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Abstract

Many of our surviving Old English texts are translations from Latin original. Given that the syntax of Latin and Old English differ in a number of ways and the possibility of transference of linguistic features from the source to the target language in translation, translation from Latin may have far-reaching consequences for the study of Old English syntax and syntactic change. In this paper I show that in one syntactic structure where the syntax of the languages differ, the prepositional phrase with pronominal complement, there is clear influence of Latin on the Old English. Overall, translations show more head-initial PP structure (the Latin type) than non-translations. Moreover, while non-biblical translations show a higher rate of head-initial PP structure only when there is a PP in the Latin source, biblical translations show a higher frequency of head-initial PPs whether or not there is a PP in the Latin source.

1 Introduction

Many of the extant Old English prose texts, especially those of the early period (pre-950), are translations from original Latin texts. Unlike literary scholars who have expended a great deal of energy establishing the connections between the original and translated texts, (see Scruggs (1997) for an overview of Old English source studies, or the electronic database Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: A Register of Written Sources Used by Anglo-Saxon Authors (2002), which aims to record the Latin sources for all Old English texts), among
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systatistics, despite a general acknowledgement of the issue and individual efforts to address it in relation to particular constructions (see, for example, among many others, Allen 1992; Calloway 1913; Denison 1985a; Gonzales-Diaz 2004; Fischer 1992; Lightfoot 1991; Pfister to appear), no systematic investigation of its effect has been carried out. The issue is an important one, however, since one of the effects of translation is (or may be) transference of features from the source to the target language, and if such transfers are sufficiently systematic and widespread they may affect our models of Old English syntax. In this paper I take a first small step toward such a systematic investigation.

In any translation there are two ways in which transference from the source to the target language might manifest itself, one direct and one indirect. The direct effect is the case where the translator, when faced with a particular structure in the original, reproduces a matching structure in the translation. The extreme version of direct translation is glossochemical, since clauses are essentially a direct translation of an entire text. This extreme version of direct translation, of course, often produces structures ungrammatical in the target language, something which competent translators not involved in glossing generally avoid. In cases in which direct translation does not lead to ungrammaticality, however, there is no reason for a translator to avoid it. Of course, if the source and target language variants are the same structure (e.g., verbal-finite clauses, head-initial NPs, etc.) the translator has no choice but to use direct translation. The interesting cases, and those in which direct translation may have an effect on our analyses of the target language, are particularly those in which the target exhibits variability (e.g., verbal-final and verbal-medial clauses, head-initial and head-final NPs, etc.) and only one of these possible structures matches the structure in the source language. In this case the translator must choose whether to follow the source or to use one of the other structures possible in the target language. A direct translation effect, therefore, is one in which the translator uses a higher than usual frequency of a particular variant in direct response to a matching structure in the source.

Translator's, of course, do not always slavishly follow the structure of the text before them. They may reword ideas, add their own comments, and generally produce a text which cannot be matched structure for structure with the source. As a result, there are often structures in the target which are not present in the original, and thus have no direct source. The effect of translation may also be present in these cases, however, in an indirect form, a kind of priming, in fact, in which the translator, under the influence of the invisible structure of the source, produces a higher frequency of a particular variant in the target, regardless of whether there is a matching structure in the source. This is the indirect effect.

In this paper I investigate direct and indirect translation effects in Old English using prepositional phrases with pronoun complements as a test case. This is a structure which has the property of being basically invariant in Latin (head-initial) but variable in

Old English (head-final, head-final, or separated),\(^1\) and there is thus potential for both direct and indirect translation effects. Interestingly, the bare frequencies show little evidence of any type of effect. However, once a number of linguistic factors that influence the position of the pronounal complement in Old English are taken into account using multivariate analysis (Goldvarb, Tagliamonte, Lawrence, and Robinson 2001) the effect of translation is isolated, a very clear pattern emerges in which some texts (non-biblical translations) show only direct translation effects, while others (biblical translations) show both direct and indirect effects. I relate these differences in translation effect, direct or indirect, to the translation strategies of the Old English writers, who approach the translation of biblical texts, as the word of God, in quite a different fashion from non-biblical ones.

2 Data and methods

The structure I investigate in this paper is prepositional phrases with pronounal complements. In Latin, with the exception of the cited forms in -cum (meaning 'with me', 'with you', etc.), all prepositional phrases with prounounal complements are head-initial, that is, with the pronoun to the right of the preposition, as in (1).

1. a. Dicitque Dominus ad eum.
   Said and Lord NOM to him-ACC.
   'And the Lord said to him.'
   (Genesis 11:1)

b. Atque in te benedicter universae cognitiones tenea.
And in you-ACC are blessed whole-GEN nations-NOM earth-GEN.
'And the nations of the whole earth are blessed in you.'
   (Genesis 15:5)

In Old English, on the other hand, in addition to the head-initial order with the pronoun to the right, as in (2), pronoun complements of prepositions may appear to the left of the preposition, either immediately as in (3a), or even further to the left, separated from the head by other material, as in (3b). Pronouns are never separated from their preposition in head-initial order.

\(^1\)There is one exception to the otherwise uniform head-initial order of Latin PPs. The preposition cum 'with' changes to the end of personal pronouns only: mecum 'with me', tecum 'with you', etc. With all other complements cum acts like other prepositions.
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(2) Head-initial PP, pronoun to the right

Sum man was send from God to us,
A man was sent from God himself to us,
‘A man was sent from God himself to us.’

(COAELROM,+Ailim 1.37.21)

(3) Pronoun to the left.

a. ly. cwæþ sce Halæd him to, "Aris hol of þam bedde."
Then said the Saviour him to, "Aris whole from the bed."
Then the Saviour said to him, "Aris whole from the bed."**

(COAELROM,+Ailim 2.38.259)

b. He gentæh him bæcum to sonfan onre gastæs wyrcæm hæmæ he syfl. sy.
He takes him them to seven other spirits worse than he himself is,
‘He then takes to him seven other spirits worse than he is himself.’

(COAELROM,+Ailim 4.47.545)

Thus while Old English and Latin share one prepositional phrase structure, head-initial, Old English also has the possibility, not generally present in Latin, of placing the pronoun somewhere to the left of the preposition. The data thus fall into four groups:2

a. the Latin source has a PP, and there is a matching head-initial PP (labelled P-PRO in the examples) in the Old English, as in (4)

b. the Latin source has a PP, and there is a non-head-initial PP in the Old English, either with the complement immediately to the left (PRO-P), as in (5), or separated (PRO...P), as in example (6)

c. the Latin source does not have a PP, and there is a head-initial PP in the Old English, as in (7)

d. the Latin source does not have a PP, and there is a non-head-initial PP in the Old English, either with the pronoun immediately to the left, as in (8), or separated, as in (9)

(4) PP in Latin, P-PRO in OE

a. Et cœpit universæ terræ neminem te esse.
Behold all-NOM earth-NOM before you-ACC is.
‘Behold all the earth is before you.’

(Genesis 13.9)

(5) PP in Latin, PRO-P in OE

a. Curatee concitacion, diversum ad currum.
When they had-eaten, they said to him-ACC.
‘When they had-eaten, they said to him.’

(Genesis 16.8)

b. Mihi pater et mater, pater cessavit ei tuum.
When they had-eaten, then they said to him.

(CO.TTEST,Gen:18.0.697)

(6) PP in Latin, PRO...P in OE

a. Dixite ad eum Deum:
Said and to him-ACC God-NOM.
‘And God said to him.’

(Genesis 20.6)

b. & Duxit eum eceptum.
And God him said to.
‘And God said to him.’

(CO.TTEST,Gen:20.6.834)

(7) no PP in Latin, P-PRO in OE

a. Quid videntis, ut hoc faceris.
What-ACC you have-seen that this-ACC you-would-do.
‘What have you seen, that you would do this?’

(Genesis 29.10)

b. Hic est gestus hu milid un, just mi awe don uscelt.
What saw you among us that you so did would.
‘What did you see among us, that you would do so?’

(CO.TTEST,Gen:20.10.848)

(8) no PP in Latin, PRO-P in OE

a. Et ecept: Sorgite,
And he said: Arise,
‘And he said: Arise!’

(Genesis 19.14)

2For details on the prepositions included and what constitutes a match between the Latin and Old English, see Appendix B.
b. & cried him to: Arise.
And said him to: Arise.
'And said to him: 'Arise'.'
(COTEST,Gen:19,14,708)

(9) no PP in Latin, PRO...P in OE
a. Respondit Abraham.
Answered Abraham-ROM.
'Abraham answered.'
(Genesis 20:11)
b. Abraham him money to.
Abraham him said to.
'Abraham said to him.'
(COTEST,Gen:20,11,847)

In this study I consider the two structures with the pronoun to the left of the head as variants of the same type and treat them together as one category. Practically, this decision rests on the fact that the crux of the investigation is to determine whether and how the Old English matches or does not match the Latin source, and both of the non-head-initial types fall into the second category. However, this is also a sound position theoretically as well. Previous analyses of the pronominal complements of prepositions (e.g. van Kemenade 1987; Koopman 1997; Pintzuk 1999) have concluded that these pronouns are clefts (like other OE pronouns) and that in addition to their base-generated position they may appear in special clitic positions. One of these positions is at the left-edge of the PP, while the others are initial in the VP and either preceding or following the topic. Thus both the structures with the pronoun to the left of the head are clitic structures, they simply differ in which clitic position is involved. Finally, the qualitative evidence also supports this approach as a multivariate analysis of each variant separately produces very similar results, showing that the factors affecting both are the same. The data used in this study have been extracted from the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English prose (YCOE) (Taylor et al. 2002). The texts used are listed in Appendix A. For English original all cases of prepositional phrases with pronominal complements are included. For the translations, shorter texts include all cases, while for longer ones, samples are used as indicated. The Latin source for each taken in the translated texts was located. Each Old English token was classified either as having a direct source, a matching Latin PP or having no source. The latter category includes cases in which there is a Latin source but it doesn't include a matching PP and cases in which there is no source, i.e. where the translation includes material not in the source.

Thus there are three major categories of data: (1) original English PPs, (2) translated PPs with a source in the Latin, and (3) translated PPs without a source in the Latin. More details about the cases included in the study are given in Appendix B.

3 Results

3.1 Head-initial order in translations vs. non-translations

Tables 1 and 2 give the overall rate of head-initial and non-head-initial PPs, labelled P-PRO and PRO(...P), respectively. Table 1 includes the translated texts and Table 2 the non-translations. All PPs are included in Table 1, whether they have a source PP in the Latin or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
<th>PRO(...P)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% P-PRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>93.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>92.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stilfores</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>83.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bote</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>82.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrestoengar</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Care</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues (C)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>73.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostolica</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beadles Rule</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicodemia</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>61.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orvies</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>54.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues (H)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>77.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Percentage head-initial PP order (P-PRO) by translated text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Translations</th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
<th>PRO(...P)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% P-PRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beadling Homilies</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verticell Homilies</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>73.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Homilies 1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>73.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>88.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offre Homilies</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>83.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives of Saints</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>86.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallian Homilies</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>57.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>2604</td>
<td>74.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Percentage head-initial PP order by non-translated text.

As predicted, it appears that translated texts have a higher head-initial order than non-translated texts. However, this effect is largely caused by the three large biblical

Separating these texts we get the results in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
<th>PRO(...)P</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Translations</strong></td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>65.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Biblical</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>67.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>57.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: A comparison of the frequency of head-initial PP order in biblical and non-biblical translations.

Table 3 shows that the percentage of head-initial order in PPs in the biblical texts is much higher than in the non-biblical ones. It also appears to show that the frequency in the non-biblical translations is the same as in the non-translations and that for these texts there is no translation effect at all. However, a more detailed examination of the data shows this to be false. If we divide the tokens from the translated texts into those that have at least one source PP in the Latin and those that do, and then compare the frequency of head-initial order in these categories to that in the non-translated texts we see a different picture. Since we have already seen that the biblical texts act somewhat differently from the other translated texts, these are separated out as well. The results are given in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
<th>PRO(...)P</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Translations</strong></td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>65.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Bib. Translation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No source PP</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>56.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source PP</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>57.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biblical Translation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No source PP</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>82.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source PP</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: A comparison of the frequency of head-initial PP order with and without a Latin source PP.

Table 4 shows that for both biblical and non-biblical translations, the frequency of head-initial PPs is higher when there is a source PP (52.40% and 51.25% respectively) than it is in non-translations (65.79%), a clear translation effect. The effect is the same in the non-translations in an interesting way. In the biblical texts the percentage of head-initial cases (82.06%) is higher than in non-translated texts, a possible indirect translation effect which will be discussed further.

The difference between non-translations and non-biblical translations with no source PP is statistically significant ($X^2 = 34.16, p < .001$), as is the difference between the with and without source PP categories for both biblical ($X^2 = 15.27, p < .001$) and non-biblical ($X^2 = 23.58, p < .001$) translations. Non-biblical translations with a source PP do not differ significantly from biblical translations with a source PP ($X^2 = 2.72, p < .05$).

3.2 Factors affecting PP order

In order to explain the discrepancy in Table 4 between the frequency of head-initial PPs in non-translations and that in translations with no source PP, we need to look at the factors that affect order in the Old English PP. As will become clear below, there are a number of factors which have an effect including the number of the pronoun, the position of the pronoun, and the verb. Because the factors affecting PP order overlap, i.e., for the most part all are present in each case, it is not possible to get an accurate picture of the effect of each of these factors separately by looking at percentages alone. I therefore carried out a multivariate analysis using Goldsmith (2001). In the following tables (5-9) I give the percentages and factor weights for four factors which affect PP order: the pronoun, the preposition, and the verb, and the desirability of the pronoun. For the most part these factors reflect the factor weights in addition, i.e., higher percentages have higher weights, although there are a few exceptions. Table 5 compares frequency and weight for head-initial order by pronoun. The Old English pronoun system is given in (10). The pronouns are divided into categories as follows. The 1st and 2nd singular and plural categories include all the case forms since for these the accusative and dative cases are not distinct and the number of genitive pronouns is very small (under 10 tokens). In the third person, accusative and dative cases are always morphologically distinct, but number in some cases ambiguous (e.g., æs can be either singular or plural dative, while æ is singular or plural accusative). The third person is thus divided into two categories, accusative and dative/genitive. As with the 1st and 2nd persons, there are only a small number of genitive forms.

The result of a multivariate analysis using Goldsmith is a probabilistic weight for each factor entered on 3. Factors with a weight above .5 favor the given order, whereas those with a weight under .5 disfavor it. The weight for each factor is that factor's effect on the application value (head-initial order) when all other factors are kept constant.
Table 5: Percentages and factor weights for head-initial PP order by pronoun.

Table 6: Percentages and factor weights for head-initial PP order by proposition.

Table 7: Percentages and factor weights for head-initial PP order by verb.

*Own common preposition 's thru' (11 occurrences) and one verb 'show' (73 occurrences) have been omitted from the factor group 'preposition' and 'verb' respectively because the PPs with which they occur are all head-initial and multivariate analysis can only be performed on variable data.
The final linguistic factor that has an effect on PP order is whether the pronoun is reflexive or not. Reflexive pronouns disfavor head-initial order slightly, a givenness effect perhaps, while non-reflexives neither favor nor disfavor, as shown in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
<th>PRL(...)P</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% P-PRO weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>52.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Reflexive</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>4198</td>
<td>71.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Percentages and factor weights for head-initial PP order by reflexivity of the pronoun.

Turning now to the effects of translation, Table 9 gives the factor weights for the effect of non-translated text vs. the two categories of translation, with and without a source PP. Recall that in §3.1 (Table 4) we saw that the while the frequency of head-initial PP order for biblical translations as well as for non-biblical translations with a source PP was higher than for non-translations, as expected, the frequency for non-biblical translations without a source PP was lower than that of non-translations, an unexpected result. The factor weights given in Table 9 show that when the other factors which affect PP order (see Tables 5-8) are taken into account by the multivariate analysis (see footnote 7), the difference between non-translations and non-biblical translations without a source PP disappears.9 The factor weights for these two categories are very close,8 while that for non-biblical translation with a source PP is higher. For the biblical translations, on the other hand, we can see that there is no difference between cases with and without a source PP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation Type</th>
<th>P-PRO</th>
<th>% P-PRO</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Translation</td>
<td>65.79%</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bib. Translation</td>
<td>60.10%</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source PP</td>
<td>88.97%</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Translation</td>
<td>82.71%</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Source PP</td>
<td>92.40%</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The frequency and weight for head-initial PPs with and without a source PP comparing non-translations and the two kinds of translation.

The results in Table 9 confirm and clarify the results in Table 4. Translators of non-biblical texts show a direct translation effect, producing more head-initial PPs in direct response to a source PP in the Latin. In the parts of the translation where there is 8There are some significant interactions between the proposition and the presence and the proposition and the text, however, including them in the analysis has very little effect on the actual weights and no apparent advantage of the weights in Table 9.

9If only the data from non-translations and non-biblical translations without a source PP are included in the analysis, the factor is not selected, indicating that the small difference is not significant.

4 Conclusions

In this paper I have shown that translation from Latin has an effect on at least one Old English structure, PPs with pronominal complements. In the non-biblical translations, the frequency of head-initial order is higher than in non-translated texts only when there is a matching PP in the Latin source of the token, making a direct connection between the source and target. In the biblical texts, on the other hand, the frequency of head-initial order is not only higher than expected in comparisons to non-translated texts when there is a source PP, but also when there is not. This indirect influence appears to be a kind of priming effect, where the high incidence of head-initial order in the Latin leads the translator to produce a higher rate of head-initial orders in general. While further work is necessary to validate this difference in translation effects across more structures, the difference in effect found here is matched by a difference in the translation strategies adopted by Old English translators for biblical and non-biblical texts. Following Jerome, who expressed his goal in translating to be non verbum a verbo, sed sensum expressum de sensu 'to render not word for word, but sense for sense' except in biblical texts where et verbum et ordine mysterium est 'even the order of the words is a mystery' (Letter 22:30 in Labouret 1953, quoted in Stanton 2002: 110). Old English writers generally felt free to paraphrase rather than give a literal translation of texts, except when it came to the Bible. In his Latin preface to the first book of gospel handle, Alfric writes that he does not translate word for word, but sense for sense (Nec una quidquid translatavit verbum a verbo, sed sensum expressum de sensu [Thorpe, I] 1848-4, quoted in Nichols 1984: 10); however, in the English preface to Genesis, he says that we do not now make mention on English jumne ne de ludens habeb, ne pro mutatis mutandis [Crawford 1922: 79 quoted in Nichols 1984: 10], going on to explain that the order can only be changed when the Latin syntax is not grammatical in English. Alfric is therefore not advocating glossing or ungrammatical English, rather that biblical words should not contain interpretation or free paraphrase of the type found in many Old English translations. Although the English writers (or Jerome, for the matter) do not always follow exactly in practice the translation theory they espouse, their attitude towards biblical and non-biblical translation is clearly different, with the biblical type requiring a much closer, literal free translation. In this
context of paying very close attention, it is not surprising that the linguistic structures of the source text have a greater influence on the output of the translator.

Appendix A

The following texts are included in the database. The whole text is used unless otherwise indicated.

Old English - YCOE

Translations

Gregory’s Pastoral Care Chapters 1-30 (COGIRA.02)

Augustine’s Soliloquies (COAUGU.02)

Orosius Books 2 and 3 (COOROSI.02)

Gregory’s Dialogues (Ms. C) Books 1 and 2 (COGRED.02)

Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People Preface, Headings, Books 1 and 2 (COCODE.02)

Apollonius of Tyre (COAPOLLO.03)
   Cookman, Peter. 1938. The Old English “Apollonius of Tyre”. London: OUP.

The Benedictine Rule (COBEN.03)

Chrodegang’s Rule (COCHDR.02)
The Gospel of Nicodemus (Ms. A) (NICODA)

Gregory's Dialogues (Ms. H) (COGREGH023)

The Heptateuch Genesis and Exodus (COGHTST03)

The West-Saxon Gospels Matthew (COWEGOS03)

Non-Translations
Alfric's Supplemental Homilies (COSALHOM03)

Alfric's Lives of Saints (COSALIVES03)

Alfric's Catholic Homilies I (COCAHAM0103)

The Old English Martyrology (COMART1, COMART2, COMART3)

Latin


Appendix B

The data set is made up of all PPs in the Old English with a personal pronoun complement. Self forms (e.g., him self, etc.) are not included as they only occur in head-initial structures. A “match” was sought in the Latin for each PP. While Latin PPs with nominal complements referring to the same entity as the English pronoun were not counted as matches, in general the requirements on the category of the complement were less than in the Old English. Demonstratives of all types except 'his (of yours)' (i.e., is 'this/that', his 'this', sē 'that', ipe 'self') were included since they are commonly used as 3rd person pronouns (Latin having only a reflexive 3rd person personal pronoun), as in (1). I also have counted PPs with with-complements in the Latin as matches, since these are commonly used in Latin with prepositional force, as in (2).

1. a. Mid bea nēo & geornece from him nāamode wesan.
   When they often and earnestly by him diminished were.
   (Corpus Bede 2:6.112.10.1069)
   b. Cinque diligenter ac sæpe ab illo exspectat audentia.
   When and diligently and often by him were warned.
   (Colgrave & Mynors p.162)
   'When they were earnestly and often warned by him.'

2. a. In a cwæd sec mid to him: sūna min, sy sae wyrangia ofac me.
   Then said the mother to him: son mine, be the curse over me.
   (Corpus Gent 27:13.1058)
   b. Ad quem mater: in me sit, sita, ista malitia, fili mi.
   To whom/whom mother in me sit be said this curse my son.
   (Corpus 27:13)
   'His mother said to him “My son, let the curse be on me.”'

In addition, a small number of Latin phrases that aren't technically prepositional, but that are commonly translated by prepositional phrases in OE have been included as matches. The only common case is adversus/adjacent 'opposite' + accusative, which is generally translated by forms of opponem 'opposite' or subj 'opposite' (20x), as in (3). The other less common cases are in medio 'middle' + genitive (5x), as in (4), obiur in the way of + datutive (1x) and quam 'than' (1x).

3. Fac tua brecher hine sayng gegen he.
   That your brother have any thing against you.
   (Corpus Gospel Mt [WSCp]:5.23.240)

4. Quia frater tuis habet aliquem adversum te.
   That brother your has anything against you.
   (Gospel of Matthew 5:23)
   'That your brother has anything against you.'

5. And tomyedes sēc hom sat on Oliveti monte.
   And amidst them sat on Oliveti mountain.
   (Concordance Nic [A]:1.4.1.267)

   And sitting-A in middle them-G in mount-A Oliveti.
   'And sitting in the middle of them on the mount of Oliveti.'
   (Cross p.178)

I have also included the cases in which the Latin has a PP with cliticised cum 'with', the only Latin prepositional structure that isn’t head-initial. With personal pronouns only cum appears finally cliticised to the prepositions: secum, secum, secum etc. with me, with you, with him(self) etc. With non-personal pronouns (i.e., demonstratives used pronominally), on the other hand, cum is always initial cliticised 'with him', cum ens 'with them'. cum is always initial or final depending on the category of the pronoun and there is no variation within categories. I have included the cliticised cum cases in the study despite their head-final nature because the Old English translators are clearly not influenced by this inversion and only produce a head-final PP in response to cliticised cum 1.92% of the time (2/104 cases). Non-cliticised cum leads to a non-head-initial PP in 87.80% of the cases (36/41 cases).
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