[SQEUAKING] [RUSTLING] [CLICKING]

ARTHUR BAHR: All right. So where last we started-- or rather, where last we ended was page 75 of Mitchell and Robinson. As with the first day of syntax reading from Mitchell and Robinson, this is mostly expansion or fuller detail, recapitulation to use a word from Old English syntax that we've already talked about, recapitulation of stuff that you have already studied in shorter form in Baker.

So beginning at the bottom of page 75 with adjective clauses, numbers 1, 2, and so on, this next section-- I guess, section 162 it is pages, 75 to 77-- recapitulates that Old English has two ways of forming relative clauses with the indeclinable particle *þe,* which we've seen from the very beginning, or with a case of the relative pronoun with or without *þe.*

There's an interesting account from Mitchell and Robinson as to how the alternation of *þe* and *se/sēo/þæt* tends to work. Namely, the indeclinable particle is very common when the relative is the subject, fairly often when the clause-- sorry, when the relative is the object, and only occasionally functions by itself in the genitive or dative.

And in those last examples, it's probably because *þe,* because it's indeclinable, offered too little information. And so authors felt it helpful to include the form of *se/sēo/þæt* as well. So the summary top of page 77, number 5, the old English relatives are the indeclinable particle *þe* to which the personal pronoun can be added to remove ambiguities of case, either alone or followed by the indeclinable particle.

I think that's the main important thing there, except for the bottom of page 77, number 5. So that, the Old English word *þæt,* often combines antecedent and relative pronoun. That is to say, Old English will often use the single word *þæt* where, in modern English, we might say "that which." So the *that* is the antecedent. And the *which* is the relative pronoun in that situation.

So Mitchell and Robinson say, it must then be translated "what." I don't consider that to be true. I'm perfectly happy with "that which," since *that* functions the same in modern English. But you can see a good example there in the Old English at the bottom of 78, *hē hæfde ðēah ġeforþod þæt hē his frēan ġehēt.* "He had, however, done what"-- or "that which," there's really sort of two *that's* embedded in that one *þæt* at the bottom-- "that which he promised his lord."

And then I thought it was funny, number 7, in the middle of 79, attempts have been made to lay down the rules which governed the use of various relative pronouns in Old English. They have not succeeded, largely because the vital clue of intonation is denied to us.

And then as for the difference between definite and indefinite adjective clauses is not really material to our purposes. Just note that the mood of these clauses, the mood of the declined verb in these relative clauses can be either indicative or subjunctive. Typically, it's indicative. But the subjunctive may happen in these listed cases.

And here, it's worth remembering in general what we saw in Baker about the flexibility, variability, sometimes the semantic illegibility, frankly, of the difference between the indicative and the subjunctive in any particular sentence. Any questions about those adjective clauses on the first few pages of the reading?

All right, so adverb clauses-- there's a lot of detail in here on pages 90-- sorry, 81 through 93. I will highlight what I take to be the most important bits, and then happily take questions on any of the rest of it. So again, most of this is recapitulation and some expansion of what we've already talked about.

Paragraph, or section rather, 167 on the multiple kinds of conjunction-- don't worry about this too much. It's a little complicated. The blank lines for number 4 and 5 are basically-- that's Mitchell and Robinson's attempt to indicate that Old English has options, namely 4 and 5. I'm not quite sure why they chose to put the blank ones in the middle of their enumerated list. That seems sort of odd to me. And it may have to you as well.

But nonetheless, basically, these are cases of where because modern English relatives do not have case, we simply can't use the word that in as many ways as the Old English can. So specifically, numbers 4 and 5, we have-- in the examples on page 82, we see that this is creative use, creative Old English use of the genitive.

So [OLD ENGLISH] is a possible-- it has nothing to do with possession. This is not about the genitive in its normal possessive sense. It's simply an idiomatic expression, so that. And similarly, with number 5, "to the extent that," where the genitive is used to indicate "to the extent that."

And you can see this schematized at the top of page 83, where you have the modern English equivalent on the left, and then the Old English example of how that is expressed on the right, where you have *þæs þe* and *þæs ... þæt* with simply no equivalent in modern English. This will not be on the exam. I'm not going to use genitives in this way. But it is something that you should be aware of as you're as you're translating. So that is that.

Non-prepositional conjunctions-- so paragraph 168 is important because they're calling these-- Mitchell and Robinson are emphasizing the fact that all of these words-- *ǣr, būton, ġif, nefne, nū*-- all of those words can indicate-- can be conjunctions, in the sense of indicating an entire dependent clause with a subject and conjugated verb.

Nevertheless, bear in mind that many of these words-- if you go back to chapter 10 in Baker-- and you don't have to right now. But many of these words can also be straight up adverbs. So this is the distinction between, yeah, table 10.1, which are Baker's list of adverbs, and table 10.3, which is his list of subordinating conjunctions. So just bear in mind that the same word can serve multiple functions.

Although, page-- sorry, section 169 indicates that they often do include a *þe* or a form of *se/þæt/sēo.* And we've talked about this phenomenon in multiple-- mostly in the context of *for þām þe* or *for þām.* But we can see that this gets this happens with other prepositions as well.

So the long example given by Mitchell and Robinson is the most common example, that of *for þām* or, as they put it, *for þǣm.* Those are interchangeable, remember. But it is also possible to have these additional cases of prepositions functioning like this, functioning as conjunctions on pages-- in 171, section 171, pages 85 and 86.

I would draw attention in particular to *oð,* often *oð þæt, tō*-- So *oð þæt,* the *þæt* is the accusative, so *oð* plus the accusative, *tō* with the dative or instrumental, meaning "to the end that," and *tō* with the genitive, meaning "to the extent that" or "so that."

The last one of those is analogous to the genitive uses on page 83, the *þæs þe* and *þæs ... þæt.* Again, this is not something I'm going to be testing on the exam. But it is something that we'll be seeing. In fact, we have already seen instances of this kind of pattern in the translation homework. And since that's from now on really the most part of your homework and the most part of your preparation, it's important to be aware of, OK?

I apologize for not saying that I didn't expect you to do their little exercise in analysis in section 172. Did anyone actually try that, by the way? Did anyone see that and think, oh, I think I need to-- you don't have to answer. But anyone who did try their strength, as Mitchell and Robinson, say I'm kind of interested in how it went.

Maybe we should talk through A together. *And forþon iċ þē bebiode, þæt þū dō swā iċ ġeliefe þæt þū wille, þæt þū, þe þissa woruldþinga tō þām ġeǣmetige swā þū oftost mæġe--* Oh my gosh, that's really complicated. So let's actually take a break on that. Let's finish what the actual homework was, and going over the mock exam, and doing the translation. And then if we have time, which seems unlikely, we'll come all the way back to *And forþon iċ þē bebiode.* But it is it is kind of fun and a good way of-- a good form of aerobics, I suppose.

All right, clauses of place, time, all of these different kinds of adverbial clauses on the following pages through to page 93-- the most important-- the most important of these really are at the top of page 90, so comparisons involving as. Here, what I want to draw your attention to is simply how many different ways, no fewer than six, that Mitchell and Robinson are able to list how many ways Old English has to express comparisons that in English would be expressed as as, including, note F, *þæs.*

So you're hopefully getting a sense of a theme, which is that genitive *þæs* can serve some sort of, to modern ears, unidiomatic purposes in Old English. And often, this is related to extent. So I suspect that the way in which this comparison, this 2F at the top of page 90-- I suspect that the way that this evolved-- or that it's related at least. I can't speak to the temporal evolution, but that it's related at least to the same *þæs* of extent on pages 82 and 83 that we talked about at the very beginning of this section.

So that's one of the things to be aware of in this long list of clauses. The other thing I would draw attention to is actually number 5 on page 92. So this is the two words, *būton* and *nemne,* which is often also spelled *nefne,* sometimes *nymþe,* although I can't actually remember seeing an example of that. But I trust Mitchell and Robinson that it exists.

These words have two distinct but related meanings. One is "unless." And the other is "except that." And usually, the subjunctive indicates "unless" and the indicative "except that." And for parataxis, we'll talk more about parataxis actually when we get to the next reading for Caedmon's Hymn after the exam because parataxis is a very typically poetic representation.

Or it's a poetic style. It's a stylistic device that's especially associated with poetry. And Caedmon is the quasi-legendary first poet in Old English, whose singing of the very first poem about Genesis is the topic of Bede's "Account of the Poet Caedmon," which we will turn to after the exam.

So we're finishing up today, as far as we get in the preface to Genesis, is as far as we get. And then we'll finish up-- sorry, we'll finish up on Monday rather, and then turn to Bede's "Account of the Poet Caedmon." So start your start your translating with the preface to Genesis and get as far as you can through the assigned "Account of Caedmon," in Mitchell and Robinson.

It's actually also in Baker so that we have two different-- it can be interesting to look at how the same text is treated by two different editors slash textbook writers. All right, any questions about the that quick and dirty overview of pages 81 through 90 whatever it was, 95, 96?

Like I say, we'll come back to parataxis shortly. So I apologize for the tardiness of the-- I hope everybody saw the announcement. I apologize. I thought I had set Canvas to automatically release the mock exam key at Saturday. And I thought it had done so. And I didn't get any emails asking that this be released. And so I just then didn't notice until this morning early when I was having insomnia that it hadn't been. And so I apologize for that.

So the way we're going to do this is,-- since the whole first three sections of the exam, there should be no questions about, since the first section is literally reproduce paradigms, the second section is vocab-- you either know it or you don't-- and the third section is the grammatical principles to which I've already given you the answers and it's simply a matter of learning them and reproducing them, we will spend all of our time today simply on the sight translation.

And as I said in the announcement, what I'd like to ask folks to do is to take us through their account of how they worked through the problem because basically I think of these sentences as a little bit analogous to problem sets in your technical subjects. They're all puzzles that should be both hard but ultimately solvable.

So I'm going to let you all look over the answer key while I put the sentences up on the board for easier diagramming and discussion. And then after I've done that, we'll come back to-- I'll come back to take volunteers for the particular sentences. OK? So look over this real quick. Formulate your questions and also your accounts. And we'll come back in just a moment.

We'll start with just these first two, all right? *Þā bær se gōda mann hringas in þæs dryhtnes healle.* So who wants to take us through how they approached this first sentence? Yeah, Ritam?

AUDIENCE: OK. So the first thing you see is the *se,* so probably-- yeah, so *se gōda mann* is probably the subject.

ARTHUR BAHR: Why is it not just probably the subject?

AUDIENCE: Well, *se* is always nominative.

ARTHUR BAHR: Exactly. So this has to be the subject. It is not just probably. Well, at least the *se* is. Yeah, exactly. All right, good.

AUDIENCE: Yeah. And you can also parse the prepositional phrase *in þæs dryhtnes healle,* "into the large hall" because *healle* can be either accusative or dative.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good, excellent. So in my translation, I say, well, to bear-- I mean, there's a kind of implicit motion. But I'm not going to quibble with "in" or "into." That's totally fine. However you translated that is not a problem.

AUDIENCE: It took me sometime to figure out that the *þā* meant "then" and not some kind of accusative object.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah, yeah, yeah. How did you ultimately come to the conclusion that this is "then' and not a demonstrative?

AUDIENCE: Well, I think it was the word order because the verb is second and the subject comes after that. The first thing that should probably be like an adverb.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good. Yeah, absolutely. So two elements to two aspects of the sentence tell you that this has to mean "then" and not be a demonstrative. One is that we've already got our subject. So the *þā* can't be related to the subject. And then the other is, as you say, this typical word order where the first element can be sometimes the subject or an adverb.

And since we already have the subject over here, it's likelier that this is the adverb so that the conjugated verb can stay in that second position. Very good. Oh, why is this ending an *-a?*

AUDIENCE: A weak adjective.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good, weak adjective, weak adjective ending after a form of *se/þæt/sēo.* Very good. Any questions about that one? Yeah?

AUDIENCE: In the footnote below, it mentioned that *hring* could be either a ring or a suit of armor. I just couldn't really parse out which one would make more sense.

ARTHUR BAHR: Oh, yeah, either one is fine. I translated "rings" just because it seemed a little likelier that someone was bearing a treasure that was sort of easily portable rings rather than a whole cart load full of ringmail. But absolutely, it could be ringmail. So you can imagine there's been some battle. And we've stripped the slain of their ringmail. You're going to get the order word-- sorry, *Word Hoard* word *wæl. Wæl* is a wonderful and very Old English word.

Wæl means "the slaughter of the battlefield," very specifically. And it's cognate with Old Norse *val.* So Valhalla is "the hall of the slain," the hall of the slaughtered on the battlefield. So you can imagine a situation in which there's all this *wæl* on the battlefield. And they decide to strip the *wæl* of its *hringas* so that we can-- but either way is fine. Good question. Any others?

Notice this very typical-- I told you I would test this. And I have. We have the preposition *in.* We have the object of the preposition, and then the dative. My chicken scratching has sort of obscured this a little bit-- so preposition, genitive, object, this typical word order that we've seen in a gazillion prepositional phrases. Yeah, Ritam?

AUDIENCE: I think you meant to write genitive there.

ARTHUR BAHR: Oh, thank you. Oh God, it's been it's been recorded for posterity now. Yes, this is correct, genitive. Thank you, Ritam. All right, any other questions with this one? This is pretty typical. There are a couple of sentences on the exam that replicate basically this pattern, a version of this pattern with different words, OK? So I'll leave that up for right now.

Let's move over here to sentence 2. *Þā wigan sceoldon gān tō þām ealdre and him hira hringas ġiefan,* We're back to-- oh, *helmas,* sorry. In this case, it's *helmas,* right? It could have been either. The *hringas* have already been borne into the hall. All right, who wants to take us through this one? Lambert?

AUDIENCE: OK. So we can have the *þā* which I figured after doing all the readings, but probably "then."

ARTHUR BAHR: OK, yeah.

AUDIENCE: When I first tried this without looking up anything, I vaguely remembered *wigan* being weak, a weak masculine noun, I think. And I saw the *-on* at the end of the sceoldon.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good.

AUDIENCE: So I figured it was like "they should" or "shall," like there's an obligation.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good, good. Exactly. So *sceoldon* is the past tense of the preterite present verbs *sculan,* which is on your list of preterite present verbs that you need to know. Remember this all important list on page 81? So *cunnan, magan, moton, sculan,* and *witan,* plus *dōn* and *gān.* So yeah, very good. So you see the plural ending of *-on.* And then that plural ending helps you disambiguate this often ambiguous *-an* ending. Very good, keep going.

AUDIENCE: Then I saw gān, which I figured might be the verb in that section because of the *tō þām ealdre.* So that was one thing on its own.

ARTHUR BAHR: OK, yep.

AUDIENCE: And then, *and him hira hringas ġiefan.* So the *him* I assumed was *ealdre* because the *hira,* I think it was genitive plural.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good.

AUDIENCE: [OLD ENGLISH]. So I figured that was like helmets. So that *hira* probably went on *wigan* because that's the only other plural thing in there.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good. Excellent, excellent. Because this is singular. This is ambiguous. But if it refers back to *ealdre,* then it is also singular. Right, so whose helmets? Well, in all likelihood-- I mean, it's kind of got to be the *wigan.* Yeah, good.

AUDIENCE: And then Yeah, so I just "and to him their helmets gave.".

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah. What's happening with the verbs in this sentence? Because we have actually three verbs in the sentence. What is governing what? What verbs are governing what? And how do they all piece together? Yeah, Joshua?

AUDIENCE: *Sceoldon* is the conjugated one. And the other two are infinitives.

ARTHUR BAHR: Exactly. Both of which are governed by the conjugated form of the verb, exactly. So either "then" or "the." It's technically ambiguous. But I intended it to be "the." So "The warriors had to"-- because it's the past tense-- so "had to go to the lord and give him their helmets," all right? And this is very typical, this construction whereby a single conjugated verb can govern multiple infinitives, just like in modern English, where we could say something very comparable to that and have it be basically idiomatic. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: Meaning-wise is that something that usually happened? After a battle, you just return--

ARTHUR BAHR: After what, sorry?

AUDIENCE: When I was reading the sentence, I was just thinking in my mind, is that something common that warriors did? They just returned everything they brought into battle to the lord? Or is that just--

ARTHUR BAHR: Oh, yeah, that's a good question. I think that is actually, honestly-- really, it would be much more likely to be the other way around, that the lord would give rings to the warriors rather than the warriors giving rings to the lord because a "ring-giver" is in fact a very typical kenning. Or sorry, a, well, helmet-- "distributor of treasure" is a common kenning for a lord. Yeah, Alyssa?

AUDIENCE: Is there any possibility to read this with a more metaphorical meaning, like sense of the warriors had to go to the lord and give them their protection, as in their fealty?

ARTHUR BAHR: Oh, yeah.

AUDIENCE: They're giving a symbolic-- they're giving him their protection, the other reading of *helmas.*

ARTHUR BAHR: Yes, the other reading of *helmas.*

AUDIENCE: Pledging that they will protect the lord, which seemed like a reasonable reading.

ARTHUR BAHR: I would totally accept that. I would totally accept that. I think in the plural, as a kind of-- I'm not sure how idiomatic that would be as a plural presentation. But it's totally grammatically possible. And I would accept that and give full points on the exam. Good question.

And I love, by the way, that you all are reading actively for the sense of the sentences and also for metaphorical possibilities because this will all serve you in very good stead when we get to the poetry. All right, any questions on number 2? So let's take a look then at number 3, which I'll put up while-- All right, what have we got here? Who wants to take us through their account of the sentence? Yeah, Alyssa?

AUDIENCE: Yeah, so here again, we have *þā,* meaning "then," at the beginning; *ēodon* is the past plural of "to be," so then went *fela,* which, at the time, I couldn't remember. But I could tell it was a weak adjective and [INAUDIBLE] *Eorla* is the singular nominative of-- or it could be a lot of things. But it's probably singular nominative masculine, I believe. It could also be plural other things.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah, yeah.

AUDIENCE: So it definitely means "lord" or "lords."

ARTHUR BAHR: OK. Yep, good.

AUDIENCE: *Hira ġesteallan-- hira* is a genitive plural, *ġesteallan* is "retainer" or "retainers."

ARTHUR BAHR: Good.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]. And *tō ġesēćanne* is the infinitive for "to seek" or "to visit."

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent.

AUDIENCE: So if you put it all together, you get "Then the [something] lord, which I have since looked up to be the many [INAUDIBLE] of the lord"--"of the lords"--

ARTHUR BAHR: Yes, exactly.

AUDIENCE: "Went to visit the retainers."

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent, excellent. So very good job. So the disambiguation process that we just heard is exactly the kind of process that you want to be doing on the exam in real time. So what is the most helpfully disambiguated part of the sentence? It's really this because you know that this--

AUDIENCE: And *hira.*

ARTHUR BAHR: Yes, absolutely. Yes, absolutely. I mean, and this too, right? There are multiple unambiguous forms. But in terms of the subject verb that we're always looking for first, this conjugated verb is the easiest. And we know that it's plural. So we know that we need a plural subject to go with it.

And this *fela eorla,* here, what I'm testing your ability is-- the ability I'm testing here is your ability is-- that, if we could do outtakes. Here, what I'm testing is your knowledge of the partitive genitive because you have many of earls. That's what's going on here. And this partitive genitive is all over the place in Old English, but very unidiomatic in modern English, which is precisely why I'm testing it, OK?

There's actually some question in my mind. I've used the plural ending here because I don't want this to be a trick exam. There's some question in my mind as to whether-- would they ever have used a singular verb because this is technically singular? I don't think so. I think there was always a sense that because the fullness of the subject is really plural, the verb form would be plural.

And certainly for the purposes of the exam, that is what I will do, OK? Was there a debate about this very question going on? I'm curious because I think that's a really interesting-- I might have to look it up in my giant two-volume syntax book. But all right, and then the last part that I wanted to emphasize was that this *-an* ending, which is one of our most ambiguous, you have to piece together last. So often, what you do with an *-an* is going to have to be like process of elimination once you've pieced everything else out. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: *Fela* doesn't decline, right?

ARTHUR BAHR: Correct.

AUDIENCE: Couldn't it, in theory, be the companions seeking the lords?

ARTHUR BAHR: Well, you'd have to deal with this *hira* because *hira* has to connect to *ġesteallan.* So they're companions. If you don't have an-- the only antecedent of this *hira*-- the only possible antecedent because the only preceding noun is *eorla.* I can't figure out a *way* that you would make that work. Does that make sense?

AUDIENCE: OK, yeah.

ARTHUR BAHR: Because if you make this the subject of the sentence, then *hira* has nothing to refer back to.

AUDIENCE: Well, it would be *hira ġesteallan* I think is what [INAUDIBLE].

ARTHUR BAHR: So then there-- then what does *fela eorla* do?

AUDIENCE: Can it be an object? You can just go back.

ARTHUR BAHR: "Then their companions"--

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]

ARTHUR BAHR: --"went to seek many of earls." Is that your idea? That would never be what it means based on Old English word order. But if you could articulate that grammatical logic, I would still give you points. I would still give you the maximum points because I don't think I can figure out an ironclad reason why it couldn't grammatically be true. But in terms of your knowledge of Old English, that's never what it will mean. Does that clarify?

AUDIENCE: Yeah.

ARTHUR BAHR: OK, yeah. So in some sense-- and we're actually going to get to-- but I'm really glad you asked because there's another comparably, actually less unlikely, but still pretty unlikely alternate translation of number 5 that we'll get to in a moment. So I'm really glad you asked the question.

I'll puzzle through. There may be a reason in there that I'm not seeing live unscripted why your version can't be right. But off the top of my head, I think that the indeclinable nature of this and the weak nature of this noun combined to make it theoretically possible. Although, basically, it's sort of like one of those-- I would compare it to-- so do you know the famous sentence, "Time flies like an arrow..."? What's the "time flies like an arrow" thing, Kenneth?

AUDIENCE: It's like, I guess, you follow it by saying "fruit flies like a banana."

ARTHUR BAHR: Right.

AUDIENCE: You don't know whether *flies* is a verb or noun, I guess.

ARTHUR BAHR: Right. Idiomatically, "Time flies like an arrow" means "Time proceeds in the same way that an arrow proceeds." But theoretically, it could mean "Measure the speed of flies in the same way that you measure the speed of an arrow." "Time flies like an arrow."

It could theoretically mean that flies of a particular kind, time flies, are fond of an arrow. I think there are actually like eight possible meanings that this linguist disambiguated, all of which except one are hilariously improbable but theoretically possible. I think your version maybe belongs in that illustrious list. And I will I will try to get back to you on that. So good question. Yeah, Lambert?

AUDIENCE: I was just wondering, is it because [INAUDIBLE]. Like, the infinitive is with *tō.* Or is that just--

ARTHUR BAHR: You're always going to have a *tō* for the inflected infinitive, yeah. And actually, I spelled it with an A because I didn't want to mess you up because you know the infinitive as *ġesēċan* or *ġesēcan.* But often, we've seen inflected infinitives where that A has resolved to an E, to *ġesēċenne* as opposed to *ġesēċanne.*

So on the exam, I'll give you the form as it most kind of properly exists. But it's worth knowing that inflected infinitives, as we've seen, can sometimes have an -enne ending. Good question. Others? All right, *Eall manna cynn sceal þone ēċe drihten lufian.* So who wants to take us through what the most versus least ambiguous parts of the sentence are, how you mapped your way through it? Yeah, Mike?

AUDIENCE: So *sceal*--

ARTHUR BAHR: Good. Is what?

AUDIENCE: Third person present *indicative,* right?

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent.

AUDIENCE: "Should" or "must."

ARTHUR BAHR: Yes, much more likely must. I mean, shall with a strong sense of normative obligation, so yeah. And as you could probably tell, I was trying to inhabit the mind of some Old English person when I was coming up with these sentences. Because, I mean, this is why this is one of the many reasons I have you memorize all of *Word Hoard.* It tells you so much about a culture what the most commonly appearing words in their poetic corpus is.

You're going to get so many more words for warrior. You thought *wiga* was it. Oh no, so many words. Because in an alliterating language, when you have an alliterative poetic tradition and you're talking about warriors a lot, it's very handy to have lots of words for warrior that all start with different letters, so you can just plug-- it's like plug and play into any line of Old English heroic poetry. So anyway, all that back to shall. This is a totally unambiguous word. And it's wonderful. And it means must. So very good. What else?

AUDIENCE: *Cynn* and *dryhten,* they both could be accusative or nominative.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good. So these words, by contrast, are ambiguous because they're strong masculine nouns for which the nominative and accusative forms are identical.

AUDIENCE: But we have *þone,* which we know is accusative.

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent

AUDIENCE: It seems to be agreeing with *dryhten.*

ARTHUR BAHR: Good.

AUDIENCE: Which means *cynn* should be the subject.

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent. So by process of elimination, as well as normative SVO word order, *cynn* has to be the subject. Very good.

AUDIENCE: So then *manna cynn* is like "mankind."

ARTHUR BAHR: It's like mankind. But what is it technically grammatically?

AUDIENCE: "The race [or kind] of men.

ARTHUR BAHR: Very good. And this is also very typical Old English word order. So this [OLD ENGLISH], this *-na* ending is a typical genitive plural, strong genitive plural ending. A version of the same preposition genitive object of preposition, that pattern of word order in Old English finds a parallel in this, where you have an adjective, its noun, and then a partitive genitive sandwiched in the middle. But the point is you get the same version or a similar version of this jump over the genitive that's sandwiched in the middle that you have with here in genitive object of the preposition. Good.

AUDIENCE: "All of the race of men shall *lufian*-- love"--

ARTHUR BAHR: Yep, yep.

AUDIENCE: *þone ēċe dryhten*-- "the eternal lord."

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent, excellent. And this is, again, very typical word order, where we've shunted the infinitive off to the end of the dependent clause, very comparably to what happened over here with *sceoldon ... ġiefan.* I could just as easily have put the *gān,* by the way, at the end here. And in some ways, that maybe would be more idiomatic. But I'm actually running with the whole variable word order. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: Is an infinitive shunting to the end like that more likely to be an inflected infinitive? Or is it kind of--

ARTHUR BAHR: Both, yeah. I think it's equally likely to be both.

AUDIENCE: Because I feel like we've seen more inflected infinitives at the end.

ARTHUR BAHR: You're probably right. It's probably even more common with inflected infinitives. But I would still say it's well over 50%, even with just plain old infinitives at the ends of clauses. Good question. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: When you have a conjugated verb governing two infinitives, do you ever have one inflected and one non-inflected? Or are they generally going to be both--

ARTHUR BAHR: You're only-- I mean, I'm hesitant to say you could never have such a thing. But it would be atypical. And I wouldn't give it to you on an exam. Yeah, good question. Yeah?

AUDIENCE: I guess, when I was first translating the sentence, I thought it was "All of mankind will love the lord eternally" because I remember "eternal" could also be "eternally."

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah, you're absolutely right. The reason that it's probably not, in this case, is just that it would be odd to sandwich an adverb in between a demonstrative and its noun. But you can. I mean, but it is theoretically possible. And this is actually-- I realize now in retrospect, *ēċe* is a weird word because it's kind of indeclinable.

One might suppose, oh, we should have a weak adjective ending here. But*ēċe,* for some reason, just it eternally exists on its own. So just bear in mind that normally we would expect a weak adjective ending here, which would be what? What's the accusative singular weak adjective ending?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]

ARTHUR BAHR: *-an,* exactly, *-an.* So if this were a different adjective, it would have that an ending. Good question. Yeah, adverbs are more likely going to be hanging out by themselves, not in the middle of some other phrase or clause. Good question. Others? All right, last one. I'll cannibalize sentence 1's space.

This is the hardest one. And number 5 is also going to be the hardest one on the exam. So I designedly tried to give a range of difficulties. And so I want us to go through what makes this one harder and why, nonetheless, it should be solvable, as it were.

I also want to talk about what the ambiguities are that we could construe differently. But I'm so parched, I'm going to refill my water very quickly while you contemplate that. Oh, for fuck's sake. Never mind. For some reason, I thought there was a water thingy out there. I swear there used to be. I will soldier on.

All right, what have we got going on here? Who wants to take this one? Fewer words than the other sentences, among other things, right? That's part of what makes it harder, actually. You have fewer pieces. You have fewer data points. Yeah, Kenneth?

AUDIENCE: OK, yeah. So I guess, first, you can identify the verb, which is *hēaldaþ.*

ARTHUR BAHR: Excellent. So what form is this? And how does that help us?

AUDIENCE: It ends in *-aþ.* So it has to be present plural.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yep. Good.

AUDIENCE: And then I guess the only plural thing is *magas.* So that has to be the subject. And that means "sons." And then the thing after the verb, *þā lēode,* is-- it could be either nominative accusative, I think. But in this case, it has to be accusative, since there's already a subject. So it's the people. And then *þæs cyninges-- cyninges* is a genitive singular because of the *-es* ending.

ARTHUR BAHR: Good.

AUDIENCE: And then it's kind of weird because *þæs* agreed with *cyninges* instead of *magas,* which I thought-- yeah, I thought that was kind of weird. But I guess the only way you could read it is the king's sons.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah. So the reason that *þæs* agrees with cyninges is because it's governed by *cyninges,* so "kinsmen of the king." So that's the reason. And that's one of the things that makes it hard, is that the first noun you see is not actually the subject or the object. So you have to use the unambiguous nature of this ending, that it has to be genitive singular, either masculine or neuter-- but in this case, masculine-- you have to use that unambiguous ending to help parse the rest of it. Ritam, did you have a question?

AUDIENCE: Well, both *þā lēode* and *þæs cyninges magas* are plural.

ARTHUR BAHR: Sorry?

AUDIENCE: Both of the noun phrases are plural. And both of them could be either nominative or accusative, right?

ARTHUR BAHR: So if you take a look at *Word Hoard*-- or I'll just tell you. So *lēod*-- and by the way, it's very helpful. There's a keyword index to the group. So it's not a glossary. But at the back of *Word Hoard,* you can look up particular words. And it'll take you back.

So word group 38, *lēod* can be a masculine, a strong, masculine noun, meaning "man," a plural noun, meaning "people," and also a feminine noun, meaning "a people or nation." So you have three quite distinct-- I mean, obviously related, but distinct meanings of *lēod.*

So you are quite correct that this could be plural. Actually, I don't think it can be plural. It has to be feminine singular because if it were plural-- yeah, because if it were plural, it would be *lēodas,* if it were plural men. And if it were feminine, then-- wait a second. Am I getting myself confused because I'm sleep deprived? That seems entirely possible.

AUDIENCE: I thought I remembered *lēode* just existing as a separate word in *Word Hoard.* This was plural.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah, it is plural. You're absolutely right. So this is another exceptional-- another unusual case of where the plural is going to have that ending. But as I was imagining it in my own head when I was writing it, my intent was for this to be the accusative singular feminine, the nation. So kinsmen, nominative plural kinsmen, of the king protect the accusative singular feminine nation.

AUDIENCE: That sentence makes more sense than the people-- or I mean, you could also have the other interpretation. But I guess this makes a little bit more sense.

ARTHUR BAHR: It really comes down-- and this is what I mean by idiomatic word order. It really comes down to-- it's really a version of Mike's question about sentence 3. It just would be vanishingly unlikely to have an object verb subject word order in a standard Old English sentence.

But again, this is actually one where, again, if you produced that and you could take me through how your grammatical interpretation was correct however unidiomatic, I would absolutely give full points. Good. Any questions on that one?

AUDIENCE: So I have a general question.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: On the exam, I feel like-- or seeing, recognized that some sentences have multiple possible interpretations. Should we--

ARTHUR BAHR: Yes.

AUDIENCE: --try to give what the most obvious interpretation is? Or try to give all the possible interpretations that we see?

ARTHUR BAHR: So I have tried to write an exam that does not admit of many multiple interpretations for many sentences, which is to say, I hope that you will not be running across that problem on a frequent or, indeed, regular basis on the exam. But if that happens, I would say, give me as much information as you can give me.

And this is actually a really important point about how to take the exam that I want to close on before we move on to a little bit of *Ælfric.* The reason I made the font so big on the mock exam is precisely to give you a lot of room to show your work, OK?

So if you do not know the meaning of a word-- so let's say *ēodon.* You couldn't place what that verb came from. But you recognize that it's plural past. You know it has to be the main verb, just tell me plural past, don't know what it means. And just in your translation, have it like "verb, *-ed,"* or however you do it. But just give me as much information as you can. And I will give you as many points as I can.

There are 10 points for each of these sentences. And I'll give partial credit liberally because I know that this is very, very, very challenging to do after literally one month of Old English. I think you all deserve to be very proud of yourselves for how much you've soaked in, in a very short amount of time. Does that answer your question? OK. Other questions before we move on? Yeah, go ahead.

AUDIENCE: On the exam itself, I found that I was flipping back to the very beginning with those tables of translations.

ARTHUR BAHR: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: Is that something we could just do?

ARTHUR BAHR: You absolutely can. So that's a very good question, Lambert. Yes, no. You are well within your rights to very quickly, as soon as the exam begins, reproduce the paradigms from table 1, and then use them literally as your crib to do-- so basically, you would be creating your own abbreviated form of the magic sheet in the first five minutes of the exam, and then use that to do the sight translation. Absolutely, that's a great idea and one that I have seen others do in the past.

And obviously, I mean, what takes the lion's share of time on the first closed book section of the exam is the sight translation. So you obviously want to be drilled-- I would think of your exam prep as having two phases. One is all of the memory work-- the paradigms, the vocab, the grammatical principles. Get all of that down as quickly as you can so that then you have a good 25 to 30 minutes to spend on section 4 before you go ahead and turn it in and take the timed portion of the assisted translation, where, remember, you will need your Baker, OK?

And this is a good point of advice I would give, actually. One strategic error-- or perhaps, it's tactical. I can never keep those straight. One error in judgment that I find some students make on the first exam is obsessing about the sight translation and trying to get it perfect, and then turning it in too late to get a good stab at section 5 of the mock-- or sorry, of the real exam. So I would do your best with these. But don't obsess to the point that you're spending more than the time-- significantly more than the time allotted because you'll need the rest of that time for section 5. All right?