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0. Foreword

The West Saxon Gospels are indispensable data in medieval English, especially for their feature of free translation in contrast with the glosses of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth versions. We hope that they present the ordinary form of late Old English, even though the Latin original always needs to be referred to. To correctly hand down the content of the Bible, some stylistic, syntactic and lexical constraints are expected. From both synchronic and diachronic viewpoints, the West Saxon Gospels should be examined in combination with the Psalter, the Hexateuch, and numerous homily pieces. On various occasions I have emphasized the necessity of examining the four Gospels separately, so that the characteristic features of each Gospel can be made clear, as well as differences between the synoptic Gospels and John. In this paper I at first review Kozuka (2006), a new philological study on the four Gospels, in some detail and then give some examples to comment on his conclusion.

1. Introduction

Kozuka (2006) discusses lexical and syntactic differences in the four Gospels of the West Saxon version. His investigation is based on Skeat’s

* I express my cordial thanks to the anonymous *EL* reviewers for their comments and advice. All remaining errors are, of course, mine.
edition of Cambridge MS Corpus Christi College 140 (hereafter CCCC 140). His choice seems appropriate, because the new edition by Liuzza (1994) is said to be based on the same manuscript, but in fact is a mixed text of MS CCCC 140, Cambridge MS University Library ii.2.11, Oxford MS Bodley 441 and British Library MS Cotton Otho C.i, vol. I. As a purpose of his investigation, he poses a problem of authorship. Multiple authorship has been argued since 1890s, as Kozuka observes in his Introduction (pp. 1–3). Drake (1894) considers the possibility of three translators, one for Matthew, one for Mark and Luke, and one for John, owing to a difference of provenance, though the translators of Matthew and John could be locally quite close to each other. Sarrazin (1897), reviewing Drake, thinks of two translators, one for Mark and Luke and the other for Matthew and John. After the proposal of the unity of authorship by Bright (1904), differences between the four Gospels were considered not so significant, until Liuzza (2000) with his lexical and syntactic investigation went back to Drake. Kozuka provides us with another division, one for John and the other for the rest. On hearing this, one may naturally think of the basic difference between the synoptic Gospels and John, which means a difference in contents between the three Gospels and John. It is necessary to take both the Latin original and the Old English translation into consideration, when discussing multiple authorship. Kozuka tries to show that the translation varies both lexically and syntactically where the Latin original has no variation.

2. Authorship Problems in Old English

To claim these lexical and syntactic differences as those of authorship, Kozuka discusses four instances, two for prose and two for poetry. Prose instances seem relevant to the study of the Gospels, though the Bible can be categorized as a third style.

The first authorship problem is an Alfredian one. Five texts were ascribed to Alfred: Gregory’s Cura Pastoralis, Orosius’ Historia adversus paganos, St. Augustine’s Soliloquia, Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum and Boethius’ De Consolatione Philosophiae. The doubt cast on Bede is based on its Mercian lexemes. As the prose Boethius could be translated by the help of a Kentish person specialized in Germanic metres,¹

¹ See Sedgefield (1968), Introd.
it is quite likely that Alfred had asked a Mercian person or used a Mercian gloss, as Kuhn (1947, 1972) insists (see Kozuka, p. 10), and the result is what we have now. *Bede* is later than the other Alfredian translations and the manuscripts have been spread more widely around Europe than the author, whoever he was, had expected. The peculiarity of *Orosius* has been pointed out by many scholars. Everyone knows, I should say, the frequent occurrence of the expanded form in the text, which seems to show no direct influence of Latin. Such syntactic features are close to the *Chronicle* owing to the content and style of the work. The first fifty prose translations of the *Paris Psalter* are quite likely to be called Alfredian, as Batley (1982) suggested; the way of writing as well as the vocabulary is independent of the *PPs 51–150* found in various versions of interlinear glosses.

The next group consists of *Ælfrician* texts. *Hexateuch* is now divided into *Ælfrician* and non-*Ælfrician*, as illustrated by the choice of *Ælfric’s andwyrdan* and non-*Ælfric’s andswarian*. The same test is also possible with the *Lives of Saints*. The authorship of *Hexateuch* poses another complex problem, when the non-*Ælfrician* part is ascribed to Byrhtferth of Ramsey, the author of Byrhtferth’s *Manual*, as discussed by Dodwell and Clemoes (1974), and involves further the *Poenitentiale Pseudo-Ecgberti*, which is also ascribed to Byrhtferth. Their claim is criticized by Baker (1980), who states that the differences among the three can be found lexically and syntactically, and moreover, can be based on stylistic distinctions, while they have some features in common.

All these authorship problems which have been presented so far can simply result from stylistic differences, which are supported by lexical and syntactic dissimilarities. We are always facing the danger of being misled by insufficient data and non-datable manuscripts. We could make more definite claims, if only we could precisely tell early from late Old English vocabulary.

Two problems about authorship of Old English poetry are in Cynewulfian poems and in *Beowulf*. The runic signature left in *Juliana, ChristB*, *Elene* and the *Fates of the Apostles* was considered as a sign of Cynewulf’s authorship. When the *Metres of Boethius* are examined by Benson (1966) on the basis of the formulaic theory, however, there is no signature to base

---

2 The different choice between West Saxon *andswarian* and Lindisfarne *andwyrdan* is discussed in Ogura (1996: 63–64).

3 Kozuka uses the short title *Christ II*. 
a claim of authorship on, since the formulas found in each poem represent a part of the whole stock of formulas common to most Anglo-Saxon poems, and since the making of an Anglo-Saxon poem seems possible as long as one knew the formulas. Kozuka introduces a syntactic investigation by Donoghue (1987), who divides the four poems into two pairs (not by the manuscripts but by the "behavior of auxiliaries" (1987: 108)), and the criticism by Fulk (1996), who points out that the different length of the four poems cannot lead to a convincing conclusion. I myself have examined all half-lines of the Metres of Boethius and the Paris Psalter and found that the two poems make good use of the Anglo-Saxon stock of formulas common to many other poems, but at the same time, that the Metres, which are the verse translation of the prose Boethius, and the Paris Psalter, which is the direct rendering of the Latin psalms, use many different formulas and formulaic expressions of their own, as well as some common to each other. This means that the same authorship of two similar poetic texts cannot be claimed so easily.

Beowulf raises much more complex problems. As Kozuka states (p. 16), two main problems are when and where the composition occurred and how many authors we can identify. The first problem does not connect with the second directly, but the choice of lexemes and the contents of a series of episodes make the judgment on the date and provenance uncertain, which has often led to the theory of multiple authorship. Bately's (1985) syntactic test, Kozuka argues, combines the three parts of Beowulf (i.e. ll. 1–1887, ll. 1888–2199 and ll. 2200–3182), which was claimed by Kiernan (1981) as evidence of not only the shift of scribes but also a possibility of multiple authorship (pp. 18–19). It is true that behind the completion of those poems whose composition was based on a long history of oral delivery there might have been a person who had organized the supervision of the whole story, as Sir Thomas Malory did on Arthurian romances.

Kozuka explains his method of study, saying that he keeps an eye on linguistic evidence when considering the authorship problem. He says that "spelling can by no means be a valid criterion of authorship unless the text examined is original, or by the author's own handwriting: it is necessary to draw a rigid line between the author and the scribe (p. 19)." How many manuscripts, however, can be ascribed to a particular author, especially in early Old English? The authorship problem could never have been posed and discussed so fervently if we could have drawn a rigid line between the author and the scribe. The choice between <y> and <i> or between <g>
and <3> can be ascribed to dialectal, diachronic, or idiolectal difference according to the date and provenance of manuscripts, but it is difficult to enter into the authorship by means of such features alone. It is also possible that the author's vocabulary may change during his lifetime or by an alteration of the principles of a particular school in a monastery.

Kozuka examines the four Gospels lexically and syntactically. He says that he examines "two aspects of word usage: (1) the renderings of specific Latin words and phrases and (2) the choices of OE words to express certain concepts," and his syntactic examination is also "of two kinds: one is the analysis of the renderings of specific Latin constructions, while the other is the examination of word order in frequently-occurring constructions (p. 20)." In saying this, he tries to give the impression that he has selected the significant words for his investigation and the word order can be a clue for identifying the author. None of the information quoted on authorship may have a direct connection with the investigation of the four Gospels of the West Saxon version, but Kozuka shows the possible ways of discussing the authorship of Old English texts. His investigation is worth pursuing even without the discussion of authorship.

3. Syntactic Differences

Chapters 3 and 4 of Kozuka (2006) are based on a series of articles read and/or written in the course of completing his dissertation. In Chapter 3 he tries to show the syntactic peculiarity of John through the investigation of word order. As the Gospel is the material to be examined, comparison is necessarily made on a particular Latin construction which is rendered into different Old English sets in the four Gospels. When variety is found, it deserves explanation even though the West Saxon version is a free translation.

Word order is examined first, especially of elements found frequently in the same combination. The order between cwedan, to and him (or the dative (pro)noun) is scrutinized in five types of clause: (i) 'and/ac/ne,' (ii) 'pa/ponne,' (iii) 'imperative,' (iv) 'others' (than all the principal clauses of (i)-(iii)) and (v) 'subordinate' clauses (p. 29). This classification is

4 A noticeable alteration is found in the Salisbury Psalter, where <g> is preferred up to Psalm 49, while <3> becomes predominant after Psalm 53, after a lacuna of two folios. See Sisam and Sisam (1959: 146–147).
necessary, because word order varies according to the clause in which the lexical elements appear, and principal clauses should be subdivided in order to get a precise result. Latin constructions occur with or without ad, while Old English free translation always needs to. The order cweðan to him is the most ordinary one, and him to cweðan is possible, though infrequent. What is noticeable is the unity of John; it always shows the order cweðan to him (or dative object). Kozuka extends his survey to other verbs than cweðan. He classifies (i) verbs of motion like astigan, becumon, cuman, faran, feran, fleon, gan, gangan, gecierran, genealæcan, (ge)wendan, gewitan, hwierfan, iernan, (ii) verbs of saying like clipian, hrieman, secgan, sprecan, (iii) verbs of giving like asendan, beran, (ge)bringan, (ge)syllan, sendan, (iv) other verbs like gecierran, (ge)clipian ‘to summon,’ (ge)gadrian, (ge)lædan, gelaðian, gesammian (p. 33). He does not explain the semantic difference between gecierran under (i) and gecierran under (iv). (Ge)clipian can be classified under (ii), since the semantic difference does not seem to lie in the prefix ge-. It is true that, as far as Kozuka’s investigation is concerned, John’s peculiarity or uniformity in renderings including element order is remarkable.

In his study of phrasal adverbs, Kozuka refers to Hiltunen (1983), who investigated only Matthew and Mark and noticed the tendency towards verb-adverb order in Matthew, and makes his own survey of the four Gospels to find a stronger tendency towards verb-(phrasal) adverb order in principal clauses. As he says, referring to Hiltunen (1983: 133) and Ogura (1995: 92), the verb-(phrasal) adverb order is obvious in principal clauses, while in subordinate clauses the (phrasal) adverb-verb order is still strong. He also examines the relation between a Latin prefixed verb and a West Saxon rendering with (phrasal) adverb-verb and finds that John prefers the verb-(phrasal) adverb order no matter what order the Latin shows. In his Table 7, however, Matthew shows a similar tendency and Luke is in the middle of

---

5 I made a similar investigation in Ogura (1993: 62–65). I said that there were six kinds of order in theory: (1) cweðan to Dat (N/Pron), (2) to Dat (N/Pron) cweðan, (3) cweðan Dat (N/Pron) to, (4) Dat (N/Pron) to cweðan, and (6) to cweðan Dat (N/Pron). (1) is most frequent, ordinary element order, and (2) is rather rare. (3), (4) and (5) are examples of postposed prepositions; (3) and (4) are often found in and/ac/ne-clauses, while (5) is mostly confined to Ælfric’s prose. (6) is impossible, as it is confusable with examples of tocweðan ‘to forbid.’ I use the term ‘element order’ for precision; as is seen in the difference between to in cweðan to and tocweðan, to can be either a free preposition or adverb or a bound prefix to-, especially in the Old English period when there is no rule with word division.
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Matthew and conservative Mark.

(1) Table 7: ‘FV + Phrasal Adverb’ Constructions Occurring in Principal Clauses in WSG and their Equivalents in the Vulgate (Kozuka, p. 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WSG</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PrV</td>
<td>PrV Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>P-V</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-P</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>P-V</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-P</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>P-V</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>P-V</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Latin equivalents are grouped into the following five types (PrV, V and Adv below stand for ‘prefixed verb,’ ‘non-prefixed verb’ and ‘adverbial,’ respectively):

(i) **PrV** (e.g. Mt 13:3 ecce *exiit* qui seminat seminare [WSG ut-eode])
(ii) **PrV Adv** (e.g. Jn 19:4 *Exiit* iterum Pilatus *foras* [WSG eode út])
(iii) **Adv V** (e.g. Mt 13:48 malos autem *foras miserunt* [WSG awurpon út])
(iv) **V Adv** (e.g. Lk 4:9 *mitte* te hinc *deorsum* [WSG ásend nyper])
(v) **V** (e.g. Jn 11:41 **tulerunt** ergo lapidem [WSG dydon aweg])

According to Kozuka’s explanation, the crucial difference between John and the others lies in the number of instances of the two patterns: (i) X-FV in subject-less principal clauses (mostly ‘*and/ac/ne*’), as in Lk 17:12 *7 hyra stefna úp-ahfon* [et *levaverunt vocem*] and (ii) S-X-FV in principal clauses with overt subjects (mostly ‘*and/ac/ne*’ and, to a lesser extent, ‘others’), as in Mt 8:16 *7 he út-adræfde* [et *eiciebat*]. These patterns are quite infrequent in John with the exception of subordinate clauses.

In his Tables 8 and 9 (pp. 40–41) SXV and XV are shaded, with the numbers in the tables, but the explanation about “shading” starts from p. 42. This kind of graphic device does not seem so helpful, because the

---

6 Lk 17:12–13 is quoted by Kozuka as his example (10) and Mt 8:16 as (12). *Stefna* is spelled *stefne* in Liuzza (1994).
shading is used in Table 28 (p. 65) and in example (30) (p. 66) for relative clauses as well. Visual devices often lack necessary explanations.

The more important point is that the Latin of the Vulgate has no decisive influence on Old English translation, i.e. the differences found in the four Gospels are those based on Old English, as long as only one version of the Vulgate is used for the ‘free’ translation of all four Gospels.

Kozuka also examines prepositional adverbs (æfter, beforan, in, mid, of, ofer, on, ongean and to) and adverbs of place (æghwanan, æghwær, feorran, ham, heonon, her, hider, innor, nyðane, onbæc, tosomme, ḏanon, ðær, ðider, ufæn, ufæ, underbæc, utan, ute, utor, and ‘here/there’-types like her-abutan, her-onmiddan, her-ut, her-ymbutan, hider-geond, ðær-abutan, ðær-æfter, ðær-beforan, ðær-on, ðær-onmiddan, ðær-onnumpan, ðær-to, ðær-ut and ðær-ymbutan). These adverbs and adverbials tend to follow the finite verb in Modern English, but in Old English they often precede the verb, again especially in subordinate clauses. But John shows ‘modern’ order, especially in and/ac/ne-clauses, where the subject is often unexpressed. As the Latin order is not copied directly in any of the four Gospels, it can be said that John’s peculiarity is evidenced by Kozuka’s investigation. He further examines the position of adverbials and the presence/absence of the object of the verb in and/ac/ne-clauses and finds that the verb-adverbial order is predominant, or almost regular, in John.

(2) Table 18: Position of Adverbials ((S)VX/(S)XV) and the Presence or Absence of the Object of the Verb in And/Ac/Ne-clauses in WSG (Kozuka, p. 53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presence or Absence of O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>SVX / SXV 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VX / XV</td>
<td>10 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>SVX / SXV 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VX / XV</td>
<td>0 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>SVX / SXV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VX / XV</td>
<td>2 / 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>SVX / SXV 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VX / XV</td>
<td>3 / 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then he goes further on to the choice between VO and OV in clauses containing the verb and the adverbials and double object constructions, the latter of which include noun and pronoun objects with relative clauses. His
sub-classified syntactic environments cover the variation of word order with about sixty verbs. Verbs which occur in ‘V + Dat + Acc’ are summarized in Tables 24–29, while ‘V + Acc + Acc’ and ‘V + Acc + Gen,’ twelve instances in total, are summed up in Table 30. In his note 71, he explains that ambiguous examples like “Lk 20:3 ic ahsige eow an word, where the indirect object eow could be interpreted as both accusative and dative” (p. 94), are treated as ‘V + Dat + Acc.’ This detailed explanation is necessary, because ambiguous forms like me, unc, us, pe, inc, eow (and hi(e)re of Dat/Gen ambiguity) often pose syntactic problems until the tendency of the dative-accusative syncretism becomes obvious in late Old English. All his investigations are aimed at emphasizing John’s peculiarity. But Table 25 (Word Order in ‘V + DAT + ACC’ Constructions in WSG (Dat = p, Acc = n)) does not show so much dissimilarity between Matthew and John, and in Tables 27 and 28 the number of constructions in question is not great enough to maintain the difference.

Table 29 (p. 67) uses symbols of circle (○) and cross (×) which show possible and impossible occurrences, but there is no explanation of the use of these symbols. The same symbols appear in tables 44 and 45 (p. 83), and the explanation (p. 82) reveals that they do not show the possible/impossible occurrences this time but the possibility/impossibility of translating Latin ablative constructions into Old English dative constructions. He should have used + /− for Table 29 and possible/impossible for Tables 44 and 45. In Table 31 (p. 69), in Note 4, Kozuka explains his term ‘omitted’ as “cases where either or both of the two objects expressed in WSG are omitted (e.g. Lk 17:4 dimitte illi [WSG forgyt hit him]).” The Latin is the base, and in the translation hit is not omitted but added by a translator in the West Saxon version.

Differences other than word order are examined under his 3.2. Table 37 is given to show the translation of Latin expanded forms (p. 75). Kozuka mentions Raith (1951) and the table immediately follows the remarks, but in the Note 78 (p. 97) he says that the complete figures are given by himself, since Raith “did not offer the full statistics on the translation of Latin expanded forms.” The note should be incorporated into the main text to show who is responsible for the survey. It is true that the West Saxon Gospels, as free translation, often render Latin expanded forms into Old English simple forms, but John is peculiar in that it never uses expanded forms here.

Partitive constructions can be rendered by the genitive or ‘of + dative.’ I represent his two types here (somehow he does not give the Latin text for
As seen from these examples, Latin unus ex-construction can be rendered either by the genitive or by ‘of + dative.’ Latin partitive genitive constructions, as illustrated by Kozuka in his Note 82 (p. 97), quoted from Heltveit (1977: 78), represent ‘of + peoples’ like quidam Pharisaeorum, which is rendered sum of pam fariseum in Lk 19:39, using an of-phrase. Translating Latin prepositional partitive phrases, as shown in Table 39 (p. 78), John uses genitive most, in contrast with the choice of of-phrases by the synoptic Gospels. It can be said that John is not ‘modern’ here, from a diachronic viewpoint, but free from word-for-word translation and cautious about using of-phrases for Latin de/ex-phrases. In his summary Kozuka says that “John shows a preference for the inflectional expressions irrespective of the Latin counterparts, whereas the synoptic Gospels are apt to follow the Latin original, preferentially employing the construction parallel to the Latin form (p. 81).” A translation calque is generally found in the synoptic Gospels, while the translator of John chooses constructions in his own way.

For the survey of the comparison of inequality, Kozuka finds a choice between the two kinds of constructions: with bome ‘than’ or with the dative, as the following examples show. He could have mentioned a variant reading in a later version (MS Hatton 38) for Lk 12:7 at least in a footnote, so that we may notice the possible supersession of the dative type by (a ‘modern’) ‘than’-type.

(4) Jn 21:15 (Kozuka’s example (46))

Simón iohannis lufast ðu me. swiðor þæne ðas;
Lk 12:7 (his (47) with my addition of MS H)
ge synt beteran manegum spearwum; [H. beteran ‘þan’]

4. Lexical Differences

Lexical choice is examined concerning several typical words and phrases. For autem, enim and ergo, Kozuka finds that John avoids using eornostlice as a rendering of ergo and chooses witodlice (p. 106). The synoptic Gospels prefer sodlice for autem and enim, and eornostlice for ergo
with the exception of Luke. For *daemonium habere* ‘to be insane,’ John avoids ‘literal’ *deofolseoc(nesse)*, which is preferred by Matthew and Luke, and uses *wod* with *beon/wesan*. For *castellum*, Mark and Luke follow Latin and use *castel*, but Matthew and John choose *ceaster* (pp. 109–110).

Kozuka makes a lexical-semantic survey concerning *mittere* (pp. 110–118). First he sets up several semantic types as criteria, divides examples into ten groups, and sees which lexeme is chosen in each Gospel. He tries to present different choices of lexemes according to semantic types, which makes his Table 54 (p. 113) a little complicated. But the result clearly shows the use of *don* in John in the sense ‘to put’ (into prison, into the fire of hell, into the sea, liquid into a vessel, finger into the ear, etc.), in contrast with *(a)sendan* or *(a)weorpan* in the synoptic Gospels. This section (4.1.4) is different from other sections in adding semantic criteria to the lexical choice. Part of this survey concerns the translation of the expression ‘to bear fruit,’ where John uses *bleeda* (more frequently than *waestm*) and *beran* and *bringan* (only once) as renderings of *(ad)ferre*, while the synoptic Gospels choose *waestm* and *bringan*. Matthew shows a variety of renderings for *facere*, e.g. *beran*, *bringan*, *don*, etc., and Luke, *bringan*, *don* and *wyrcan*. In general, lexical variety is a feature of Matthew, and regularity of John. The reason for this difference can be ascribed to either authorship or changes in scribe’s attitude.

The different choice of synonyms may include the choice among morphological forms. Kozuka’s survey reveals that the preterite forms of *feran* are preferred by the synoptic Gospels and those of *faran* by John. This fact matches the results of my own investigation that *Orosius* and *Chronicles* prefer *for* to *ferde* and, as Kozuka partly mentions (p. 140, Notes to Ch. 4, 71), Ælfric intentionally avoids using *for*. Between *cweðan* and *secgan*, John usually chooses *cweðan* to introduce direct speech and *secgan* to take the accusative (pro)noun or a *þæt*-clause, while the synoptic Gospels use *secgan* to introduce both direct and indirect speech as well as taking the accusative. The synoptic Gospels use both *clypian* and *hryman* and, when introducing direct speech, they can make a pair with *cweðan*; John uses *clypian* alone. The synoptic Gospels use *betwux* and John *betwynan*, especially when the latter takes a personal pronoun.

What is good about Kozuka (2006) is that he quotes in full all the examples he has found in the Gospels (citing chapter and verse), which helps

---

readers to re-examine his examples and confirm his reports. Such efforts are indispensable for philological studies.

5. Summarizing the Findings

His syntactic and lexical survey, Kozuka thinks, has given evidence for the idiosyncrasy of John: the word order (S)VX especially in and/ac/ne-clauses, to + Dat, V-PrAdv (phrasal adverb), periphrastic constructions, and renderings of Latin autem/enim/ergo, daemonium habere, castellum, mittere (in a lexical-semantic survey), fructus, verb choice between the two synonyms, etc. He ascribes this peculiarity of John to the change of authorial hand, after he rejects other two possibilities, i.e. scribal change and change and development in a single translator’s style. Scribal change can be safely discarded because of the lack of evidence. The possibility of single authorship is also denied by Kozuka; he thinks that the supposition that “the assumed single translator might change his/her style deliberately only during the translation of Jn” is not convincing. The translation lacks stylistic variety owing to its biblical nature, which means that one person cannot develop stylistic changes in translating the four Gospels. Kozuka adds that the distinction of the Latin original in John contributes little to the peculiarity of the West Saxon translation. Composite authorship, he concludes, is supported by his investigation.

6. Concluding Remarks

I summarize Kozuka’s survey and distinct features of John in the following way.

(5) Summary: Preferred Syntax/Lexeme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the synoptic Gospels</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V + to + Dat</td>
<td>cweđan to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>him to cweđan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cweđan to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + phrasal Adv</td>
<td>ut-gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gan ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in principal cl.</td>
<td>(S)XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in principal cl.</td>
<td>(S)VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S)OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S)VX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S)VO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kozuka quotes 94 examples in the main text of his Chapters 3 and 4. The numbers of examples from each Gospel are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6) Examples from</th>
<th>Mt</th>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>Lk</th>
<th>Jn</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 3 (syntactic)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 4 (lexical)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This looks fine, when we consider his aim of showing the peculiarity of John. Examples from John are given less in the syntactic survey than in the lexical survey, probably because John is more regular in syntactic pat-
terns than the other three.

When the manuscripts are consulted, in MS CCCC 140, Bodley 441 and ULC II.2.11 the Gospels are written in the order of Mt, Mk, Lk and Jn. Cotton MS Otho C.i, vol. I lacks Mt, but the order of the rest is Mk, Lk and Jn. (Cf. the later MS Royal I.A xiv shows the order of Mk, Mt, Lk and Jn, and Hatton 38 Mk, Lk, Mt and Jn.) John is always the last and so has a chance to acquire conformity in style. Besides, the Latin differs in content between the synoptic Gospels and John. Even though Kozuka says that the Latin original has no specific influence which could cause variety (p. 148: “plays little, if any, important role on the differentiation of Jn in WSG”), a translator cannot take the same attitude towards John, which differs in content and way of expression in the original. Here I quote some examples, in which contents are much the same, but not exactly the same, in Latin, and translated in all four Gospels, in order to confirm Kozuka’s survey and to add some explanatory comments.8

(7) ‘Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house:’
Mt 9:6 [Surge tolle lectum tuum, et uade in domum tuam]
aris 7 nym þin bedd. 7 gang on þin hus;
Mk 2:11 [Tibi dico: surge, tolle grabattum tuum, et uade in domum tuam]
þe ic secge aris. nim þin bed. 7 gá to þinum huse
Lk 5:24 [Tibi dico, surge, tolle lectum tuum et uade in domum tuam]
þe ic secge aris. nim þin bed. 7 ga on þis hús;
Jn 5:8 [Surge, tolle grabattum tuum et ambula]
aris nim þin bed 7 gá.

Lexical differences between lectum and grabattum are not reflected in the translation, but each Gospel uses different lexemes in the latter part, like Mt gang and Mk to þinum huse. This is too short to show John’s peculiarity.

(8) ‘The voice of one crying in the wilderness:’
Mt 3:3 [Uox clamantis in deserto, parate uiam Domini, rectas facite semitas eius.]
Clypiendes stefn was on westene. gegearwiað drihtnes weg.
dȡ his sīðas rihte;
Mk 1:3 [Uox clamantis in deserto: Parate uiam Domini, rectas facite

8 The edition of the Latin text I use here is Wordsworth and White (1912), which is based on a non-Vulgate version Vetus Italicae, so as to show that the West Saxon version is not based on the Vulgate.
The form *clypiendes* makes the sense ‘of one crying’ clearer and Jn clarifies it further by using the first person. Different lexemes, *gegearwiað* and *gerihtac*, reflect the difference in the original, *parate* and *dirigite*; Jn expresses two phrases in one.

(9) ‘Isn’t this the carpenter’s son?:’

Mt 13:55  [Nonne hic est fabri filius? Nonne mater eius dicitur Maria, et fratres eius Iacobus et Ioseph, et Simon et Iudas?]

Mk 6:3  [Nonne iste est faber, filius Mariae, frater Iacobi, et Ioseph, et Iudae, et Simonis?]

Lk 4:22  [Nonne hic est Iesus filius Ioseph, cuius nos nouimus patrem et matrem?]

Jn 6:42  [Nonne hic est Iesus filius Ioseph, cuius nos nouimus patrem et matrem?]

The Latin texts differ in Lk and Jn, but the rhetorical *nonne*-construction appears in each Gospel. Mt uses *hú ne*, Mk and Jn *hu nis*, while Lk chooses a simple imperative; the latter choice is rare in Old English.

(10) ‘Before the cock crow, thou shalt betray me thrice:’

Mt 26:34  [Amen dico tibi, quia in hac nocte, ante quam gallus cantet, ter me negabis.]

Mk 14:30  [Amen dico tibi, quia tu hodie in nocte hac, prius quam bis gallus uocem dederit, ter me es negaturus.]
Soplice ic þe secge. þ þou on þisse nihte ðer hana tuwa crawe. þriwa wið-sæcst míþ.

Lk 22:34  
[Dico tibi, Petre, non cantabit hodie gallus, donec ter abneges nosse me.]  
ic secge þe petrus. ne cræwp se hána to-dæg ðer þu me æt-sæcst;

Jn 13:38  
[Amen, amen dico tibi: Non cantabit gallus, donec me ter neges.]  
Soð ic þe secge. ne cræwð se cocc ær ðu wið-sæcst me þriwa

Here ante quam, prius quam and donec are all rendered ær (þam þe). Lk alone uses æt-sæcst in contrast with wið-sæcst.

(11)  `One of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot:'

Mt 26:14  
[Tunc abiit unus de duodecim, qui dicebatur Iudas Iscarioth, ad principes sacerdotum,]  
Da ferde an of þam twelfum þe wæs genemned iudas se wiþersaca to þera sacerda ealdrum

Mk 14:10  
[Et Iudas Scariotis, unus de duodecim abiit ad summos sacerdotes, ut proderet eum illis.]  
Da iudas scarioth þ is wiþersaca. án of þam twelfum. ferde to þam heah-sacerdum þ he hine belæwde;

Lk 22:3–4  
[Intrauit autem Satanás in Iudám qui cognominabatur Scarioth, unum de duodecim. Et abiit, et locutus est cum principibus sacerdotum, et magistratibus, quemadmodum illum traderet eis.]  
Da eode satanas on iudam. se wæs ðære naman scarioth. an of þam twelfum. þa ferde he 7 spæc mid þara sacerda ealdor-mannum 7 duguðe ealdrum hu he hine him gesealde;

Jn 6:71  
[Dicebat autem Iudam Simonis Scariotis: hic enim erat traditurus eum, cum esset unus ex duodecim.]  
he hyt cwæþ be iuda scarioþe þes hine belæwde þa he wæs an þara TWELFA.

Here Jn uses an þara twelfa, contrasting with the Latin unus ex duodecim, as suggested by Kozuka with other examples (pp. 76–77). But compare

(12)  `One of you shall betray me:'

Mt 26:21  
[Amen dico uobis, quia unus uestrum me traditurus est.]  
Witodlice ic sece eow þ án eower belæwð me;

Mk 14:18  
[Amen dico uobis, quia unus ex uobis me tradet, qui manducat mecum.]
Soolice ic eow sece Ƿ eower án þe mid me yt gesylð me;
Lk 22:21 [Uerum tamen ecce manus tradentis me mecum est in mensa.]
ðeah-hwaðere her is þæs læw Close hand mid me on mysan.
Jn 13:21 [Amen, amen dico uobis, quia unus ex uobis tradet me.]
Soð ic eow sece Ƿ eower án me belæwþ;

Here Latin uses the genitive in Mt (see Kozuka, p. 76) and unus ex-con-
structions in Mk and Jn, but all three translate the same way, though the
element order varies between them. Lk has a different content.

(13) ‘And you shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake:’
Mt 10:22 [et eritis odio omnibus propter nomen meum:]
7 ge beð on hatunge eallum mannum for mínun naman.
Mk 13:13 [Et eritis odio omnibus propter nomen meum:]
7 ge beð eallum on hatunge for mínun naman;
Lk 21:17 [et eritis odio omnibus propter nomen meum:]
7 ge beð eallum on hatunge. for mínun naman.
Jn 15:18 [Si mundus uos odit, scitote quia me priorem uobis odio
habuit.]
Gif middan-eard eow hatað witað Ƿ he hatede me ðer eow;
Both the Latin and the translation differ in Jn; it uses hatan, instead of beon
on hatunge, for both the Latin verb and ‘noun + habere.’

(14) ‘A prophet is not without honour save in his own country:’
Mt 13:57 [Iesus autem dixit eis: Non est propheta sine honore nisi in
patria sua et in domo sua.]
ða soðlice sæde se hælend him nys nan witega butan wurþ-
scape buton on hys earde 7 on hys huse.
Mk 6:4 [Et dicebat eis Iesus: Quia non est propheta sine honore nisi
in patria sua et in cognitione sua et in domo sua.]
þa cwæð se hælend; Soðlice nís nán witega buton wurðscipe.
buton on his eðele 7 on his mægðe. 7 on his húse;
Lk 4:24 [Ait autem: Amen dico uobis, quia nemo propheta acceptus
est in patria sua.]
ða cwæð he soðlice ic eow sece Ƿ nán witega nis and-fenge
on his eðele;
Jn 4:44 [Ipse enim Iesus testimonium perhibuit quia propheta in sua
patria honorem non habet.]
Se hælend sylf cyþde gewitnesse Ƿ nan witega næfð nanne
wurð-scape on hys agenum eared.
Mt and Mk are much the same in both Latin and the translation. Lk is
shorter and the verb in the subordinate clause is different. Jn differs in
content and uses *cynde gewitnesse* and *hys agenum*.

(15) ‘He that finds his life shall lose it:’

Mt 10:39  
[Qui inuenit animam suam, perdet illam: et qui perdiderit animam suam propter me, inveniet eam.]  
Se þe ge-met hys sawle se for-splîp hig. 7 se þe for-splîp hys sawle for me hé ge-mét hi;

Mt 16:25  
[Qui enim uoluerit animam suam saluam facere, perdet eam: qui autem perdiderit animam suam propter me, inueniet eam.]  
Soplice se þe wyle hys sawle hale gedón he hig forspilþ. 7 se þe wyle hig for me forspyllan se hig fint;

Mk 8:35  
[Qui enim uoluerit animam suam saluam facere, perdet eam: qui autem perdiderit animam suam propter me et evangeliun, saluam eam faciet.]  
Se ðe wyle his sawle hale gedon se hi for-splîð; Se ðe for-splîð his sawle for me. 7 for þam godspelle se hi ge-hælð;

Lk 9:24  
[Qui enim uoluerit animam suam saluam facere, perdet illam: nam qui perdiderit animam suam propter me, saluam faciet illam.]  
Se þe wyle hys sawle hale gedon. se hig for-splîp. witodlice se ðe his sawle for me for-splîð he hi gehæleð;

Lk 17:33  
[Quicumque quaesierit animam suam saluam facere, perdet illam: et quicumque perdiderit illam, uiuificabit eam.]  
swa hwylc swa secð his sawle ge-dón hálse he hig for-splîþ; 7 swa hwylc swa hig forspilþ se hig gelif-fæstað;

Jn 12:25  
[Qui amat animam suam, perdet eam: et qui odit animam suam in hoc mundo, in uitam aeternam custodit eam.]  
Se þe luðð his sâwle forspilþ hig. 7 se þe hataþ his sawle on þison middan-earde gehylt hi on éceon life;

Three types of constructions are found with this gnomic expression: Mt 10:39 and Jn 12:25, Lk 17:33, and the rest. The different lexical/syntactic choice is more or less based on the Latin text. *For-spillan* is always chosen for *perdere* and *hale gedon* or *gehælan* for *saluam facere*. When Latin differs, Old English may change its constructions and lexemes. As seen from these examples, it is not always Jn which differs from the other three. It is hard to decide which change is more important than others from the viewpoint of authorship.

In addition, West Saxon versions of the Gospels have manuscript variants, as Kozuka himself shows in his Appendix (pp. 151–158). For instance, Jn 6:26 *Sop ic eow secge* has a variant reading *secge eow* in MSS ULC ii.2.11,
Bodley 441 and Cotton Otho C.i, vol. I. We cannot simply say that this represents a variety of element order, SOV and SVO, since *Sop(lice) ic eow sece* and *Sop(lice) ic sece eow* are set-phrases rendering *Amen amen dico vobis* and they show stylistic, rather than syntactic, variety.

This Latin-OE comparison may not be so constructive, because we know that the Latin text of the *West Saxon Gospels* is neither the *Vulgate* nor a single manuscript of the non-*Vulgate*. Still we need Latin when we make comparison between the Old English versions of the Gospels, between the interlinear gloss, paraphrase, and free translation. We need a little more tolerance to accept the varieties, as the Anglo-Saxon scribes (including some of Irish and other backgrounds) were trying to find the best version among God’s plenty.

What we can say is that a fact is not the truth. It is a fact that John differs from the synoptic Gospels in many ways or, I should say, more than coincidence. I should ascribe this fact not to composite authorship but to the difference of the Latin original (variation in lexemes and contents) and the regularity of the West Saxon translation of John which, with its consistent choices among syntactic patterns and lexemes, reflects peculiarities of its original, in spite of being a free translation.
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