containing the copulative verb and, as such, are considered to perform the adjectival function in this analysis.

For the adjectival and the verbal functions of the participle, the morphological cases nominative, accusative, genitive, dative and instrumental have been searched and quantified, together with the forms without adjectival inflection. In the YCOE morphological tagging, participles formally ambiguous as to case, as well as zero marked cases count as uninflected participles. The whole set of tags can be seen in figure 5, in which the columns correspond, respectively, to the present participle of general verbs, *habban* and *bēon*; and the past participle of general verbs, *habban* and *bēon*.

VAG	HAG	BAG	VCN	HVN	BEN
VAG^N	HAG^N	BAG^N	VCN^N	HVN^N	BEN^N
VAG^A	HAG^A	BAG^A	VCN^A	HVN^A	BEN^A
VAG^G	HAG^G	BAG^G	VCN^G	HVN^G	BEN^G
VAG^D	HAG^D	BAG^D	VCN^D	HVN^D	BEN^D
VAG^I	HAG^I	BAG^I	VCN^I	HVN^I	BEN^I

Figure 5. The final set of YCOE morphological tags for the participle.

With the searches on the YCOE just defined, two types of analysis are carried out. In the first place, the morphological questions of the undertaking are addressed, including the variables of inflected vs. uninflected participle, morphological case of inflected participles, present vs. past participle, and prose vs. poetry. The data for the morphological analysis include the whole YCOE, both its prose and its poetry segments. This part of the analysis intends to offer an overall picture of the morphology of the participle in Old English prose and poetry. Secondly, the form of the participle is analysed with respect to its function. The data for this part of the study have been extracted from the ten texts that evince the highest number of participles, all of which are written in prose (see Appendix): COAELHOM (*Ælfric, Supplemental Homilies*), COAELIVE (*Ælfric’s Lives of Saints*), COBEDE (*Bede’s History of the English Church*), COCATHOM (*Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies*), COCHRON (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*), COCURA (*Cura Pastoralis*), COGREGD (*Gregory’s Dialogues*), COOROSIU (*Orosius*), COVERHOM (*Vercelli Homilies*) and COWSGOSP (*West-Saxon Gospels*). With this selection, the number of participles per text ranges between 947 and 3,379. The variables of this part of the analysis are both syntactic and textual. On the syntactic side, the adjectival and the verbal functions of the participle are distinguished, while, on the textual side, quantification by text (and type of text) has explanatory purposes.

3. Morphological analysis

This section presents the morphological side of the analysis, which revolves around the questions of the inflected vs. uninflected participle, morphological case of inflected participles, present vs. past participle, and prose vs. poetry. As has just been said, the

data for the morphological analysis include the prose and the poetry segments of the YCOE, in order to provide an overall assessment of the morphology of the participle in Old English.

The total figure or instances of the participle in the YCOE, both prose and poetry, is 35,241, 6,811 of the present participle and 28,430 of the past participle. By text type, 33,655 appear in prose texts and 1,586 in poetry texts. It may be useful at this point to take into account the size of the prose and the poetry parts of the YCOE. If these absolute figures are normalised to 1,000 words, it turns out that the relative importance of the participle is much higher in the poetry than in the prose texts. The poetry texts in the corpus have 30.7 participles per one thousand words, while the prose texts present 22.4 participles per one thousand words. Of the 35,241 participles, 20,256 are uninflected, and 14,985 are inflected for the five morphological cases. That is, 42.52% of the participles in the corpus only are inflected.

Beginning with the present participle, a total of 6,811 textual forms have been identified. Out of 6,811, 6,612 correspond to prose texts whereas 199 have been found in poetry texts. In prose texts, a total of 2,241 present participles are not inflected, as opposed to 4,371 inflected present participles. In percentual terms, 66.1 of the present participles in prose texts are inflected, with the corresponding 33.9% of uninflected participles. The nominative case clearly stands out (60.2% of inflected participles in prose texts are inflected for the nominative), although the dative and the accusative also present a considerable number of occurrences. In poetry, out of 199 instances, 105 are inflected (57.2%) and 94 uninflected (47.3%). The nominative and the accusative stand out with respect to the other cases in poetry texts. As is the case with the prose, the nominative is by far the most frequent case (58% of inflected participles are marked for this case). The instrumental, which is negligible in prose, does not have any occurrences in poetry. These figures have been tabulated in table 1.

	Prose	Poetry	Total
Nominative	2,631	61	2,422
Accusative	542	13	555
Genitive	312	17	329
Dative	885	14	899
Instrumental	1	0	1
Inflected total	4,371	105	4,476
Uninflected total	2,241	94	2,335
Grand total	6,612	199	6,811

Table 1. The present participle by morphological case and text type.

Turning to the past participle, the corpus evinces a total of 28,430. This total represents more than four times as much as the total of the present participle. Out of the 28,430 past participles, 27,043 have been extracted from prose texts, with poetry texts containing the much lower figure of 1,387. In prose texts, the number of uninflected past participles is 17,062, a much higher figure than that of the inflected past participles, 9,981. Percentually, the uninflected past participle represents 63% whereas the inflected past participle reaches 37% only. In poetry, 859 past participles do not show adjectival inflection (62%) while 528 do (38%). By case, the nominative stands out in prose and

poetry (68.6% of past participles in prose and 80% of past participles in poetry are inflected for the nominative), although the accusative also turns out significant figures. These results are in accordance with Kilpiö's (1989: 134) remark that *towards the late OE period the inflection of the past participle in passive constructions, already simpler than that of the adjective in early OE, underwent further simplification so that basically only two forms occurred: an endingless participle in the singular and one ending in -e in the plural*. The results corresponding to the past participle by case and text type are presented in table 2.

	Prose	Poetry	Total
Nominative	6,852	423	7,275
Accusative	1,617	82	1,699
Genitive	335	13	348
Dative	1,171	10	1,781
Instrumental	6	0	6
Inflected total	9,981	528	10,509
Uninflected total	17,062	859	17,921
Grand total	27,043	1,387	28,430

Table 2. The past participle by morphological case and text type.

Textually, the past participle is far more frequent than the present participle. This is the case with prose and poetry texts, but the gap is wider in poetry than in prose. Although these aspects require further research, from a diachronic perspective this may mean that, whereas the periphrasis of copulative verb plus past participle is well established in the language, the periphrasis involving a present participle is not fixed yet. As Denison (1993: 380) states, *in Old English the progressive is unevenly distributed, its overall frequency low but in certain texts (notably Orosius) remarkably high*. Denison (1993: 380) illustrates the point with examples like the ones in (3).

(3)

- a. *Or* 100.20
 þætte se consul wæs *wenende* þæt eall þæt folc wære gind þæt lond tobræd,
 & þiderweard farende wæs...
 ‘so that the consul assumed wrongly that the army was all scattered
 throughout the country, and he was heading there...’
- b. *Or* 123.2
 Hit wæs þa swiþe *oþþyncende* þam oþrum consulum...
 ‘Then it displeased the other consuls greatly...’

Synchronically, the higher frequency of appearance of the past participle may be interpreted as the result of the existence of numerous passive constructions, including syntactic passives like (2a) and (2b).

4. Syntactic and textual analysis

This section analyses the form of the participle with respect to its adjectival and verbal function with *bēon* ‘to be’. The data for this part of the analysis comprise the ten texts with the highest figures of participles. As a matter of fact, the ten are written in prose.

The present participle is practically always inflected when it performs the adjectival function (97.1% of the participles functioning as adjectives display adjectival case marking). This contrasts with the inflection of the present participle as verb, which is inflected in approximately two thirds of the cases (64.3% is the exact figure). If a closer view is taken of the verbal function, the results indicate that Ælfrician texts (*Ælfric's Homilies*, the *Lives of Saints* and the *Catholic Homilies*) show over 80% of inflected present participles in the verbal function. The present participle total largely reflects the results of the verbal function because the present participle is widely inflected in its adjectival function and, consequently, differences among texts arise as to the verbal function, not the adjectival function. Considering the total figures of the present participle, the abovementioned texts by Ælfric turn out the highest figures of inflection and, at the opposite end, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and some translations from Latin (Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and *Orosius*) contain the lowest number of inflected participles. These aspects are tabulated in table 3. As in the following tables, the quantification in table 3 shows the figure of inflected participles by function with respect to the total of participles in verbal and adjectival function. The percentage of totals only is given.

Text	Adjectival function	Verbal function	Present participle total
coaelhom	75/79	132/162	207/241
coaelive	151/156	328/375	479/531
cobede	127/130	161/469	288/599
cocathom	264/270	605/745	869/1,015
cochron	10/14	30/90	40/104
cocura	82/82	58/97	140/179
cogregd	183/187	432/663	615/850
coorosiu	15/15	29/241	44/256
coverhom	72/74	23/73	95/147
cowsgosp	40/42	293/334	333/376
Category total	1,019/1,049	2,091/3,249	3,110/4,298
(%)	(97.1%)	(64.3%)	(72.3%)

Table 3. The present participle in adjectival and verbal function by text.

As regards the past participle, in its adjectival function it is inflected even more frequently than the present participle, which nears the total (97.6% of the past participles in the corpus show adjectival inflection when functioning as adjectives). In its verbal function, the past participle is slightly less inflective than the present participle (only 30.2% of the instances present adjectival inflection). Considering these two aspects, the gap between the inflection of the adjectival function and the verbal function is wider in the past participle than in the present participle. Remarkable differences appear, though, when the results are analysed text by text. Whereas the texts by Ælfric (the *Homilies*, the *Lives of Saints* and the *Catholic Homilies*) show over 80% of inflected present participles in the verbal function, they evince percentages of inflection of the past participle in the same function below 40%. This percentage of inflection is still higher than the one displayed by some translations from Latin. Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, *Orosius* and the *Cura Pastoralis* throw percentages of inflected past participles in the verbal function under 20%. Other Latin translations, such as

Gregory's Dialogues and the *West-Saxon Gospels* turn out higher percentages but still around 30%. The data on the past participle are tabulated in table 4.

Text	Adjectival function	Verbal function	Past participle total
coaelhom	104/110	271/700	375/810
coaelive	184/187	541/1,431	725/1,618
cobede	174/176	399/1,645	573/1,821
cocathom	449/465	1,138/3,219	1,587/3,684
cochron	56/58	205/1,166	261/1,224
cocura	184/189	307/1,114	491/1,303
cogregd	339/341	692/2,188	1,031/2,529
coorosiu	16/16	120/650	136/666
coverhom	90/91	226/679	316/770
cowsgosp	58/61	328/1,059	386/1,120
Category total (%)	1,654/1,694 (97.6%)	4,227/13,951 (30.2%)	5,881/15,545 (37.8%)

Table 4. The past participle in adjectival and verbal function by text.

Table 5 summarises the data on the adjectival and the verbal functions of the participle in the corpus and offers the absolute as well as the relative totals by text.

Text	Adjectival function	Verbal function	Text total
coaelhom	179/189	403/862	582/1,051 (55.3%)
coaelive	335/343	869/1,806	1,204/2,149 (56%)
cobede	301/306	560/2,114	861/2,420 (35%)
cocathom	713/735	1,743/3,874	2,456/4,609 (53.2%)
cochron	66/72	235/1,256	301/1,328 (22.6%)
cocura	266/271	365/1,211	631/1,482 (42.5%)
cogregd	522/528	1,124/2,851	1,646/3,379 (48.7%)
coorosiu	31/31	149/1,161	180/1,192 (15.1%)
coverhom	162/165	249/752	411/917 (44.8%)
cowsgosp	98/103	621/1,393	719/1,496 (48%)
Category total (%)	2673/2,743 (97.4%)	6,318/17,280 (36.5%)	8,991/20,023 (44.5%)

Table 5. The verbal and adjectival function of the participles by text.

As is shown in table 5, the selection of ten prose texts from the YCOE comprises a total of 20,023 participles, of which 2,743 function as adjectives and 17,280 perform the verbal function with *beon* 'to be'. With respect to inflectional morphology, the vast majority of participles with adjectival function display, together with the verbal ending, the adjectival inflectional endings. On the other hand, when the function performed by the participle is verbal with *beon* 'to be', around one third of the participles present adjectival inflection. By text, the count of inflected participles is around one half of the total (ranging between 42% in the *Cura Pastoralis* and 56% in the *Lives of Saints*), except in three texts: Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and *Orosius*, which evince about 35%, 22% and 15% of inflected participles respectively.

On the other hand, religious prose as represented by Ælfric's *Homilies*, *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*, shows over 55% of inflected participles.

In other words, leaving the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* aside, the translations from Latin throw figures below 50% of inflected participles, thus *Gregory's Dialogues* (48%), the *West-Saxon Gospels* (48%), the *Cura Pastoralis* (42%), Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (35%), and *Orosius* (15%). Although the total of inflected participles in *Gregory's Dialogues* and the *Cura Pastoralis* is similar to those in the *Vercelli Homilies* (44%), Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (35% of inflected participles) and *Orosius* (15%) confirm the tendency of Old English translations to present fewer inflected participles than the religious prose.

Interestingly, the translations from Latin show fewer inflected participles while containing more participles than the other texts. As can be seen in table 6, the translations have at least two participles per one hundred words (which amounts to approximately 20,000 words per million, WPM), while presenting lower figures of inflected participles. The word count seems to support the view that the translations from Latin opt for rendering the present and the past participle undeclined even though it is declined as an adjective in the source language.

Text	Word count	Text total	%
coaelhom	62,669	1,051	1.6%
coaelive	100,193	2,149	2.1%
cobede	80,767	2,420	2.9%
cocathom	204,756	4,609	2.2%
cochron	104,201	1,328	1.2%
cocura	70,675	1,482	2%
cogregd	117,146	3,379	2.8%
coorosiu	51,020	1,192	2.3%
coverhom	52,123	917	1.7%
cowsgosp	71,104	1,496	2.1%

This higher textual frequency of the participle in the Old English translations from Latin may confirm the role played by Latin influence in the increase in the use of the participle (Callaway 1901; Wedel 1978; Mitchell 1985; Ogura 2009), although Lamont (2015: 351) finds 1,511 Latin present participles in the four gospels, as opposed to the 453 present participles used to render them in Old English. As regards the adjectival inflection of the participle, the data discussed above do not indicate direct influence from Latin. As has already been said, the translations from Latin show lower frequencies of inflected participles than vernacular texts, with the exception of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. On the other hand, the texts by Ælfric show the highest rates of inflected participles, particularly with the verbal function. On the question, Sato (2009: 4) holds that Latin influenced Ælfric's syntax to such an extent that he adopted syntactic constructions from the Latin language, including the absolute participle. Furthermore, Sato (2009: 4) goes on to say that Ælfric could use absolute participles with and without their direct Latin counterparts and *skillfully modified the syntax of the Latin source, inventing a more sophisticated style in his vernacular language than the style of his Latin sources. Thus, Ælfric's use of this loan syntax should not be dismissed as such a direct Latin influence.* In a similar line, Lamont (2015: 352) remarks:

The translators of both the OE Genesis and the Old English Gospels use Old English present participles even when the Latin does not. There is always the possibility that the Latin exemplar(s) differed from the extant versions of the Vulgate, but it also appears possible that the OE present participle was somewhat idiomatic for the translators of both parts of Genesis and all four Old English Gospels [] While scholars have argued that the OE present participle and progressive developed as reactions to Latin, they do not appear to observe that these unattested participles in the translations suggest more than a reaction to Latin, but perhaps a native idiom, albeit in late Old English.

The results of this study are in accordance with this view. Considering the unattested participles noted by Sato (2009) and Lamont (2015), as well as the low level of participial inflection in the translations from Latin, which inflects the participle for case, number and gender on a regular basis, it may be the case that the inflection of the participle in Ælfric is a matter of grammatical purism rather than direct influence from Latin.

With respect to *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, it is relatively predictable that a highly narrative text has less adjectival modification than more descriptive texts like the ones from the religious prose. Although this question deserves more attention, the narrative style of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* could explain the low count of participles performing the adjectival function (where, as has been shown above, inflection is much more frequent) and, ultimately, the low level of adjectival inflection of the participle.

5. Conclusions

This article has analysed the inflectional morphology of the present and the past participle of Old English, both in adjectival and in verbal function with *bēon* ‘to be’, in order to answer the question whether or not the function performed by the participle determines the presence of adjectival inflection to the right of verbal inflection.

The data, extracted from *the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* and *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*, indicate that the verbal function is performed by the participle far more frequently than the adjectival function. With respect to the relation between the function and the inflection of the participle, the analysis of the corpus leads to the conclusion that the adjectival segment in the inflection of the participle is functionally motivated. Indeed, nearly all participles with adjectival function are inflected for adjectival morphology, whereas only around one third of participles with verbal function get both verbal and adjectival inflection.

Some authors cited in this paper attribute the growing importance of the participle in Old English to Latin influence. This may be confirmed by the fact that in a selection of texts from the corpus made on the basis of the absolute number of participles, four are translations from Latin, out of a total of ten texts. However, the results of the analysis show that the translations from Latin present the lowest frequency of inflected participles. On the other hand, religious prose, as represented by Ælfric’s *Homilies*, *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*, shows the highest rates of inflected participles. It remains for further research to determine if other texts originally written in the vernacular language also opt for the inflected participle in a number of cases comparable to Ælfrician texts.

References

- Callaway, M. 1901: *The appositive participle in Anglo-Saxon*. Baltimore, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.
- Closs Traugott, E. 1992: Syntax. *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume I: The Beginnings to 1066*. R. M. Hogg ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 186-201.
- Denison, D. 1993: *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*. London, Longman.
- Fischer, O. 1992: Syntax. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. N. Blake ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 207-408.
- Kilpiö, M. 1989: *Passive Constructions in Old English Translations from Latin. With Special Reference to the OE Bede and the Pastoral Care*. Helsinki, Société Néophilologique.
- Lamont, G. J. M. 2015: *The Present Participle as a Marker of Style and Authorship in Old English Biblical Translation*. PhD Dissertation, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.
- Lass, R. 1992: Phonology and Morphology. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. N. Blake ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 23-155.
- Mitchell, B. 1985: *Old English Syntax. Concord, the parts of speech and the sentence. Volume 1*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ogura, M. 2009: The interchangeability of the endings *-ende* and *-enne* in Old and Early Middle English. *English Studies* 90, 6: 721-734.
- Sato, K. 2009: The Absolute Participle Construction in Old English: Ælfric's Exploitation of the Latinate Syntax in his Vernacular Prose. *English Studies*, 90.1: 2-16.
- Taylor, A., A. Warner, S. Pintzuk & F. Beths. 2003: *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*. Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York [<http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/corpora/YCOE/>].
- Taylor, A., A. Warner, S. Pintzuk, F. Beths & L. Plug. 2001. *The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry*. Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York [<http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/pcorpus.html>].
- Visser, F. 1984 (1966): *A Historical Syntax of the English Language. Part two (vol. II): Syntactical units with one verb (continued)*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Wedel, A. R. 1978: Participial Construction in High German and West Saxon of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Latin and Germanic Differences. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 77.3: 383-397.
- Wojtyś, A. 2009: Suffixal past participle marking in Mediaeval English. *Anglica*, 18: 45-68.

Appendix. Information on texts from the YCOE

coaelhom.o3

Text name	Ælfric's Homilies Supplemental
File name	coaelhom.o3
DOE short title	ÆHom
Cameron number	B1.4
Manuscript	various, see edition
Dialect	West Saxon
Genre	Homilies
Latin translation	No
Word count	62,669
Edition	Pope, J.C. 1968. <i>Homilies of Ælfric, A supplementary Collection</i> . Early English Text Society, 260. London: OUP.

coelive.o3

Text name	Ælfric's Lives of Saints
File name	coelive.o3
DOE short title	ÆLS
Cameron number	B1.3.2 - B1.3.35
Manuscript	London, British Museum, Cotton Julius E.VII
Manuscript date	s. xi in.
Dialect	West Saxon
Genre	Biography, lives
Latin translation	No
Word count	100,193
Edition	Skeat, Walter William. 1966 (1881-1900). <i>Ælfric's Lives of Saints</i> . EETS 76, 82, 94, 114. London: OUP.

cobede.o2

Text name	Bede's History of the English Church
File name	cobede.o2
DOE short title	Bede
Cameron number	B9.6
Manuscript	Cambridge, University Library Kk.3.18
Manuscript date	s. xi
Dialect	West Saxon/Anglian
Genre	History
Latin translation	Yes
Word count	80,767
Edition	Miller, Thomas. 1959-1963 (1890-1898). <i>The Old English Version of "Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People"</i> . EETS 95, 96, 110, 111. London: OUP.

cocathom1.o3

Text name	Ælfric's Catholic Homilies I
File name	cocathom1.o3
DOE short title	ÆCHom I
Cameron number	B1.1.2 - B1.1.42
Manuscript	Cambridge, University Library, Gg.3.28

Manuscript date s. x/xi
Dialect West Saxon
Genre Homilies
Latin translation No
Word count 106,173
Edition Clemoes, P. 1997. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*. EETS s.s. 17. Oxford: OUP.

cocathom2.o3

Text name Ælfric's Catholic Homilies II
File name cocathom2.o3
DOE short title ÆCHom II
Cameron number B1.2.2 - B1.2.49
Manuscript Cambridge, University Library, Gg.3.28
Manuscript date s. x/xi
Dialect West Saxon
Genre Homilies
Latin translation No
Word count 98,583
Edition Godden, M. 1979. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*. EETS s.s. 5. London: OUP.

cochronA.o23

Text name Anglo-Saxon Chronicle A
File name cochronA.o23
DOE short title ChronA
Cameron number B17.1
Manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
Manuscript date s. ix/x-x²
Dialect West Saxon
Genre History
Latin translation No
Word count 14,583
Edition Plummer, Charles. 1965 (1892-1899). *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reissued D. Whitelock, Oxford 1952.

cochronC

Text name Anglo-Saxon Chronicle C
File name cochronC
DOE short title ChronC
Cameron number B17.7
Manuscript London, British Museum, Cotton Tiberius B.I
Manuscript date s. xi¹ - xi²
Genre History
Latin translation ?
Word count 22,463
Edition Rositzke, H.A. 1967 (1940). *The C-Text of the Old English Chronicles*. Bochum-Langendreer: Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 34.

cochronD

Text name Anglo-Saxon Chronicle D
File name cochronD
DOE short title ChronD
Cameron number B17.8
Manuscript London, British Museum, Cotton Tiberius B.IV
Manuscript date s. xi med. - xi²
Genre History
Latin translation ?
Word count 26,691
Edition Classen, E. and F.E. Harmer, eds. 1926. *An Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

cochronE.o34

Text name Anglo-Saxon Chronicle E (Peterborough Chronicle)
File name cochronE.o34
DOE short title ChronE
Cameron number B17.9
Manuscript Oxford, Bodleian, Laud Misc. 636
Manuscript date s. xii¹, xii med.
Dialect West Saxon/X
Genre History
Latin translation ?
Word count 40,641
Edition Plummer, Charles. 1965 (1892-1899). *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reissued D. Whitelock, Oxford 1952.

cocura.o2

Text name Cura Pastoralis
File name cocura.o2
DOE short title CP
Cameron number B9.1.2, B9.1.3
Manuscript Oxford, Bodleian, Hatton 20
Manuscript date s. ix ex.
Dialect West Saxon
Genre Religious treatise
Latin translation Yes
Word count 68,556
Edition Sweet, Henry. 1958 (1871). *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. EETS 45, 50. London: OUP.

cocuraC

Text name Cura Pastoralis
File name cocuraC
DOE short title CP (Cotton)
Cameron number B9.1.3.1
Manuscript London, British Museum, Cotton Tiberius B.XI
Manuscript date s. ix ex.

Genre Religious treatise
Latin translation Yes
Word count 2,119
Edition Sweet, Henry. 1958 (1871). *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. EETS 45, 50. London: OUP.

cogregdC.o24

Text name Gregory's Dialogues
File name cogregdC.o24
DOE short title GD (C)
Cameron number B9.5.1 - 9.5.6
Manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 322
Manuscript date s. xi²
Dialect West Saxon/Anglian Mercian
Genre Biography, lives
Latin translation Yes
Word count 91,553
Edition Hecht, Hans. 1965 (1900-1907). *Bischof Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Bibliothek der Angelsaechsischen Prosa, V. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

cogregdH.o23

Text name Gregory's Dialogues
File name cogregdH.o23
DOE short title GD (H)
Cameron number B9.5.7, - B9.5.10
Manuscript Oxford, Bodleian, Hatton 76
Manuscript date s. xi¹
Dialect West Saxon
Genre Biography, lives
Latin translation Yes
Word count 25,593
Edition Hecht, Hans. 1965 (1900-1907). *Bischof Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Bibliothek der Angelsaechsischen Prosa, V. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

coorosiu.o2

Text name Orosius
File name coorosiu.o2
DOE short title Or
Cameron number B9.2.1 - B9.2.7
Manuscript London, British Museum, Add. 47967
Manuscript date s. x¹
Dialect West Saxon
Genre History
Latin translation Yes
Word count 51,020

Edition Bately, Janet. 1980. *The Old English Orosius*. EETS s.s. 6. London: OUP.

coverhom

Text name Vercelli Homilies

File name coverhom

DOE short title HomS (ScraggVerc 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20)
HomU (ScraggVerc 2, 4, 6, 7, 15, 22)
HomM (ScraggVerc 14, 21)
LS (ScraggVerc 17, 18)

Cameron number HomS: B3.2.1, B3.2.2, B3.2.3, B3.2.4, B3.2.11.5, B3.2.24, B3.2.34, B3.2.36, B3.2.38, B3.2.39, B3.2.40.6, B3.2.43
HomU: B3.3.6, B3.4.7, B3.4.8, B3.4.9, B3.4.10, B3.4.11
HomM: B3.5.11, B3.5.13
LS: B3.3.17.3, B3.3.19

Manuscript Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII

Manuscript dates. x²

Genre HomS: Homilies
HomU: Homilies
LS: Biography, Lives

Latin translation ?

Word count 45,674

Edition Scragg, D.G. 1992. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. EETS 300. Oxford: OUP.

coverhomE

Text name Vercelli Homilies, Homily I

File name coverhomE

DOE short title HomS 24.1 (Scragg)

Cameron number B3.2.24.1

Manuscript Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 340 and 342

Manuscript date s. xi in.

Genre Homilies

Latin translation ?

Word count 4,463

Edition Scragg, D.G. 1992. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. EETS 300. Oxford: OUP.

coverhomL

Text name Vercelli Homilies, Homily IX

File name coverhomL

DOE short title HomU 15.1 (Scragg)

Cameron number B3.4.15.1

Manuscript Oxford, Bodleian, Hatton 115

Manuscript date s. xi²

Genre Homilies

Latin translation ?

Word count 1,986

Edition Scragg, D.G. 1992. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. EETS 300. Oxford: OUP.

cowsgosp.o3

Text name	West-Saxon Gospels
File name	cowsgosp.o3
DOE short title	Mt (WSCp), Mk (WSCp), Lk (WSCp), Jn (WSCp)
Cameron number	B8.4.3.1, B8.4.3.2, B8.4.3.3, B8.4.3.4
Manuscript	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 140
Manuscript date	s. xi ¹
Dialect	West Saxon
Genre	Bible
Latin translation	Yes
Word count	71,104
Edition	Skeat, Walter William. 1871-1887. <i>The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian Versions</i> . Cambridge: CUP. Reprinted Darmstadt 1970.

[<http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/info/YcoeTextInfo.html>]