

# Principles of Mood Selection in Psalm 20: A Diachronic Study on Psalm Translations from Old to Late Modern English

Kinga Lis<sup>1</sup>

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

**Abstract:** The paper analyses verbal structures employed in 16 translations of Psalm 20 coming from Old, Middle, Early Modern and Late Modern English periods, spanning over ten centuries, with a view to determining the principles of mood selection in each of the psalter translations and observing any diachronic shifts in this respect. The major finding of the study is that grammatical choices seem to lie at the intersection of language change and the type of translation aimed at by the translators rather than reside in the source text underlying the rendition. The changes in the grammatical structure of the language inevitably surface in the text of the translation unless they are blocked by the overriding principle of formal faithfulness to the original, resulting in such marked choices as adherence to the subjunctive in main clauses in a Late Modern English rendition. The paper is a preliminary step in a larger diachronic study of the subjunctive in English and its findings suggest that it is possible to investigate the change in mood selection also on the basis of linguistic material gathered in biblical translations.

**Keywords:** English, mood, psalter, subjunctive, translation

## 1 Introduction

The use of (predominantly mandative) subjunctive has in recent decades become a subject of multiple studies, especially those juxtaposing its synchronic use in varieties of English from across the globe.<sup>2</sup> Sadly, the recently observed renaissance of the

---

1 I would like to express my profound gratitude to the anonymous reviewer of this paper for their most helpful corrections and insightful comments on this paper. These have greatly contributed to the paper and improved its final shape.

2 To mention only a few well-known studies on the topic: Turner (1980) investigated the subjunctive in British English; Övergaard (1995), Crawford (2009), Hundt *et al.* (2009), Kjellmer (2009), and Waller (2017) in British and American English, Peters (1998) in Australian English. Recently, attention has been drawn to the use of the subjunctive in other varieties of English: see for instance Hundt (2018) and Deshors and Gries (2020). For the investigation of the use of the subjunctive in non-mandative context, see: Auer (2008), Schlüter (2009).

subjunctive<sup>3</sup> has attracted much less diachronic interest: Moessner (2020) is the only book-length diachronic study covering the history of the subjunctive in English from Old English to Early Modern English.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, still a lot remains to be done, especially when it comes to the analysis of actual texts as opposed to the data obtained from various corpora.<sup>5</sup> This paper is a preliminary step aimed at filling this gap.<sup>6</sup>

The objective of the present study is to investigate the patterns of distribution of the subjunctive in opposition to other constructions in Psalm 20 across 16 psalter translations in OE, ME, eMnE and lMnE, four from each period. Although wide-cast diachronically, the study is conducted on a text consisting of only ca. 170 words. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from this research need, perforce, to be formulated with caution. Due to the specificity of the type of text selected for the analysis, the findings should, nevertheless, shed some light on the possible influence of the source text on mood selection in translations of biblical texts, which are considered to adhere more closely to the original than it is the case in other types of renditions. The text selected for this purpose is Psalm 20, where the majority of sentences are simple clauses linked by means of coordination and the use of subordination is very limited. Considering that the gradual decrease in the use of the subjunctive observed from OE onwards was quite conspicuous in main clauses, the use of the subjunctive in these in later periods could be indicative of the endeavour to stay close to the source text. Whether this is the case will become apparent in the course of the study.

The methodological approach adopted in this study and a brief diachronic account of the use of the subjunctive in English presented in Section 2 of the paper should be sufficient to sketch the background against which to view the results obtained in the study. I treat each of the texts analysed in this paper independently and hence provide their concise descriptions, especially in terms of their adherence to the source text. At the same time, to preclude showing too narrow a picture, I measure overall preferences in each of the periods (to the extent that it is possible in the scope of this paper). All of this is given in the

---

3 Not all researchers agree as to the actual renaissance of the mandative subjunctive. See Kastronic and Poplack (2014) for an example of a paper contesting this phenomenon. The paper, however, is not without its problems.

4 One cannot omit to mention Visser (1966 [1972]) who in his historical account of English syntax discusses the subjunctive, illustrating its use in 57 contexts in each of the periods with a set of representative quotations.

5 While the advantages of the use of corpus data for linguistic analysis are multiple and undeniable, it is also true that such studies have limitations of their own as it is common practice to discard all data (multiple *that*-clauses, and coordinated structures) that cannot be searched automatically (Serpellet 2001, 536).

6 In Lis (in prep.) I will offer a diachronic study of the use of the subjunctive across four major periods in the history of English on a selection of 20 texts of five different types.

subsections of Section 3: 3.1 for Old English (OE), 3.2 for Middle English (ME), 3.3 for Early Modern English (eMnE), and 3.4 for Late Modern English (lMnE) periods. Section 3.5 gathers and compares all the data both synchronically and diachronically. Finally, Section 4 offers some tentative conclusions.

## 2 Methodology

For the purposes of this analysis I have selected four translations of Psalm 20 from each of the four main periods in the history of English, i.e. OE, ME, eMnE and lMnE, which gave me in total 16 renditions to examine. Psalm 20 counts only nine verses and consists of approximately 170 words, which translates into a corpus of 2,720 words. The textual data were obtained either through transcription (from manuscripts or original printed texts) or through consulting, where available, reliable editions of the texts in question.<sup>7</sup> Within the analysed text, 22 clauses can be distinguished,<sup>8</sup> giving a total of 352 clauses for the whole corpus. Each clause was examined in terms of mood and grammatical form. The identification of the subjunctive was based on strictly formal criteria, and thus in the contexts where ambiguity between forms arose (cf. Section 3.2), they were classified as ambiguous, instead of being assigned to either the subjunctive or indicative on the basis of their semantic component. This decision was dictated by the need to maximise the transparency of the data presented numerically.<sup>9</sup>

This approach is encapsulated by a reworked definition based on that offered for the first time in Lis (2021, 56):

The subjunctive is a mood realised by means of the subjunctive form, as long as it was available, and the so-called “plain form” (Aarts 2011) later on in the present tense or *were* in the past, functioning in competition with “other constructions” even if on a limited scale, used to convey non-factual information, “an action or a state as conceived (and not as a fact).” (OED)

---

7 Precise information as to the source for each of the analysed texts can be found in Section 3.

8 This is the number of clauses in the Latin text, which is, as will be explained in Section 3, the source for the majority of the translations. In order to analyse exclusively these contexts, which are present in all the texts, I decided to limit the study to these 22 clauses common to all the translations.

9 Certainly, many researchers, e.g. Johansson and Norheim (1988) and Övergaard (1995), would adhere to semantic criteria in order to argue the use of the subjunctive in certain contexts, in which, due to the use of the forms in 1st and 2nd person, it is formally impossible to prove its employment, but this is not the approach adopted here.

The parts of the definitions enclosed in square brackets are my additions, necessary in order to render it applicable to this diachronic study. In particular, prior to eMnE, inflectional endings still served to differentiate subjunctive forms from the indicative and imperative in these earliest periods of the history of English. The endings ultimately disappeared later in the ME period, rendering positive identification of the subjunctive impossible from eMnE onwards except for the contexts in which the indicative makes use of overt inflectional endings on the verb. Therefore, the more distant the texts, the easier it is to differentiate between the subjunctive and other moods. This is depicted in Tables 1 and 2 below. In the former, I present inflectional endings for the indicative and subjunctive for each of the four periods in the history of English, setting in bold the instances in which it is possible to identify the subjunctive.

TABLE 1: Inflectional endings in indicative and subjunctive<sup>10</sup>

Person & number	present							
	OE		ME		eMnE		IMnE	
	strong / weak		strong / weak					
	indicative	subjunctive	indicative	subjunctive	indicative	subjunctive	indicative	subjunctive
1sg	-e	-e	-(e)	-(e)	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
2sg	-(e)st	<b>-e</b>	-(e)st	-(e)	-st	<b>-∅</b>	-∅	-∅
3sg	<b>-eþ</b>	<b>-e</b>	-eth	-(e)	-th / -s	<b>-∅</b>	-s	-∅
plural	<b>-aþ</b>	<b>-en</b>	-e(n)	-e(n)	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
	past							
1sg	-∅ / -e	<b>-en / -e</b>	-∅ / -(e)	-(e)	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
2sg	-e/ -(e)st	<b>-en / -e</b>	-(est) / -(e)st	-(e)	-∅-st	<b>-∅</b>	-∅	-∅
3sg	-∅ / -e	<b>-en / -e</b>	-∅ / -(e)	-(e)	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
plural	-on	<b>-en</b>	-e(n)	-e(n)	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅

<sup>10</sup> The information concerning inflectional endings comes from: Lass (1992, 134) for OE, Lass (1992, 138) for ME, and Lass (1999, 161) for eMnE.

Table 2, in turn, provides the conjugational paradigm for the verb “to be”, with items in bold being distinctively subjunctive forms. Additionally, I have underlined a few forms (in the case of the indicative) for which it is possible to positively determine that the indicative and not the subjunctive is employed, but the opposite is impossible.

TABLE 2: Paradigm for the verb “to be”<sup>11</sup>

Person & number	present							
	OE		ME		eMnE		IMnE	
	strong / weak		strong / weak					
	indicative	subjunctive	indicative	subjunctive	indicative	subjunctive	indicative	subjunctive
1sg	eam / bēo	<b>sīe / bēo</b>	am	<b>be</b>	am	<b>be</b>	am	<b>be</b>
2sg	eart / bist	<b>sīe / bēo</b>	art	<b>be</b>	art	<b>be</b>	are	<b>be</b>
3sg	is / bið	<b>sīe / bēo</b>	is	<b>be</b>	is	<b>be</b>	is	<b>be</b>
plural	sindon, sint, (e) aron / bēoð	<b>sīen / bēon</b>	be(n) / <u>are(n)</u>	be(n)	be / <u>are</u>	be	are	<b>be</b>
	past							
1sg	wæs	<b>wær-e</b>	was	<b>were</b>	was	<b>were</b>	was	<b>were</b>
2sg	wær-e	<b>wær-e</b>	were	were	<u>wast</u> / wert	wert	were	were
3sg	wæs	<b>wær-e</b>	was	<b>were</b>	was	<b>were</b>	was	<b>were</b>
plural	wær-on	<b>wær-en</b>	were(n)	were(n)	were	were	were	were

Generally speaking, the subjunctive in OE was “used to cast some doubt on the truth of the proposition or to express obligation, desire and so forth” (Traugott 1992, 184) and was “associated with such properties as potentiality,

11 The paradigms of the verb “to be” for OE and ME are provided after Lass (1992, 140) and Lass (1992, 141), respectively. The eMnE data come from Fillbrandt (2006, 137) for the present forms and Denison (1998, 161) and Lass (1999, 176–177) for the past.

contingency, hypothesis, conjecture, unreality, exhortation, prohibition, wishing, desiring” (Traugott 1972, 98), whereas the presence of the indicative meant that a proposition in question was (believed to be) true (Traugott 1992, 184, Molencki 2012, 305).<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, as emphasised by Traugott (1972, 98 and 1992, 184), a straightforward account of the use of the two moods cannot be provided, as their application was not strictly limited to the contexts which would satisfy these criteria and reveal the attitude of the speaker.<sup>13</sup> Thus, the indicative could be employed in *if*-clauses and the subjunctive functioned in reported speech, expressing a fact (Traugott 1972, 100-101, and 1992, 184) since “certain verbs and certain syntactic structures favor[ed] subjunctive complements” (Traugott 1972, 98). However, this latter use was probably only possible because the subjunctive was already “semantically empty” in such clauses (Fischer and van der Wurff 2006, 143).

Importantly, the subjunctive could occur both in main and subordinate clauses. This continued in ME (Mustanoja 1960 [2016], 451-473), even though the typical environment of the subjunctive even in OE was dependent clauses, because main clauses, “where modality needed a stronger expression, already usually contained a modal verb” (Fischer and van der Wurff 2006, 142).

On the whole, the contexts for the use of subjunctive did not change in ME, but the number of subjunctive forms used in these underwent a gradual reduction, just as the external marking of the mood did. In Visser’s (1966 [1972], 789) words,

[t]he modally marked forms of the present tense go on being used in Middle and Modern English in almost the same cases as in Old English, but with a gradually diminishing frequency.

One could generalise and state that the circumstances conducive to the use of the subjunctive were still wishes and exhortations for the present subjunctive, and unrealisable wishes and hypothetical situations for the past subjunctive (Fischer 1992, 248). As regards the former, the difference (between OE and

---

12 A slightly different approach is presented in von Mengden (2012, 286), who states that “[t]he indicative is the default value and the subjunctive is mainly used when the predication represents the wish of the speaker rather than a real event”.

13 That such correlation was strong is not, however, in doubt and can be well observed on the basis of the use of the subjunctive with verbs of thinking which often take subjunctive complements: such verbs express subjective beliefs and opinions, not the objective truth (Traugott 1972, 101).

ME) in the use of the subjunctive in this context lies in the fact that, while in OE the subjunctive was “the prime signal of the wish,” meaning that it was not introduced by any overt means indicating wishing (Traugott 1972, 99), in ME this use “survived primarily in complements of the verb *wish*, and then especially when expressing a wish contrary to fact at the time of the wish, as in *I wish he were here*” (Traugott 1972, 149). Traugott (1972, 149-150) states that traces of the use of the subjunctive remain after verbs of saying, reporting, thinking, hoping, wondering, in negative contexts and also, although “quite marked”, “in the exclamatory, almost hortatory” contexts. Yet, contrary to the OE use of the subjunctive in reported speech, its application in reported affirmative statements in ME was only occasional (Mustanoja 1960 [2016], 460). This contrasts with “indirect questions, revealing the speaker’s unfamiliarity with the subject of the inquiry” (Mustanoja 1960 [2016], 460) where the subjunctive was still employed (Mossé 1952 [1991], 118, Mustanoja 1960 [2016], 460).

The frequency of the use of subjunctive continued to decline throughout the eMnE period (Strang 1970, 209, Görlach 1991, 113), but its existence does not seem to have been threatened in the period (Rissanen 1999, 228, Dons 2004, 222, Cowie 2012, 609). The downward trend in the frequency seems to be related to the gradual disappearance of formal means of distinguishing of the subjunctive from the indicative (Smith 1996, 152, Rissanen 1999, 228). In fact, a concurrent increase can be observed at the time to use more analytic and thus less ambiguous periphrastic constructions (Rissanen 1999, 228).

This is not to say that the subjunctive was hardly in use in eMnE. Some researchers would even see it as “part of everyday familiar speech, even among lower-class characters” (Barber 1976 [1997], 173 and Kihlbom 1938, 262).<sup>14</sup> Others simply acknowledge its presence in a variety of contexts (Visser 1966 [1972], Görlach 1991, Rissanen 1999).

Strang (1970, 209) noticed a reversal of the frequency decrease trend in the use of the subjunctive in the 18th century. This is corroborated by Auer’s (2009) corpus study of adverbial clauses where she observes “a rise in frequency in the second part of the eighteenth century and the first part of the nineteenth century, that is, 1750-1849, which is followed by a continuous decrease until

---

<sup>14</sup> Barber (1976 [1997], 173) formulates his claim on the basis of dramatic texts in which the subjunctive is visible in the speech of people from all walks of life. The same findings are obtained by Kihlbom (1938, 262) in her study of private letters with respect to which she notes that “the subjunctive appears to have been the general rule in the colloquial language of the latter part of the 15th century”.

1990" (Auer 2009, 70). As mentioned in the Introduction, recently the subjunctive has also experienced a renaissance in its mandative use.

### 3 Texts and data

#### 3.1 OE

##### 3.1.1 Presentation of texts

As I mentioned in the Introduction, four renditions of Psalm 20 will be analysed for each of the periods in the history of English. The four OE versions of Psalm 20 come from the following translations. The oldest text is the Regius Psalter (RegiusP) dated to 950-1050 and kept in the British Library in London (Royal MS 2 B V). It was most probably written in a scriptorium in Winchester (Toswell 2014, 261) and contains "an excellent version of the Roman Psalter" (Toswell 2014, 264) and high quality interlinear Anglo-Saxon glosses in which the scribe omitted all pronouns and nouns directly denoting God (Toswell 2014, 266).

Next chronologically is the Paris Psalter (ParisP) dated to 1025-1050 and kept in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris (BnF MS Latin 8824). King Alfred's authorship of the OE translation of the first 50 psalms in this manuscript is usually accepted, although the character of this translation is at times debated.<sup>15</sup> In contrast to the Regius Psalter, OE rendition is presented this manuscript in a column parallel to the Latin (*Romanum*) text of the psalms.

The Cambridge Psalter (CambridgeP) is the third translation to which I resorted. The text is preserved in MS Ff.1.23 now kept in Cambridge University Library and dated to the mid-11th century. It is assumed that it was written in Winchcombe Abbey in Gloucestershire and hence the alternative name: Winchcombe Psalter. In Toswell's (2014, 268) view the gloss (to Roman Psalter) as presented in this manuscript could function as a stand-alone text and the manner in which it is presented on the page resembles more an *alternate-line* than *interlinear* glossing.

The most recent OE text analysed in this study is that of interlinear gloss to the Roman Psalter as presented in the Eadwine Psalter (EadwineP) now kept in Trinity College, Cambridge (MS R.17.1). It is dated to the 12th century and is in fact one of the most exceptional psalters in being trilingual and presenting next to three versions of the Latin text and the OE rendition, an Anglo-Norman gloss to the *Hebraicum*. Despite strong criticism of the quality of the OE gloss voiced by other researchers,

---

<sup>15</sup> See the discussion in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013, 58).



Toswell (2014, 391) perceives it to be a work “of an independent mind” and considers both its syntactic and lexical decisions as “a move away from past models and an exploring of contemporary language (however unsuccessful) and locution”.

For the purposes of this study, with the exception of the ParisP for which I used Charzyńska-Wójcik’s (2013) edition and gloss, the remaining texts were consulted in the original and transcribed from the respective manuscripts.

### 3.1.2 Data

As signalled above, since Psalm 20 only counts nine verses and consists of 22 clauses, the total number of analysed contexts for each translation is 22. Within this total only three clauses are subordinate and two function as main clauses.<sup>16</sup> The remaining 17 clauses are independent, in the majority of cases employed in compound sentences. The data concerning mood selection in these as well as the information concerning the number and person of each verbal form are provided below in Table 3. A glance at the table is sufficient to notice some *lexical* variation. In contrast, the decisions concerning the selection of the *mood* appear to be consistent in the majority of cases between the renditions but also with the underlying source text whose grammatical moods employed in these places are presented in Table 11 (Section 3.5). Divergences (set in bold) can be noted in rows 9, 10, 14 and 22. It is notable that apart from the 3rd person singular, there are also instances of the use of the subjunctive in the 1st person plural in all the translations with the exception of CambridgeP.

Table 3: OE data

	RegiusP			ParisP			CambridgeP			EadwineP		
	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]
1	gehyre	SUB	3sg	gehyre ðe Drihten	SUB	3sg	gehyre þe drihten	SUB	3sg	gehere þe drihten	SUB	3sg
2	gescylde noma [...]	SUB	3sg	gefrīðie þe se nama [...]	SUB	3sg	gescylde þe nama [...]	SUB	3sg	gescylde þe nomæ [...]	SUB	3sg
3	he asende	SUB	3sg	onsende	SUB	3sg	sende	SUB	3sg	he asende	SUB	3sg
4	he behealde	SUB	3sg	gehæl	SUB	3sg	gescylde	SUB	3sg	he behealde	SUB	3sg

<sup>16</sup> Subordinate clauses are marked with an ‘[s]’ and main clauses with an ‘[m]’ on the ordinal number of the clause in Table 3 and all the subsequent tables.

5	he gemyndig sie	SUB	3sg	gemyndig sy Drihten	SUB	3sg	gemyndig sy drihtyn	SUB	3sg	he gemyndig sie	SUB	3sg
6	onsægdnis þin fatt sie	SUB	3sg	þin ælmesse sy andfengu	SUB	3sg	on sægdnyse þine gefættige gewyrðe	SUB	3sg	þin offrung onseigdnese fett sie	SUB	3sg
7	selle	SUB	3sg	gylde þe Drihten	SUB	3sg	syllle þe drihtyn	SUB	3sg	selle þe drihten	SUB	3sg
8	he getrymme	SUB	3sg	he getrymie	SUB	3sg	gestrongie	SUB	3sg	he getrymme	SUB	3sg
9	we blißiað	IND	1pl	we moton fægñian	MAY	1pl	we beoð	IND	1pl	we blißiaþ	IND	1pl
10	we beoð gemiclode	IND	1pl	we syn gemyclade	SUB	1pl	we beoð gemiclode	IND	1pl	we beoð gemiclode	IND	1pl
11	gefylle dryhten	SUB	3sg	gefylle, Drihten	SUB	3sg	gefylle drihten	SUB	3sg	drihten gefylle	SUB	3sg
12 [m]	ic ancneow	IND	1sg	we ongitað	IND	1pl	ic oncneow	IND	1sg	ic oncneow	IND	1sg
13 [s]	halne gedep	IND	3sg	Drihten wile gehælan	IND	3sg	halne gedep drihten	IND	3sg	halne gedep drihten	IND	3sg
14 [s]	gehyrð	IND	3sg	he hine gehyrð	IND	3sg	gehyre	SUB	3sg	gehereþ	IND	3sg
15	we [...] beoð gemiclode	IND	1pl	we [...] us micliað	IND	1pl	we beoð gemiclod	IND	1pl	we [...] beoð gemicylde	IND	1pl
16	hy gewriðene synd	IND	3pl	hy synd [...] gebundne	IND	3pl	hi gebundynne syndum	IND	3pl	hi synt gewriðene	IND	3pl
17	hy feollon	IND	3pl	hi afeollon	IND	3pl	gefeollon	IND	3pl	gefeollen	IND	3pl
18	we arison	IND	1pl	we [...] arison	IND	1pl	we [...] aryson	IND	1pl	we [...] ærysæþ	IND	1pl
19	arehte we synt	IND	1pl	synt uppahafene	IND	1pl	uparelite we synde	IND	1pl	ryhte bioþ gewordene	IND	1pl
20	halne do	IMP	2sg	Drihten, gehæl	IMP	2sg	drihten halne doo	IMP	2sg	drihten gedo [...] hælna	IMP	2sg
21 [m]	gehyr	IMP	2sg	gehyr	IMP	2sg	gehyr	IMP	2sg	gehiere	IMP	2sg
22 [s]	we gecigen	SUB	1pl	we [...] clypiað	IND	1pl	we gecigað	IND	1pl	we gecygen clipien	SUB	1pl

When it comes to the frequency of occurrence of each of the moods (cf. Table 4 below), it is exactly the same for RegiusP, CambridgeP and EadwineP (despite the differences noted above), but not for ParisP, which opts for a periphrastic

expression with the verb *moton* in the context where remaining translations employ the indicative. Interestingly, the percentage participation of the subjunctive is exactly the same for all translations and equals 45% of the analysed 22 clauses.

Table 4: Frequency of different grammatical structures in the OE data

[mood]	RegiusP		ParisP		CambridgeP		EadwineP	
	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%
SUB	10	45%	10	45%	10	45%	10	45%
IND	10	45%	9	41%	10	45%	10	45%
MAY	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%
IMP	2	9%	2	9%	2	9%	2	9%

### 3.2 ME

#### 3.2.1 Presentation of texts

The four ME translations of Psalm 20 used in this study represent the only prose translations of the psalter available for the period: Richard Rolle's Psalter (RRP) translation (1st half of the 14th century), Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter (MEGPP, middle of the 14th century), Early Version (EV) of the Wycliffite Bible (1370s-1380s) and Late Version (LV) of the same (1388-1400). Each of these translations is unique. Both RRP and EV are usually held to adhere strictly to the Latin source text (*Gallicanum*). Rolle's reverence for the source text is evident even in the structure of his psalter, in which each Latin verse is followed by literal ME rendition and later on commented upon. In the case of EV the source text is not provided but the linguistic features of the rendition clearly indicate a close relation to its Latin source. LV, also a rendition of the *Gallicanum*, is generally viewed as a revised version of EV and one that is freer in its syntactic and lexical choices. MEGPP's unique character is best visible in the explanatory glosses incorporated into the translation, at times replacing the original wording of the psalter. The inconsistencies between the Latin source text (*Gallicanum*) and the ME rendition are easily noticeable since Latin verses always precede ME. All ME transcripts used in the study come from Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).<sup>17</sup>

17 For more on the translations, see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013), Sutherland (2015) and Lis (2017).

### 3.2.2 Data

As is clear from even a cursory inspection of Table 5 below, an even greater congruence in mood selection is to be observed between the ME translations of Psalm 20 than was the case for the OE texts. There is also a clear correspondence between the structures in use in these renditions and the underlying Latin text (cf. Table 11 in Section 3.5). A slight hint of divergence can only be seen in rows 16-19 and 22 where some of the translations employ verbs whose forms are ambiguous between the indicative and the subjunctive, i.e. either *ben* or purely lexical verbs ending in *-e(n)*, which sets them apart from the texts in which verbs are clearly in the indicative, or, as is the case of EV in row 22, from *shall*.

Table 5: ME data

	RRP			MEGPP			EV			LV		
	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]
1	here the. the lord	SUB	3sg	my soule, her our Lord þe	SUB	3sg	here thee the Lord	SUB	3sg	the Lord here	SUB	3sg
2	hile the. the name [...]	SUB	3sg	be name [...] de- fende	SUB	3sg	defende thee the name [...]	SUB	3sg	the name[...] de  fende	SUB	3sg
3	send he	SUB	3sg	sende he	SUB	3sg	sende he	SUB	3sg	sende he	SUB	3sg
4	defend he	SUB	3sg	defende he	SUB	3sg	defende he	SUB	3sg	defende he	SUB	3sg
5	menand be he	SUB	3sg	be he þenchand	SUB	3sg	myndeful be he	SUB	3sg	be he myn- deful	SUB	3sg
6	thin offerand fat be made	SUB	3sg	be þyn of- fryng made gode	SUB	3sg	thi brent sacrifise be maad fat	SUB	3sg	thi brent sacrifice be maad fat	SUB	3sg
7	gif he	SUB	3sg	gif he	SUB	3sg	gelde he	SUB	3sg	gyue he	SUB	3sg
8	he conferme	SUB	3sg	conferme he	SUB	3sg	conferme	SUB	3sg	conferme he	SUB	3sg
9	we sall ioy	SHALL	1pl	whe shul ioyen	SHALL	1pl	we shul gladen	SHALL	1pl	we schulen be glad	SHALL	1pl

10	we sall be worschipid	SHALL	1pl	we shul herien	SHALL	1pl	wee shul be magnified	SHALL	1pl	we schulen be magny- fied	SHALL	1pl
11	Lord fulfil	SUB	3sg	our Lord fulfille	SUB	3sg	fulfille the Lord	SUB	3sg	the Lord fille	SUB	3sg
12 [m]	i. knew	IND	1sg	haue ich knowen	IND	1sg	I haue knowe	IND	1sg	Y haue knowe	IND	1sg
13 [s]	lord has makid safe	IND	3sg	ur Lord made sauf	IND	3sg	the Lord made saf	IND	3sg	the Lord hath maad saaf	IND	3sg
14 [s]	He sall here	SHALL	3sg	He shal here	SHALL	3sg	He shal [...] heren	SHALL	3sg	He schal here	SHALL	3sg
15	we [...] sall in kall	SHALL	1pl	we shul herien	SHALL	1pl	wee [...] shul in- wardli clepen	SHALL	1pl	we schulen inwardli clepe	SHALL	1pl
16	thai ere obligid	IND	3pl	hij ben bounden	IND / SUB	3pl	thai ben oblisht	IND / SUB	3pl	thai ben boundun	IND / SUB	3pl
17	thai fell	IND / SUB	3pl	feld adoun	IND	3pl	fellen	IND / SUB	3pl	felden doun	IND	3pl
18	we rase	IND	1pl	we ros vp	IND	1pl	wee risen	IND / SUB	1pl	we han*. [haue I.] rise	IND	1pl
19	we ere rightid	IND	1pl	ben adresced	IND / SUB	1pl	ben up rigt	IND / SUB	1pl	ben reisid	IND / SUB	1pl
20	Lorde make saf	IMP	2sg	Lord, make [...] sauf	IMP	2sg	Lord, mac saaf	IMP	2sg	Lord, make [...] saaf	IMP	2sg
21 [m]	here	IMP	2sg	her	IMP	2sg	here	IMP	2sg	here	IMP	2sg
22 [s]	we inkall	IND / SUB	1pl	we haue cleped	IND	1pl	wee shul [...] clepe	SHALL	1pl	we [...] clepen	IND / SUB	1pl

In terms of frequency, the participation of the subjunctive remains almost the same as in the OE renditions (45%) and is equal 41% in all ME translations (cf. Table 6 below). Interestingly, not a single occurrence of periphrasis with *may* is to be found in these texts but *shall* appears in all translations, taking over almost half of what was rendered in the indicative in the OE renditions. This would suggest that *shall* started to be employed in its future function, however, I do not classify these uses of *shall* as straightforward instances of the indicative in light of the fact that, as explained by Görlach (1991, 112),

[i]t is uncertain whether ‘future’ existed as a ‘pure’ tense in ME or whether all instances of *shall/will* should not be classified as modals

[...] but the semantic weakening of *will* (originally ‘wish’) and *shall* (originally ‘be obliged to’) throughout ME is uncontested.

The use of the imperative remains unchanged and two occurrences of verbs in this mood are noted in all ME texts.

Table 6: Frequency of different grammatical structures in the ME data

[mood]	RRP		MEGPP		EV		LV	
	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%
SUB	9	41%	9	41%	9	41%	9	41%
IND	5	23%	5	23%	2	9%	4	18%
SHALL	4	18%	4	18%	5	23%	4	18%
IMP	2	9%	2	9%	2	9%	2	9%
IND/SUB	2	9%	2	9%	4	18%	3	14%

### 3.3 eMnE

#### 3.3.1 Presentation of texts

The four eMnE renditions of Psalm 20 selected for the analysis represent three different Christian denominations: Anglicanism, Catholicism and Protestantism. The first among the translations, chronologically, is the 1535 Coverdale’s Bible (CoverdaleB), i.e. the first complete *printed* Bible in English. The text of the psalms in the Bible was translated by Myles Coverdale from Latin and German sources.<sup>18</sup> The psalms in his translation were at the basis of the Church of England’s worship for over 400 years (Daniell 2003, 181-182), having been included in the Book of Common Prayer.

Another text strongly tied with the Anglican Church is that from the Bishops’ Bible (1568). The idea behind this Bible was put forward by Archbishop Matthew Parker, inspired by Cranmer’s earlier failed project, who managed to gather a group of bishops to translate the Bible into English anew (Daniell 2003, 338). The work on the Book of Psalms was entrusted to the Bishop of Rochester, Edmund

---

18 The Bible is composed of two parts, one of them (the New Testament and portions of the Old Testament) being the text translated by William Tyndale from the original languages, the other, Coverdale’s own translation from Latin and German sources (Daniell 2003, 174–176).

Guest, however, as conceded by Lewis (2016, 46-47) the translation might have been later reworded by Thomas Becon since the Book of Psalms is followed by initials "T.B." A still different possibility is that "T.B." stands for Thomas Bickley, who was one of Parker's chaplains (Lewis 2016, 47). Daniell (2003, 340) explains Bickley's participation in the project by hypothesising that the psalter was perhaps one of the parts of the work not completed by the bishops to whom they were assigned and thus it was among the renditions that were later finalised by "certain other learned men" referred to by Parker. Even less is known about the actual sources of this translation.

In contrast to the two Anglican renditions, the Geneva Bible (GB) from 1560 is a Protestant Bible. It was taken to America in the early 17th century and used there by generations of colonists (Daniell 2003, 294-295). The merit of the text lies in the fact that for the parts not translated earlier by Tyndale from the original languages (i.e. poetic and prophetic books), it provided a fresh translation directly from Hebrew into English (Daniell 2003, 297). So, it offers the Book of Psalms based on a different source than the Latin Vulgate, which had served in this capacity so far.

The last among the eMnE translations to be analysed here is the psalm from the Douai-Rheims Bible (DR), whose volume II of the Old Testament, containing the Book of Psalms, was printed in 1610 in Douai. This was a translation created to respond to the need for the Bible in the vernacular voiced by the members of the Catholic Church (Daniell 2003, 358). In line with the long Catholic tradition, it was rendered from the Latin Vulgate, i.e. from the text with ecclesiastical authority, following it closely (Daniell 2003, 359-362).

The analysis presented in the following section is based on a facsimile of the original 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible, Charzyńska-Wójcik's (2013) transcription of the 1610 text of the Douai Psalter, and transcriptions of the 1535 Coverdale Bible and 1568 Bishops' Bible available at the *Textus Receptus Bibles* website.

### 3.3.2 Data

The grammatical choices as regards the mood or use of the periphrastic constructions in the four translations are presented in Table 7 below. The variation in the decisions concerning the use of the subjunctive, indicative, *shall-*, *will-*, *may-* and *let-* constructions is unquestionably much more conspicuous than was the case for the OE and ME renditions analysed above. Since in the eMnE period "the category of modal auxiliary was [still] not yet fully established", "the ellipsis of the main verb

(gapping) [wa]s more flexible than today” (Rissanen 1999, 234). At the beginning of the 16th century *shall* and *will* could be already noted in contexts in which they conveyed “pure futurity” but this was not the rule (Cowie 2012, 608). In fact, the OED provides some 18th-century attestations of *will* in its purely lexical function. Therefore, a decision was taken to distinguish *shall* and *will* from the indicative. Moreover, in order to facilitate comparison between the periods, instances of *will* and *shall* in the IMnE data will also be set apart from other instances of the indicative.

Table 7: eMnE data

	CoverdaleB			GenevaB			Bishops’B			DR		
	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]
1	the Lorde heare	SUB	3sg	the Lord heare	SUB	3sg	God heare	SUB	3sg	ovr Lord heare	SUB	3sg
2	the name [...] defende	SUB	3sg	the name [...] defende	SUB	3sg	the name [...] defende	SUB	3sg	the name [...] protect	SUB	3sg
3	sende	SUB	3sg	send	SUB	3sg	let him sende	LET	3sg	send he	SUB	3sg
4	strength	SUB	3sg	strengthen	SUB	3sg	ayde	LET	3sg	defend he	SUB	3sg
5	remembre [...] offerynges	SUB	3sg	let him remember	LET	3sg	let him remember	LET	3sg	be he mindeful	SUB	3sg
6	accepte	SUB	3sg	turne [...] offrings into asshes	LET	3sg	turne into asshes	LET	3sg	be thy holocaust made fatte	SUB	3sg
7	graunte	SUB	3sg	grante	SUB	3sg	let him graunt	LET	3sg	geue he	SUB	3sg
8	fulfil	SUB	3sg	fulfil	SUB	3sg	accomplishe	LET	3sg	confirme he	SUB	3sg
9	we will reioyce	WILL	1pl	we may reioyce	MAY	1pl	we wyll reioyce	WILL	1pl	we shal reioyce	SHALL	1pl
10	triuphe	WILL	1pl	set vp the banner	MAY	1pl	triumph	WILL	1pl	we shal be magnified	SHALL	1pl
11	the Lorde perfourme	SUB	3sg	the Lord shal performe	SHALL	3sg	God wyll perfourme	WILL	3sg	our Lord accomplish	SUB	3sg



12 [nl]	knowe I	IND	1sg	know I	IND	1sg	I knowe	IND	1sg	haue I knowen	IND	1sg
13 [s]	the Lorde helpeth	IND	3sg	the Lord wil helpe	<b>WILL</b>	3sg	God wyll saue	<b>WILL</b>	3sg	our Lord hath saued	IND	3sg
14 [s]	will heare him	<b>WILL</b>	3sg	wil heare	<b>WILL</b>	3sg	he wyll heare	<b>WILL</b>	3sg	he shal heare him	<b>SHALL</b>	3sg
15	we wil remebre	<b>WILL</b>	1pl	we wil remember	<b>WILL</b>	1pl	we wyll remember	<b>WILL</b>	1pl	we wil inuocate	<b>WILL</b>	1pl
16	they are brought downe	IND	3pl	they are broght downe	IND	3pl	they shal be made to bowe	<b>SHALL</b>	3pl	they are bound	IND	3pl
17	fallen	IND	3pl	fallen	IND	3pl	fall	<b>SHALL</b>	3pl	haue fallen	IND	3pl
18	we are rysen	IND	1pl	we are risen	IND	1pl	we shall arise	<b>SHALL</b>	1pl	we haue risen	IND	1pl
19	stonde vp right	IND	1pl	stande vpright	IND	1pl	stande vpright	IND	1pl	are set vpright	IND	1pl
20	saue (Lorde)	IMP	2sg	saue Lord	IMP	2sg	saue thou o God	IMP	2sg	Lord saue	IMP	2sg
21 [nl]	helpe (o kynge)	IMP	2sg	let the King heare	<b>LET</b>	3sg	the king may heare	<b>MAY</b>	3sg	heare	IMP	2sg
22 [s]	we call vpon	IND / SUB	1pl	we call	IND / SUB	1pl	we call	IND / SUB	1pl	we shal inuocate	<b>SHALL</b>	1pl

Frequency-wise the participation of various grammatical structures is as presented in Table 8 below:

Table 8: Frequency of different grammatical structures in the eMnE data

[mood]	CoverdaleB		GenevaB		Bishops'B		DR	
	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%
<b>SUB</b>	9	41%	6	27%	2	9%	9	41%
<b>IND</b>	6	27%	5	23%	2	9%	6	27%
<b>LET</b>	0	0%	3	14%	6	27%	0	0%
<b>MAY</b>	0	0%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%
<b>IMP</b>	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	2	9%
<b>SHALL</b>	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	4	18%
<b>WILL</b>	4	18%	3	14%	6	27%	1	5%
<b>IND/SUB</b>	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%

Whereas CoverdaleB and DR employ the subjunctive to exactly the same extent as the earlier ME translations (41%), Bishops'B makes hardly any use of it (9%), with GenevaB occupying the middle ground (27%). Bishops'B is also exceptional in its lower use of the indicative (than the level noted in the other three texts) and in its generous use of periphrastic *let*-structure and repeated occurrences of *will* and *shall*.

### 3.4 IMnE

#### 3.4.1 Presentation of texts

The IMnE renditions are more varied in terms of their dates of publication, with the earliest coming from 1750 and the most recent from 2009. More precisely, the 1750 rendition is Richard Challoner's revision of the DR text. The second text is by over a century younger and is a part of the Bible translated from the original languages by Robert Young in 1863. The remaining two translations were published already in the 21st century but differ in the languages of their source texts: whereas Robert Alter's (2007) rendition is from Hebrew, John Cunyus (2009) translated from the Vulgate.

For Young and Alter I relied on my own transcriptions, the transcript of the text of Challoner was offered to me by Charzyńska-Wójcik (pc)<sup>19</sup> and that of Cunyus comes from Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

#### 3.4.2 Data

The four translations exhibit some diversity when it comes to their selection of grammatical structures (Table 9) but the variation seems to be more limited than in the case of eMnE. Young's 1863 rendition is unique among the IMnE texts to make extensive use of the subjunctive. The remaining three translations differ systematically from the earlier texts in their conspicuous use of *may*.

---

<sup>19</sup> It will be a part of Charzyńska-Wójcik (*in prep.*).

Table 9: IMnE data

	Challoner			Young			Alter			Cunyus		
	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]	[text]	[mood]	[form]
1	may the Lord hear	MAY	3sg	the Lord answer	SUB	3sg	may the Lord answer	MAY	3sg	may the Lord hear	MAY	3sg
2	may the name [...] protect	MAY	3sg	the name [...] set	SUB	3sg	the name [...] make you safe	MAY	3sg	may the name [...] protect	MAY	3sg
3	may he send	MAY	3sg	send	SUB	3sg	may He send	MAY	3sg	may He send	MAY	3sg
4	defend	MAY	3sg	support	SUB	3sg	may He sustain	MAY	3sg	watch over	MAY	3sg
5	may he be mindful	MAY	3sg	remember	SUB	3sg	may He recall	MAY	3sg	may He remember	MAY	3sg
6	may thy [...] offering be made fat	MAY	3sg	reduce	SUB	3sg	may He relish	MAY	3sg	may [...] offering be made fat	MAY	3sg
7	may he give	MAY	3sg	give	SUB	3sg	may He grant	MAY	3sg	may He give	MAY	3sg
8	confirm	MAY	3sg	fulfil	SUB	3sg	may He fulfill	MAY	3sg	strengthen	MAY	3sg
9	we will rejoice	WILL	1pl	may we sing	MAY	1pl	let us sing	LET	1pl	we will be happy	WILL	1pl
10	we shall be exalted	SHALL	1pl	set up	MAY	1pl	raise	LET	1pl	we will be made greater	WILL	1pl
11	the Lord fulfil	SUB	3sg	the Lord fulfil	SUB	3sg	may the Lord fulfil	MAY	3sg	may the Lord fulfil	MAY	3sg
12 [m]	have I known	IND	1sg	I have known	IND	1sg	do I know	IND	1sg	I have known	IND	1sg
13 [s]	the Lord hath saved	IND	3sg	the Lord hath saved	IND	3sg	the Lord has rescued	IND	3sg	the Lord made His Christ secure	IND	3sg
14 [s]	He will hear	WILL	3sg	He answereth	IND	3sg	He has answered	IND	3sg	He will hear	WILL	3sg
15	we will call upon	WILL	1pl	we [...] make mention	IND/ SUB	1pl	we [...] invoke	IND/ SUB	1pl	we will invoke	WILL	1pl

16	they are bound	IND	3pl	they have bent	IND	3pl	they have tumbled	IND	3pl	they are bound	IND	3pl
17	have fallen	IND	3pl	have fallen	IND	3pl	fallen	IND	3pl	have fallen	IND	3pl
18	we are risen	IND	1pl	we have risen	IND	1pl	we arose	IND	1pl	we [...] have risen	IND	1pl
19	are set upright	IND	1pl	station ourselves upright	IND	1pl	took heart	IND	1pl	are standing up straight	IND	1pl
20	Lord, save	IMP	2sg	o Lord, save	IMP	2sg	o Lord, rescue	IMP	2sg	Lord, make	IMP	2sg
21 [ml]	hear us	IMP	2sg	let Him answer	LET	2sg	may He answer	MAY	2sg	hear us	IMP	2sg
22 [sl]	we shall call upon	SHALL	1pl	we call	IND / SUB	1pl	we call	IND / SUB	1pl	we invoke	IND / SUB	1pl

In terms of frequency of the subjunctive, Young's rendition appears to be most traditional, predominantly ranging in its selection of verbal structures between the indicative (32%) and subjunctive (41%). Alter's text opts either for the indicative (32%) or periphrasis with *may* and *let* (54%). Challoner's revision makes use of all the available structures, with the exception of periphrasis with *let*. Cunyus' preference lies with the indicative (27%) and periphrasis with *may* (41%), although some instances of *will* are also noted (18%).

Table 10: Frequency of different grammatical structures in the IMnE data

[mood]	Challoner		Young		Alter		Cunyus	
	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%
SUB	1	5%	9	41%	0	0%	0	0%
IND	6	27%	7	32%	7	32%	6	27%
LET	0	0%	1	5%	2	9%	0	0%
MAY	8	36%	2	9%	10	45%	9	41%
IMP	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	2	9%
SHALL	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
WILL	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	4	18%
IND / SUB	0	0%	2	9%	2	9%	1	5%

### 3.5 Comparison and discussion

All the observations noted so far are gathered together and presented again in a simplified form in Table 11 below. It is also there that some general tendencies appear to emerge out of what seems a disarray when individual periods are analysed in Sections 3.1-3.4. It seems that starting with the eMnE period a greater diversity in mood selection started to obtain in psalm translations, albeit not in all of them. Whereas in Geneva and Bishops' Bibles replacements with hortative *let* are employed in some cases, Coverdale's translation and the Douai rendition preserve the subjunctive in the manner reminiscent of all the earlier translations. Interestingly, the same phenomenon is to be observed in Young's 1863 rendition. How substantial this diversity is can be illustrated by means of verses 4 and 6 from all the analysed renditions, preceded by the Latin *Romanum* and *Gallicanum* texts:

#### verse 4:

Romanum	<b>Memor sit</b> Dominus omnis <omnes> sacrificii tui, et holocaustum tuum <b>pingue fiat</b> .
Gallicanum	<b>Memor sit</b> omnis sacrificij / <[sacrificii]> / tui: & holocaustum tuum <b>pingue fiat</b> .
RegiusP	he <b>gemyndig sie</b> ealre ofrunga ðinre ofrung 7 onsægdnis þin <b>fatt sie</b>
PariP	<b>Gemyndig sy</b> Drihten ealra þinra ofrunga, and þin ælmesse <b>sy andfengu</b> .
CambridgeP	<b>gemyndig sy</b> drihtyn ealle onsægydnysse þine 7 on sægdnyse þine <b>gefæt-tige gewyrðe</b>
EadwineP	he <b>Gemyndig sie</b> eælre þinre onseigdnesse 7 þin ofrung onseigdnesse <b>fett sie</b>
RRP	<b>Menand be</b> he of all thi sacrifice; and thin offerand <b>fat be made</b> .
MEGPP	<b>Be he þenchand</b> on al þy sacrifice, and <b>be þyn offryng made gode</b> .
EV	<b>Myndeful be</b> he of alle thi sa   crifise; and thi brent sacrificise <b>be maad fat</b> .
LV	<b>Be he myndeful</b> of al thi sacrifice; and thi brent sacrifice <b>be maad fat</b> .
CoverdaleB_1535	<b>Remembre</b> all thy offerynges, and <b>accepte</b> thy brent sacrifice.
GenevaB_1560	<b>Let him remember</b> all thine offrings, and <b>turne</b> thy burnt offrings into ashes.
Bishops'B_1568	<b>Let him remember</b> all thy offerings: and <b>turne</b> into ashes thy burnt sacrifices.
DR_1610	<b>Be he mindeful</b> of al thy sacrifice: and be thy holocaust <b>made fatte</b> .
Challoner_1750	<b>May he be mindful</b> of all thy sacrifices: and may thy whole burnt offering <b>be made fat</b> .
Young_1863	<b>Remember</b> all Thine offerings, And all Thy burnt-offerings <b>reduce</b> to ashes.

- Alter\_2007 **May** He **recall** all your grain-offerings, and your burnt-offerings **may** He **relish**.
- Cunyus\_2009 **May** He **remember** all your sacrifices, and **may** your burnt offering **be made fat**.

**verse 6:**

- Romanum **Letabimur** /Læ[æ]tabimur/ in salutari tuo, et in nomine Domini Dei nostri **magnificabimur**.
- Gallicanum **Letabimur** /<Læ[æ]tabimur>/ in salutari tuo: & in nomine Domini dei nostri **magnificabimur**.
- RegiusP we **blissiað** on hælo þinre on naman ures we **beoð gemiclode**
- PariP þæt we **moton fægnian** on ðinre hælo, and on ðæm naman Drihtnes ures Godes we **syn gemyclade**
- CambridgeP we **beoð** on hæle þinre 7 on naman drihtnys godys urys we **beoð gemiclode**
- EadwineP We **blissiaþ** on þinre helo 7 on drihtnes namæn ures godes we **beoð gemiclode**
- RRP We **sall ioy** in thi hele: and in the name of oure god we **sall be worschipid**.
- MEGPP Whe **shul ioyen** in þyn helþe, and we **shul herien** in þe name of our Lord.
- EV We **shul gladen** in thin helthe 3iuere; and in the name of oure God wee **shul be magnified**.
- LV We **schulen be glad** in thin helthe; and we **schulen be magnyfiend** in the name of oure God.
- CoverdaleB\_1535 We **will reioyce** in thy health, & **triupe** in ye name of the LORDE oure God:
- GenevaB\_1560 **That** we **may reioyce** in thy saluacion, and **set vp the banner** in the Name of our God,
- Bishops'B\_1568 We **wyll reioyce** in thy saluation, and **triumph** in the name of our Lorde:
- DR\_1610 We **shal reioyce** in thy saluation: and in the name of our God we **shal be magnified**.
- Challoner\_1750 We **will reioyce** in thy salvation; and in the name of our God we **shall be exalted**.
- Young\_1863 **May** we **sing** of Thy salvation, In the name of our God **set up a banner**.
- Alter\_2007 **Let** us **sing** gladly for Your rescue and in our God's name **our banner raise**.
- Cunyus\_2009 We **will be happy** in your security. We **will be made greater** in our God's name.

The grammatical choices made by Coverdale and the DR translators might reflect the fact that the use of the subjunctive in simple clauses was still possible at the time, declining at a greater pace only in the IMnE period. Alternatively, they might be related to the source text used for the translation since both DR and Coverdale's Bible employed as their source the Latin Vulgate, whose mood selection they reflect almost perfectly (cf. Table 11). The situation

is more complex with Young's rendition, which, similarly to Geneva and Bishops' texts, was translated from the original languages and yet is manifestly *different* from these two renditions in terms of the grammatical choices it makes. Moreover, Cunyus (2009), who also translated from Latin, does not resort to the subjunctive even once in the body of Psalm 20, choosing instead the structures natural for PdE.

Therefore, the answer to the question as to what determined these grammatical choices seems to lie at the intersection of language change and the type of translation aimed at by the translators rather than in the source text underlying the rendition. This hypothesis is corroborated by all the translations at hand. The OE translators, having at their disposal the present and past tenses and the rising modals, opted precisely for the grammatical structures present in the Latin text from which they translated (cf. Table 11). The ME renditions with their unrivalled reverence for the underlying original concur with the Vulgate in their choices in the area of mood, with available formal means of expressing the future already surfacing in the translations in verses 6, 7 and 8.<sup>20</sup> Greater diversity appears among the eMnE renditions, which is understandable in light of the fact that it was the time of religious reformation and turmoil, giving slowly rise to a variation in approaches to translation and acceptance of the idea that the text should serve the readers in their religious pursuits rather than represent a tribute to the 'original'. These changes continue to transpire through the lMnE renditions. The different positions taken with respect to the purpose of translations and their relationship to the *original* are visible both in the eMnE and lMnE renditions at the level of grammatical choices. A good illustration of this phenomenon is Young's (1863) approach: in his preface to the translation he pledges to remain faithful to the original even at the grammatical level, where the structures in use in Hebrew would be unnatural for speakers of English. The idea he proposes in the preface was that it was the readers that should adjust themselves to the ancient text and not the other way round.

---

20 Verse 10 in Latin also employs future, but this time in its perfect form, which resulted in greater diversity among the translations. As transpires from the data from Table 9, in ME *shall* was preferred over *will* to express the future, with tables turning in the eMnE period to *will*'s favour, although not in all renditions.

Table 11: OE-IMnE data

		LATIN		OE			ME				eMnE				IMnE				
	[verse]	Romanum	Gallicanum	RegiusP - 950-1050	ParisP - 1025-1050	CambridgeP - ca. 1050	EadwineP - 12th c.	RRP - before 1350	MEGPP - ca. 1350	EV 0s-1380s	LV - 1388-1400	CoverdaleB - 1535	GenevaB - 1560	Bishops'B - 1568	DR - 1610	Challoner - 1750	Young - 1863	Alter - 2009	Cunyus - 2009
1	2	SUB													MAY	SUB	MAY		
2	2	SUB													MAY	SUB	MAY		
3	3	SUB											LET	SUB	MAY	SUB	MAY		
4	3	SUB											LET	SUB	MAY	SUB	MAY		
5	4	SUB										LET	SUB	MAY	SUB	MAY			
6	4	SUB										LET	SUB	MAY	SUB	MAY			
7	5	SUB											LET	SUB	MAY	SUB	MAY		
8	5	SUB											LET	SUB	MAY	SUB	MAY		
9	6	IND		MAY	IND		SHALL		WILL	MAY	WILL	SHALL	WILL	SHALL	WILL	MAY	LET	WILL	
10	6	IND		SUB	IND		SHALL		WILL	MAY	WILL	SHALL			MAY	LET	WILL		
11	6	SUB										SHALL	WILL	SUB			MAY		
12 m]	7	IND																	
13 [s]	7	SUB	IND									WILL	IND						
14 [s]	7	IND		SUB	IND		SHALL		WILL		SHALL	WILL	IND		WILL				
15	8	IND					SHALL		WILL						IND / SUB	WILL			
16	9	IND						IND / SUB	IND	SHALL	IND								
17	9	IND					IND / SUB	IND	IND / SUB	IND	SHALL	IND							
18	9	IND						IND / SUB	IND	SHALL	IND								
19	9	IND						IND / SUB	IND										
20	10	IMP																	
21 [m]	10	IMP										LET	MAY	IMP	LET	MAY	IMP		
22 [s]	10	IND	SUB	IND	SUB	IND / SUB	IND	SHALL	IND / SUB			SHALL	IND / SUB						



## 4 Conclusion

The study has attempted to investigate mood selection practices in 16 translations of Psalm 20 spanning over ten centuries of the history of English in which the structure in focus, i.e. the subjunctive, has undergone a major change. The findings obtained in the course of the investigation could be summarised as follows. The grammatical choices in OE renditions are both remarkably similar to one another and in full compliance with the moods in use in the underlying Latin text. The ME translations exhibit an even great convergence as a group, at the same time remaining exceptionally *faithful* to the Latin source. The chief change observed in these translations is the use of *shall* to render the future tense in the *Gallicanum*. A major shift in the mood selection practices is to be noted in the texts from the eMnE period onwards, where – due to language change – a diversity in grammatical choices obtains. Some of the renditions (CoverdaleB, DR and Young) preserve the use of the subjunctive as observed in the OE and ME renditions but the remaining five texts opt for periphrastic grammatical structures in line with the current language use.

I propose, therefore, that the decisions concerning the choice of grammatical constructions reflect both (i) the structure of the language at the time of rendition, *and / or* (ii) the translator's views on the function of the translation and its relationship to the source text. In particular, in the case of OE it is impossible to determine conclusively *on the basis of the analysed data* whether the mood selection stemmed from the adherence to the Latin text or simply reflected the current state of the language as it is congruent with the two. In order to obtain a means to differentiate between the two I would need to work on a broader selection of textual data encompassing also such contexts in which default language use would be different for Latin and OE.

In ME the grammatical repertoire available in the language was already more diverse but the renditions do not exhibit any structures not present in the *Gallicanum*. This could indicate a purposeful dependence on Latin, which would also be congruent with what is known about the renditions at hand,<sup>21</sup> but does not stand in opposition to the use of the relevant moods in this period of the history of English. Thus, I am unable to postulate in any conclusive manner that their

---

21 RRP, MEGPP and EV were not envisaged as texts independent of Latin and they remain conspicuously faithful to their source texts, with the first two being even presented next to it at all times. EV, despite not being given next to the source, relied on Latin in all aspects, including word order. LV, although planned as a more *idiomatic* text did not diverge from EV unless it was necessary in order to render the text intelligible to the reader.

choices with respect to grammatical shape of the verbs were determined by the approach to the translation.

It is only in the eMnE translations that a diversity in the area of grammatical constructions sets in, which could thus be attributed to the language change surfacing in the texts. On the other hand, however, the eMnE translations are products of the age of reformation, when for the first time sources different than the Latin Vulgate, i.e. the original languages, could serve as the basis for such a rendition. Therefore, whereas in the context of the eMnE texts translated from Latin (CoverdaleB and DR) one could point to the source text as the driving force in mood selection, for the other two texts, without a resort to the underlying source texts, it is impossible to prove their independence of them and thus, I cannot postulate that their diversity in terms of mood selection is due to the changes in the English language.

The IMnE translations seem to support the untenability of this claim. Both translations from the Latin Vulgate (Challoner and Cunyus) and Alter's rendition from Hebrew opt for periphrastic *may* structures in place of the subjunctive, in line with linguistic developments of the period. In contrast, the 1863 Young's translation from the original languages is consistent in its preference for the subjunctive, despite it no longer being the unmarked choice in simple clauses at the time. This, however, can be accounted for Young's convictions concerning biblical translations and their function (cf. Section 3.5).

Therefore, it is not so much the source text itself, but the translator's approach to this source and to the purpose of the rendition that motivate translators' decisions concerning mood expression. The changes in the grammatical structure of the language inevitably surface in the text of the translation unless they are blocked by the overriding principle of formal faithfulness to the original (cf. Young's rendition), even at the cost of producing a text less intelligible to the target audience.

As mentioned at the beginning of this study, the paper is only a preliminary investigation into the diachronic developments in the area of mood selection in contexts conducive to the use of the subjunctive. Despite the fact that my larger study (Lis *in prep.*) will be limited to dependent clauses where use of the subjunctive has been less threatened, it can be deduced from the results obtained here that a bigger study resorting among others to some biblical translations need not be imperilled with obtaining skewed results since the renditions, when *viewed as a whole*, do seem to reflect the linguistic changes taking place in the language, in spite of their reverence for the sacred text.

## Works Cited

### Primary sources

- Alter, Robert. 2007. *The Book of Psalms. A Translation with Commentary*. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- “Bishops’ Bible.” *Textus Receptus Bibles* <https://textusreceptusbibles.com/>.
- Cambridge Psalter*. Cambridge University Library MS Ff.1.23. <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-FF-00001-00023/12>.
- Challoner. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. in prep.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. 2013. *Text and Context in Jerome’s Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. in prep. *The Psalms of David over the Water. John Caryl and David Nairne’s Translation ‘from the Vulgat’*.
- “Coverdale Bible.” *Textus Receptus Bibles* <https://textusreceptusbibles.com/>.
- Cunyus, John G. 2009. *The Audacity of Prayer: A Fresh Translation of the Book of Psalms (Latin-English Edition)*. Glen Rose: Searchlight Press.
- Douay-Rheims Bible*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Eadwine Psalter*. Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.17.1. <https://mss-cat.trin.cam.ac.uk/Manuscript/R.17.1/UV#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=103&r=0&xywh=2561%2C-222%2C7934%2C4413>.
- Early Version of the *Wycliffite Bible*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Gallicanum*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Geneva Bible. A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition with an Introduction by Lloyd E. Berry*. Peabody: Hendrickson Bibles
- Late Version of the *Wycliffite Bible*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Paris Psalter*. Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Latin 8824. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Regius Psalter*. British Library Royal MS 2 B V. [https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal\\_ms\\_2\\_b\\_v\\_fs001r](https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal_ms_2_b_v_fs001r).
- Romanum*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Richard Rolle’s Psalter*. See Charzyńska-Wójcik. 2013.
- Young, Robert. 1863. *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Covenants, Literally and Idiomatically Translated out of the Original Languages*. Edinburgh, Dublin and London: A. Fullarton and Company.

## Secondary sources

- Aarts, Bas. 2011. *Oxford Modern English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Auer, Anita. 2008. "Lest the Situation Deteriorates – A Study of *Lest* as Trigger of the Inflectional Subjunctive." In *Standards and Norms in the English Language*, edited by Miriam A. Locher, and Jurg Strassler, 149–173. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Auer, Anita. 2009. *The Subjunctive in the Age of Prescriptivism. English and German Developments during the Eighteenth Century*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barber, Charles. 1976 [1997]. *Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. 2013. *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. in prep. *The Psalms of David over the Water. John Caryl and David Nairne's Translation 'from the Vulgat'*.
- Cowie, Claire. 2012. "Early Modern English: Morphology." In *English Historical Linguistics. An International Handbook*, edited by Alexander Bergs, and Laurel J. Brinton, vol. I, 604–620. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Crawford, William J. 2009. "The Mandative Subjunctive." In *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English*, edited by Gunter Rohdenburg, and Julia Schluter, 257–276. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniell, David. 2003. *The Bible in English. Its History and Influence*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Denison, David. 1998. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume IV: 1776–1997*, edited by Suzanne Romaine, 92–329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deshors, Sandra C., and Stefan Th. Gries. 2020. "Mandative Subjunctive vs. Should in World Englishes: A New Take on an Old Alternation." *Corpora* 15 (2). [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332544511\\_To\\_appear\\_Deshors\\_Sandra\\_C\\_Stefan\\_Th\\_Gries\\_Mandative\\_subjunctive\\_vs\\_should\\_in\\_world\\_Englishes\\_A\\_new\\_take\\_on\\_an\\_old\\_alternation\\_Corpora\\_152](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332544511_To_appear_Deshors_Sandra_C_Stefan_Th_Gries_Mandative_subjunctive_vs_should_in_world_Englishes_A_new_take_on_an_old_alternation_Corpora_152).

- Dons, Ute. 2004. *Descriptive Adequacy of Early Modern English Grammars*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fillbrandt, Eva-Liisa. 2006. "The Development of the Mandative Subjunctive in the Early Modern English Period." *TRAMES* 10 (60/55), 2: 132-151.
- Fischer, Olga. 1992. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume II: 1066-1476*, edited by Norman Blake, 207-408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Olga, and Wim van der Wurff. 2006. "Syntax." In *A History of the English Language*, edited by Richard Hogg, and David Denison, 109-198. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Görlach, Manfred. 1991. *Introduction to Early Modern English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hundt, Marianne. 2018. "It Is Time That This (Should) Be Studied Across a Broader Range of Englishes: A Global Trip around Mandative Subjunctives." In *Modelling World Englishes: Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, edited by Sandra C. Deshors, 217-244. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hundt, Marianne, Geoffrey Leech, Christian Mair, and Nicholas Smith. 2009. "The Subjunctive Mood." In *Change in Contemporary English. A Grammatical Study*, edited by Marianne Hundt, Geoffrey Leech, Christian Mair, and Nicholas Smith, 51-70. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, Stig, and Else Norheim. 1988. "The Subjunctive in British and American English." *ICAME Journal* 12: 27-36.
- Kastronic, Laura, and Shana Poplack. 2014. "The (North) American English Mandative Subjunctive in the 21st Century: Revival or Remnant?" *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20 (2): 71-80.
- Kihlbom, Asta. 1938. "Concerning the Present Subjunctive in Conditional Clauses." *Studia Neophilologica* 11: 257-266.
- Kjellmer, Goran. 2009. "The Revived Subjunctive." In *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English*, edited by Gunter Rohdenburg, and Julia Schluter, 246-256. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lass, Roger. 1992. "Phonology and Morphology." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume II: 1066-1476*, edited by Norman Blake, 23-155. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lass, Roger. 1999. "Phonology and Morphology." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume III: 1476–1776*, edited by Roger Lass, 56–186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, Jack P. 2016. *The Day after Domesday. The Making of the Bishops' Bible*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- Lis, Kinga. 2017. *The Etymology of Nouns in Middle English Prose Psalter Renditions*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Werset.
- Lis, Kinga. 2021. *The Use of the Subjunctive in an Early Modern English Translation of the Laws of Oléron*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Werset.
- Lis, Kinga. in prep. *A Diachronic Study of the Subjunctive in English*.
- Mengden, Ferdinand von. 2012. "Old English: Morphology." In *English Historical Linguistics. An International Handbook*, edited by Alexander Bergs, and Laurel J. Brinton, vol. I, 272–293. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Moessner, Lilo. 2020. *The History of the Present English Subjunctive. A Corpus-Based Study of Mood and Modality*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Molenccki, Rafał. 2012. "Old English: Syntax." In *English Historical Linguistics. An International Handbook*, edited by Alexander Bergs, and Laurel J. Brinton, vol. I, 294–313. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mossé, Fernand. 1952 [1991]. *A Handbook of Middle English*. Translated by James A. Walker. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960 [2016]. *A Middle English Syntax: Parts of Speech*. With an Introduction by Elly van Gelderen. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. See Simpson, and Weiner.
- Övergaard, Gerd. 1995. *The Mandative Subjunctive in American and British English in the 20th century*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Peters, Pam. 1998. "The Survival of the Subjunctive. Evidence of its use in Australia and Elsewhere." *English World-Wide* 19 (1): 87–103.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1999. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume III: 1476–1776*, edited by Roger Lass, 187–331. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlüter, Julia. 2009. "The Conditional Subjunctive." In *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English*, edited by Gunter Rohdenburg, and Julia Schlüter, 277–305. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Serpellet, Noelle. 2001. "The Mandative Subjunctive in British English Seems to Be Alive and Kicking... Is This Due to the Influence of American

- English?" In *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 Conference*, edited by Paul Rayson, Andrew Wilson, Tony McEnery, Andrew Hardie, and Shereen Khoja, 531–542. Lancaster: UCREL.
- Simpson, John and Edmund Weiner, eds. 1989. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, Jeremy J. 1996. *An Historical Study of English. Function, Form and Change*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Strang, Barbara. 1970. *A History of English*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Sutherland, Annie. 2015. *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300–1450*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toswell, Mary Jane. 2014. *The Anglo-Saxon Psalter*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1972. *The History of English Syntax. A Transformational Approach to the History of English Sentence Structure*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1992. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume I: The Beginnings to 1066*, edited by Richard M. Hogg, 168–289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Visser, Frederik Theodor. 1966 [1972]. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Waller, Tim. 2017. *The Subjunctive in Present-Day English. A Critical Analysis of Recent Research, Leading to a New Diachronic Investigation of the Mandative Subjunctive*. PhD Dissertation: University College of London. [http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1575514/1/Waller\\_Waller%202017%20PhD%20thesis.pdf](http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1575514/1/Waller_Waller%202017%20PhD%20thesis.pdf).