

[SQUEAKING] [RUSTLING] [CLICKING]

**ARTHUR BAHR:** All righty. So quite a lot of reading for today and all-- almost all pretty important. The good news is that, from after today-- well, I guess it depends on whether-- I guess it's up for discussion, whether it's good news or not. But I think it's good news. We are moving from Baker to Mitchell and Robinson for your grammar readings. And most of what you're reading for Wednesday and Monday is further detail and reinforcement of what got introduced in Baker.

So Mitchell and Robinson, the chapter we're reading for our next two class sessions is-- I think it's just called Syntax. So you'll get reinforcement of a lot of the things that got introduced-- hey, Farnas-- that got introduced somewhat briefly for today.

But we'll go through chapters 9 through 12 in order, starting with the extremely brief chapter 9 about numerals, cardinal and ordinal numbers. You don't have to worry too much about these, to be perfectly honest. The most important thing to remember is that the numbers one, two, and three-- that is, the cardinal numbers, one, two, and three-- all get declined in Old English.

So one, *ān*, this is on page 95-- 97, rather. The cardinal *ān* is usually declined as a strong noun. When it is declined as weak, *āna*, it means alone. So *hē āna læg*, "he lay alone." If it is ambiguous, the form, whether it's strong or weak, which, of course, it could be, then you will need to use context to help you decide.

The cardinal numbers two and three also have their own peculiar inflectional system, shown below in table 9.1. The only real thing to note about this table is that it's laid out somewhat confusingly. The genitive and dative forms, Baker's listed the forms just under the neuter. But those apply to all the genders. So in other words, it's *twēga* or *twēgra* in the genitive of two, whether it's masculine, neuter, or feminine.

Of interest but not particular importance is the top of 98, namely the fact that starting with 70, Old English prefixes *hund-*, which actually means 100, to the numbers-- so *hundseofontiġ*, *hundehtiġ*, and so on. These curious forms seem to reflect a number system common to all the earliest Germanic languages, in which counting preceded by 12s. And 60 was a significant number in much the same way that 100 is now.

That's of cultural interest, but not something you're going to need to worry about. The number of times that you see numbers of this sort is very, very small. Any questions about numbers-- or rather, numerals, as they are properly entitled?

All right, then let's move on to chapter 10-- Adverbs, Conjunctions, and Prepositions. The good news, which Baker trumpets in his opening sentence, is that these are all indeclinable. And so that is indeed good news. I don't know that I would agree that, for that reason, they are relatively easy. That is one aspect of them that is easy. But in fact, other aspects are challenging. So we'll go through those in order.

One of the things that's challenging about adverbs is, in fact, the way that it makes-- that the adverbial form is made, namely by adding an *-e*. So to just make the regular, plain old adverb, you add an *-e* to the end. Why is this challenging? Because it is yet another thing that the *-e* ending can be.

So you'll often need to use context in order to distinguish the adverbial-*e* ending from an *-e* ending that's a form of the adjective. The *-or* and the *-ost* endings are for the comparison of adjectives on page 101. So [GARBLED]-- sorry, *lēoflicor* and *lēoflicost* from *lēoflice* is the example that they give in 12.2.1. So this is the regular comparative and the superlative forms.

10.2, switching back the page to page 100, so the most common-- you get a brief paragraph at the top of the page on another way in which adverbs can be made, namely by adding case endings to nouns. This is rare. And it's mostly in idiomatic expressions, some of which we've already seen before. So *dægēs* and *nihtes*, the genitive, that's a relic of the old genitive of time. *unðances*, "unwillingly," literally "without thanks."

And then datives, so *nēode*, literally "by need"- so that's a case of where you could actually translate it as the noun that it is. And it would have adverbial effect. *hwīlum*, literally "at times," that one is actually very common. So *hwīlum* often, in fact, I would say usually is adverbial rather than-- functions adverbially even though it's actually a noun. So be on the lookout for that one.

Common adverbs listed with a star in table 10.1-- I will draw attention, even though it's not starred, *tƿæs* in the right-hand column, the lone unstarred word in the midst of a whole list of starred ones. Afterwards, *ƿæs*, that may strike you as strange because *ƿæs*, of course, is what case of *se*?

**AUDIENCE:** [INAUDIBLE]

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Genitive. Yes, exactly, genitive, singular, masculine, or neuter. And yet, here, it seems to mean "afterwards." If you look up *ƿæs*-- and I will do it for you. If you look up *ƿæs* in Baker's glossary, then you will see that it can mean also-- so it can mean "afterwards," "accordingly," "therefore," "to that extent." *ƿæs* is a tricky word in that respect. I'm not going to give you-- on an exam, I'm not going to make *ƿæs* behave in such a way. But you should be on the lookout for it in your translations, all right?

One thing to be aware of is that the same word-- and Baker does say this. The same word can often function either as an adverb or as a subordinating conjunction, which we get to in 10.3. So the difference between these is that an adverb, like *for ƿām*-- so let's take the let's take *for ƿām* as a good example.

So as an adverb, it means "therefore"-- so literally, "for this reason." But it can also be, if you take a look to, take a quick look at 10.3-- so we're going to flip back and forth between page 100 and 102, tables 10.1 and 10.3. It can also mean "because"-- so subordinating conjunction, adverb.

All right, so the difference is that this adverb stands alone, therefore, whereas the subordinating conjunction introduces a subordinate clause that's going to need to have its own subject and verb of the subordinating clause. Often, I would say, in the prose usually, and in the poetry sometimes, they will give you a hint-- the author will give you a hint as to which is which by adding this-- by adding this indeclinable *ƿe* introducing the clause version, the subordinating conjunction version of the word or phrase.

This is something to be on the lookout for. But it's also something you shouldn't necessarily always expect. We see this, actually a similar-- for those French speakers among you, it's almost exactly the same formulation that gives us the French expression for "because," *par ce que*, "for the reason that" in medieval French. But of course, now, it's just become combined into a single expression.

Reinforcing this point that the same word or words can serve either adverbial or conjunctive functions, modern English is much more comfortable with this ambiguity. So at the bottom of page 100, Baker points out that we use, in modern English, interrogatives, like *where* and *when*, both to ask questions, like "Where do you live?" and to introduce adverb clauses, like "I know *where you live*," or adjective clauses, "on the street *where you live*."

The same is rarely true for Old English. So usually, you're going to get some indication. And usually, it's thi~~þe~~ or sometimes even the *þām* that does that. So for example, if you take a look at *æfter* on table 10.1, there, it's an adverb, which we would probably say "afterwards" in modern English.

So even in modern English, we do sometimes make a distinction between the adverbial form of a word and the conjunctive form of a word. It sounds a little strange to say, "After, he went to the store." We would usually say, "Afterwards, he went to the store." "After he went to the store" suggests that the *after* is serving as a subordinating conjunction introducing a whole clause.

In Old English, by contrast, *æfter* by itself is going to have the adverbial function comparable to *afterwards*. And if you take a look at 10.2, you see *æfter þām þe*, *æ̅r þām þe*, *for þām þe*. Those indicate the subordinating conjunctions "after," "before," and "because." But as you can see, it's not uniform because with *æ̅r*, for example, it can either have the *þām þe* or not have the *þām þe*, depending. So just be on the lookout for that. And especially if you see a *þām* or a *þām þe*, look for a clause along with it.

These starred ones, you don't have to memorize-- well, many of these are Word Hoard words. So in that sense, you do have to memorize them. You don't have to memorize them. They're not like the preterite present verbs that I said that you have to memorize. So these will only show up on the exam if they've been Word Hoard words to that point in the class.

Top of page 102, the little box with the exclamation point says explicitly what I've just been going on about. The ambiguity of some of these conjunctions with matching adverbs may optionally be resolved by adding the particle *þe*, which marks the word as a conjunction.

Sometimes, they get doubled to indicate conjunctiveness. So *swā* can mean "so" or "as." But *swā swā* always means "as," in the sense of-- in a conjunctive sense-- that is to say, as introducing an entire dependent clause, like "as the sun set" versus "as a horse" or whatever, introducing a clause versus introducing a simile, all right?

Take a look at the correlative conjunctions down at the bottom. Sorry, rather at the middle, middle-ish of page 102, the end of 10.3. Correlative conjunctions, like modern English *both ... and*, are as follows. We had *æ̅gðer ... ġe*. And in fact, I think it was *æ̅gðer ġe ... ġe* that meant "both ... and" in the passage that Mike translated a while back. *hwæðer ... oððe*, meaning "whether ... or," "not only ... but also," "neither ... nor."

And then *þȳ* and *þȳ*, that's an expression, an adverbial use of the instrumental that is actually one of the main uses of the increasingly obsolete instrumental in Old English, to have a *þȳ ... þȳ* to mean "the [blank], the [blank]," as in "The more the merrier" or "The less the better," something like that, if you're talking about something you don't like. Any questions about these adverbs and conjunctions?

All right, so correlation, we got a brief introduction to it with just that list of correlative conjunctions above 10.4. Correlation is a construction in which an adverb at the beginning of an independent clause recapitulates or anticipates an adverb clause. This happens a lot in Old English. It happens a little bit in modern English. And Baker gives you some examples.

But the examples in modern English are often either totally optional-- so for example, the example, "If you were in Philadelphia, then you must have seen Independence Hall." That *then* is totally optional. We could just as easily and probably would more naturally say, "If you were in Philadelphia, you must have seen Independence Hall."

In modern English, neither element of the coordinate of the coordination-- or sorry, rather of the correlation, neither element is optional. So you basically are just going to get used to seeing both of these, rather than just one. Sometimes, this causes difficulty when the conjunction and the adverb have the same form.

So for example, take a look at page 104, top of the page. These are very common. And this explains, by the way, way back when in week 1 of this class, when you were memorizing meanings of *þær* and *þā* and so on, this explains how the same word can mean "when" and "then."

Specifically, *þā* means "when" in the initial-- that is to say subordinative, subordinated part of the clause, and "then" in the main clause. So "When you go outside, then you will see the sun," (today at least). And similarly, *þone ... þone, þær ... þær*. Yeah?

**AUDIENCE:** Are there any obvious differences semantically or syntactically between the use of *þā* and *þone*?

**ARTHUR BAHR:** I would say *þā* is just much more common, yeah. So the more ambiguous word is the more common word, unfortunately.

**AUDIENCE:** [INAUDIBLE] over clarity.

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Yeah, exactly, concision over clarity. Are there other semantic differences? *þone ... þone*. No, not that I can think of. Good question. Others?

10.5 on prepositions, the two things I want to reinforce here-- one we previewed very slightly last time, namely the distinction between the dative and the accusative case with prepositions that can take either. Typically-- and this is in the very last part of the chapter on page 105-- typically, the dative is associated with location or stability while the accusative is associated with movement towards. This isn't a 100% rule. But I would say it's 90% to 95%.

The other thing that I want to emphasize about prepositions we've also seen a number of times. And that is how many things individual prepositions can mean, which is to say, many more things than the cognate preposition in modern English. So for example, *tō* can mean "to," "towards," "at," "for," "before," "in front," "because of," "in place of," "for the sake of," "mid," "with," "as well as," "by means of."

The other thing I would draw attention to is the difference between *mid*, which is the typical Old English word for "with," cognate with German *mit*, and *wið*, which is where we get our preposition *with*, but more often in Old English means "against" or "opposite," sometimes "towards," sometimes "in exchange for." So think *withstand*, *withhold*, the oppositional sense of the prefix in those verbs, as opposed to "with you." Any questions about prepositions or indeed anything in chapter 10 so far?

All right, concord. So concord, all this really means, chapter 11, is the agreement in gender, case, and number between different words that share a reference. So this basically just means that parts of the sentence that are grammatically related have to have the same case.

So the preposition-- sorry, not the preposition, the adjective, the demonstrative pronoun that go with a given noun are going to match that noun in gender, case, and number with the very rare exceptions that we've discussed, like second person genitives or second person possessive adjectives. So "your ring," we talked a little bit about that. That goes back to chapter 5.

**AUDIENCE:** The first and second person [INAUDIBLE].

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Yeah, exactly, sorry. It's the third person that's the-- yeah, so that exception is covered on the bottom of on page 43, 5.1.2. But other than that, that is one of the very few exceptions. The reason that this is helpful is because-- especially in the poetry, is that Old English word order is much more flexible than modern English. We've seen this before.

So bottom of page 107, Baker gives you a passage, a short passage from *Beowulf*, about the coming of Grendel-- *þæt wæs yldum cūþ þæt hie ne mōste, þā metod nolde se synscaþa under sceaðu bregdan. So hie ne mōste*, that *hie* looks initially like it's the subject of the dependent clause. It could be.

And yet, we're going to find out that-- so two things should give us pause. One is the ending of the verb, which has to be singular. The other thing that's even more unambiguous is the *se* in the next line, *se synscaþa*. We know that that has to be the subject. So very often in translating-- in fact, I think almost always-- you should be thinking about translating clause for clause or sentence for sentence rather than word by word because the words themselves are going to have a more flexible order than they do in modern English.

Turning the page to 108, sometimes, in situations where modern English uses a pronoun subject-- so like "he," "they," "she"-- the Old English finite verb can sometimes express the subject all by itself. And then there are three examples there of that very phenomenon, namely having an unexpressed subject that's contained within or rather implied within the verb itself.

This rarely happens, I would say quite rarely happens in prose. And I will not give you a version of this on any of the exams. But especially as we move into the poetry for our own translations in class, you'll want to keep an eye out for this possibility.

Bottom of the page-- or rather, bottom half of page 108, compound subjects may be split in Old English, one part divided from the others by the verb or some other sentence fragment. So we basically, I think, never do this in modern English. So a compound subject is like "*He and his friends* went to the movies."

We would never say "He went to the movies and his friends," because without the benefit of case endings, that makes it sound like we have not a compound subject, but rather a compound object. He went, somehow in some sense, to the movies and also went to his friends. In Old English, because of the presence of case endings, however ambiguous they sometimes are, Old English is prepared to split up a compound subject.

Sometimes, quite dramatically, when it does so-- and this is worth highlighting. When this happens-- so the paragraph beginning, "Compound subjects may be split in Old English," next sentence, "When this happens, the verb will typically agree with the first part of the subject." So in the case that I gave you of "He"-- if we separated this such that it were-- let's see, "He, to the movies, went and his friends," what would this verb-- what form would this verb take, singular or plural?

**AUDIENCE:** [INAUDIBLE]

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Singular, exactly. What would the verb be, by the way? What is the third singular of "went"? Anyone got it ready to hand?

**AUDIENCE:** [INAUDIBLE]

**ARTHUR BAHR:** *ēode*, very good, excellent. If, by contrast, we simply reversed them-- His friends to the movies went and he"-- then it would be *ēodon*. Right? Good.

**AUDIENCE:** It sounds so cursed.

**ARTHUR BAHR:** It sounds what?

**AUDIENCE:** Because we still have case endings for our pronouns in English, the reverse of this sounds so much more cursed. To attempt to say in modern English, his friends went to the movies and he is just--

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Oh, "cursed," you mean in the sense of awkward?

**AUDIENCE:** Yeah.

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Oh, OK. I thought you meant it literally sounded like a curse.

**AUDIENCE:** No, in the casual slang sense.

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Oh, I'm so glad to learn the casual slang sense of "cursed." This is how I learn things, how the youth speak in today's vernacular. No, that is interesting. And you're right, cursed. All right, good, excellent. Impersonal verbs-- we've talked a little bit about this in the context of *þencan*, so *þencan* taking an impersonal subject.

So where was that? It was in, oh, *be þām þe hire þūhte*, "according to what it seemed to her," namely Eve, that fruit of the tree seemed good to eat. The only thing really to know about this is that Old English has significantly more impersonal verbs than modern English. In fact, many languages have more impersonal verbs than modern English.

"To dream," "to be hungry," these are some examples-- "to long for," at the top of page 110. Bottom line here is just feel free to translate colloquially into how we would actually express it in modern English and not be-- don't be too tethered to a literal translation of the grammar.

Pronouns and antecedents-- we've already seen a good example of where you have to translate a masculine or feminine pronoun as the neuter, simply because of how modern English uses grammatical gender, which is to say barely at all. So remember, in *The Miracle of Saint Benedict*, *se, se stān*, we did a lot of talking about "the stone," that is, the masculine stone.

So when we subsequently refer to the stone using a pronoun, we had to use *hē*, because the stone itself is masculine grammatically. But you would go ahead and translate it as it because we would never talk about a stone as-- well, I shouldn't say never. People talk about a lot of things. We would most typically not talk about a stone as being masculine.

And then nouns and modifiers-- a noun and all its modifiers must agree in gender, case, and number. This sounds straightforward. And indeed, it is straightforward. But the reason that it's important to remember is that if you turn the page to the top of 112, the adjective is frequently separated from its noun, even in prose, and especially in poetry.

When this happens, the rules of concord will help you match up the adjective with its noun. And there's an example here from the Old English poem, "Judith." It's talking about "the wavy-haired one." This is when she's about to chop off Holofernes' head. And well, she cuts his head halfway off. "Then the wavy-haired one struck the hostile-minded enemy with a decorated sword so that she cut through half of his neck."

And if you take a look up to the Old English, *Slōh ðā wundenlocc þone fēondsceaðan fāgum mece*, There's a good example of a dative of instrumentality. And it's also a good example, *fāgum mece*. Why is *fāgum*-- why doesn't *fāgum* look like *mece*, even though they go together?

**AUDIENCE:** [INAUDIBLE]

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Excellent. *fāgum* is a dative singular masculine strong adjective.

**AUDIENCE:** Is that the decorated sword?

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Yes, that's the decorated sword, exactly. And then *heteponcolne*-- There, the *-poncolne* and the *healfne* go together and thus have the same ending, despite being separated in the sentence.

All right. When participles are inflected-- so take a look at the very bottom of that, just above 11.5, that last paragraph. Past and present participles are often inflected as adjectives even when they form periphrastic verb forms. So in other words, basically, all this means is that participles-- well, participles often get declined in Old English in a way that they do not get declined in modern English.

One thing to note, when they are inflected, the ending -e is added to the nominative and accusative plural of all genders and may occasionally be omitted. So just keep a slightly flexible eye out for participial forms. But again, not something I'm going to test you on, on an exam, all right?

And then bad grammar, 11.5-- all that really means-- all that Baker's really going into is that sometimes when the sentences get especially complicated or often the author gets especially heated or especially excited about something, they lose track of their case endings. And that's fine. Don't worry too much about it.

All right. Let's quickly go through chapter 12. So you're going to get a lot more on word order. If you thought that the treatment was rather cursory, it is. You're going to get more on word order when we dive into syntax next time for Mitchell and Robinson.

But the quick start is that most often, modern English has an SVO-- subject, verb, object-- word order, just like modern English. That's handy. And about 2/3 of the way down page 116, "If the clause has both a direct and an indirect object and one of them is a pronoun, the pronoun comes first." This is just like in modern English. So here, you may hear that "He gives us the power." *Us* is the indirect object. It's a pronoun. So it comes first. *Power* is the direct object. And so it comes second.

All right, 12.3, this is where it starts to get trickier. So verb subject word order is common in independent clauses introduced by the adverbs *pā, pone, pæ̃r, panan, bider* and the negative adverb *ne* and the conjunctions *and, ond, and ac*.

We've had a preview of this before. And I've mentioned it as well. This is related to the fact that Old English in independent clauses very much wants-- has a preference for the conjugated verb to be the second element of the sentence. So if that first element is taken by the subject, all's well and good. The verb naturally takes the second position.

If, by contrast, it's introduced by an adverb, then, more often, the verb is going to be second. And you'll get the subject. Again, most often the subject will be the third element, as in the examples below. Very occasionally, this word order, this VS word order, also appears in independent clauses not introduced by an adverb. So *wæ̃ron hie ac swīpe druncene*, et cetera, that's quite unusual. So it can happen. But typically, it's going to happen for the other reasons.

12.4-- subject, dot, dot, dot, verb-- this is commonly found in subordinate clauses and clauses introduced by *and, ond, or ac*. This sort of is related to-- well, I shouldn't say with confidence that it's related to. It's parallel to and seems likely related to the fact that German also tends to put the conjugated verb at the end of a dependent clause.

So we see examples. Yeah, bottom of 119-- "If you find you're having difficulty locating the end of a clause and the word order appears to be subject, dot, dot, dot verb, consider the possibility that the finite verb marks the end of the clause." My memory from my dim, dim memories of having studied German is that that's a pretty hard and fast rule in modern German.

**AUDIENCE:** There's a unifying linguistic theoretical treatment of why it's subject verb or something verb in non-subordinate clauses [INAUDIBLE] the end of the subordinate clause. If you look up V2 syntax--

**ARTHUR BAHR:** V2 syntax?

**AUDIENCE:** It makes sense.

**ARTHUR BAHR:** OK, excellent. And by the way, this was something that I wanted to run by folks. Often, I get asked technical or even sometimes not very technical linguistic questions that I just don't know the answer to. I'm totally-- I would love to come up with some sort of system of-- I don't know-- extra credit or something where those of you who have an interest in these questions that I can't answer-- I think somebody-- I think it was you, Alyssa, said I think there's research out there. We could find the answer. If you all want to find the answers to some of these questions-- I don't remember what the question. It was--

**AUDIENCE:** [INAUDIBLE]

**ARTHUR BAHR:** Yeah, exactly. I think it was something you asked, Lambert, about the word order of negatives. Yeah, just let me know if anyone wants to do a deep or even shallow dive on that. I would love to get a folder of answers to questions that I get asked so that future students will have the benefits of your wisdom. And I promise to give credit where credit is due.



Where was I going with this? Oh, right. It's less of a rule in Modern English-- or sorry, in Old English. But it is a marked tendency. And this is something that I will expect you to have some comfort level with in the sight translation on the exam. But don't worry too much about it just yet. We're going to get more detail on word order when we turn to Mitchell and Robinson's treatment of syntax for Wednesday and next Monday.

All right, bottom of 12-- sorry, bottom of 119, 12.5, correlation-- "When a subordinate clause and an independent clause are correlated and are introduced by an ambiguous conjunction adverb pair, especially *pā ... pā*, *þone ... þone* and *þær ... þær*, you can usually tell the subordinate clause from the independent clause by looking at the word order. In this situation, the tendency of the independent clause is to have the VS word order. And the subordinate clause is more likely to have SV or S, dot, dot, dot, V word order."

So there are some good examples in the little boxed section at the bottom of 120 that you can take a look at. Unfortunately, this rule does not work in poetry. In prose, it will work most of the time, but you cannot count on it absolutely. So be aware of the tendency, but don't expect to be a hard and fast rule.

The last part of chapter 12, which is actually fairly-- well, I guess you all can decide how tricky it is. But it is quite common is something called anticipation. So the technical explanation is as follows. "When a noun clause functions as a subject or an object, it must follow the verb. But often a pronoun, usually *þæt* but sometimes *hit*, appears before the verb anticipating the coming clause," hence the term. "This pronoun occurs in the position that a pronoun subject or object would normally take."

So the examples here are helpful. So *geheald þū þy mīn word*, so "hold fast my words and don't tell them to any other man," *gif þæt should gelimpe*-- sorry, *gif þæt gelimpe*, So "If that should occur" or "should happen"-- notice the use of the subjunctive, *gelimpe*, for the potential.

"If it should happen that you speak with him"-- now, that's a case where the anticipation actually translates pretty well into modern English. We would say-- or at least, we could say something pretty similar. The next example is much less readily translated literally. So *Hē Drihten þæt ongeat*-- So "He, the Lord, perceived that." That's the first independent clause.

[OLD ENGLISH]. So that first italicized *þæt* is basically a dummy word that alerts us to the fact, alerts the reader to the fact that there's going to be this long dependent clause, which is actually a noun clause. It's the object of the verb "saw," the object of the verb *geseah*, all right?

This is actually very, very common. We're going to see examples in the prose and also in the poetry. So you'll learn to get comfortable with this by-- you'll learn by doing, which is the leitmotif of this class. But in those cases, you do not have to translate the introductory, dummy *þæt*, all right?

And then periphrastic verbs-- modern English generally keeps the auxiliary and the verbals together. Although, we sometimes separate them with an adverbial element. So "I will come quickly." We could say, and often do, "I will quickly come." But that's about the extent of it. That's about as far as modern English is willing to tolerate a separation of the auxiliary and the verbal.

Old English, by contrast-- and you can see some examples on page 122-- is perfectly happy to have quite a distance between the two parts of the verb. Just keep an eye out for that. So you have examples of all three of the word orders that we've discussed-- subject verb, verb subject, and subject, dot, dot, dot, verb. But other than that, that's about it for word order for today. But like I said, we're going to get more for Wednesday. Any questions on any of this? All righty.