AARHUS UNIVERSITY

Cover sheet

This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.
The content in the accepted manuscript version is identical to the final published version, although typography and layout may differ.

How to cite this publication
Please cite the final published version:

Publication metadata

The subjunctive in the Lindisfarne gloss: a focus on past tense *be*[1]

Johanna Wood, Aarhus University

Abstract

The use of the subjunctive mood in the Old English gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is investigated. All the examples of the Latin third person singular imperfect subjunctive, *esset*, are examined. There are three aims: to contribute to understanding the use of the subjunctive in the gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospel; to add to the authorship debate; to explore the question of how much Latin influences the glosses. Although, generally indicative mood is expected in Old English adverbial temporal clauses, this clause type is often found in the subjunctive. The tendency is strongest in the Gospel of Luke. A few doublets of subjunctive and indicative occur, but only in the Gospels of Luke and John.

1 Introduction

This paper investigates past tense *be* in the subjunctive in the Lindisfarne Gospels, focusing on the glosses of the Latin third person singular imperfect subjunctive, *esset*. Present tense *be* has been investigated in detail recently (cf. Bolze 2013, 2016) but past tense *be* has not, and although admittedly it does not afford such a rich ground for dialectal variation as the present tense, it is still a relevant area, and one that, to the best of my knowledge, has not been extensively explored. There are three goals. The first is to contribute to understanding the use of the subjunctive in the gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospels; this includes an analysis of multiple glosses, instances where the Latin imperfect subjunctive is glossed with both indicative and subjunctive. The second is to explore the question of how much influence Latin has on the glosses. The third is to address the authorship debate surrounding the Old English (OE) gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels, by reviewing and further examining variant features. There are three reasons to limit the investigation of the subjunctive this narrowly. First, there is no ambiguity in form between the indicative and subjunctive, as there is with most other main verbs, which removes the need for speculation whether the subjunctive is intended or not. Second, auxiliary *be* and copula *be* are frequent and both may be considered functional. For such items a speaker or writer's choice of which forms to use is more likely to be a subconscious one in comparison with verbs that have more lexical content Third, it gives a manageable amount of data for microanalysis.

The authorship issue has been an on-going topic for a century or more. Palaeographic evidence points to there being one hand with some variation, interpreted as breaks in composition rather than different scribal hands (Ker 1943: 5–6). Matthew is said to be written in a "bold vigorous" hand, whereas the writing in John is "neat and compact"; also "<v> supplants <u>" (Ross et al. 1960: 23). However, this variation is judged by palaeographers to be not so great that it could represent the hands of two or more different scribes, even identically trained ones (Cole 2016: 174). Nevertheless, there is some significant orthographic, lexical, morphological and syntactic variation in the gloss. The glossator is reportedly Aldred the Scribe who, in 970, was provost of the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street, Durham. The gospels include a colophon describing Aldred's part in the enterprise, but even then, the difficulty of interpreting the phrase *hine gihmadi mið ðæm ðriim dælu* 'made himself at home with the three parts', leads to a dispute over whether or not he is claiming authorship of the first three Gospels as well as John (Brunner 1947–1948: 33).

A number of authorship proposals for the Lindisfarne gloss have been made over the years. It could be the work of one glossator, as suggested by Ker (1943) among others, but there is considerable linguistic variation, so that person's idiolect would have to admit a wide range of variants. Others (e.g. Skeat 1871–1887) suggest that, since the gloss does not appear to represent a homogeneous dialect, it could be the work of more than one person, possibly persons from different dialect areas or of different ages. A third possibility is that the variants represent one glossator (hence only one scribal hand), who drew on one or more exemplars overlaid with his own northern dialect (hence the linguistic variation). Elliott & Ross (1972: 65), for example, entertain the hypothesis that the gloss of the Gospel of John was copied from work by the Venerable Bede. Cole (2016) includes a summary of many of the features that have been considered in establishing authorship and adds her own study of the Northern Subject Rule. In doing so, she strengthens the evidence for demarcations at specific points and contributes to the authorship debate, concluding that "the commonalities between the linguistic and palaeographical demarcations could indicate that the involvement of other hands in writing the gloss remains a possibility" (Cole 2016: 187). The debate, then, is far from settled.

With respect to the subjunctive, previous investigations into the subjunctive mood in the Lindisfarne glosses, apart from Bolze's (2013, 2016) research into present tense *be* and Cole's (2015) article on the periphrastic subjunctive, tend to focus on lexical verbs. Hotz (1882) reports exact counts for instances of subjunctive use in Lindisfarne, but in each case he must report figures for "indeterminate forms", which could be indicative or subjunctive. Blakely (1949) examines all third singular preterite forms of strong verbs, concentrating on the variant forms, and attempts to evaluate indeterminate morphology, i.e. forms that could be indicative or subjunctive. However, he excludes *be* from the investigation because there are many examples and, in his judgement, including them would not add to the analysis. Barasch (1979) considers to what extent Latin influences the subjunctive mood in the OE gloss. However, she examines Matthew's Gospel only, which cannot be taken as representative of the entire gloss. There are indeed a large number of examples; therefore, my investigation is limited to glosses of the Latin third person singular imperfect

subjunctive *esset,* giving a manageable number of examples for qualitative study, and for which there are no indeterminate examples.

It might be thought that glossed texts are too heavily influenced by Latin to give any syntactic information about the native language. This view sometimes assumes that glossators operate on a word for word basis with little regard for the grammar of the language of the gloss. However, several studies have shown that this is not the case (Kroch & Taylor 1997; Ingham 2006; Taylor 2008) and that glossators do not necessarily slavishly follow the word order and tenses of the Latin original; consequently, the analysis of glosses need not be confined to phonology and morphosyntax. With respect to the extent of Latin influence on the Lindisfarne glosses, the findings are mixed. Both van Bergen (2008) on contracted negation and Walkden (2016) on null subjects find that the distribution of variants is not predictable based on the Latin original. However, Rodriguez Ledesma (2016), on genitive word order, finds that the gloss follows the Latin for the most part.

As for the method, in the analysis of variants, earlier (and some later) scholarship tends to look at each gospel as a unit, or to take one gospel as representative of the whole, although by doing so the uneven distribution of certain variants is masked, as it cannot be assumed that the frequency of a variant in one part of the text is representative of the whole text. Research has found that specific features are more frequent in certain parts of the texts than in other parts, and that the division based on features does not follow the gospel divisions. In this investigation, I take, as a starting point, already established demarcations that have been suggested in the literature.

The earliest systematic investigation into the distribution of features divides the gospels into 64 sections of approximate equal length and finds a clear demarcation at the section ending in MkGl (Li) 5,40 (Brunner 1947: 52). This is substantiated by Blakeley (1949: 91-94) who, in his investigation of the distribution of *-s* and *-ð* verbal endings, finds convincing support for dividing the text into 4 blocks with divisions at MtGl (Li) 26,16; MkGl (Li) 5,40; LkGl (Li) preface 2,9. Cautious support is offered by van Bergen's (2008) investigation of negative contraction with results that confirm and correlate with the main section breaks, one around Mark 5,40, and the other near the start of John. Additionally, Rodriguez Ledesma (2016) finds Matthew stands out through the use of genitive variants of kinship terms not attested elsewhere in the gloss. Brunner's demarcations are corroborated most recently by Cole (2016: 181) with the addition of one more division near the start of John. This extra division is intuitively appealing, as others have also singled out the Gospel of John as potentially different from the others, not only because of its differently coloured ink and because Aldred himself makes separate mention of John, but also because of the ambiguity that arises in the translation of the colophon, as mentioned above. I therefore take the following five sections as my starting point.

	Sec 1	Sec 2	Sec 3	Sec 4	Sec 5

Chapters	MtGL (Li) start–MtGl (Li) 26,16	MtGl (Li) 26,17–MkGl (Li) 5,40	MkGl (Li) 5,41–LkGl (Li) 2,9	LkGl (Li) 2,10–JnGl (Li) 3,13	JnGl (Li) 3,14–end.
Skeat pps	MtGl (Li) 1–MtGl (Li)–215	MtGl (Li) 215–MkGL (Li) 41	MkGl (Li) 41–LkGl (Li) 29	LkGl (Li) 29–JnGl (Li) 54	JnGl (Li) 54 –JnGl (Li) 187

Table 1. Division of the gospels into sections

The following research questions are addressed with respect to the glosses of the Latin third person singular imperfect subjunctive *esset*.

1   a. How is the English subjunctive of past *be* used in Lindisfarne?
    b. What is the distribution and what are the possible reasons for multiple glosses of *be*?
2. How much influence does Latin have on the choice of indicative or subjunctive in the gloss?
3. What does this investigation of past tense *be* contribute to the authorship debate?

Section 2 analyses the English glosses of *esset*. Section 3 looks at doublets, and Section 4 is the conclusion.

2. Subjunctive

2.1 The forms of the subjunctive

It is frequently pointed out that investigations into the subjunctive in OE are challenging, due to the amount of morphological syncretism already present in the early language, making identifying the forms difficult. For example, a weak verb, such as *fremman* 'to perform', has identical forms in the singular past indicative and subjunctive:both are *fremede*. Strong verbs have different forms in the singular past:the subjunctive ending is -*e*, while the first and third persons have no ending in the indicative. However, as Blakely (1949: 133) observes, strong verbs ending in -*d* have a tendency to acquire an unetymological -*e* in the singular past indicative, possibly on the analogy of weak verbs. In addition, inflection is already breaking down, particularly in the northern dialects, and although strong and weak verbs form their past tense indicative plural with -*on* and the subjunctive with -*en,* these tended to fall together as -*on* already in the 9th and 10th centuries (Hogg 1992: 150). This loss of distinct forms for the morphological subjunctive continues throughout the history of English, and the function is taken over by periphrastic expressions consisting of a modal plus infinitive. However, with the past subjunctive singular of the verb *be* there is no need to speculate over whether a form is actually the subjunctive or not.

In studies focusing on dialect differences between West Saxon and Northumbrian, Bolze (2013, 2016) examines present tense *be*. It is well documented that, in English, different verb roots contribute to the suppletive paradigm and these vary dialectally, with different paradigms existing in the north and the south. The lack of *b*-root forms in the Northumbrian subjunctive is not surprising, since generally there is more morphological syncretism in northern varieties than in West Saxon.

	Indicative		Subjunctive	Indicative	Subjunctive
	Present tense				Past Tense	
	r-root	*b*-root	*s*-root	*b*-root	*w*-root	
W. Saxon 1,2,3 sing	*eom, eart, is*	*beo, bist bið*	*sie/si/sy*	*beo*	*wæs, wære, wæs*	*wære*
North. 1,2,3 sing	*am, arð, is*	*biom, bist, bith*	*sie/se*		*wæs, were, wæs*	*were*

Table 2. The verb *be*

Bolze (2013) confirms that in Lindisfarne, in the present-tense indicative, the *b*-forms are used to gloss a Latin verb inflected for future and the non-*b*-forms are used for the present tense. However, in the subjunctive singular, the Northumbrian dialect does not have *b*-forms, and uses only *sie/se* in the singular and plural subjunctive, meaning that Northumbrian does not have a special morphological form for future reference. When it comes to the subjunctive forms of the past tense, only the *w*-root is used in Northumbrian and West Saxon, although with different medial vowels in spellings. As can be seen from Table 2, there is no ambiguity in the third person singular past tense of 'be'. Much like in present-day English, the indicative form is *wæs* and the subjunctive *wVre*. Table 3 shows the attested forms. There is some spelling variation that varies regionally. It can be seen that for the short vowel in the indicative singular (*wæs*) there is no variation, but for the other forms, which have a long vowel /æ:/ in West Saxon, there are two different spellings in the past indicative: <e> and <oe> and three spellings in the subjunctive: <e>, <æ>, <oe>.

Indicative sing.	Indicative pl.	Subjunctive sing.	Subjunctive pl.
wæs, wæss, uæs	weron, woeron, uoeron, ueron	were, wære[2] woere, uere, uoere.	uoere.

Table 3. Past tense *be* spelling in Lindisfarne

Orthographic <æ>, which in all dialects represents a low front unrounded vowel, both short and long, normally transcribed as /æ/ and /æ:/ is the vowel of the West Saxon indicative plural (Hogg 2011: 14), whereas the <e> and <oe> variants are found in Lindisfarne. Initially, West Germanic [ɑ:] was fronted to [æ:]. It remained as such in West Saxon but was raised to [e:] in the other varieties, i.e. Anglian (Mercian and Northumbrian) and Kentish (Moore & Marckwardt 1969:25). Since this change affected only long vowels, the result is *wæs* in the Anglian singular, with its etymological short vowel, but *weron* in the plural because of its long vowel. The vowel spelled <oe> is a particular feature of later northern Northumbrian, the result of a tendency to round /e/ and /e:/ to /ø/ and /ø:/ after the back approximant /w/ (Hogg 2011:13, Wood 2019). I assume these spelling variations are independent of syntax and are not relevant to this investigation.

2.2 The function of the subjunctive in Old English and Latin

---

[2] Infrequent. Seven examples in all.

As well as the forms taken by the subjunctive, the functions need to be considered, over which there is some dissension. In a paragraph entitled "The moods of fact and fancy?" Mitchell (1985a: 370) is at pains to point out the erroneous assumptions of various scholars, including Visser:

> In general terms we can agree that the *indicative* is used to present something as a fact, as certain, as true, or as a result which has followed or will follow, and that when the *subjunctive* is found, some mental attitude to what is being said is usually implied – condition, desire, obligation, supposition, perplexity, doubt, uncertainty, or unreality. [. . .]. The indicative does not always state a fact. [. . .], nor does the subjunctive always imply uncertainty, doubt or the like [. . .]. It is more than time that we dismissed the simplistic notion encapsulated in my heading.

While it may be true that "the *indicative* is used to present something as a fact, as certain, as true, or as a result which has followed or will follow, and that when the *subjunctive* is found, some mental attitude to what is being said is usually implied—condition, desire, obligation, supposition, perplexity, doubt, uncertainty, or unreality", it is a "simplistic notion" to suppose that this is always the case. Traugott (1992: 239) echoes this position, but in more specific terms:

> Choice of mood (indicative vs. subjunctive) in complements is extremely complex, and is not adequately understood. It depends in part on whether there is a negative or a modal verb in the main clause, in part on whether the report is direct or indirect, and in part on the lexical verb governing the complement. However, there appear to be no or at least few absolute rules.

This is somewhat borne out by detailed descriptions of individual verbs (Hotz 1882: 89–11). Mitchell (1985) eschews a general summary and proposes to deal with the subjunctive when discussing each individual construction. Therefore, as a general guideline, I have summarised, in Figure 1, the list provided by Quirk & Wrenn (1957: 81–84). However, since the results show adverbial temporal clauses to be of particular interest, I consulted Mitchell (1985: II) for further details about mood in OE temporal clauses.

Indicative used in:
– the majority of expressions that do not involve grammatical dependence
– those dependent expressions that involve 'fact' and 'reality'
– noun clauses relating to fact and or certainty, relative clauses
– adverb clauses of time, place, reason, manner, result and condition.
Subjunctive used in:
– independent clauses of wishing and commanding
– noun clauses in negative or conjectural contexts or those that depend on verbs of saying, thinking or suggesting
– adverb clauses of condition (hypothetical or impossible conditions), concession purpose, result (where the result is anticipated), temporal (relating to the future)
– conjectural events and comparative clauses.

Figure 1. General guidelines for subjunctive mood use in Old English

I use these guidelines in order to select, for further examination, the examples for which it cannot be straightforwardly explained why the English gloss is in the subjunctive mood.

In general, the subjunctive in OE was used less than in Latin, and therefore not all Latin subjunctive forms are expected to be rendered by the same mood in English. Previous work that directly addresses the Lindisfarne subjunctive and its relationship to that of Latin includes Barasch (1979: 18), whose aim is to assess to what extent the gloss follows the rules of Latin grammar. She concludes that "the Anglo-Saxon subjunctive is less subjected to strict rules than its counterpart in Latin. Though the translator occasionally imitates Latin usage he generally uses this mood in its basic function, i.e., as the mood of uncertainty and doubt". However, there are some limitations to Barasch's study. Firstly, it looks only at Matthew's Gospel, not the entire text; secondly, it is not clear what criterion is being used to assess how Anglo-Saxons generally used the subjunctive; thirdly, it is not clear how many examples were analysed. Whereas Barasch limits her study to one of the gospels, my study considers all the gospels but limits the forms to the gloss of the Latin third person singular imperfect subjunctive *esset*.

2.3 Glosses of Latin Subjunctive singular, *esset*

All the examples of the Latin subjunctive *esset* were counted and tabulated along with their gloss. Each example was then assessed as to whether the mood of the gloss (indicative or subjunctive) has an obvious explanation. These results are shown numerically in Table 4. Since each of the sections is a different length, the percentages are only meaningful as a comparison within the sections. It can be seen that in sections 1–4, the ratio in each section is approximately 3:1.

Section	Sec 1	Sec 2	Sec 3	Sec 4	Sec 5	Total
Chapters	MtGL (Li) start–MtGl (Li) 26,16	MtGl (Li) 26,17–MkGl (Li) 5,40	MkGl (Li) 5,41–LkGl (Li) 2,9	LkGl (Li) 2,10–JnGl (Li) 3,13	JnGl (Li) 3,14–end.	
English gloss has no straightforward explanation	2 (2.4%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (3.6%)	7 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	**14 (16.6%)**
English gloss has an explanation	9 (10.7%)	8 (9.5%)	15 (17.9%)	21 (25%)	18 (21.4%)	**71 (83.3%)**
Total	**11**	**10**	**18**	**28**	**18**	**85**

Table 4. Examples of Latin *esset* and gloss for all clauses examined

There are also 8 examples where a multiple gloss was used for *esset*. These are not tabulated and are addressed separately in Section 3.

Examples of the types of clause in which subjunctive in the English gloss can be explained with reference to Figure 1 are shown in (1)–(7). These include complements of verbs of saying/thinking/suggesting, hypothetical situations, conditionals, indirect questions, negatives and future

reference. I found that all the clauses in which the subjunctive in the English gloss occurs variably are adverbial temporal and reason clauses. These are exemplified in (8)–(14).

First, consider the 71 examples that have an obvious explanation for subjunctive mood in OE. Complements of verbs of saying, thinking or suggesting are shown in (1) and (2); the subordinate clauses are the complement of *hieran,* 'hear' and *cueðan* or *secgan*, 'say'.

(1)   L: *Cum   autem   audisset   quod iohannes   traditus   **esset***

         OE: Mið ðy soðlice geherde   ðæt iohannes   gesald   **were**

            when   indeed   heard   that Johannes   betrayed   were

         PDE: 'When [he] heard that John was handed over.'   (MtGl (Li) 4,12)

(2)   *Tunc praecepit discipulis suis ut nemini   dicerent   quia ipse **esset** iesus christus*

        Ða geheht ðegnum   his   ðæt nænigum men [cueðas ł saegas]   forðon he **were** crist hælend

        then ordered thanes   his   that to not-any man   tell/say   for that he were christ saviour

        'Then [he] ordered his disciples not to tell anyone that he was Christ [the] Saviour.'

                                                     (MtGl (Li) 16,20)

In (3) and (4), *gif* 'if' introduces a hypothetical situation. Note also that, in both examples, a periphrastic form with *willan,* is part of the conditional: *ualde lufiga* (cf. Cole 2015).

(3)   *si   sciret   paterfamilia   qua hora   fur   uenturus*

        gif he wiste   ðe fader hiorodes   of huelc tid   ðeaf tocymende

        if   he knew   the father of house of which time   thief to-coming

        esset   *uigilare   utique*

        were   waecca   he **walde**   uutedlice

        were   stay awake he   would   indeed

        'If the father of the family knew at what time the thief were to be coming, indeed he would watch.'

                                                     (MtGl (Li) 24,43)

(4)   *dixit   ergo   eis   iesus   si deus pater   uester **esset**   diligeretis   utique me*

        cuoeð forðon him   se hælend gif god faeder iuer   **woere**   gie **ualde** lufiga uutedlice mec

        said therefore   to them the saviour if god father your   were   ye would   love   indeed   me

        'The Saviour therefore said to them, 'If God were your father, you would indeed love me'.'

                                                     (JnGl (Li) 8,42)

In example (5), a negative conditional, *uoere,* glosses *fuisses*, the second person pluperfect subjunctive of Latin *esse*, 'be' and *nære* is a contracted negative in the subjunctive mood.

(5)   *et dixit   ei domine   si   **fuisses**   hic   **non esset** mortuus   frater   meus*

        & cuoeð him to drihten gif   ðu **uoere**   her   **nære**   dead   broðer min

        & said him to lord   if   thou were   here not-were   dead   brother mine

        'and said to him, 'Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died'.'

                                                     (JnGl (Li) 11,32)

Examples (6) and (7) have indefinite pronouns, *hua* and *huelcum* respectively, and are conjectural contexts; they also reference future events.

(6) *sciebat enim ab initio   iesus   qui **essent**   credente   et quis traditurus   **esset** eum*
uiste forðon from fruma   se hælend   ðaðe **uoeron** gelefendo & hua sellende   **uere** hine
knew indeed from start the saviour who were   believing & who betraying   were him
'For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed, and who would betray him.'

(JnGl (Li) 6,64)

(7) *Hoc   autem   dixit   significans   qua morte   clarificaturus   **esset** deum*
Ðis uutedlice   cuoeð   [tahte ł becnade] of huelcum deað   [gibrehtnad ł giuuldrad]³ **uere** god
this indeed   said   taught/signified of what sort of death   glorify/glorify   were god
'Indeed he said this, signifying by what death God would be glorified.'   (JnGl (Li) 5,12)

Next, the 14 examples for which there is no immediately obvious reason for the English gloss to be in subjunctive mood are considered in detail. 12 of these are adverbial clauses of time, and two are adverbial clauses of reason; all are in the subjunctive mood, although indicative is expected. The two reason clauses, introduced by *forðon*, glossing Latin *quoniam* and *quod* 'because' are shown in (9) and (10). Here, the indicative is expected in English, much like the way it is used in (8).

(8) *quod   **esset** discipulus iesu   occultus   autem   propter metum iudaeorum*
forðon   **uæs** ðegn   ðæs hælendes deigle   uutedlice   fore   ondesne iudeana
because   was thane   of the the savior secretly indeed   for   fear   of Jews
'because [he] was Jesus' disciple, but secretly for fear of the Jews.'   (JnGl (Li) 19,38)

(9) *ascendit   autem et   ioseph a galilaea . . .   quod **esset** de domo   et familia dauid*
astag   ðonne æc   iohannes of galilea . . . forðon **were** from hus   & higo dauides
went   then also   Johannes from Galilee because were from house & line of David
'And Joseph also went up from Galilee . . . because he was of David's house and family.'

(LkGl (Li) 2,4)

(10) *. . . dixit   parabola eo   quod   **esset**   prope   hierusalem*
. . . cuoeð   þæt geddung   forðon   **wære**   neh   hierusalem
. . . said   that parable   because were   near   Jerusalem
et *quia   existimarent   quod confestim   regnum   dei   **manifestaretur***
&   forðon   hia   woendon   þæte sona   ric   godes   **were ædeauad**
& because   they thought   that directly   kingdom   of god   were appeared

---

³ *ge-beorhtnian* 'to make bright' and *ge-wuldrian* 'to glorify'

'. . . [he] spoke that parable because [he] was near Jerusalem and because they thought that immediately [the] kingdom of God would have been revealed.'   (LkGl (Li) 19,11)

In example (9), the subjunctive mood is unexpected, and difficult to explain, as presumably Joseph's patrimony is an established fact. A tentative explanation for (10) is that the coordination led to the two clauses being glossed in the same mood. Although in the first reason clause, with subjunctive *wære neh hierusalem,* there appears to be no doubt about the disciples' position, subjunctive mood is expected in the second clause of reason as the verb *were ædeauad* (from *æt-íwian* 'to be seen') is the complement of the verb *wenan*, 'think', 'suppose', 'fancy'. If this explanation is correct, (9) remains as the only puzzling exception.

Turning now to temporal clauses, these are generally found with indicative voice in English, as seen in (11) and (12).

(11) *Et* **cum**   *eiecta*   **esset**   *turba*   *intrauit et*   *tenuit*   *manum eius*
     & mið ðy   fordrifen   **wæs** [ðy ðreat ł ðy menigo]   inneade & [geheald ł genom][4]   hond hire
     & when   driven away   was   the crowd/the multitude   entered & held/took   hand   her
     'And when the crowd was expelled, [he] entered and took her by the hand.'   (MtGl (Li) 9,25)

(12) **Cum**   *autem*   **esset** *iesus*   *in bethania*   *in domo simonis*   *leprosi*
     Ðende   ðonne   **wæs** ðe hælend   in bethania   in huse symonis   ðæs reafa
     while   then   was the saviour   in Bethania   in house of Simon   the leper
     'And when Jesus was in Bethany, in Simon the Leper's house.'   (MtGl (Li) 26,6)

Although *ðende*, 'while', as in (12), is a possible gloss of Latin *cum* there are only 3 examples in the Lindisfarne Gospels, all of which are followed by the indicative (Callaway 1931: 78). Instead of *ðende*, Latin *cum* is usually glossed as *mið ðy* (or *miððy*). The frequent combination *mið ðy* is the preposition *mid*, 'with', combined with a demonstrative, the dative or instrumental of *se,* and can mean 'when' or 'while'. The usage is thought to be literary rather than colloquial, though it is rare in poetry (Mitchell 1985: II, 327). 12 examples use the subjunctive in the data examined, as is seen in (13) and (14).

(13) **cum**   *ergo*   *natus*   **esset**   *iesus*   *in*   *bethleem iudeae*
     mið ðy   ecsoð   gecenned   **were**   haelend in   ðær   byrig
     when   moreover   born   were   saviour in   that   city
     'Moreover, when [the] Saviour was born in that city.'   (MtGl (Li) 2,1)

(14) **cum**   *sero*   *autem*   *factum*   **esset**
     mið ðy [efern ł ic sædi]   uutedlice   geworden   **were**
     When   evening/I sow   indeed   become   were
     'When evening came.'   (MtGl (Li) 20,8)

---

[4] To facilitate reading the glosses, multiple glosses are enclosed in square brackets.

The double gloss of Latin *sero* in (14) is interesting. As reviewer 1 points out, the glossator shows some random knowledge of Latin homonyms, giving the gloss of both the Latin adverb *sero*, 'late' (in the day) but also translating the Latin verb *sero* 'I sow seed'.[5]

Since temporal clauses were the only clause type found to be variable, the figures were reworked for temporal clauses only, as shown in Table 5. Although the figures are very small, it is clear that Section 4 (Luke) stands out from the others in that the ratio of subjunctive to indicative is greatest. The low numbers for Section 5 (John) result from there being very few temporal clauses. This is most likely due to the different narrative style in the Gospel of John.

Section	Sec 1	Sec 2	Sec 3	Sec 4	Sec 5	Total
Chapters	-MtGl (Li) 26,16	MtGl (Li) 26,17–MkGl (Li) 5,40	MkGl (Li) 5,41–LkGl (Li) 2,9	LkGl (Li) 2,10–JnGl (Li) 3,13	JnGl (Li) 3,14–end.	
English gloss has an explanation	6	2	8	3	3	**22**
English subjunctive has no straightforward explanation	2	2	2	6	0	**12**
Total	**8**	**4**	**10**	**9**	**3**	**34**

Table 5. Examples of Latin *esset* and gloss for temporal clauses only

Although, as a broad generalisation, as seen in Figure 1, temporal clauses in OE use the indicative and in Latin the subjunctive mood, this does not hold for all clauses of time. First, the mood depends on which conjunction is used. The preterite indicative (never present indicative) occurs with clauses introduced by *þa* 'when', but with other conjunctions both tenses and moods are used. As for an explanation of when subjunctive occurs in clauses of time and when indicative occurs, there is no consensus. Mitchell (1985: II, 331–3) discusses two positions. One position, represented by Adams (1905), advocates that the doubtful or hypothetical character of the main clause leads to subjunctive mood in the temporal clause. I suggested something similar above for the clause of reason, example (10). The other position, subscribed to by Callaway (1931), holds that the chief deciding factor is the nature of the dependent temporal clause. Mitchell (1985: I, 333) chooses a middle ground, saying that "we can cut down the fence and occupy both positions" by taking Adams' position but admitting there are exceptions.

In the initial analysis of the data, discussed above, I considered only the temporal adverbial clause itself (taking Callaway's position) and not the main clause. However, I revisited the data and also examined the main clauses. Under the assumption that any uncertainty in the main clause or the temporal clause influences the mood of the temporal clause, eight of the 12 examples in Table 5 can be explained. First, two of the examples in subjunctive mood may be due to an indefinite noun phrase in the temporal clause, i.e. *stowe sumre* in (15).

---

[5] Ponz-Sanz (2016: 320) notes *sero* double glossed twice in Mark as both *smolt* 'quiet' and *smyltnes* 'calmness'.

(15) **cum**   **esset**   in loco quodam   orans . . .

  miððy   **were**   in stowe sumre   gebiddende . . .

  when   was   in place some   praying . . .

  'when he was in a certain place, praying . . .'   (LkGl (Li) 11,1)

Such an analysis is substantiated by Cole (2015: 79), who gives double gloss examples with both a verb in the indicative as well as a subjunctive modal (of *willan*) plus infinitive, and notes that both the indicative and the subjunctive were acceptable alternatives in clauses of indefiniteness.

In six of the examples, I find that the main clause rather than the temporal clause could have caused subjunctive mood in the temporal clause. Three of these examples have a verb of 'saying' in the main clause and in three there is indefiniteness or uncertainty in the main clause. See, for example, (16), where a vision is described.

(16) *in inferno eleuans*   *autem*   *oculos suos*   **cum**   **esset** *in tormentis*   *uidebat Abraham . . .*

  in helle   ahof   ða   ego his   **miððy**   **were** in tintergum   gesæh Abraham . . .

  in hell   lifted   then   eyes his   when   were in torment   saw   Abraham . . .

  'In hell, lifting up his eyes when he was in torment, he saw Abraham . . .'   (LkGl (Li) 16,23)

Also consider (17), where an indefinite person *vir quidam*, glossed as *wer sum,* is introduced into the narrative.

(17) *et*   **cum**   *egressus*   **esset**   *ad terram*   *occurrit*   *illi*   *uir quidam*

  &   **miððy**   færende   **woere**   to londe   togægnes arn him   wer sum

  and   when   went   were   to land   towards ran   him   man some

  'And when he went off landwards, a certain man ran towards him.' (LkGl (Li) 8,27)

In conclusion, only four of the 12 examples in Table 4 remain unexplained: MtGl (Li) 2,1; MkGl (Li) 6,47; MkGl (Li) 11.19; LkGl (Li) 24.21.

Finally, four examples not included in Tables 4 and 5 above should be mentioned. These are evidence that the glossator does not follow the Latin word for word but considers the entire semantic and syntactic context. First, in three examples, the subjunctive *were* is used to gloss *erat*, the Latin third person singular imperfect indicative. Two are quite similar, conditional constructions with *if.* In (18) and (19), *fuisset* and *fuissetis* are both pluperfect subjunctive of *esse,* 'be', (third person singular and second person plural respectively, translated as 'he had been' and 'you had been'). Reviewer 1 points out that the Latin indicative here is an oddity of post-classical Latin grammar, where the indicative can be used for a conditional construction, as opposed to classical Latin which would use a subjunctive. The glossator seems to recognise this and uses the subjunctive mood in English.

(18) *bonum*   **erat**   *ei*   *si*   *natus*   *non*   **fuisset**   *homo ille*

  god   **were**   him   gif   accenned   ne   **were**   ðe monn

  good   were   him   if   born   not   **were**   that man

  'If that man were not born it would be good for him.'   (MtGl (Li) 26,24)

12

(19)

si	de	mundo	**fuissetis**	mundu
gif	of	middangearde	gie **uoere**	se middangeard
if	of	world	ye were	the world

quod	suum **erat**	diligeret
[þætte ł gif]⁶	his **uoere**	walde lufia
that/if	his **were**	would love

'If you had been of the world, the world would love its own.' (JnGl (Li) 15,19)

In the third example, (20), subjunctive is expected in the clausal complement of *geuitigade* (from *witgian,* 'prophesise'), since the reference is to the future. The glossator has provided this, despite the Latin being in indicative.⁷

(20)

hoc autem	a	semet	ipso	non	dixit	sed	cum	esset
ðis uutudlice	from	him	seolfum	ne	cuoæð	ah	mððy	uoere ł uæs
this indeed	from	him	self	not	said	but	when	were ł was

pontifex	anni illius	prophetauit	quia	iesus	moriturus	**erat** . . .
biscop	ðæs geres	geuitigade	ðæte	ðe hælend	[dead ł suoeltende]	**were** . . .
bishop	that year	foretold	that	the saviour	dead/dying	were

'Indeed, (he) didn't speak this about himself, but being bishop that year, (he) prophesied that Jesus would die.' (JnGl (Li) 11,51).

Finally, I found one clause only in which a subjunctive might be expected in English and an indicative is given as in (21). Otherwise, the reverse seems to occur, as has been described.

(21)

nuntiauerunt autem illis	et qui	uiderant	quomodo	sanus **factus**	**esset** a	legion
sægdon ða	ðæm	& ðaðe gesegon	huu	hal **aworden**	**wæs** from	diowla here
said then	to them	& those who saw	how	whole become	was from	devil army

'Then told them and those who saw how [he] had been healed from the army of devils.'

(LkGl (Li) 8,36)

In (21), following a verb of 'saying', subjunctive is expected. However, there is a possible explanation. According to Henshaw (1894: 17) the indicative in reported speech "shows that the content of the dependent clause is regarded as actual fact; the subjunctive shows that it is considered merely as the opinion of the

---

⁶ Reviewer 1 points out that the OE *gif* here is odd in this context and suggests that the glossator is showing random knowledge of possible multiple meanings in Latin (as with *sero* above) even if only the first one is correct for the context.
⁷ The entire verse is given in order to show there is a multiple gloss in the first part of the verse.

person quoted". It might be the case, then, that since the report comes from eyewitnesses it is considered actual fact and this prompted the glossator to use the indicative.

The examples above show that generally, when Latin has subjunctive mood and when subjunctive is expected in English, then English follows with the subjunctive. Examples (1)–(15) exemplified subjunctive use in complement clauses, negatives, conditionals and indefinites. Something different was seen in temporal adverbial clauses where both moods are found in OE with the complementiser *miððy*. Two clauses of reason also are in subjunctive mood. Finally, three examples, (18)–(20) were reported where Latin indicative is glossed with English subjunctive, as well as one example (21) of an unexpected English indicative.

3. Multiple glosses

Multiple glosses occur frequently in Lindisfarne and, as first pointed out by Ross (1933: 108), can be either lexical, different words with similar meaning, or grammatically different forms of the same word. Additionally, examples that recognise homonyms in the Latin were shown above, providing different words of completely unrelated meaning, as in (14) and (19). According to Kotake (2006: 37) there are over 3000 multiple glosses, of which 466 are grammatical in nature (Kotake's fn. 4 gives 3159 for the total occurrences of multiple glosses).

Multiple glosses have been investigated from several perspectives, focusing on reasons for their use, as well as the significance of the order in which the lexemes are presented (cf. Ross 1933; Ross & Squires 1980; Kotake 2006). Summarising five possible reasons for the employment of multiple glosses, Pons-Sanz (2016: 303–304) lists *uncertainty, multiple sources, clarity, lexicological and lexicographic concerns* and *stylistic reasons*. However, 'uncertainty' can be dismissed. It is "not a very convincing explanation (certainly not for all cases) because very often a lemma that in some places receives a multiple gloss is, on other occasions, translated by a single OE interpretamentum" (Pons-Sanz 2016: 304). This was exemplified in my data by (14) above, where Latin *sero* is glossed as 'evening' and 'I sow', although single glosses for *sero* as well as two other doublets occur in the text, as mentioned in fn. 4. As seen in (14) and (19), the glossator points out a possibility although it is out of the question within the context. This suggests an additional reason for the use of multiple glosses, i.e. pedagogic concerns: the glossator is attempting to instruct the reader, in this case, in Latin. Investigations of multiple glosses of grammatical variants include present tense *be* (Bolze 2013, 2016), inflectional and periphrastic subjunctive (Cole 2015), verbal tenses (Kotake 2006), and negation (van Bergen 2008). These are further discussed below.

For present tense 'be', in both West Saxon and Northumbrian, generally in the present-tense indicative the *b*-forms are used to gloss a Latin verb inflected for future and the non-*b*-forms are used for present tense, as was mentioned above. When it comes to the subjunctive, there are no *b*-forms[8] in the Northumbrian

---

[8] The Lindisfarne gloss contains two examples of *b*-forms. However, these two both occur in doublets and Bolze 2013: 228 suggests they are glossing mistakes and are in indicative mood.

dialect, only *s*-forms, as shown in Table 2. However, in the Lindisfarne Gospels subjunctive *s*-forms occur in multiple glosses with a present tense indicative *b*-form, glossing the Latin future, *erit*. The indications are that each member of the pair contributes to the interpretation. The present tense indicative *b*-form contributes a reference to the future, and the present subjunctive *s*-form indicates the speaker's opinion, and can be understood as a wish or desire. This is exemplified in (22).

(22) *qui*   *maior*   *est uestrum*   ***erit*** [3sg fut ind.act] *minister uester*
      seðe   heist ł maas   is iuer   **bið ł sie**   embihtmonn iuer
      'He who is greatest of you will be your servant.'   (Bolze 2013: 228, ex 16)

Another occasion when both parts of a multiple gloss supply information is when a (subjunctive) modal+infinitive is paired with a present indicative. When glossing a Latin subjunctive there are two options: to use a simple form, which could be either the indicative or an inflectional subjunctive, or to use a periphrastic expression (modal + infinitive). It might be expected that adherence to the Latin would discourage modal + infinitive constructions but Cole (2015:72) claims this is not so. However, the modal verbs at this time generally retained their primary meaning and so added semantic content. For example, in clauses of indefiniteness, such as (23) in which *wel(l)e* + infinitive is paired with an indicative, an "implied element of volition, intention or acquiescence" is provided by the subjunctive of *willan* 'want'.

(23) *et quicumque*   *dixerit*   *uerbum*   *contra*   *flium hominis*   *remittitur ei*

      7 sua **hua**   [**cueðes ł cueða wele**] word   wið   sunu monnes   forgefen bið him

      & so who   says ł say want   word   against son man   forgiven be him

      'and whosoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him' (MtGl (Li) 12,32)

                                                                    (Cole 2015: 79, ex. 3c.)

In conclusion, Cole (2015: 81) claims that this type of multiple gloss is not a "mechanical substitute for the inflectional subjunctive. Double glosses in *Li* clearly provide alternatives that are equally acceptable in a given context but they convey differing nuances". In both these examples of multiple glosses it appears that the glossator is ensuring sematic clarity.

Another type of grammatical multiple gloss, which could be considered 'stylistic', is examined by Kotake (2006). In example (24), the Latin *sedebat* is double glossed, both with the imperfect, *gesætt*, as well as the periphrastic *wæs sittende*, which is thought to be grammatically closer to the imperfect than the simple OE past. Although simple past in OE gives an adequate translation, the use of *be* + present participle is a more natural form favoured by OE writers (Kotake 2006: 39).

(24) *In illo*   *die*   *exiens*   *iesus*   *de domo*   ***sedebat***   *secus*   *mare*
      In ðæm   dæge   geeade ðe hælend of hus   he [**gesætt ł wæs sittende**] [æt ł neh] sæ
      in that   day   went   the saviour from house he [sat ł was sitting   ]   [at ł near] sea
      'The same day Jesus went out of the house, and sat by the sea.' (MtGl (Li) 13,1)

Kotake's main focus is on the actual order of the elements in multiple glosses. He finds that in the translation of the Latin imperfect, the Latin infinitive and in the use of modal auxiliary verbs there is a tendency to first provide a literal translation that closely follows the Latin, usually a simple form, and then a more morphologically marked form, often a periphrastic form as in (24).

Finally, the situation found with negation should be mentioned, where alternative forms come from two different dialect areas. In Old and Middle English, a small set of mostly high frequency verbs that begin with a vowel or /h/ or /w/ optionally contract with the preceding negative particle *ne*. For example, *willan* 'want' is either *nolde* or *ne wolde* in the past tense. Generally, in northern varieties contraction is rare but in Southern and West Midland varieties it is variable, making negative contraction predominantly a West Saxon phenomenon (Levin 1958; van Bergen 2008; Wood 2002). The distribution of contracted and uncontracted negation has been investigated from the perspective of possible Latin influence and from the viewpoint of variation within the sections. Although the data is limited, Luke (Section 4) stands out as remarkable, having less contraction for all verbs except with *willan*, and there is more tendency towards contraction in John; that is, Luke is more northern than John. Some multiple glosses occur, e.g. *ne habbas* ł *nabbas* glosses Latin *non habent* 'they do not have' (MtGl (Li) 14,16). Here the glossator gives dialect variants, possibly for stylistic reasons. Van Bergen (2008: 284) mentions, but unfortunately does not report, the multiple gloss data. It is possible that here the glossator is giving one predominantly Northumbrian form and the other West Saxon, either from his own linguistic knowledge or because the examples occurred in an exemplar from a dialect different from his own.

3.1 Multiple glosses of *esset*

Eight multiple glosses were found in doublets, where the glossator has glossed the Latin third person singular imperfect subjunctive with a form of *was* or *were*. The examples were checked carefully with the manuscript to ensure they are not editorial errors.

Sec 3		Sec 4		Sec 5	
LkGl (Li) 1,29:	wæs ł were	LkGl (Li) 15,20	wæs ł wære	JnGl (Li) 5,13:	were ł uæs
		LkGl (Li) 22,14	woere ł wæs	JnGl (Li) 6,24	uæs ł uere
		LkGl (Li) 24,6	were ł wæs	JnGl (Li)11,51	uæs ł uere
		JnGl (Li) 2,23	uere ł uæs		

Table 6. Doublets of past tense *be*

As can be seen from Table 6, the doublet examples all appear in LkGl (Li) and JnGl (Li). There are five examples of temporal clauses, where *miððy* glosses Latin *cum*. These clauses, as was already discussed in 2.3, could be subjunctive or indicative mood. Four of these temporal examples occur in Section 4 and one, JnGl(Li) 11,15 in Section 5. Two of the remaining three doublet examples, JnGl (Li) 5,13 and JnGl (Li) 6,24, are in Section 5 and involve negation, where, generally, subjunctive mood is expected. Finally, the one

example in Section 3, LkGl (Li) 1,29, involves the complement of *þencan* 'think', which, as will be explained below, can be in either mood depending on the intended meaning.

First, consider the five examples of clauses of time, Latin *cum* glossed as *miððy* 'when'. As was discussed above, there is no consensus on whether the main clause or the temporal clause is the main reason for subjunctive mood in OE clauses of time. In three of the main clauses, the main verb could have led the glossator to consider using subjunctive mood in the temporal clause: in (25), the verb *eft-ðencgað* from *þencan*, 'think'; in (26) *gilefdun* from *geliefan* 'believe'; in (27) *geuitigade* 'prophesy'.

(25) *recordamini   qualiter locutus   est   uobis **cum**   athuc in   galilea **esset***

eft-ðencgað   hu   sprecend wæs   iuh   **miððy** ðaget in   galilea **were ɫ wæs**

back-think   how   speaking was   to you when   yet   in   Galilee were ɫ was

'Remember how he spoke to you when he was still in Galilee.'   (LkGl (Li) 24,6)

(26) *cum   autem   **esset**   hierosolymis in   pascha in   die festo*

mið ðy   wutudlice   **were ɫ wæs**   ðæm liodum   in   eostru   in   halgum dæge

when   indeed   were ɫ was   in Jerusalem at   Easter   on   holy days

multi   crediderunt in   nomine   eius . . .

monige   gilefdun   in   noma   his . . .

many   believed   in   name   his . . .

'Now when he was in Jerusalem at Easter, on the feast days, many believed in his name.'

JnGl(Li) 2,23)

Similarly, in (20) mentioned above, repeated here as (27), there is no uncertainty in the temporal clause; presumably it was known that the person involved had the role of bishop. However, the verb *geuitigade* 'prophesy' followed by a subjunctive and co-ordination with a negated clause: *ne cuoæð* could have prompted the glossator to provide both options.

(27) *hoc autem   a   semet ipso   non   dixit sed   **cum   esset***

ðis uutudlice   from him   seolfum ne   cuoæð ah   **miððy uoere ɫ uæs**

this indeed   from him   self   not   said   but   when   were ɫ was

*pontifex   anni illius   prophetauit quia iesus   moriturus   **erat** . . .*

biscop   ðæs   geres geuitigade   ðæte ðe hælend [dead ɫ suoeltende] **were** . .

bishop   that   year   foretold   that the saviour dead or dying   were

'Indeed, (he) didn't speak this about himself; but being bishop that year, (he) prophesied that Jesus would die.'   (JnGl (Li) 11,51)

It could also be noted that in these three examples the order is subjunctive first, perhaps indicating that although indicative mood is also possible, subjunctive mood is the preferred option.

In the remaining two examples of doublets in temporal clauses, (28) and (29) below, a reason for the doublet is not immediately apparent in either the temporal clause or the main clause.

(28)

et	*surgens*	*uenit ad*	*patrem*	*suum*	***cum***	*autem*	*athuc*	*longe*
&	aras	cuom to	feder	his	**miððy**	uutedlice	ða get	fearra
&	arose	came to	father	his	when	indeed	still	far

esset	*uidit*	*illum*	*pater ipsius*
wæs ł wære	gesæh	hine	fæder his
was ł were	saw	him	father his

'And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was still far (away), his father saw him.'

(LkGl (Li) 15,20)

(29)

et	***cum***	*facta*	***esset***	*hora*	*discubuit*
&	**miððy**	aworden	**woere ł wæs**	ðio tid	gesætt ł gehlinade
&	when	arrived	were ł was	the time	sat ł sat (at table)

'And when it was time, he sat down.' (LkGl (Li) 22,14)

Example (28) uses the unusual (for Lindisfarne) spelling, i.e. the West Saxon *wære.*

Next, consider example (30), which is from Luke's Gospel and occurs in Section 3. The verb *geþencan* 'think; deliberate' takes an indirect question as its complement, introduced by a subordinating conjunction in a doublet, *hulig ł huu* 'of what sort; how'. For complements of *geþencan*, particularly when followed by an indirect question, subjunctive mood is expected. However, even here there is some optionality. As Traugott (1992: 239) points out, there is a lexically-based distinction:

An example of a lexically based distinction is the fact that *þencan* 'think' favours the subjunctive but *geþencan* the indicative. The distinction may be interpreted as reflecting a difference in meaning between 'I think' and 'I have come to think'. The second meaning is perfective/resultative, which correlates well with the use of the indicative.

Here, then the glossator could be indicating that, in the context, both meanings are possible. Note also the gloss of Latin *quae*, feminine singular and feminine plural of *quis* 'who', which is the doublet *ða ł ðiu.* The glossator shows knowledge of Latin and OE dialect variation by giving both *ða*, the nominative plural demonstrative and *ðiu*, a Northern variant of the feminine singular.

(30)

quae	*cum*	*audisset*	*turbata*	*est*	*in*	*sermone*	*eius*	*et*	***cogitabat***

ða ł ðiu		miððy	geherde	gedroefad	wæs	in	word	his	&	**geðohte**
this/this		when	heard	troubled	was	at	word	his	&	thought

qualis	**esset**	*ista*	*salutation*
hulig ł huu	**wæs ł were**	ðios	groeteng
how like/how	[was ł were]	this	greeting

'She, when [she] heard, was troubled at his words and considered what sort of greeting this was/might be.' (LkGl (Li) 1,29)

In the final two doublet examples, from John's Gospel, shown in (31) and (32), subjunctive is the expected mood due to the negation.

(31)
is	autem	qui		sanus	fuerat	effectus	nesciebat	quis
ðe ilca	uutudlice	seðe		hal	uæs	geuorht	[nyste ł ne cuðe]	hua
the one	indeed	who		whole	was	made	not-know	who

esset		iesus	enim	declinauit	turba	constituta	in loco
[**were ł uæs**]		se hælend	forðon	fromgebeg	ða menigo	efne-gesettede	in stou
were/was		the saviour	because	left	the throng	standing	in place

'And he that was healed didn't know who (it) was for the Saviour had turned away, the crowd being in (the) place.' (JnGl (Li) 5,13)

In (31) there is a negated doublet giving a choice of verb, *nyste ł ne cuðe.* As mentioned, this is thought to be a dialect variant, as negative contraction is rare in the north and predominantly a West Saxon phenomenon. A northern flavour is introduced also with the prefix *efne*, which is used in the north to translate the prefix *con-* in many Latin verbs (Bosworth-Toller, s.v. *efne*). Subjunctive mood is expected with negation, and also with the indefinite *hua*, making this particular example somewhat puzzling. In (32) negation also features.

(32)
cum ergo	*uidisset*	*turba*	*quia*		*iesus*	*non*		**esset**
miððy	uutudlice	gesæh	ðio menigo	ðæt	se hælend	ne		**uæs ł uere**
when	indeed	saw	the throng	that	the saviour	not		[was ł were]

ibi		*neque*	*discipuli*	*eius*		*ascenderunt*	*nauiculas*
ðer		æc ne	ðegnas	his		astigun	ða sciopu
there		also not	thanes	his		went in	the ships

'When therefore the crowd saw that Jesus was not there, nor his disciples, they got into ships.'

(JnGl (Li) 6,24)

The optionality in these two examples is difficult to explain, though they do occur close to each other and both are in Section 5, which is John's Gospel.

4 Conclusion

This investigation examined all the examples of Latin third person preterit subjunctive *esset* and noted whether the Lindisfarne glossator uses subjunctive *were* or indicative *was* in the OE gloss. The verb *be* was selected because there are no indeterminate examples. These had introduced an element of speculation into some previous investigations of the subjunctive mood. The relevant clauses were then assessed as to whether or not subjunctive mood is expected in OE. A small number of other unexpected uses of the subjunctive were noted, as well as doublets, where both indicative and subjunctive are used. There are three aims: to further understand how the subjunctive is used in the gloss of the Lindisfarne Gospels, to explore the question of how much influence Latin has on the glosses, and to contribute to the authorship debate surrounding the OE gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels.

With respect to how subjunctive mood is used in the Lindisfarne Gospels, OE conventions are employed when using subjunctive mood with complements of verbs of saying/thinking/suggesting, hypothetical situations, conditionals, indirect questions, negatives and future. However, for 12 adverbial clauses there was no immediate explanation for the use of subjunctive mood and these were investigated further. Detailed analysis coupled with consideration of the disagreement among OE scholars as to the circumstances under which subjunctive mood occurs in temporal clauses with *miððy* lead to the conclusion that uncertainty in the main clause as well as in the temporal clause could be a reason why subjunctive mood is used in these OE examples. The outcome is that only one clause of reason and four temporal clauses remain without explanation, i.e. apparently directly influenced by the Latin. However, it should be borne in mind that, as was mentioned earlier, it is still not fully understood how and when each mood is employed. Most revealing are examples (18)–(20), which clearly show awareness that reference to the future in OE calls for the subjunctive mood, despite the Latin original being in the indicative. Indeed there are many examples where skill in and knowledge of Latin are shown, particularly in some of the multiple glosses in which an additional possible English gloss is given, despite it being highly improbable in the context, perhaps showing a wish to educate the reader.

With the 8 doublets, where both the indicative and subjunctive glosses are provided, 5 of these were temporal; as was seen, temporal clauses with *miððy* tend to be variable. These doublets are evidence that there is perhaps sometimes optionality as to which mood to use in temporal clauses, which is why no definitive "rule" has been discovered. In relation to example (30), the semantic distinction between the verbs *geþencan* and *þencan* was discussed, though the doublet might be showing that in the glossator's dialect the semantic distinction was in the process of being lost. In this same example, a northern and a southern variant was given (*ða ɫ ðiu*) so perhaps also dialect variation is a factor here. The two examples with negation are

less easy to explain, but there are indications in one, (31), that dialect variation is being demonstrated as both uncontracted and contracted negation variants are given as well as a northern prefix. Possible dialect variation might also be seen in (28), where the West Saxon <æ> is used in *wære*. This use is rare and the examples are scattered, occurring in Sections 1, 3 and 4, and consequently they do not contribute significantly to the authorship debate (Wood 2019: 179).

On the authorship question, convincing evidence to support multiple authors or different varieties of English would be clustering of any of the significant phenomena. The four temporal clauses from Table 4 that were difficult to explain – MtGl (Li) 2,1; MkGl (Li) 6,47; (MkGl (Li) 11,19; LkGl (Li) 24,21 – are in Sections 1, 3 and 4. There are, of course, none in John, but considering that the numbers are small anyway and John has fewer temporal clauses than the other sections, this is not significant. More interesting is the distribution of doublets: 7 of the 8 examples cluster in Sections 4 and 5, as seen from Table 6, and these show differences only in Luke and John.

This investigation has shown some of the advantages of microanalysis. Table 4 shows the overall results of past *be* but is less revealing than Table 5, where the results for temporal clauses only are given. Careful examination of each clause within the context further reveals that in most of the initially puzzling instances it is possible to find an explanation, but only by accepting the merits of various positions on temporal clauses, i.e. that of Adams (1907) and that of Callaway (1931). For further work on the subjunctive, I suggest that temporal clauses could benefit from future research. Although Callaway (1931) divides his treatment of OE temporal clauses by function, according to whether they denote an action that is prior to, subsequent to, or contemporaneous with that of the main clause, for future work on the subjunctive in the Lindisfarne Gospels, main clauses should also be examined. Callaway (1931: 105) points out that throughout the Lindisfarne Gospels when *miððy* occurs with a subjunctive, it almost always glosses a Latin subjunctive; he notes approximately 65 examples, all except 11 glossing a Latin subjunctive. Also, of these 65, approximately 50 are reported to occur with an indicative in the West Saxon Gospels, which he ascribes to more Latin influence in Lindisfarne. However, Latin influence cannot be definitively assumed without re-examining the reason for each subjunctive in the light of Mitchell's "middle ground" position, since Callaway's chief deciding factor is the nature of the dependent temporal clause.

References

Adams, A. 1907. *The syntax of the temporal clause in Old English prose*. Yale Studies in English, 32. New York: Holt.

Barasch, M. 1979. A study of the Anglo-Saxon subjunctive in the Lindisfarne Gospels. *USK Language Quarterly*. 18(1/2). 16–18 and 52.

Bergen, L. van. 2008. Negative contraction and Old English dialects. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 109. 275–312.

Blakeley, L. 1949. *Studies in the language of the Lindisfarne Gospels*. University of Birmingham. (Doctoral dissertation).

Bolze, C. 2013. The verb 'to be' in the West Saxon and the Lindisfarne Gospels. In G. Diewald, L. Kahlas-Tarkka & I. Wischer (eds). *Comparative studies in early Germanic languages with a focus on verbal categories* [Studies in Language Companion Series, 138]. 217–234. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bolze, C. 2016. Multiple glosses with present tense forms of OE *beon* 'to be' in Aldred's gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In J. Fernández Cuesta & S. Pons-Sanz (eds). 289–300. *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Bosworth-Toller *Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. Digital Edition. http://bosworth.ff.cuni.cz/

Brunner, A. 1947–1948. A note on the distribution of the variant forms of the Lindisfarne Gospels. *English and Germanic Studies* 1. 32–52.

Callaway, M. 1931. *The temporal subjunctive in Old English*. Austin: The University of Texas. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/006610412

Cole, M. 2015. The Periphrastic Subjunctive in the Old English Multiple Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In P. Shaw, B. Erman, G. Melchers & P. Sundkvist (eds). *From Clerks to Corpora: essays on the English language yesterday and today*. 71–85. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.16993/bab.eLicense: CC-BY.

Cole, M. 2016. Identifying the Author(s) of the Lindisfarne Gloss: Linguistic Variation as a Diagnostic for Determining Authorship. In J. Fernández Cuesta & S. Pons-Sanz, (eds), 169–188.

Elliott, C. O. & A. S. C. Ross 1972. Aldrediana XXIV: The Linguistic Peculiarities of the Gloss on St. John's Gospel. *English Philological Studies* 13. 49–72.

Henshaw, A. N. 1894. The syntax of the indicative and subjunctive moods in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels. University of Leipzig (Doctoral dissertation).

Hogg, R. M. (ed.). 1992. *The Cambridge history of the English language*. Volume I: *The beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hogg, R. M. 2011. *A grammar of Old English.* Malden, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hotz, G. 1882. *The use of the subjunctive mood in Anglo-Saxon and its further history in Old English*. University of Zurich (Doctoral dissertation).

Ingham, R. 2006. On two negative concord dialects in early English. *Language Variation and Change* 18 241–266.

Ker, N. R. 1943. Aldred the scribe. *Essays and studies by members of the English Association* 28. 7–12. Reprinted in A. G. Watson (ed.). 1985. *Books, collectors and libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*. 3–8. London: Hambledon.

Kotake, T. 2006. Aldred's multiple glosses: is the order significant? In M. Ogura (ed.). *Textual and Contextual studies in medieval English: Towards the reunion of linguistics and philology*. 35–51. Bern: Lang.

Kroch, A. S. & A. Taylor, 1997. Verb movement in Old and Middle English Dialect variation and language contact. In A. van Kemenade & N. Vincent (eds), *Parameters of morphosyntactic change.* 297–325. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell B. 1985. *Old English syntax*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

Moore, S. & A. H. Marckwardt. 1951. *Historical Outlines of English Sounds and Inflections*. Ann Arbor: George Wahr.

Quirk, R. & C. Wrenn. 1957. *An Old English grammar*, 3rd edn. London: Oxford University Press.

Pons-Sanz, S. 2016. A Study of Aldred's multiple glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In J. Fernández Cuesta & S. Pons-Sanz (eds). 301–328.

Rodríguez Ledesma, N. 2016. *Dauides sunu* vs. *filii david*: The genitive in the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In J. Fernández Cuesta & S. Pons-Sanz, (eds). 213–238.

Ross, A. S. C. 1933. Notes on the method of glossing employed in the Lindisfarne Gospel. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 108–119.

Ross, A. S. C., E. G. Stanley & T. J. Brown. 1960. Some Observations on the Gloss and the Glossator. In T. D. Kendrick, T. J. Brown, R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, H. Roosen-Runge, A. S. C. Ross, E. G. Stanley & A. E. A. Werner (eds). *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis, Musei Britannici Codex Nero D.IV*. Volume II: *Commentariorum libri duo, quorum unus de textu evangeliorum latino et codicis ornatione, alter de glossa anglo-saxonica*. (5–33). Olten/Lausanne: Graf.

Ross, A. S. C. & A. Squires.1980. The Multiple, altered and alternative glosses of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels and the Durham Ritual. *Notes and Queries* 225. 489–495.

Taylor, A. 2008. Contact effects of translation: Distinguishing two types of influence in Old English. *Language Variation and Change* 20. 341–365.

Traugott, E. 1992. Syntax. In R.M. Hogg (ed.). 168–286.

Walkden, G. 2016. Null subjects in the Lindisfarne Gospels as evidence for syntactic variation in Old English. In J. Fernández Cuesta & S. Pons-Sanz, (eds). 239–256.

Wood, J. L. 2002. Negative contraction, dialect and the AB language: A note on Levin (1958). *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14(4). 357–368.

Wood, J. L. 2019. Northumbrian rounded vowels in the Old English gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In A.M. Nyvad, M. Hejná, A. Højen, A.B. Jespersen & M.H. Sørensen (eds). *A sound approach to language matters*. Aarhus: University of Aarhus Press.

Sources

The Lindisfarne Bible. 2002. Munich: Faksimile Verlag.

Skeat, W. W. 1887. *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and old Mercian versions, synoptically arranged, with collations exhibiting all the readings of all the mss.*

https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=inu.32000000891434;view=1up;seq=16

Skeat, W. W. 1871.The Gospel according to Saint Luke in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian versions synoptically arranged, with collations exhibiting all the readings of all the mss.
https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001357329

Skeat, W. W. 1878. The Gospel according to Saint John in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian versions synoptically arranged, with collations *exhibiting all the readings of all the mss*.
https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001357326

Skeat, W. W. 1878. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark, in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian versions, synoptically arranged, with collations exhibiting all the readings of all the mss*.
https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001925960

Johanna L. Wood
Department of English, School of Communication & Culture
Aarhus University
DK-8000 Aarhus C
Denmark
engjw@cc.au.dk