

Old English *þa* in Farman's glosses to the Rushworth Gospels: signal of idiomatic discourse structuring in Old English?

Ursula Lenker

Interlinear glosses: idiomatic Old English?

Old English glosses to Latin texts have long been considered to be one of the best kind of evidence for the multilingualism of Anglo-Saxon England, reflecting the interaction of Latin and Old English in thought and language. As concerns the language of the glosses, research has focussed mainly on the lexical choices of the glossators in attempts to understand how Latin texts were interpreted in Anglo-Saxon England.

Old English glosses added to the principal Latin texts of Christianity, such as the psalter, the gospels, prayers and also a number of curriculum texts, have generally been agreed to serve didactic purposes¹. The glosses aim at explicating the concepts expressed by the Latin *lemmata* and they frequently also try to make the morphological and semantic structure of the Latin as explicit as possible, in order to facilitate the understanding and learning of Latin in a school context. With respect to the lexical structure of the Latin *lemmata*, research has centred on the results of borrowing, such as semantic loans, or, more frequently, on the rendering of complex Latin words in loan renditions. These studies regularly also discuss the status of these loan formations, i.e. whether they are *ad hoc* nonce-formations for the purpose of explaining the Latin *lemma* in a particular co-text or whether they were coined for permanent incorporation into the Old English lexicon (see, for instance, Kornexl's discussion of whether these words are «unnatural»)². A more general question thus is whether Old English interlinear glosses can be taken as samples of «idiomatic» Old English.

Such an idiomaticity is even more contested for the field of morpho-syntax, since the dependence of Old English interlinear glosses on the fixed linearity of the Latin text allows for only very little flexibility³. Commonly, a focus on the Latin rather than

¹ For a survey of scholarship, see the articles by P. Lendinara, *Glossaries*, and M. Gretsche, *Glosses*, both in M. Lapidge *et al.* (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, 2nd ed., Wiley, Chichester 2014, pp. 212-215.

² See L. Kornexl, 'Unnatural Words?' – *Loan-Formations in Old English Glosses*, in D. Kastovsky and A. Mettinger (eds.), *Language Contact in the History of English*, Lang, Frankfurt a.M. 2001, pp. 195-216.

³ For some recent studies on the morpho-syntax of the Lindisfarne gloss, see the chapters by R. McColl Millar, M. Cole, L. Garcia, M. Ledesma and G. Walker in J. Fernández Cuesta and S.M.

the Old English structures can be noticed in morpho-syntactical glosses: some glosses, for instance, clarify the Latin case or word class and a particular kind of so-called syntactical glosses consists of diacritics that aim at explicating the structure of the Latin sentence by marking its constituents such as subject or object⁴. These syntactical glosses are commonly regarded as aids to construe the Latin syntax and to find vernacular equivalents for the often complicated Latin word order. Recently, however, there have also been some attempts at utilizing not only diacritics, but the basic material of diverse Old English interlinear glosses, i.e. the Old English translation equivalents themselves, for qualitative studies of Old English syntax, such as word-order patterns or null subjects⁵.

By referring to «style» and «functional word order»⁶, already Robinson has also addressed issues beyond constituent order and suggested that interlinear glosses are valuable tools to investigate «Old English discourse and information structure», a field of study which has been thriving in recent years. In the relevant scholarship, one of the key features identified as a signal of discourse structure in Old English is OE *þa* 'then, when'⁷.

Farman's «bold style of rendition» in Ru¹

Inspired by Patrizia Lendinara's magisterial study on the "unglossed" words of the Lindisfarne Gospels⁸, the present paper will resume Robinson's suggestions and will explore whether we can learn anything on Old English discourse structure from a

Pons-Sanz (eds.), *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context* (Buchreihe der Anglia / Anglia Book Series 51), de Gruyter, Berlin and Boston, MA 2016.

⁴ On these syntactical glosses, see F. Robinson, *Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance*, «Speculum» 48 (1973), pp. 443-475, and M. Korhammer, *Mittelalterliche Konstruktionshilfen und altenglische Wortstellung*, «Scriptorium» 34 (1980), pp. 18-58.

⁵ See J. Crowley, *Anglicized Word Order in Old English Continuous Interlinear Glosses in British Library, Royal 2. A. XX*, «Anglo-Saxon England» 29 (2001), pp. 123-151; T. Kotake, *Differences in Element Order between Lindisfarne and Rushworth Two*, in M. Amano, M. Ogura and M. Ohkado (eds.), *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, Lang, Berlin 2008, pp. 63-77, and G. Walkden, *Null Subjects in the Lindisfarne Gospels as Evidence for Syntactic Variation in Old English*, in J. Fernández Cuesta and S.M. Pons-Sanz (eds.), *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, pp. 239-256.

⁶ F. Robinson, *Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts*, p. 470. For a survey of the relevant literature, see U. Lenker, *Old English: Pragmatics and Discourse*, in A. Bergs and L. Brinton (eds.), *English Historical Linguistics. An International Handbook*, I, de Gruyter, Berlin 2012, pp. 325-340.

⁷ For literature on the discourse functions of OE *þa*, see below note 21.

⁸ P. Lendinara, *The 'Unglossed' Words of the Lindisfarne Glosses*, in J. Fernández Cuesta and S.M. Pons-Sanz (eds.), *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, pp. 329-360. In this study, Lendinara finds, among other omissions quite common in Old English interlinear glosses, that Latin particles such

particular Old English interlinear gloss, namely the glosses Farman inserted into parts of the Latin gospel text of the so-called "Macregol" or "Rushworth Gospels" in a Mercian dialect⁹. The interlinear glosses to this gospel manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auctarium D.2.19) were added in the late tenth century somewhere in Harewood (either in Yorkshire or Herefordshire)¹⁰. The two scribes responsible for the glosses identify themselves as Farman and Owun in their respective colophons (f. 50v and f. 168v, respectively). Farman's glosses to the whole of the gospel according to Matthew, and to parts of Mark (Mc. I.1-II.15) and John (Io. XVIII.1-3) are now commonly labelled Rushworth 1 (Ru¹).

While Owun's southern Northumbrian gloss (Rushworth 2; Ru²) depends heavily on the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, British Library, Cotton Nero D.iv) and follows common Old English glossing principles, it has long been acknowledged that Farman (i.e. Ru¹) worked in a much more independent and original fashion, at least in his gloss to Matthew. Skeat, certainly the scholar best acquainted with all of the Old English gospel glosses and translations, characterises Farman's work as a «bold style of rendition»¹¹.

The originality and independence of Farman's gloss is, particularly at the beginning of Matthew, obvious at first glance¹². Firstly, we find many instances where Farman reverses the Latin word order, changing the Latin principle of right-determination to one of Germanic left-determination. Thus, the possessive determiner is moved to the left in the phrase *his stigas*, which translates *semitas eius* in Mt. III.3 (the Old English being placed over *semitas*, while the space over *eius* is left blank), and the equivalents for *rectas* and *facite* are also shifted. The Lindisfarne gloss (= Li), by contrast, follows the order of the Latin gospel text¹³:

as *autem* and *etiam* are left untranslated (ten times and once respectively). The glosses to *autem* in particular will be shown below to be of explanatory value for the status of þa in Ru¹.

⁹ See W.W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Version*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1871-1887, and K. Tamoto, *The Macregol Gospels or The Rushworth Gospels. Edition of the Latin text with the Old English interlinear gloss transcribed from Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Auctarium D. 2. 19*, Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA 2013. All Old English texts from Ru¹, Ru², the Lindisfarne Gloss (Li) and the West-Saxon Gospels (WSG) are cited from these editions (only the abbreviation for þæt 'that' is silently expanded in all texts).

¹⁰ On the Old English glosses, see K. Tamoto, *The Macregol Gospels*, pp. xciii-cix.

¹¹ W.W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*, p. xii.

¹² For further examples, see K. Tamoto, *The Macregol Gospels*, p. ci.

¹³ The Latin text cited is that of the Rushworth Gospels (ed. K. Tamoto, *The Macregol Gospels*). The Latin text for Li (from W.W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*) will only be specified when there are major textual differences between the Rushworth and Lindisfarne Gospels (purely orthographical variants are not charted).

Ru ¹ :	wircap	rihte	his stigas	
Li:	ræhta	doeð t wyrkas	stiga	his
Latin:	rectas	facite	semitas	eius
	straight	make	paths	his

(make his paths straight)

Similarly, the genitive modifier *olbendena* (camels) is shifted in «vestmentum de pillis camillorum: *brægl of olbendena herum*» (garment of camels' hair) in Mt. III.4 (Li = *gewede of herum ðæra camella*).

Secondly, there are a number of cases where Farman glosses one Latin *lemma* with two Old English words. These glosses are, however, usually not lexical or grammatical alternatives signalled by *t* (*uel* 'or'), as common in other glosses, such as the Lindisfarne gloss (see the examples from Li above and below). In Ru¹, Farman not only inserts personal pronouns in the nominative (common, e.g., for «dico: *ic sæcge*» 'I say' in Mt. X.23, X.27, XI.9, etc.) or in the genitive, but he also adds determiners (mostly simple demonstratives) to indicate the case and gender of the Old English noun, as is frequent for «*ihsus: se hælend*» (Jesus [*se* nom. sg.], the savior) throughout Matthew (e.g. Mt. VIII.13, XXII.1, etc.). Also, adverbs are added which, on the one hand, clarify the meaning of the Latin verbs and, on the other hand, also render the Latin verb by a prefixed or particle verb typical of idiomatic Old English, as can be exemplified by, e.g., *ut aworpen* in «*cum iecta ess& turba intrauit: 7 þa ut aworpen wæs siu mengu he eode* [...]» (and when the multitude had been thrown out, he went [...]) in Mt. IX.25.

Another striking feature of Farman's gloss concerns the rendering of discourse-structuring items in Latin, such as non-finite clausal connection by participles, subordinate temporal conjunctions (e.g. Latin temporal *cum* + subjunctive in adverbial anterior clauses 'when, at the time when'), or, in particular, Latin items such as *autem*, *enim* or *nam* in second position, which are traditionally classified as (post-positioned) conjunctions. In her various studies, Caroline Kroon has been able to show, however, that *autem* and *enim* in second position have very specific discourse functions and should accordingly be characterised as «discourse particles» rather than conjunctions¹⁴. *Autem*, for instance, which is traditionally regarded as an adversative conjunction 'but, on the other hand, on the contrary, however'¹⁵ can thus be identified as a

¹⁴ See, for instance, C. Kroon, *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*, Gieben, Amsterdam 1995, and Ead., *Latin Linguistics between Grammar and Discourse: Units of Analysis, Levels of Analysis*, in E. Rieken and P. Widmer (eds.), *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie*, Reichert, Wiesbaden 2009, pp. 143-158.

¹⁵ Ch. Lewis, *An Elementary Latin Dictionary*, American Book Company, New York and Cincinnati, OH 1890, *s.v.* *autem*. Even if old reference books like this one give an adversative meaning as the core meaning of *autem*, its discourse function is usually also commented on: «an adversative particle

discourse particle «which does not primarily indicate a semantic relationship of adversativity between two successive clauses, but is mainly involved in marking some kind of thematic discontinuity in the discourse»¹⁶.

As concerns the interlinear glosses to the gospels, there are striking differences between the renderings of *autem* in the Lindisfarne gloss (and, consequently, Ru²), on the one hand, and in Ru¹, on the other. This especially concerns the use of OE *þa*, an item which reflects the idiomaticity of Old English narrative prose. Before having a closer look at the distinctive usage patterns of *þa* in Ru¹ and comparing it to the other glosses and also the continuous prose rendering in the West-Saxon Gospels, it will thus be necessary to summarise the findings for the discourse functions of *þa* in Old English prose.

Discourse functions of þa in Old English prose

OE *þa* (traditionally classified as adverb or «ambiguous adverb/conjunction»¹⁷) is a shibboleth of Old English narrative prose. According to the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English*¹⁸, *þa* in all of its uses is the third most frequent word in Old English. Yet, *þa*, of course, is highly polyfunctional in its two basic uses as a personal pronoun or demonstrative determiner (nom./acc. plural) and as an adverb/conjunction. Wårvik illustrates the variety of functions by an example from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 885¹⁹:

þa hie *þa* hamweard wendon mid þære herehyþe, *þa* metton hie micelne sciphere wicenga, & *þa* wiþ *þa* gefuhton þy ilcan dæge, & *þa* Deniscan ahton siges (ChronA 885.10)

(When [subordinating conjunction] they then [adverb] returned homeward with that booty, then [adverb in a correlative construction with initial subordinating conjunction] they met a large fleet of pirates, and then [adverb] fought against them [personal pronoun; acc. pl.] the same day, and the [determiner; nom. pl.] Danes had the victory.)

which regularly follows an emphatic word, or two or more closely connected words» (*ibid.*). See also Th. Burkard and M. Schauer, *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*, 5th ed., Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 2012, pp. 605-607, who list *autem* in the chapter «Adversative Konjunktionen» (adversative conjunctions), but then refer to it as a «particle», calling it «die schwächste adversative Partikel» (the weakest adversative particle) and continue by illustrating its various cohesive and text-structuring discourse functions (p. 606).

¹⁶ C. Kroon, *Latin Linguistics*, pp. 143-144.

¹⁷ B. Mitchell, *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols., Clarendon Press, Oxford 1985, § 2536.

¹⁸ A. di Paolo Healey and R.L. Venezky, *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*, Brepols, Turnhout 1980.

¹⁹ Text and translation are taken from B. Wårvik, *Connective or "Disconnective" Discourse Marker? Old English þa, Multifunctionality and Narrative Structuring*, in A. Meurman-Solin and U. Lenker (eds.), *Connectives in Synchrony and Diachrony in European Languages*, VARIENG, Helsinki 2011, ch. 8, ex. (1). The analyses are mine (U.L.).

For the rest of this paper, I will only deal with the uses of *þa* as an adverb/conjunction, for which BT (*s.v.* *þa* adv. conj.) list the following meanings²⁰:

- I. *then; at that time;*
- II. marking sequence, *then, after that, thereupon;*
- III. as adverbial connective, 1. of time, *when*, 2. of cause or reason, *when, since, as;*
- IV. in combination with other demonstrative forms, *then ... when, when ... then.*

In line with BT's meanings II and III, *þa* has been identified as the most prominent device for signalling narrative structuring in Old English. Various studies on the particular discourse functions of *þa* have shown that the basic function of *þa* is a cohesive one²¹: it is a «signal of connectivity and continuity in the text» in that it creates cohesion by signalling the «progress of the story-line and keeping track of the main participants in the story». In addition to this underlying cohesive function, *þa* in particular serves as an «action marker» or an «episode introducer»²². In all of these functions, it is similar to Lat. *autem* (see above).

As it combines «story-line sequentiality and text structuring», it is the most frequent of Old English discourse signals, not only in independent Old English prose. As an illustration, see the following passages from the Vision of Leofric, in which every single sentence starts with *þa*, thereby taking the readers through the narrative steps of the story:

Ða geseah he ofer *þa* rode ane hand swylce heo bletsode; *þa* wende he ærost þæt sum man hine bletsode, for þam seo cyrce wæs eall folces afylled; *þa* næs þæt na swa. *ða* beheold he hit *þa* gyt geornor, *þa* geseah he ealle *þa* rode swa swutole, swylce þær nan þing beforan nære, & wæs seo bletsende hand styriende & wendende upward. *þa* forhtode he & tweonode him hweðer hit swa wære, swa him þuhte. *ða* mid þæs modes tweonunge *þa* æteowde heo him swa swutole [...]²³

²⁰ T.N. Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1898 (henceforth BT).

²¹ See, for instance, N. Enkvist, *Old English Adverbial þa – An Action Marker?*, «Neuophilologische Mitteilungen» 73 (1972), pp. 90-96 and B. Wårvik, *Peak Marking in Old English Narrative*, in B. Wårvik, S.-K. Tanskanen and R. Hiltunen (eds.), *Organization and Discourse: Proceedings from the Turku Conference*, University of Turku Press, Turku 1995, pp. 549-558 and, for a more recent line of research, A. van Kemenade and B. Los, *Discourse Adverbs and Clausal Syntax in Old and Middle English*, in A. van Kemenade and B. Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*, Blackwell, Oxford 2006, pp. 224-248. For a useful summary, see B. Wårvik, *Connective or "Disconnective" Discourse Marker?* For *þa* in the West-Saxon Gospels, see T. Kim, *The Particle þa in the West Saxon Gospels: A Discourse-Level Analysis*, Lang, Bern and New York 1992.

²² All of these characterizations are from B. Wårvik, *Connective or "Disconnective" Discourse Marker?*, Conclusions.

²³ A.S. Napier, *An Old English Vision of Leofric, Earl of Mercia*, «Transactions of the Philological Society» 1907-1910, pp. 181-186, at 186. (My emphasis and translation).

(*Then (When?)* [adverb 'then' or subordinator 'when, as soon as' in a correlative construction] he saw over the cross a hand as if it blessed; *then* [adverb 'then' or second connector in the correlative construction] he immediately went in order to find someone to bless him, because the church was full with people; *then/there* [adverb] was none there. *Then, when* [adverb 'then' or subordinator 'when' in correlative construction] he studied it [the cross] *then* [adverb] even more intensely, he *then* [adverb 'then' or second connector in the correlative construction] saw the complete cross so clearly as if there had never been anything before it, and the blessing hand was directing and going upwards. *Then* [adverb] he was frightened and he doubted whether it was so as it seemed to him. *Then* [adverb] against the doubt of the mind *then* [adverb] it [the cross] appeared so clearly [...])

This prominence of *þa* in Old English narrative prose also holds for the Old English gospel translation, the so-called West-Saxon Gospels. In this gospel translation, which can be characterised as «literal but idiomatic», *þa*-clauses similarly signal discourse discontinuity, «indicating a shift of topic, ground, time-line, scene, listener or content»²⁴.

þa in Ru¹

If we now compare these findings for «idiomatic» OE *þa* with its use in the interlinear gospel glosses, the difference between Ru¹, on the one hand, and the Lindisfarne gloss (and, since it is an almost direct copy of Li, also Ru²), on the other, is striking.

For the following account, I will leave Ru² aside and concentrate on a comparison of three translations of the gospel of Matthew, namely the interlinear gloss by Farman in Ru¹, the interlinear gloss by Aldred in the Lindisfarne Gospels (Li) and the continuous prose rendering of the West-Saxon Gospels (WSG) as attested in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140²⁵. In this sketch of first findings, I will first give examples for the uses of connective *þa* as translation equivalents for the Latin adverb *tunc* 'then, at that time' and the Latin temporal subordinator *cum* + subjunctive in adverbial anterior clauses 'when, at the time when'. The temporal semantics of both *tunc* and *cum* inherently signal discourse structuring functions of «continuity» and «discontinuity» (see above), i.e. a sequence in the narrative.

This is different from the translation equivalents of the next item discussed, Lat. *autem*, which, as has been shown above, although traditionally classified as an adver-

²⁴ 92 per cent of the about 1200 sentence-initial *þa*-clauses investigated by Kim show one or more of these discourse shifts; see the summary in T. Kim, *The Particle þa*, p. 152.

²⁵ The readings for Li and WSG are taken from W.W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*. The basis for Ru¹ is K. Tamoto, *The Macregol Gospels*, because Skeat does only give the running text, which does not allow an unambiguous mapping to the respective Latin *lemma*.

sative conjunction 'but, on the contrary, however', principally functions as a discourse particle signalling some kind of thematic discontinuity in the discourse.

The most important cases for testing the value of the gloss in Ru¹ for principles of marking discourse structure of Old English are, however, the instances where no explicit Latin *lemma* triggers the use of *þa*. These attestations of *þa* in Ru¹ will be shown to provide valuable information about discourse structure in Old English and thus to be indeed a sign of Farman's «bold style of rendition»²⁶, also when it comes to issues of discourse structure.

Equivalents of Lat. tunc 'then, at that time'

The most striking difference between the three different translations of the gospel according to Matthew is that Li has very few instances of *þa*, the shibboleth of Old English narrative prose.

In Li, *þa* (corresponding with BT, *s.v.* *þa* I. 'then, at that time') is almost exclusively used to render the 89 instances of the Latin temporal adverb *tunc* 'then'. *þa* is thus relatively infrequent in Li, compared to the prominence of *þa* in Old English prose narratives, such as the above-mentioned Anglo-Saxon Chronicle or the Vision of Leofric. Moreover, it is only in these renderings of Lat. *tunc* that Li agrees with both Ru¹ and WSG:

Mt. IV.5

Latin:	tunc adsumpsit eum zabulus [...]
Ru ¹ :	þa genom hine þæt deoful [...]
Li:	ða gefeng † genóm hine diobul [...]
WSG:	Ða gebrohte se deofol hine [...]

(After that the devil brought him [...])

Mt. XVII.13

Latin:	tunc intellexerunt discipuli [...]
Ru ¹ :	þa onget'ón þa leorneras [...]
Li:	ða ongeton ða ðegnas [...]
WSG:	Ða ongéton hys leorning-cnihtas [...]

(Then the disciples realised [...])

In these cases, the semantics of both *tunc* and *þa* correspond with their discourse functions, since the adverbial 'then' in both Latin and Old English inherently signals discourse continuity, but also marks the introduction of a new aspect to the narrative, which is chronologically subsequent in the storyline.

²⁶ W.W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*, p. xii.

Equivalents of Latin temporal cum + subjunctive in adverbial anterior clauses 'when, at the time when'

Moving on to the other uses of *þa* in Ru¹, we notice a striking difference to Li, since Li commonly renders Latin temporal *cum* + subjunctive in adverbial anterior clauses 'when; after'²⁷ by Old English *mið ðy* (also spelt *miððy*), a variant of the Old English pronominal connector *mid þam/þæm ðe* or *mid þy (þe)* 'when, as soon as'²⁸. Ru¹, by contrast, commonly has *þa* and thus agrees with WSG in the Old English word chosen (though not necessarily in the word order):

Mt. VIII.28

Latin: & cum ueniss& trans fretum in regionem gerasenorū occurrerunt ei duo homines [...]

Ru¹: 7 þa he cuom ofer sáe in lond gerasinga urnon ongægn him twegen menn [...]

Li: 7 mið ðy gecuom ofer luh in lond ðara ðeade ge-uurnon him tuoege [...]

WSG: Þa se hælend com ofer þone muþan on gerasenisca rice þa urnon him togenes twegen þe [...]

(When Jesus arrived on the other side of the lake in the country of the Gadarenes, two men who [...])

Mt. XVII.14

Latin: & cum uenisset ad turbas [Li: turbam] accessit ad eum homo [...]

Ru¹: 7 þa he cwom to mengu eode to him monn [...]

Li: 7 mið ðy cuome to ðæm ðreat geneolecde to him monn [...]

WSG: And þa he côm to þære menegu. him to genealæhte sum mann [...]

(When he came to the multitude, a man came to him [...])

The pronominal connector *mið ðy* 'when' in Li is obviously a correct rendering of Latin temporal *cum* + subjunctive in anterior adverbial clauses dependent on the preterite. Still, the translations of these *cum*-phrases by *mið ðy* (altogether about 100 instances in Matthew) may be considered to have an unidiomatic ring, since the comparison with the West-Saxon Gospels shows that the latter employ *þa* instead of *mið ðy*, as does Ru¹. Thus, both Ru¹ and WSG employ *þa* to mark the discourse functions of storyline sequentiality and text structuring.

²⁷ See Ch. Lewis and Ch. Short, *A Latin Dictionary, s.v. cum*² B: «In adverbial anterior clauses dependent on preterite predicates, the time of the *cum* clause preceding that of the principal sentence (always with *subj.*, [...]), *when, after*». Ch. Lewis, *Elementary Latin Dictionary, s.v. cum* «with *subj.* in a subordinate statement. – Fixing a point of time, *when, at the time when*: [...].»

²⁸ On these pronominal connectors, see U. Lenker, *Argument and Rhetoric. Adverbial Connectors in the History of English*, de Gruyter, Berlin 2010.

Equivalents of Lat. autem in past contexts

Li also diverges from both Ru¹ and WSG in its translation of Lat. *autem* in second position. As has been already pointed out, *autem* can be characterised as a discourse particle «marking some kind of thematic discontinuity in the discourse»²⁹, that is, it serves functions which are also attested for OE *þa*. Accordingly, *þa* is chosen as the usual translation of *autem* in past contexts³⁰ in both Ru¹ and WSG.

Li, by contrast, renders Lat. *autem* by OE *uutedlice/wutedlice/wutoðlice* and other spelling variants of OE *witodlice* ‘certainly’ (or occasional *soplice* ‘truly’) in almost all of its about 360 instances. That these translations are somewhat mechanical is evinced by the fact that *witodlice* and *ec soð* ‘also truly’ are also used in the genealogy of Jesus in Mt. I.1-16, which is mostly left unglossed³¹ in Ru¹. While, for example, Ru¹ does not provide a single gloss for Mt. I.10, Li glosses *autem* in the phrase *ezechias autem genuit manassem* (Ezekias [particle *autem*] begot Manasses) by *uutedlice cende* (while the proper names are left unglossed). This illustrates that Aldred employs *witodlice* mechanically as a standard gloss for *autem* in Li, irrespective of whether it is used in non-narrative or narrative passages (see the following two examples) of the gospels.

Mt. XV.15

Latin: Respondens autem petrus [...]

Ru¹: andwyrde þa petrus [...]

Li: onduarde uutedlice [...]

WSG: Ða andswarode him petrus [...]

(Peter *autem* [discourse particle] answered him [...])

Mt. XIX.18

Latin: ihsus autem dixit ei [...]

Ru¹: hælend þa cwæþ to him [...]

Li: ðe hælend uutedlice cuoeð [...]

WSG: Ða cwæþ he [...]

(Jesus *autem* [discourse particle] said to him [...])

The effects of these differences in glossing become even more obvious when we compare passages where the Latin text has both *cum* and *autem*, quite a regular combination, since *cum* and *autem* have similar discourse functions:

²⁹ C. Kroon, *Latin Linguistics*, pp. 143-144.

³⁰ OE *þa* can only be used with a completed act in the past, *þonne* with a repeated act in the past or a single act at some indefinite time, not only in the past. See B. Mitchell, *Old English Syntax*, § 1116. For non-past or indefinite temporal uses of *cum* and *autem*, Ru¹ commonly uses *þonne*.

³¹ The sole exceptions in Ru¹ are *sodlice* for *autem* in Mt. I.1 and I.18.

Mt. VIII.1

Latin: Cum autem discendiss& de monte secuti sunt [Li: de monte secutae sunt] eum [...]

Ru¹: þa he þa wæs astigen of dune folgedun him [...]

Li: miððy uutedlice of gestag of mor fylgende weron t sint t gefylgdon hine [...]

WSG: Sopllice þa se hæl[e]nd of þam munte nyber-astah. þa fyligdon him [...]

(And when he had come down from the mountain, [...] followed him [...])

The employment of *sopllice* by WSG in this example shows that *sopllice* and – though more restrictedly – also *witodlice* may function as discourse particles in Old English, in particular as markers of a new episode³². Unlike in Li, however, they are commonly placed in initial (not second) position in WSG, often followed by simple *þa* or correlative *þa ... þa* ‘then ... when’, as in the example above (*Sopllice þa se hæl[e]nd [...] þa fyligdon him*).

The more common idiomatic rendering of *autem* in past contexts, and namely in its functions as a marker of some kind of thematic discontinuity in the discourse, is OE *þa*, as shown by the predominance of this translation pattern in both WSG and Ru¹ (though frequently with a different word order).

OE þa without a Latin lemma in Ru¹

As has been shown above, Ru¹ generally agrees with WSG in choosing *þa* (instead of *miððy* for *cum* or *witodlice* for *autem*) as a translation for Latin items which mark some kind of thematic discontinuity. Farman thus seems to have decided to value idiomaticity in Old English higher than a more mechanical and unambiguous rendering of specific Latin *lemmata* by distinct translations.

This impression is supported by a number of examples, where *þa* is an addition by Farman unparalleled in the Latin text (which, then, leads to two words above one Latin *lemma*; on this, see above). Such indications of discourse structure are found in the following examples:

Mt. XV.35

Latin: & praecipit turbae ut discumberent super terram [...]

Ru¹: 7 þa bebead þæm mengu þæt hie gesetun on eorþan [...]

Li: 7 geheht ðæm menigo þæt he gedælde ofer eorðu [...]

WSG: 7 he bebead þa þæt seo menegu sæte ofer þære eorþan [...]

(And he commanded the multitude to sit down upon the ground [...])

³² On the discourse functions of *sopllice* and *witodlice* in Old English, see U. Lenker, *Sopllice and witodlice: Discourse Markers in Old English*, in O. Fischer, A. Rosenbach and D. Stein (eds.), *Pathways of Change. Grammaticalization in English*, Benjamins, Amsterdam 2000, pp. 229-249.

This verse follows a dialogue between Jesus and the multitude gathered around him on the number of loaves they have. After their answer – Mt XV.34: *at illi dixerunt: uii & paucos pisciculos* (and they said: seven, and a few little fishes) –, he asks them to sit down. Then follows the multiplication of the loaves and fish. The use of *þa* in Ru¹ and WSG signals the progression of the storyline, similarly to the uses of *þa* showed above for the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Old English Vision of Leofric.

A similar use can be described for the following example:

Mt. XVII.7

Latin: & accessit ihsus & tetigit eos dixitque eis surgite & nolite timere [...]

Ru¹: 7 þa eode se hælend 7 æt-hran heom 7 cwæð to heom arisaþ 7 eow ne ondredaþ [...]

Li: 7 geneolecde ðe hælend 7 gehran him 7 cueð him arisas 7 nallas ge ondrede [...]

WSG: Hé genealæhte þa 7 hig æt-hrán. 7 him to cwæð. Arisað 7 ne ondrædaþ eow [...]

(And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid [...])

The use of *þa* as an indication of the discourse structure in Ru¹ (without a trigger in the Latin) again marks a very important narrative step in the gospel storyline, this time in the tale of the Transfiguration of Jesus. The disciples are sore afraid but by Jesus's touch and words – the scene introduced by *and þa* – they lose their fear, which certainly marks a very important narrative turn.

In all of the examples where Farman adds a *þa* in Ru¹ (altogether more than 20 unambiguous instances), both Ru¹ and WSG correspondingly employ *þa* as a marker of discourse structure. In the literal but idiomatic rendering of WSG this is not surprising, since one of the factors which led Anglo-Saxonists to characterise WSG as «idiomatic» is exactly these correspondences in its use of *þa* as a signal of discourse structure with other, more independent prose, such as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

Conclusions

Much more research into the specific contexts of Farman's use of *þa* is surely needed, in particular in the word order patterns he employs (see my comments on diverging word-orders above), and in the kind of verbs or agents attested for his insertions of *þa* in verses without a Latin *lemma* such as *tunc*, *cum* or *autem*. Yet, the foregoing discussion of Farman's employment of *þa* in Ru¹ has shown that he is closer to the renderings of WSG than to those of the Lindisfarne gloss (which was used as a model for Ru² by Owun in the same gospel manuscript). Farman's employment of *þa* generally

corresponds to what we know about the use of *þa* as a shibboleth of Old English narrative prose in more independent texts. The interlinear glosses in Ru¹ are thus another example of Farman's «bold style of rendition»³³ and they also allow some insight into the principles of marking discourse structure of Old English, a finding not generally expected from the study of interlinear glosses.

University of Munich

³³ W.W. Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*, p. xii.