

**HESPERIA, NUMBER 5; STUDIES IN
THE SYNTAX OF THE
LINDISFARNE GOSPELS: WITH
APPENDICES ON SOME IDIOMS
IN THE GERMANIC LANGUAGES**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649087488

Hesperia, Number 5; Studies in the syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels: with appendices on some idioms in the Germanic languages by Morgan Callaway

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

MORGAN CALLAWAY

**HESPERIA, NUMBER 5; STUDIES IN
THE SYNTAX OF THE
LINDISFARNE GOSPELS: WITH
APPENDICES ON SOME IDIOMS
IN THE GERMANIC LANGUAGES**

21563

Hesperia

SUPPLEMENTARY SERIES:
STUDIES IN ENGLISH PHILOLOGY

Edited by JAMES W. BRIGHT

Number 5

STUDIES IN THE SYNTAX OF THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

With Appendices on Some Idioms in the
Germanic Languages

BY

MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR.

Professor of English in The University of Texas

146595
29/7/18

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1918

PREFACE

The present instalment¹ of my projected *Studies in the Syntax of the "Lindisfarne Gospels"* is restricted to an investigation of the Participle and of the Infinitive. The main object of this instalment is to determine whether the syntax of these verbals in the Northumbrian dialect differs essentially from that in the West-Saxon dialect as set forth in the writer's monographs² on the Participle and the Infinitive in the latter dialect. The investigation is based upon a statistical reading of the four Lindisfarne Gospels and of their Latin originals, as given in W. W. Skeat's *The Holy Gospels: Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions*, Cambridge, 1871-1887. In the study of each verbal, I have attempted to make my statistics complete, and have habitually given an account of the Latin correspondents of the Northumbrian gloss, and in the more doubtful constructions have cited the parallel passage in the Rushworth version of the Gospels, which latter has been read entire, although no account is taken thereof except in the way here indicated. Occasional omissions and misclassifications are inevitable, but I hope that they will not prove so numerous or so serious as to invalidate the trustworthiness of this investigation.

As the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is merely an interlinear gloss, and in many respects a faulty one, a larger question at once presents itself, whether or not such a gloss can give any trustworthy evidence as to the normal syntax of the dialect in which it is written. That very gross errors are made, is evidenced by such passages as the following, in which the author uses a nominative as the direct object of a verb and a dative as the subject of a finite verb:—*John 18. 28: gelæddon forðon se hælend* from

¹ The next instalment will be devoted to the Subjunctive Mood.

² *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, Baltimore, 1889; *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, Baltimore, 1901; and *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, Washington, D. C., 1913.

caifa = *Adducunt ergo iesum a caiapha* (similarly in the Rushworth version); *Luke 16. 5: miððy weron geceigedo forðon syndrigum scyldgum hlaferdes his cuoæð = conuocatis igitur singulis debitoribus domini sui dicebat* (leaf lost in the Rushworth version). But even these errors are not in reality so gross as they at first appear. The probability is that, in the former example, the glossator is merely naming the word, not the form thereof, to be used; and that, in the second, he turns the ablative absolute of the participle in the native English way, by a finite verb, but, on reaching the ablative subject, has forgotten about his rendering of the participle, and, naturally therefore, translates the ablative of the Latin noun by a dative. At any rate, such errors are exceptional; and the proper answer to our question seems to be this. As to the normal order of words, this Northumbrian gloss, like most interlinear translations, gives next to no evidence of value, since, as a rule, the glossator adheres strictly to the order of his Latin original. As to the normal idioms to be used in the combining of words into sentences, however, it gives invaluable evidence, especially in those locutions in which the Northumbrian gloss consistently diverges from the idiom of the Latin original. In a word, if in the syntax of any part of speech, as of the participle or of the infinitive, the glossator consistently shuns a Latin idiom, and consistently substitutes therefor another idiom, we are justified in holding that the substitute idiom represents his native usage,—a principle that seems to me to hold perfectly in the syntax of the verbals.

While, as stated above, the main purpose of the present investigation is to discover what light this Northumbrian material may throw upon the syntax of the West-Saxon dialect, it is hoped that the studies may prove of interest from an absolute standpoint, the more so that they disclose several idioms not known in West-Saxon. Among the more noteworthy of these idioms may be mentioned the Absolute Participle with an Accusative Subject, possibly also with a Nominative Subject; the Infinitive as the Object of a Preposition; the Imperative

Use of the Infinitive; and that substitute for the Infinitive which I have ventured to denominate the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction. Moreover, certain constructions that are only slightly represented in West-Saxon, are somewhat frequent in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, as the Inflected Infinitive with an Accusative Subject in Objective Clauses and the Uninflected Infinitive with Accusative Subject in Subjective Clauses.

So far as I have been able to learn it, I have given the history of opinion on all points discussed by me. Numerous works dealing with the phonology or the inflections of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* have been published, and are duly recorded in my Bibliography. Of these I need here mention only those that have been of most service to me: Professor Albert S. Cook's *A Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels (Lindisfarne Gospels, or Durham Book)*, Halle, 1894; Dr. H. C. A. Carpenter's *Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienuebersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift*, Bonn, 1910; Dr. Theodor Kolbe's *Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien*, Bonn, 1912; and the several works by Professor Uno Lindelöf listed in my Bibliography. So far as I know, my monograph is the second treatise devoted specifically to the syntax of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, the first being Mr. C. E. Bale's *The Syntax of the Genitive Case in the Lindisfarne Gospels*, a University of Iowa Master's dissertation of 1907. But, in the nature of the case, some syntactical observations occur in the three works mentioned above, in the other treatises dealing with the inflections of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, and in the various editions of that text by Bouterwek, by Stevenson and Waring, and by Skeat, all recorded in my Bibliography. Wherever help has been found, it has been gratefully accepted and specifically acknowledged.

Perhaps a word should be added as to the date of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. And here I cannot do better than quote the most recent deliverance in reference thereto by the editor of our text, the late Professor Walter W. Skeat. In his *English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day* (Cam-

bridge, 1911), p. 22, Professor Skeat expressed himself as follows: "The Northumbrian glosses on the four Gospels are contained in two mss., both of remarkable interest and value. The former of these, sometimes known as the Lindisfarne MS., and sometimes as the Durham Book, is now MS. Cotton, Nero D 4 in the British Museum, and is one of the chief treasures in our national collection. It contains a beautifully executed Latin text of the four Gospels, written in the isle of Lindisfarne, by Eadfrith (bishop of Lindisfarne in 698-721), probably before 700. The interlinear Northumbrian gloss is two and a half centuries later, and was made by Aldred, a priest, about 950, at a time when the ms. was kept at Chester-le-Street, near Durham, whither it had been removed for greater safety. Somewhat later it was again removed to Durham, where it remained for several centuries."

Since, as already incidentally stated, I have cited the *Rushworth Gospels* in rare and difficult constructions, I quote, also, Professor Skeat's account of the Rushworth version of the Gospels, as given on p. 22 of his *English Dialects*: "The second ms. is called the Rushworth MS., as it was presented to the Bodleian Library (Oxford) by John Rushworth, who was deputy-clerk to the House of Commons during the Long Parliament. The Latin text was written, probably in the eighth century, by a scribe named Maeregol. The gloss, written in the latter half of the tenth century, is in two hands, those of Farman and Owun, whose names are given. Farman was a priest of Harewood, on the river Wharfe, in the West Riding of Yorkshire. He glossed the whole of St. Matthew's Gospel, and a very small portion of St. Mark. It is worthy of especial notice, that his gloss, throughout St. Matthew, is not in the Northumbrian dialect, but in a form of Mercian. But it is clear that when he had completed this first Gospel, he borrowed the Lindisfarne MS. as a guide to help him, and kept it before him when he began to gloss St. Mark. He at once began to copy the glosses in the older ms., with slight occasional variations in the grammar; but he soon tired of his task, and turned it over to

Owun, who continued it to the end. The result is that the Northumbrian glosses in this ms., throughout the three last Gospels, are of no great value, as they tell us little more than can be better learnt from the Durham book; on the other hand, Farman's Mercian gloss to St. Matthew is of high value, but need not be considered at present. Hence it is best in this case to rely, for our knowledge of Old Northumbrian, on the Durham book *alone*." The italics in the last sentence of this quotation are Professor Skeat's. As to the question raised in this sentence concerning the relative value of the Lindisfarne and the Rushworth versions of the Gospels, the present writer prefers to reserve judgment until the appearance of further instalments of his studies in the syntax of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

As in my former syntactical studies, I have taken account of the verbals in the kindred Germanic languages. This fact will justify, I trust, the several Appendices strewn throughout the present monograph. In these appendices I have striven to bring up to date the chapter on the Absolute Participle in the Germanic Languages, published in 1889; that on the Appositive Participle in the Germanic Languages, published in 1901; and that on the Infinitive in the Germanic Languages, published in 1913. And I have devoted one Appendix (IX) exclusively to a consideration of some "Germanic Analogues to the Northumbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction." It is a pleasure to find that these later investigations strongly tend to confirm the theories formerly set forth by me as to the syntax of the verbals not only in Anglo-Saxon but also in the other Germanic Languages. With slight modifications here and there for individual languages, the theories derived from a minute study of the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian dialects seem to apply equally well to the other Germanic languages. Though fairly confident of the correctness of the view just expressed, I realize that my interpretation of the idioms of the participle and of the infinitive in the Germanic languages other than English rests upon statistics which, though carefully gathered by others, are for several of the languages incomplete, and in

some instances take little account of the original Greek or Latin. I should be glad, therefore, if Germanic grammarians would test the theories in question by making as detailed a study of the syntax of the verbals in the other Germanic languages as I have attempted to give thereof in the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian dialects.

Although my Bibliography lays no claim to exhaustiveness, I have striven to make it as nearly complete as was possible considering my remoteness from the larger libraries and the difficulties of communicating with Europe incident to the International War. Even partial success in this direction would have been impossible but for the kindness shown me by the librarians of several of our older universities. For such courtesies I wish to tender my cordial thanks to the librarians of the following universities: Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins. And to the librarian of the University of Texas, Mr. John E. Goodwin, I am indebted for many kindnesses. In the Bibliography I have given the titles not only of the chief accessible works on the Northumbrian Dialect of the Old English Period, but also of a few of the more noteworthy treatises on the other dialects of that epoch and on the Northern Dialect of the Middle English Period and of the Modern English Period. And, as I am throughout comparing the Old Northumbrian syntax with that of West-Saxon and of the Germanic languages, I have added, in the Bibliography, the titles of the more noteworthy treatises dealing with the syntax of the participle and of the infinitive in English and in the other Germanic languages, in the later as well as in the earlier periods, that have appeared since the publication of my monographs on these verbals. A few dissertations that had appeared before the publication of those monographs, but that had escaped me or had been inaccessible, have likewise been added. In a word, as this study is supplemental to my former studies, so this Bibliography is supplemental to my former bibliographies. And only in the case of a few of the more important works have I repeated here titles given in my former monographs.