On the Use and the Form of the Present Participle in *Lambeth Homilies* and *Trinity Homilies*

Toshihiko Tokizaki

Laboratory of the English Language, Nippon Veterinary and Life Science University

Introduction

There are two kinds of participles in the English language. They are the present participle and the past participle. In Old English (hereafter OE) and Middle English (hereafter ME) they are different from those in Modern English in some respects. For instance, in OE the present participle ends in *–ende*, while its ending is *–ing* in Modern English. The past participle generally prefixes *ge–* in OE, while no *ge–* is added to it in Modern English.

We have been very much interested in the history of the two participles, especially of the present participle, and have wanted to observe the use and the form of the present participle in ME prose writings. So we have taken up *Lambeth Homilies* and *Trinity Homilies* (hereafter *TH*)[1], which were written in the early ME period[2]. According to Sisam (1951 : 105–113), *Lambeth homilies* may be divided into two groups. The two groups are as follows :

(1) *Lambeth Homilies*, Group A, that is, Homilies Ⅰ– Ⅴ, and Ⅸ–ⅩⅢ (hereafter *LHA*).

(2) *Lambeth Homilies*, Group B, that is, Homilies Ⅶ, Ⅷ, and ⅩⅣ–ⅩⅦ (hereafter *LHB*).

Sisam demonstrates that *LHA* is linguistically older than *LHB*. Accordingly, in this paper, we will treat *LHA* and *LHB* as two distinct texts. The aim of the present paper is to examine the use and the form of the present participle in *LHA*, *LHB* and *TH*, considering how different they are in each text.

The Use of the Present Participle

In discussing the use of the present participle, we have followed the classification of Mustanoja for the most part. His classification, which follows that of Callaway, is as follows :

(1) *Predicative participle*. This construction is of two kinds—

  (a) *predicate nominative*, having reference to the subject of the finite verb ;

  (b) *predicate accusative*, having reference to the object of the finite verb.

(2) *Attributive participle*.

(3) *Appositive participle*, the participle being so loosely connected with its governing word that the two seem to constitute two separate ideas.

Apart from these dependent uses the participle occurs in a detached clause usually referred to as the *absolute participle*.   (Mustanoja (1960 : 551–552))

However, we have made some revisions of the classification given above. First of all, the substantive use of the present participle is added here, since Mustanoja has not treated the participle in this use. Another revision to be mentioned is that the use of the present participle as a predicate nominative is referred to as the *ing*-periphrasis according to Mustanoja (1960 : 552). It is because the present participle in this use is more properly discussed as a part of the finite verb. In addition, the term *objective predicative* is used instead of *predicate accusative* according to the terminology of Tajima (1970 : 369). Accordingly, in this paper the use of the present participle is classified as follows :

(1) Substantive Use   (4) Appositive Use

(2) Objective Predicative   (5) Absolute Use

(3) Attributive Use   (6) *Ing*-periphrasis

*

(1) Substantive Use

With regard to the present participle used as a substantive, Trnka explains as follows :

As substantivized present participles the –ing forms are seldom found in English, owing to the tendency of the language not to confound *nomina actoris* with *nomina actionis*. Frequent instances of their use in the former

function found in Wyclif's translation of the Bible (e.g. *sittinge* ＝ sedentes) are undoubtedly due to the close imitation of the constructions used in the original, and cannot therefore be accounted for as a continuation of the Old English practice of converting the present participles into substantives (e.g. *sittende* ＝ sedentes). In this function the Old English present participles were replaced in Middle English by verbal nouns in –*er* (e.g. *sitter*, *doer*, *seeker*) …　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Trnka (1930 : 87–88))

Sweet (1953 : 41) also says that the ending –*end* comes from the present participle –*ende* and is used to form an agent noun in OE. We find the examples of the present participle in this use in *LHA*, *LHB* and *TH*, respectively. The present participle *helend* (*e*) 'savior' appears most frequently in each text. Some examples will be given here.

LHA (Ⅰ : 3 : 12) Þa apostles eoden and dedeun alswa þe *helende* heom het

LHA (XⅡ : 129 : 26) Ac swa sone swa he forseh his *scuppend* þurh his wifes red; heo forluren ba þa murie wununge þe heom bitaht wes ; þet wes eorðliche para[d]is.

LHB (Ⅶ : 75 : 26) *scuppende* and *weldende* of heouene and of orðe and of alle iscefte

LHB (XV : 147 : 29) alse ure *helende* wes ine þe halie rode for ure gultes. þet nefde him solf nane.

TH (XXI : 123 : 14–15) is on almihti god. *Shuppende*. and *wealdende*. and *dihtende* of alle shafte.

TH (XXⅥ : 159 : 2) and al þat man doð for sunderlepes to quemen gode. alle hie quencheð sinne. and þingeð þe *sinbetinde* to ure drihten.

(2)　Objective Predicative

According to Mustanoja (1960 : 552), the present participle used as an objective predicative is comparable to the infinitive in the same function, and it usually occurs after verbs of perception and, in some measure, after those of mental action. With regard to the difference between the participle and the infinitive in this function, Mustanoja explains as follows :

In many cases, particularly in poetry, thythm seems to play a part in the choice between the infinitive and the participle, but there is also a certain functional difference between the two constructions. The participle describes an action in a more vivid, graphic way than does the infinitive. In other words, while the infinitive records the mere fact, the participle brings the dynamic element into the picture.　　　　　　　　(Mustaonja (1960 : 552))

In addition, Mustanoja (1960 : 553) says that the use of the present participle makes slow progress, and even in ME it is less common than the infinitive. The present participle in this function is found only four times in *TH*, and is not found at all in *LHA* and *LHB* as Mustanoja explains. All the examples will be given here.

TH (XX : 119 : 32) þat he cume uppen us and wune in us. and freure us of alle sorege alse he hem dide. and lihte on us rihte bileue. and make us *wallende* of soðe luue

TH (XXⅨ : 175 : 3) and seið þat ure helende giede bi þe se. and segh þos tweie brodren in þe se on here shipe *werpinde* ut here fishnet in þe se[3].

TH (XXXI : 193 : 6) and mugen mucheles þe eðere. gef hie findeð *slepende*.

TH (XXXI : 201 : 17) Ac gef ure drihten hine fint þus *slepende*. þat is on sinne; ne wakeð he nafre ef[t].

(3)　Attributive Use

The adjectival character of the present participle is shown most clearly by its attributive use. We find the examples of the present participle used attributively in *LHA*, *LHB* and *TH*, respectively. Some examples will be given here.

LHA (Ⅰ : 7 : 16) Drihten þu dest þe lof of milc *drinkende* childre muðe wu warpest þene alde feont for þine feonden and þine feond þu biscildest.

LHA (Ⅲ : 27 : 4) ah ʒif eni mon hit muste isean. he mahte iseon ane *berninde* glede þet hine al for-bernað þurut to cole.

LHB (Ⅷ : 83 : 7) Alse þe *liuendes* godes sune in to þe meidene com. and ho of hire meiden-had nawiht ne wemde.

LHB (XⅦ : 159 : 21–22) eche hele. *lestende* liht. and endeles lif.

TH (XⅣ : 87 : 13) þe frend shopen þe child name. and mid stone þe for þe nones was maked for to keruen þat fel biforen on his *strenende* lime.

TH (XXⅨ : 177 : 21) Þe water stormes an-hefden here stefne. for wat is folc bute *fletende* water. þe flitteð fro þis þat was. alse water storm fro stede to stede.

(4)　Appositive Use

As stated at the beginning of this section, the participle occurs appositively when it is so loosely connected with its governing word that the two seem to constitute two separate ideas. Callaway says that the appositive participle has three chief uses :

Ⅰ.　The Adjectival, in which the Appositive Participle is equivalent to a Dependent Adjectival (Relative) Clause, and denotes either an action or a state…

Ⅱ.　Adverbial, in which the Appositive Participle is equivalent to a Dependent Adverbial (Conjunctive) Clause, and denotes time, manner, means, etc.…

Ⅲ.　Co-ordinate, in which the Appositive Participle is

substantially equivalent to an Independent Clause, and either (1) denotes an accompanying circumstance (the "circumstantial" participle), or (2) repeats the idea of the principal verb (the "iterating" participle)...

(Callaway (1918 : 78–80))

According to Mustanoja (1960 : 555), the appositive participle becomes quite common in the course of ME. The appositive use of the present participle occurs frequently in our corpus, especially in *TH*. In *TH*, most of the present participles in this use are found in the expression *þus queðende* or *queðinde*. In *TH*, out of the 75 examples of the present participle in the appositive use, 60 are used in this expression. Some examples will be given here.

LHA (Ⅱ : 25 : 17) from þan helle and from þan pine us bureʒe þe lauerd þe is feder and sune and hali gast *wuniende* and *rixlende* on worlde a buten ende.

LHA (Ⅸ : 89 : 22) Þat halie hired cristes apostles weren wuniende edmodliche on heore ibeoden on ane upflore efter cristes upstiʒe *onbodinde* his bi-hates.

LHB (Ⅶ : 77 : 20) swa ho ifeng ure drihten. þa þe engel hire brohte þe blisfulle tidinge. þus *queþende*.

LHB (XⅧ : 155 : 6) heo oden *wepende*. and sowen and sculen eft cumen mid blisse and mawen.

TH (Ⅳ : 15 : 17) Of þe bileue specð ure louerd ihesu crist on þe holie godspelle. þus *queðende*.

TH (XX : 117 : 17) On þe fiftuðe dai. after estrene dai weren alle þe apostles. and here fereden gadered on one stede. *sittinde* and salmes *singende*. and god *heriende*. in þe temple of ierusalem.

(5)　Absolute Use

Accroding to Mustanoja (1960 : 559), the absolute participle is very rare in early ME, but becomes increasingly common towards the end of the period. In our corpus, we find no examples in which the present participle is used absolutely.

(6)　*Ing*-Periphrasis

In this paper, we represent the construction *be* and the present participle by the term "*Ing*-Periphrasis". Mustanoja states that two things are particularly to be taken into consideration in interpreting the ME use of this construction :

1.　An implication of imperfectivity (durativity) is naturally associated with the periphrasis.

2.　The implication of imperfectivity (durativity) does not, however, seem to be the main reason for the use of this construction. In the large majority of instances, if not in all, its use seems to be due primarily to a desire to describe the action in a more graphic and forceful way. The periphrasis, being longer and therefore weightier than the simple tense form, is well suited for this pur-

pose. That this is the primary reason for the use of the constructon is suggested by the numerous OE instances where the periphrasis has only a very weak durative force or none at all.　　　(Mustaonja (1960 : 593–594))

There are some examples of the *ing*-periphrasis in *LHA* and *TH*, but no such examples are found in *LHB*. With regard to the verbs used in this construction, Mustanoja explains as follows :

The periphrasis occurs particularly with certain verbs of rest, such as *dwell*, *last*, *live* and *wone*, of motion, such as *come* and *go*, and of speaking, although its use is by no means restricted to these verbs... (Mustaonja (1960 : 586))

In our corpus, the verbs used in this construction are tabulated as follows :

Table 1.

	LHA	TH	Total
beren	0	1	1
bodien	1	0	1
brinnen	2	0	2
dreoʒen	1	0	1
feren	0	1	1
fleoʒen	0	1	1
fleoten	0	1	1
lokien	1	0	1
speken	1	0	1
suken	1	0	1
understanden	0	1	1
waʒien	0	2	2
wakien	0	2	2
walken	0	2	2
wallen	0	1	1
witen	0	1	1
wunien	6	4	10
wurchen	0	1	1
Total	13	18	31

As Table 1 shows, in our corpus, the verbs used in this construction are not so restricted, though the verb *wunien* is most frequently used. Some examples will be given here.

LHA (Ⅳ : 41 : 12) and þa scawede mihhal to sancte paul þa wrecche sunfulle þe þer were *wuniende*

LHA (Ⅸ : 95 : 19) þe halia gast wes iseȝen on fures heowe bufan þam apostlas. forðon þe he dude þet heo weren *birnende* on godes willan. and *bodiende* umbe godes riche.

TH (Ⅵ : 31 : 8-9) were herdes *wakiende* bi side þe buregh and wittende here oref.

TH (XXI : 121 : 26) Þe man is *understondinde* þe him seluen cnoweð and gode leueð.

*

The statistical results of the classification given above are tabulated as in Table 2.

The Form of the Present Participle

In OE, the present participle ends in *–ende*, while its ending is *–ing* in Modern English. With regard to the transition from *–ende* to *–ing*, Mustanoja states as follows :

The OE ending of the present participle, *–ende*, is found in ME in the form *–inde* (*–ende*) in the South and the Midlands and in the form *–and*(*e*) in the North and the N Midlands. At the end of the 12th century and in the course of the 13th the ending of the participle becomes *–ing*(*e*) in the southern and central parts of the country….   (Mustaonja (1960 : 547))

In our sorpus, the present participle ends in two forms, namely, the OE form *–ende* (or *–end*) and the transitional form *–inde* (or *–ind*), and the form *–ing*(*e*) is not found at all as the ending of the present participle[4]. As stated in Introduction, *LHA* is said to be linguistically older than *LHB*. In this section, we will observe the distribution of these two participial endings in our corpus.

We can get the following figures with regard to the relative frequencies of *–end*(*e*) and *–ind*(*e*) in our corpus :

As shown in Table 3, as the ending of the present participle, *–end*(*e*) occurs much more frequently than *–ind*(*e*) in *LHA*, *LHB* and *TH*, respectively. It may safely be said that there is little or no difference in each text with regard to the relative frequencies of *–end*(*e*) and *–ind*(*e*), though we can not say anything definite about *LHB* because the examples are small in number.

In addition, in our corpus the relative frequencies of *–end*(*e*) and *–ind*(*e*) in each use are tabulated as in Table 4, 5, 6 and 7.

As shown in Table 4, 5, 6 and 7, in the substantive use of the present participle the ending *–end*(*e*) is the rule, while the ending *–ind*(*e*) occurs only four times in our corpus. The present participle used as an objective predicative ends in *–end*(*e*) more frequently than in *–ind*(*e*), though the examples are so small in number that we can not say anything definite about this use. As the ending of the present participle in the attributive use, *–end*(*e*) occurs more frequently than *–ind*(*e*), though in *LHA* *–end*(*e*)

Table 3.

	–end(e)	*–ind(e)*	Total
LHA	48 (73.8%)	17 (26.2%)	65 (100%)
LHB	16 (94.1%)	1 (5.9%)	17 (100%)
TH	148 (73.6%)	53 (26.4%)	201 (100%)
Total	212 (74.9%)	71 (25.1%)	283 (100%)[5]

Table 2.

	LHA	*LHB*	*TH*	Total
Substantive	25	10	88	123
Objective Predicative	0	0	4	4
Attributive	12	4	17	33
Appositive	15	3	75	93
Absolute	0	0	0	0
Ing-periphrasis	13	0	18	31
Total	65	17	202	284

Table 4.　*LHA*

	−*end(e)*	−*ind(e)*	Total
Substantive	23 (92.0%)	2　(8.0%)	25 (100%)
Attributive	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)	12 (100%)
Appositive	8 (53.3%)	7 (46.7%)	15 (100%)
Ing-periphrasis	10 (76.9%)	3 (23.1%)	13 (100%)
Total	48 (73.8%)	17 (26.2%)	65 (100%)

Table 5.　*LHB*

	−*end(e)*	−*ind(e)*	Total
Substantive	9 (90.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10 (100%)
Attributive	4 (100%)	0　(0%)	4 (100%)
Appositive	3 (100%)	0　(0%)	3 (100%)
Total	16 (94.1%)	1　(5.9%)	17 (100%)

Table 6.　*TH*

	−*end(e)*	−*ind(e)*	Total
Substantive	87 (98.9%)	1　(1.1%)	88 (100%)
Objective Predicative	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4 (100%)
Attributive	12 (70.6%)	5 (29.4%)	17 (100%)
Appositive	34 (45.3%)	41 (54.7%)	75 (100%)
Ing-periphrasis	12 (70.6%)	5 (29.4%)	17 (100%)
Total	148 (73.6%)	53 (26.4%)	201 (100%)

Table 7.　Total of *LHA*, *LHB* and *TH*

	−*end(e)*	−*ind(e)*	Total
Substantive	119 (96.7%)	4　(3.3%)	123 (100%)
Objective Predicative	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4 (100%)
Attributive	23 (69.7%)	10 (30.3%)	33 (100%)
Appositive	45 (48.4%)	48 (51.6%)	93 (100%)
Ing-periphrasis	22 (73.3%)	8 (26.7%)	30 (100%)
Total	212 (74.9%)	71 (25.1%)	283 (100%)

is only a little more frequent than –*ind*(*e*). As the ending of the present participle in the construction of the *ing*-periphrasis, –*end*(*e*) is more frequent than –*ind*(*e*). However, it should be noted that as the ending of the present participle used appositively –*ind*(*e*) occurs a little more frequently than –*end*(*e*) in *TH* and is almost as frequent as –*end*(*e*) in *LHA*. We can not say anything definite about *LHB* because the examples are rare, but with regard to *TH* and *LHA*, it may be safe to say that there is a tendency that the present participle ends in the transitional form –*ind*(*e*) more frequently in the appositive use than in the other uses, especially in *TH*. Some examples of –*end*(*e*) and –*ind*(*e*) will be given here.

Present Participle (–*end*(*e*)) :

LHA (IX : 93 : 28) forðon þet cristes apostlas weren *specende* mid alle spechen. and ec þet wunderluker

LHA (X : 115 : 13) King is ihaten rex; þet is *wisegend* for he scal wissian mid wisdome his folke and unriht aleggen and þene ileaue areren.

LHB (XVII : 159 : 2–3) þos fure kunnes teres boð þe fuwer wateres; þa þe beoð ihaten us on to weschen þurh ysaiam þe prophete þus *queðende*. beoð iweschen; and w[u]nieð clene.

LHB (XVII : 159 : 21–22) eche hele. *lestende* liht. and endeles lif.

TH (XXIX : 183 : 29) þus doð þe *libbende* frend to-genes þe *liggende*.

TH (XXXI : 201 : 17) Ac gef ure drihten hine fint þus *slepende*. þat is on sinne; ne wakeð he nafre ef[t].

Present Participle (–*ind*(*e*)) :

LHA (I : 3 : 15) þa wes hit cud ouer al þe burh þet þe *helind* wes þiderward. heo urnen on-ȝein him al þa hebreisce men mid godere heorte and summe mid ufele þeonke.

LHA (XII : 127 : 28) þet is þet þe deofel þe geð abutan alswa þe gredie leo *sechinde* hwen he maȝe fordon þet he neure ne maȝe cuman wið-innan us.

LHB (XIV : 143 : 27) þe þet spekeð faire bi-foren and false bi-hinden. þe niðfulle. þe prude. þe fordrunkene. þe *chidinde*. þe forsworene. þe heðene. þe erites.

TH (XI : 63 : 30) and of þis festing specð ure drihten þurh þe holie prophetes muð; þus *queðinde*.

TH (XXV : 147 : 8) and on þis reuliche wei hie weren *walkinde* forte þat hie comen to þe lichamliche deaðe.

Summary

We have attempted to examine the use and the form of the present participle in *LHA*, *LHB* and *TH*, considering how different they are in each text. The results of this study may be summarized as follows :

(1)　*Helend*(*e*) 'savior' is most frequently found as the present participle used substantively in each text.

(2)　The use of the present participle as an objective predicative is infrequent, occurring only four times in *TH*.

(3)　Most of the appositive present participles are found in the expression *þus queðende* or *queðinde* in our corpus.

(4)　We find no examples in which the present participle is used absolutely in our corpus.

(5)　In our corpus, the verbs used in the construction of the *ing*-periphrasis are not so restricted, though the verb *wunien* is most frequently used.

(6)　As the ending of the present participle, the OE form –*end*(*e*) occurs much more frequently than the transitional form –*ind*(*e*) in each text, and –*ing*(*e*) is not found at all in our corpus. It may safely be said that there is little or no difference in each text with regard to the relative frequencies of –*end*(*e*) and –*ind*(*e*), though we can not say anything definite about *LHB* because the examples are small in number.

(7)　With regard to *TH* and *LHA*, it may be safe to say that there is a tendency that the present participle ends in –*ind*(*e*) more frequently in the appositive use than in the other uses, especially in *TH*.

Notes

1）　In this paper, we have taken up only the homilies written in prose, so the homilies VI, XVIII in *Lambeth Homilies* and XXXV in *Trinity Homilies* are excluded from our corpus.

2）　According to *MED* (*Plan and Bibliography*), *Lambeth Homilies* and *Trinity Homilies* were written in about 1225 and in the dialect of South-East Midland.

3）　In this example, *werþinde* can also be treated as the present participle used appositively.

4）　In our corpus, out of the 284 examples of the present participles, 20 end in –*end*, and only one ends in –*ind*.

5）　In discussing the ending of the present participle, the following example is excluded from our corpus :

　　TH (XXIX : 175 : 25) He is *fleonde* alse shadewe and ne stont neure on one stede.

In the example given above, it is impossible to decide whether the present participle ends in –*ende* or –*inde*.

Texts

MORRIS, R. ed. (1867-8) *Lambeth Homilies*, in *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, First Series, EETS, 29&34, Trübner & Co., London.

MORRIS, R. ed. (1873) *Trinity Homilies*, in *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century*, Series II, EETS, OS 53, Trübner & Co., London.

References

CALLAWAY, M. (1918) *Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels,* The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

MUSTANOJA, T.F. (1960) *A Middle English Syntax*, Part I, Société Néophilologique, Helsinki.

SISAM, C. (1951) "The Scribal Tradition of the *Lambeth* Homilies," *Review of English Studies*, NS 2, pp. 105-113.

TAJIMA, M. (1970) "On the Use of the Participle in the Works of the *Gawain*-Poet," *Collected Articles on the English Language* 4, pp. 367-378.

TRNKA, B. (1930) *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden*, Kraus Reprint, Prague.