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The Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* survives as only a fragment of a popular medieval romance which is recorded in numerous Latin manuscripts. Approximately half the story is missing; therefore, studies of this prose romance are usually restricted to linguistic and stylistic analyses. Hence this study focuses on the word order of phrases and clauses and on features of style apparent in the Old English version, with comparison to the Latin source where significant divergences occur.

Chapter I furnishes a background for this study. Here are provided a general description of the manuscript and the fragmentary story and an overview of the previous studies of *Apollonius*. In addition, a general history of the study of Old English syntax and style is provided. This chapter clarifies the need for a close study of word order and style in *Apollonius*, the aim of which is to identify its translator and place of translation.
Chapter II illustrates the general conformity of word order in *Apollonius* to that of classical West Saxon of the late Old English period (ca. 1000-1150). Phrases are analyzed first, followed by principal and subordinate clauses.

Chapter III compares the Old English translation with the Latin original, as determined by Peter Goolden in his parallel text edition. It identifies additions, omissions, paraphrases, and mistranslations, and suggests reasons for the differences between the two versions.

Chapter IV proposes the theory that at least two translators rather than one made the original Old English translation. This theory is substantiated by identifying several clear shifts in style after p. 140 of the manuscript, most notably in the word order of certain clauses and phrases and in the morphology of several words. Even though the evidence suggests two translators, their identities and the place of translation still remain beyond discovery. This study therefore concludes with a call for renewed interest in these questions.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Old English translation of the Latin Apollonius of Tyre survives in two fragments bound in MS. Corpus Christi College Cambridge 201, pp. 131-45. Unfortunately, the manuscript breaks off after the end of p. 142, and pp. 143-45 bring to a close a narrative over half of which is lost, as may be ascertained by comparison with the complete story recorded in numerous surviving Latin versions.¹ This translation is a mid-eleventh century copy of a slightly earlier Old English translation of a lost Latin text.² The roots of the medieval Latin story ultimately reach back to a third century A.D. Greek original, also lost. Thus, the story was already circulated in the Greek and Roman world long before it was translated into English. Its enduring

²Goolden, p. xxxiv.
appeal for English audiences of different tastes and times is shown by two Middle English metrical versions in the fourteenth century, the more important of which was included in Book 8 of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*;\(^3\) by its early seventeenth century revision as Shakespeare's *Pericles* (1608) and by Lillo's *Marina* (1738), a revision of the Elizabethan play. Peter Goolden, the modern editor of *Apollonius*, has aptly described it as "the one story in English literature designed primarily for amusement and pleasure, that continued to be read and rehandled in Old, Middle, and Modern English."\(^4\)

Most Old English prose survives in the form of chronicles, charters, writs, and sermons, the literature of information, law, and instruction. Yet the translation of *Apollonius* testifies to the presence of the literature of escape as well. In fact, in addition to *Apollonius*, there also survive two prose echoes of Oriental romances, the

---


\(^4\)Goolden, p. xiii.
fictional Letter of Alexander to Aristotle and The Wonders of the East, both of which are bound with the Beowulf manuscript in Cotton Vitellius A. xv. These two rather uncouth productions describing the marvels of the faraway world are of slight literary value. However, the existence of these two works and of Apollonius suggests that "the Anglo-Saxons did not always wish to be reminded of the world around them or the one to come." Indeed, one of the major attractions of Apollonius to Old English scholars is precisely as an indication of the evident popularity of the prose romance during the pre-Conquest period of English literary history, an era presumably dominated in fiction by alliterative heroic poetry. The plot of Apollonius, derived from Greek and Roman sources, is entirely foreign to Old English heroic literature as exemplified by such characteristic Germanic productions as Beowulf, Caedmonian and Cynewulfian poetry, and The Battle of Maldon.

This story relates the several misfortunes and final joy of Apollonius, a young ealdorman of Tyre. However, the narrative begins with an episode describing the incestuous

---

5 Goolden, p. xxv.
love of Antiochus for his daughter. In order to keep her privately for himself, Antiochus poses a riddle to be solved by any suitor clever enough to win her hand in marriage. However, it matters not whether any of the suitors solves it, because he is treated "swa same swa se ðe hine ariht ne rædde" (4, 26-27)--he is beheaded. In this way the father evidently proposes to eliminate all possible sons-in-law and enjoy his daughter "to gemæccan" (2, 12). Apollonius enters the narrative in Chapter 4 and solves the riddle; however, Antiochus claims that Apollonius is "feor fram rihte" (6, 27) and grants him thirty days more time in which to solve the riddle. After Apollonius departs, puzzled at the apparent failure of his wisdom, Antiochus sets in motion plans to have him killed. When those plans fail, he lays a bounty on the life of Apollonius: fifty pounds of gold to anyone who captures him alive or one hundred pounds to anyone who brings in his head. When Apollonius learns the news of his doom, he flees to Tarsus, where he saves the town from a dire famine. From Tarsus he sets sail for Pentapolis of Cyrene, arriving there the sole survivor of a violent seastorm, bereft of companions, clothes, and money. However, as in many such medieval
romances, his nobility shines through his destitute exterior, and while there he so impresses King Arcestrates and his maiden daughter with his athletic ability, courtesy, and knowledge that, at her insistence, he is taken on as her tutor. Soon she falls in love with him, and somewhat later he awakens to the fact that he loves her also. The manuscript breaks off at the point where the king learns of their love and begins to plan their wedding. When it resumes, the time is many years later, and the setting is Ephesus, where Apollonius, his wife Arcestrate, and their daughter are reunited at the temple of Diana after many years of separation and because of fate and the treachery of false friends. At the close of the narrative the evil characters are punished, the "helpers" who showed mercy to the principals are rewarded, and all live happily ever after.

Certain details of the plot as just described clearly indicate the foreign climate of the story. First, and most obvious, is the setting of the narrative in the Middle East. More importantly, though, there are several rather un-Germanic details in the story. Apollonius' flight from the certain death that Antiochus had decreed (Chap. 6)
violates the code of heroism espoused by Leofsunu in Maldon:

"Ic þæt gehæte, þæt ic heonan nelle / fleðn fōtes trym, ac wille furðor gan . . . ."\(^6\) His weeping after relating his tale of misfortune to King Arcestrates (Chap. 16) appears to violate the stoicism of the Wanderer poet. And the whole matter of Princess Arcestrate's swooning lovesickness and Apollonius' blushing recognition of it (Chaps. 17-21) is unique in Old English literature, belonging rather to the mode of the later courtly romances and anticipating the behavior of Troilus in Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde.

It is quite apparent, then, that this is no Anglo-Saxon adaptation of a foreign story on the order of the Old English Judith or Dream of the Rood. There is almost no distinctive Anglo-Saxon element present in the narrative. That this story was translated into Old English at all raises some questions regarding its entrance into English literature during the Old English period. The translator must have recognized the moral applicability of the story,\(^6\)

if one assumes that there was a monkish hand in its preservation. And indeed, the story of Apollonius, like Beowulf, has much to say about how one should live. Like Beowulf, it sets up a dichotomy between good and bad kingship, in the persons of Arcestrates and Antiochus. It also presents models of virtuous and immoral love, natural and unnatural family relationships, and righteous and unrighteous conduct. As stated earlier, the translation of this courtly tale, belonging more properly to the "Matter of Rome," also suggests the popularity in England of the romance, the pure adventure story, fully a century before its development on the continent. However, since Apollonius of Tyre is the only surviving specimen of prose fiction (indeed, the first "novel" in English), the many questions it raises are not likely to be answered; questions concerning the number of and demand for such foreign stories in England and the responsibility for their preservation and circulation. Whatever may remain unknown about Apollonius, it occupies the unique position in the literary heritage of the Anglo-Saxons

as the only surviving example of dramatic prose fiction in Old English. It has been justly described by one scholar as "the most notable piece of late secular prose" in Old English and by another as "something approaching a masterpiece in its kind."  

Since more than half the manuscript has been lost, it is difficult to assess the overall literary merit of the Old English *Apollonius*. A fragmentary manuscript is thus more likely to be the subject of linguistic and stylistic studies rather than of thematic studies. This is in fact the case with *Apollonius*. There have appeared a number of linguistic studies focusing entirely or partially on the work, among them two articles proposing emendations and new readings. One is Zupitza's "Verbesserung und Erklärungen," in which he proposes several emendations of the text, most of which are corrections of Thorpe's transcriptions and glosses. All of these emendations have been


10 *Anglia*, 1 (1878), 463-67.
adopted in Goolden's edition. The other article is O. F. Emerson's "Notes on Old English," half of which he addresses to some textual problems in *Apollonius*. Emerson proposes new readings for these passages, based largely upon comparison with the Latin text. Many of his readings support the punctuation proposed by Zupitza; however, in one instance he proposes a rather wrong-headed reading that was wisely ignored by all later commentators.

Three of the four remaining linguistic studies of *Apollonius* compare Old English participial constructions with those of the Latin version. In his 1893 study of the absolute participle in the Old English *Apollonius*, Frank H. Chase showed that only a few Latin ablative absolutes are translated as absolute participles in the Old English *Apollonius*, evidence which strongly indicates the resistance of Old English to the influence of Latin. Emily Helm's later study of the same construction covers much the

---

11 *Modern Language Notes*, 38 (1923), 266-72.

12 Compare Emerson's reading of *nas git yfel wif* (30, 30-31) on p. 271 of his article with Goolden's commentary on the passage, p. 57.

13 "The Absolute Participle in the Old English 'Apollonius'," *Modern Language Notes*, 8 (December, 1893), 243-45.
same ground as that of Chase,14 and, like the previous study, hers makes reference to Morgan Calloway's study, The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon.15 Helming verifies Calloway's contention that the Old English absolute participle was probably borrowed from Latin but "failed to recommend itself to our forefathers and never acquired a real hold on the language."16 The remaining study of the Old English participle in Apollonius is A. R. Wedel's recent study of participial constructions in High German and Old English, including many examples from Apollonius.17 Finally, Paul Pillsbury uses Apollonius for examples in his analysis of discourse in late West Saxon texts.18

14 "The Absolute Participle in the Apollonius of Tyre," Modern Language Notes, 45 (March 1930), 175-78.
15 Diss. Johns Hopkins, 1889.
16 Cited in Helming, p. 175.
18 Descriptive Analysis of Discourse in Late West Saxon Texts (The Hague: Mouton, 1967).
The translation has been generally defended and lauded as an achievement of Old English prose style. In a brief discussion of the Old English translation which concludes his study of the narrative material of the Greek and Latin versions, Philip Goepp has defended the Old English *Apol·lonius* from E. Kelbs' charge that it shows "eine gewisse Unbeholfenheit des Ausdruckes"\(^{19}\) by laying the responsibility for its relative clumsiness on the Latin version from which the translator worked. Yet he identifies some examples from the Old English version which are clearly superior to the style of the Latin. He summarizes:

The Latin, as I have said, is essentially meagre, but it is also falsely elegant—a literary genteel poverty. The English, as a close translation, must necessarily share this poverty, but here the simplicity is real.\(^{20}\)

C. L. Wrenn, in his book-length study of Old English literature, states emphatically, "The handling of the Latin by the maker of the Old English *Apol·lonius* . . . is excellent in that he has produced a masterpiece in an exactly

\(^{19}\) *Die Erzählung von Apollonius aus Tyrus* (Berlin, 1899, p. 132.

\(^{20}\) "The Narrative Material of *Apol·lonius of Tyre*," *ELH*, 5 (1938), 172.
appropriate prose style." However, Wrenn does not and
cannot elaborate on the features of this "exactly appro-
priate prose style" because his study is only a survey of
Old English literature.

Although there has been a special interest in the
subject of participial constructions in *Apollonius*, sur-
prisingly little extensive analysis of either the language
or the style of the Old English translation has been pub-
lished. Perhaps this dearth of studies owes partially to
the rather unremarkable nature of the manuscript, which
has been described by N. R. Ker in his *Catalogue of Manu-
scripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, where he fails to note
anything unusual about it. He writes that it is a "close
translation" copied in the dominant hand of four responsi-
ble for transcribing pp. 1-178, the hand which accounts
for all but seventeen of the pages. Goolden notes that
the handwriting "has no distinguishing marks which might
attribute it to any 'school' or area." The language,

21 Wrenn, p. 256.

22 Ker, p. 90.

23 Goolden, p. xxxiii.
too, is rather undistinguished, being classical Old English of the late West Saxon period, with few dialectal forms, none exclusively Anglian. Thus the original translation may be placed somewhere in the south of England. Another reason for the lack of extensive studies of Apollonius may be that it is, however interesting, after all only a fragment of a complete story. So far as I have determined, only one article has been published which devotes itself to criticism of the narrative. Morton Donner discusses what he labels as the "prudery" of the Old English scribe, who deliberately toned down references to explicit sexuality or love in two passages, the first of which describes Antiochus' rape of his daughter (Chap. 1) and the second of which describes Arcestrate's love-sickness over Apollonius (Chap. 18). In spite of its incomplete state, the Old English Apollonius still furnishes the scholar with enough material for studies of theme, plot, and characterization. Another reason for the lack of extensive studies of

24 Goolden, p. xxxiv.

Apollonius is probably the conclusion that the Old English is a "close translation" of its Latin source, which may sound like the last word on the subject. In his edition, Goolden nevertheless catalogues most of the variations between the Latin and Old English versions to demonstrate the quality of the Old English translation. For any or all of the reasons cited above, Apollonius has received relatively little critical notice since it was first edited by Benjamin Thorpe in 1834.

The most extensive work which has been done to date on Apollonius is that published by Goolden on pp. xx-xxxiv in the "Introduction" to his edition of the Old English translation and parallel conflated Latin text. Goolden's commentary on the style of the Old English version is general rather than exhaustive, consisting of general discussions followed by selected examples of additions, omissions, paraphrases, and mistranslations. His comprehensive footnotes provide the line numbers of all other additions, omissions, etc., but they are only lists of line numbers. His explanatory notes following the text are extensive, too, but it is not his purpose there to present a comprehensive discussion of stylistic agreement and variance between the
Old English translation and the Latin original. In short, the Old English *Apollonius* is overdue for an extensive study of syntax and style.

The study of Old English sentence structure, long a neglected field, has flourished since the publication of S. O. Andrew's *Syntax and Style in Old English* in 1940.\(^{26}\) Indeed, before the publication of Andrew's book there existed no full-length discussion of the subject.\(^{27}\) Etsko Kruisinga had written in 1926 that it was "strange that there should be no book of any type, whether advanced or elementary, on Old English syntax."\(^{28}\) As late as 1936, George W. Small noted that there was still no adequate method of conducting syntactic research in Old English.\(^{29}\) Perhaps the major reason for the lack of extensive studies


\(^{27}\) With the exception of Johann Wulfing's *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreeds des Grossen* (Bonn, 1894-1901). However, this study is limited to early Old English prose, a far remove from the more ornate style that resulted from the Benedictine Renaissance of the tenth century.

\(^{28}\) "How to Study Old English Syntax," *English Studies*, 8 (1926), 44.

of Old English syntax to 1940 was the assumption that Old English was primarily a synthetic language, one dependent mainly upon inflections for carrying meaning in sentences rather than on word order. In an article published in 1940, Charles C. Fries had concluded that "in Old English . . . the order of words in such sentences (actor-action-goal or subject-verb-object) has no bearing whatever upon the grammatical relationship involved."\(^{30}\) An example of this synthetic nature of Old English is offered by Myers and Hoffman in a popular textbook, The Roots of Modern English. They offer *Him saw I* as an illustration of the contrast between the linguistic signals of Old and Modern English.\(^{31}\) A speaker of Old English understood *Hine geseah ic* upon perceiving the *-ne* (accusative) inflection, whereas a speaker of Modern English translating this statement can render it intelligible only by transposing the word order to read *I saw him* (in Old English, *ic geseah hine*). However, Myers and Hoffman acknowledge the general similarity of word order between Old and Modern English.

\(^{30}\) "On the Development of the Structural Use of Word-Order in Modern English," *Language*, 16 (1940), 199.

Indeed, it has been clearly demonstrated in the past four decades that the word order of Old English is basically that of Modern English. Early philologists had suggested the influence of Latin on Old English word order, citing the general features of the Indo-European languages, especially of Greek and Latin. Since Latin was a highly-inflected language, it was only natural to assume that Old English was also highly inflected. Although evidence to the contrary was rather slow in coming, it finally arrived through Henry Sweet, one of the first scholars to consider the question of Latin influence on Old English:

In tracing the development of O. E. prose, the interesting question arises, How far must the influence of Latin models be taken into consideration? In other words, Can the numerous translations of Latin works, especially the translations of Alfred, be regarded as faithful representations of the natural utterance of the translators? There seem to be strong reasons for answering this question in the affirmative . . . .

S. O. Andrew made the most significant contribution to the study of Old English syntax with the publication of *Syntax and Style in Old English*. He outlined and elaborated on the "orders" of Old English and the limitations on them.

Andrew establishes three types of order found in Old English sentences: common order, conjunctive order, and demonstrative order. A fuller discussion of these orders is reserved for a later chapter; a brief outline of them will suffice for the present discussion. "Common order" is described as subject-verb-object-adverb (when the last two occur), and it is the type to be found in principal sentences—i.e., non-compound, non-complex sentences, such as

\[
\text{Se cyning besæt hie on ære ceastre. 'The king besieged them in the city.'}
\]

"Conjunctive order" is Andrew's label for the order usually found in coordinated and in subordinate clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ba he hie him eft ægeaf} & \quad \text{‘when he them to him again gave’} \\
\text{bar hie se cyning besæt} & \quad \text{‘where them the king besieged’} \\
\text{ond he gewundad wæs} & \quad \text{‘and he wounded was’} \\
\text{ac he hine feor forwæc} & \quad \text{‘but he him far banished’}
\end{align*}
\]

Its distinguishing mark is the verb-final arrangement, and its usual order is conjunction-subject-object-verb, although, as in the second example above, the object may precede the subject. "Demonstrative order" contrasts sharply with conjunctive order, as Andrew illustrates:

\[
\text{Da andswarode he him ‘Then answered he him’}
\]
Dorrne cymb se Antecrist. 'Then shall come the Anti-Christ.'

Dar besæt hie se cyning. 'There besieged them the king.'

Here one notices the position of the verb as the first element following the demonstrative adverb. Of course, the above is an over-simplification of Andrew's analysis and does not account for questions, negatives, emphatic statements, and special syntactic relationships. Nevertheless, it provides a concise summary of Andrew's three basic word orders.

Bruce Mitchell confirms Andrew's three orders in his Guide to Old English. In a rather full discussion of syntax, rare among basic grammars of Old English, he identifies essentially the same three arrangements and notes possible variations, as does Andrew.


where he also discusses the three basic clause structures: the SVO, SOV, and VSO structures. However, his consideration of the structures is necessarily brief in a book with so broad a scope as the history of English prose from the earliest times to the present.

Elizabeth Traugott covers the subject of Old English word order in her *History of English Syntax*, a case-grammar approach to diachronic linguistics. In her section on Old English word order she, too, identifies the same three types of word order.

Thus, previous syntactical research has established the general rules governing the ordering of words in Old English sentences. These studies have shown that although Old English was indeed an inflected language, the ordering of elements in an Old English sentence was by no means as free as it was in Latin. In order to illustrate the freedom of Latin, Gordon provides the following line from Latin verse:

\[\text{Nec amara Tibullo tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae.} \]

"Nor bitter with Tibullus time friendship fate to

grant my.' (Literal) 'Nor did bitter fate grant the time for my friendship with Tibullus.'

Gordon notes that "the firm links of concord in gender, number, and case leave no opportunity for ambiguity."\(^{37}\) However, even in the earliest extant Old English documents, word order was already rather fixed and already noticeably "modern," so that a "free" syntax such as in the Latin passage cited above would be quite impossible even in early Old English.

In his 1938 dissertation, Frederic G. Cassidy had written that, as early as 900, "when case-distinction is still strong, the word order patterns found in Modern English were already well established, at least in their parts."\(^{38}\) He goes on to state: "By c. 1050, then, the word-order in the major Old English pattern is already over 75\% the same as in the modern pattern."\(^{39}\)

These discussions of syntax all reinforce the idea that Old English, though an inflected language, was


\(^{39}\)Cassidy, p. 87.
nevertheless dependent upon word-order signalling as well. Moreover, the structure of later Old English prose is more recognizable to the Modern English speaker than is that of early Old English. And the influence of Latin syntax on Old English is minimal, although, as will be shown later, the influence of the Latin rhetoricians may have been heavy in the work of Alfric and Wulfstan. Hence, an analysis of phrase and clause structures in *Apollonius of Tyre* should verify the findings of earlier scholars.

"A style is a way of writing," writes one recent critic. "And that is almost as much as one can say with assurance on the subject. . . ."40 Stylistic studies tend to be less systematic and sometimes less rigorous than descriptive syntactic analyses, yet there exist several excellent models of Old English stylistic studies, particularly in the field of prose and especially of the great prose stylists writing between the latter quarter of the tenth and the first half of the eleventh centuries. These studies concern the work of Alfric (ca. 955-1020), Abbot of Eynsham, and Wulfstan (d. 1023), Archbishop of York.

The writings of Ælfric have commanded the attentions of Old English scholars ever since Thorpe edited the two-volume collection of Anglo-Saxon homilies (1844-1846) which contains Ælfric's homilies and their translations. Until 1925 most critics agreed that Ælfric's rhythmic, highly formal prose style was influenced by Old English poetry. However, Gordon Gerould changed the course of Ælfrician studies in 1925 by arguing that Ælfric's alliterative and rhythmic style was influenced not by Old English verse but rather by Latin prose. Dorothy Bethurum defended the earlier view seven years later by arguing convincingly that there is little direct borrowing from Latin sources apparent in Ælfric's work. These two positions represent the poles of Ælfric studies, having been adopted and defended

41 The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church, 2 vols.


by distinguished scholars on both sides. However, the weight of support is against Gerould's position, though not entirely in favor of Bethurum's.

Kemp Malone accepts Gerould's conclusions in his section of Baugh's Literary History of England. But Angus McIntosh, writing in "Wulfstan's Prose," rejects Gerould's argument in a terse note. John C. Pope and Frances Lipp both deny the influence of Latin rhetoric, Lipp concluding her lengthy argument by stating confidently:

The hypothesis that the alliterative and rhythmical framework of lfric's Old English prose is in any direct way a consequence of an effort to reproduce in his own language the effects of rhyme and rhythm in Latin prose is, in the face of the evidence, scarcely tenable.

In addition to those critics who accept or reject Gerould's

---


46 (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 1-34. This is a separately printed extract from Proceedings of the British Academy, 35 (1949), 109-42.

47 Pope, pp. 108-09.


49 Lipp, p. 718.
argument, there are those who take a position in the middle. Stanley B. Greenfield accepts neither position in his Critical History of Old English Literature, and Peter Clemoes perceives evidence of the influences of both Latin prose and Old English poetry in the work of Ælfric.

At stake in this controversy is the integrity and continuity of Old English syntax and style during the Benedictine Renaissance, which began about 960, and which, through its subsequent influence on prose style, lasted through the Norman Conquest. Certainly, at least some general influence of Latin on Ælfric's prose style can be detected, as even Bethurum and Lipp point out; however, as Lipp concludes, the end result is a style which is distinctively Ælfric's.

Archbishop Wulfstan, a contemporary and friend of Ælfric, is the other great prose stylist of the early

52 Athelwold's translation of the Rule of St. Benedict (ca. 960-970) marks the beginning of the monastic revival known as the Benedictine Renaissance.
53 Lipp, p. 718.
eleventh century. Like Ælfric and the unknown composers of Latin and vernacular charters and writs during this period, he exhibits "the fondness of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries for ornate language and ... skill in turning it to oratorical uses." In some respects, the styles of Ælfric and Wulfstan are similar, as can be determined by their habits of using two-stress units of rhythm, in all probability borrowed from Old English poetry; of employing alliteration; and of using occasional rhyme. However, the two differ in matters of both form and content. Wulfstan's characteristic prose style has been the subject of several excellent studies, among them Karl Jost's two articles and his book, Wulfstanstudien. More accessible to the English reader are Dorothy Whitelock's

55 Bethurum, p. 53.
56 McIntosh, p. 11; Lipp, pp. 690-94.
57 See Wrenn, pp. 238-39; Bethurum, pp. 53-54.
58 "Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik," Anglia, 47 (1923), 105ff; "Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen," Anglia, 56 (1932), 265ff; Wulfstanstudien (Bern, 1950).
commentaries, \(^{59}\) Angus McIntosh's Gollancz Lecture of 1948,\(^{60}\) and Dorothy Bethurum's discussion of style in her edition of Wulfstan's homilies.\(^{61}\)

Ælfric's and Wulfstan's contributions to Old English prose during this period are paralleled by the development of a polished historical prose in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, especially in the annals covering the long and politically troubled reign of Æthelred Unræd (978-1016).\(^{62}\)

Thus it can be seen that Old English prose during the latter tenth and early eleventh centuries was especially sophisticated. Syntactic and stylistic studies of the Old English prose of this period have established it as the most advanced of the vernaculars, capable of communicating the most complex ideas in law, science, and theology.\(^{63}\)

Thus it is all the more important to study the Old English


\(^{60}\) *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 35 (1949), 109-42. See note 46.

\(^{61}\) Bethurum, pp. 87-98.

\(^{62}\) Wrenn, pp. 248-52.

\(^{63}\) Chambers, pp. lxi-lxii.
translation of Apollonius of Tyre, recognized by all critics as one of the finest productions of conscious literary art in a period characterized by high achievement in prose. Scholars are certain as to the literary importance of the Old English Apollonius; it remains to determine how the Apollonius works as a prose composition.
CHAPTER II

THE WORD ORDER OF PHRASES AND CLAUSES IN APOLLONIUS

Apollonius of Tyre is a product of the age of sophisticated prose in Old English, an age during which Old English was, in the words of one scholar, "far more developed for the expression of both prose and poetry than any other contemporary European vernacular . . . ."¹ Although the syntax of Old English is much like that of Modern English, it does differ, for instance, in the rarity of the indefinite article (an), in the frequent splitting of "heavy groups," and in some matters of clause structure. All of these and other dissimilarities will be noted in passing during the course of the following discussions. Yet Old English word order is not fundamentally different from that of Modern English, as the following discussions of phrasal and clausal structures in Apollonius will demonstrate.

The purpose of this chapter, however, is not to show

similarities between Old and Modern English syntax; rather it is to sketch an outline of the phrasal and clausal structures in Apollonius of Tyre, showing that its word order conforms generally to that of Late West Saxon and citing significant departures from the standard patterns where they occur. This chapter serves as the background for later chapters which analyze in greater detail the style of the translation; those chapters will focus on differences between Late West Saxon syntax and that of Apollonius.

This chapter is restricted to a discussion of word-order rather than a more comprehensive syntax, which would include lexical rules, morphology, and phonology as well. The concern at this point is not to explain, for example, noun case endings or distinctions between strong and weak adjective declensions and between strong and weak verb conjugations, matters which are well explained in introductory Old English grammars, most of which, as already noted in Chapter I, pay only lip-service to matters of word order and style. Hence the emphasis on word order here. The

\[\text{Chapter I, pp. 17-22.}\]
ordering principle in this chapter follows that suggested by a typical generative-transformational phrase structure rule which explains the basic structure of the sentence or clause as the following: Sentence (or Clause) \[ \rightarrow \text{Noun Phrase} + \text{Verb Phrase}. \] Thus, phrasal structures will be considered first in this chapter, followed by clausal relationships and their effects on word order.

**Phrases**

**Noun Phrases**

As in Modern English, Old English sentences typically begin with subject noun phrases. Thus, noun phrases are the logical place to begin a study of phrasal structures. In *Apollonius* they are rather unremarkable, however.

The majority of noun phrases in *Apollonius* are two- or three-position NP's. The most frequently occurring NP pattern is article + noun (*se fader, seo ceaster, bat maeden*), a pattern occurring 248 times in the manuscript. The second most frequently occurring NP pattern is the structure genitive (*mangeres naman, his dohtor*), occurring 195 times. Single-word common-noun
NP's, including objects of prepositions (of life, to wife, on armemergen), are next in frequency, appearing 131 times. (Not included among these single-word NP's are proper names, pronouns, and non-noun word groups functioning as nouns.) The adjective + noun pattern (sarlicum gelimpe, mid unrihtre gewilnunge, sum cyningc) is next in frequency, occurring 119 times. The most frequent three-word NP is the pattern article + adjective + noun (bam ungeseligan cingce, ba faderlican arfæstnesse, se wælreowa cyningc), occurring sixty-six times. These five patterns comprise over 78 per cent of all common-noun NP's in Apollonius of Tyre and illustrate the relative simplicity of description in the translation, a plainness which derives from the "essentially meagre" style of the Latin original. 3

Yet twenty-one different three-position NP's are present in Apollonius, along with ten different four-position NP's and one five-position NP. The most frequently occurring three-position NP besides article + adjective + noun is article + genitive noun + noun (on ðære ceastre

---

stræte, after þæs cyninges naman, þæs mædenes fostormodor), a construction occurring twenty-one times. Another frequently-occurring NP is the idiomatic vocative phrase nominative pronoun + adjective + noun, which occurs seventeen times as a formal expression of address (þu iunga man, þu ealda man, þu goda cyningc). A related vocative construction occurs in Apollonius’ apostrophe to the sea in Chapter XII, where he cries, "Eala þu se Neptune" (16, 26). That this construction is unique to the Old English translator may be seen by comparing it with the Latin, which has simply "O Neptune" (17, 20). Similarly, in 18, 5, Apollonius cries, "Gemiltsa me, þu ealda man . . .," where the Latin has only "Miserere mei . . . senior" (19, 5-6). In all instances, except one, the Latin vocative does not employ a personal pronoun. However, in one—Domine mea regina (43, 9), translated þu eadige cwæn (42, 10)—the pronoun does appear, though not in initial position. Thus, the construction Nom. pronoun + adjective + noun must be treated as an idiomatic NP rather than as a pronoun.

^Peter Goolden, ed., The Old English Apollonius of Tyre (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958). References are to page and line number.
followed by an appositive noun phrase. Of the four-position NP's, only thirteen of which occur in Apollonius, the most frequent pattern is numeral + numeral + noun + partitive genitive noun (hundteontig bæsenda mittan hwætes [occurs twice], twa hund punda goldes). This construction appears only three times and contains a genitive singular form for the noun head-word. This construction survives in Modern English in noun phrases headed by the so-called "mass" nouns, such as in two teaspoons of sugar, a few cups of coffee, several years of work. The surface structure of such phrasal noun groups is, of course, NP + Prep P; however, in Old English the partitive genitive noun must be considered the head noun of the phrase.

Intensifiers and adverbs are rare in the noun phrases of Apollonius. Only two intensifiers occur in the manuscript: ane swīde wlitige dohtor (2, 6) and swīde irlicum andwlitan (6, 5). Other adverbially modified NP's are, however, more frequent, though not at all common. Eight adverb + adjective + noun constructions appear, seven of them employing swa, the other hu. One of the seven swa phrases is compound (on swa micclum heafe and wope [10, 4]).
In all, the noun-headed noun phrases in Apollonius are rather simple. As a result the narrative is noticeably lacking in description. For example, there are no color adjectives and few references to sizes or shapes. Most nouns are limited by either determiners alone or determiners plus combinations of genitive nouns, pronouns, adjectives, or any of these. The table below lists the major structures and their frequencies.

TABLE I

NOUN PHRASE PATTERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-position NP's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prep) + Noun</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>dead, of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-position NP's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prep) + Art + Noun</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>seoc ceaster, fram pare gewilunge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prep) + Adj + Noun</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>sarlicum gelimpe, on billicon bingon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prep) + Dem + Noun</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>his gewrit, on hisum bingum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-position NP's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prep) + Art + Adj + Noun</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>bam ungesëligan cingce, to ðare cynelican healle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prep) + Art + Gen Noun</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ðæs cyninges irre, on ðare ceastr stræte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom Pron + Adj + Noun</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>bu iunga man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantives.---The Old English translator made use of adjectives as noun substantives, thereby creating noun phrases without head nouns. The most obvious cases of this practice involve deleting the noun slot in a typical determiner + adjective + noun phrase, as in, for example, to ðæm selran (22, 25), fram bam iungan (24, 25-25), and bam uncuðan (18, 2). Here one expects to ðæm selran tide, fram bam iungan man, and bam uncuðan man. Twenty of these adjective substantives appear in the manuscript.

Splitting compound adjectives in noun phrases.---In Old English the splitting of "heavy groups" is a common tendency. This characteristic is associated with the coordinating conjunctions, especially with and. Consider, for example, the following clause: ba be in Norþymbrum bugæð and on East Englum 'those that in Northumbria dwelt and in East Anglia.' In this clause the coordinated adverbial phrase in East Englum is "split" from in Norþymbrum by the verb. However, by no means is this phenomenon regular.

---

5Mitchell and Robinson, pp. 64-65.

in Old English as the exclusive means of combining like structures. For example, the following entry from the Old English Annals, anno 455, illustrates the method that would endure throughout subsequent years of Old, Middle, and Modern English usage: *Her Hengest 7 Horsa fuhton wip Wyrt georne [sic] bam cyninge . . . 'In this year Hengest and Horsa fought with Vortigern the king . . . .'*

In *Apollonius*, the internal structure of the noun phrase employs both the normal *Adj + conj + Adj + Noun* structure and the idiomatic structure *Adj + Noun + conj + Adj*. Five of these compound-adjective phrase structures occur in the manuscript:

1. *mid manifealdum and genihtsum reafum* 'with manifold and abundant garments' (8, 20-21)
2. *sum eald and sum æfestig ealdorman* 'a certain old and a certain envious alderman' (22, 16)
3. *to godum faeder and arfaestum* 'to a good father and honored' (6, 3)
4. *bone heardestan hungor and bone reæstætan* 'the hardest famine and the severest' (14, 8-9)
5. *bry gelærede weras and æpelborene* 'three learned men and noble-born' (30, 10)

---

7 Plummer, I, p. 12.
Because the compound-adjective structure occurs only five times in Apollonius, it is difficult to make a generalization regarding the relative frequency of these structures. However, three of the five here recorded are indeed split compound-adjective noun phrases.

Prepositional Phrases

The structure of prepositional phrases in Apollonius is generally unremarkable and virtually indistinguishable from that of Modern English. However, two contrasts between Old and Modern English are worthy of note. First, the use of prepositions is much more restricted in Apollonius than in Modern English. Although twenty-five different prepositions appear in the manuscript, these prepositions compete with the oblique cases of nouns to render ideas that are always expressed by prepositional phrases in Modern English. The following phrases illustrate this usage:

6 he hafde ane swiðe wlitige dohtor ungelifedlicre fægernesse 'he had one very beautiful daughter (of) incredible fairness' (2, 5-6)

7 he swiðe irlicum andwlitan besæah to ðam iungan ealdorman 'he (with) a very angry countenance looked at the young alderman' (5, 6-7)
and minre ceasterwaru mis nan haleo hint 'and (for) my citizens (there) is no hope of relief'
(14, 8-9)

be bam folce ungecnownen wes and ungewunelic 'which (to) the people was unknown and unusual'
(26, 17-18)

he gehyrsun wes Hinre hæse and minum willan 'he was obedient (to) thy bidding and (to) my will'
(34, 29)

Dæt forscildgode wif ba eallum limon abifode 'The merciless woman then (in) all limbs trembled'
(40, 12-13)

Such constructions are frequent in Apollonius; however, the use of prepositions is just as frequent. For instance, several lines after the occurrence of 7 above appears the following construction:

Beseah 5a mid irlicum andwilitan to him and cwæð '(He) looked then with angry countenance to him and said'
(6, 26)

Indirect objects also behave in much the same way. However, there is no fixed position for the indirect object, which may occur for example in the patterns S-V-IO-DO (as in modern English), S-IO-V-DO, and S-V-DO-IO (with or without the preposition to). Following are illustrations of each arrangement from Apollonius:

---

8This is of course another example of "splitting" co-ordinated elements (see pp. 36-38 above). In this case the elements coordinated are predicate adjectives.
13 Ic sille eowrum ceastergewarum hundteontig busenda mittan hwætes 'I will give your citizens a hundred thousand measures of wheat' (14, 12-13)

14 ic him gife fifti pundæ goldes 'I him will give fifty pounds of gold' (10, 17)

15 Ic befæste mine dohtor Stranguilionem and Dionisiade 'I entrusted my daughter to Stranguilio and Dionysia' (40, 4-5)

16 Heo raehste pa sóglice hire handa him to 'She extended then truly her hands to him' (40, 22-23)

The second contrast between Old English and Modern English with respect to prepositional phrases is the occasional inversion of the preposition and its object. This occurs thirteen times in Apollonius. In all of the cases, the object is a pronoun, either him, heom, or hire. Following is a list of these inverted phrases:

- *hire cwæð to* (2, 22)  *him ongean* (15, 21)
- *hire to* (4, 9)  *hyre to* (24, 24)
- *him fram* (4, 17)  *heom cwæð to* (28, 9-10)
- *him to* (8, 4)  *him to* (28, 29)
- *him to* (8, 7-8)  *heom to* (30, 13)
- *him after* (10, 20)  *him to* (40, 23)
- *him after* (10, 23)

These constructions appear side by side with such constructions as *after him, fram me, fram him, to him, ongean ðe, and to hyre.*
The analysis of noun and prepositional phrases here does not include the noun clause or the gerund phrase, constructions to be dealt with later in this chapter. The foregoing brief analysis of noun phrase and prepositional phrase constructions in Old English, as illustrated in Apollonius, reveals little of note. The structure of these phrases accords with established usage in Old English.

**Verb Phrases**

The structure of the Old English verb phrase is similar in general outline to that of Modern English, with a few exceptions. As in Modern English, the Old English verb phrase consists of an auxiliary phrase and a main verb. The auxiliary carries the tense marker—either past or present—and it may also include modals and the auxiliaries habban, beon, wesan, and weorgan. The purpose of the following discussion is to outline these basic features of the auxiliary and the main verb as the Old English translator of Apollonius uses them.

The auxiliary.—The Old English auxiliary is similar to that of Modern English in form although not necessarily
in word order. As in Modern English, verb tense is an obligatory element of the auxiliary in deep structure. When the clause contains only a main verb, the main verb attracts the past or present tense marker. All main verbs in *Apollonius*, except for those accompanied by modal verbs, have past or present inflections. However, when an auxiliary verb occurs, it accepts the tense marker and determines the inflection of the accompanying auxiliary or main verb. In Old English, here illustrated by *Apollonius*, auxiliary verbs appear in three typical constructions: *habban* + Main Verb (past participle); *beon* + Main Verb (present participle); and *beon* + Main Verb (past participle).

A. *Habban* + Main Verb.—In *Apollonius*, the construction *habban* + Main Verb occurs seventeen times. In all cases *habban* accepts the present or past tense, and the accompanying main verb is a past participle. Four examples follow:

17  ac *pu hæfstan* beheafdunge geearnad  'but thou hast beheading earned'  (5, 28)

18  *hæt ic hæbbe purh weax aboden*  'that I have by wax announced'  (32, 15)
Disregarding for the moment the structural differences between subordinate and coordinate clauses (17-19) and interrogative clauses (17), one can easily see that, just as in Modern English, the auxiliary verb habban, either past or present, precedes the past participle of the main verb, here illustrated by -en, -(e)d, and -ad.

In all seventeen occurrences of habban as auxiliary, the clause includes a direct object complement. In one case the past participle is inflected to agree with the direct object:

21 Nabbe ge na godne tim an aredodne 'You have not hit upon a good time' (30, 19-20)

This is a common practice in Old English, existing alongside uninflected participial constructions. 9

B. Beon, wesan, and weorðan.—Beon, wesan, and weorðan all perform the same general function as auxiliaries in verb phrases. They accompany past participial and

9 See Mitchell, p. 109, para. 200.
present participial verbs. In addition, wesan and weorðan function as auxiliaries in passive constructions. In Apollonius, beon, wesan, and weorðan auxiliaries occur sixty times.

Twenty-seven of the phrases are passive structures, most with agents [by SOMEONE] deleted. The few phrases that do retain their agents, however, may make use of prepositions other than *be*, such as *fram* and *burh*. Examples of these passive phrases follow:

22 *se wæs fram Antiocho bam cynincge asænd* 'who was by Antiochus the king sent' (8, 30-31)

23 *ðe wæs burh ungelymp beswicen* 'who was by misfortune betrayed' (34, 18)

24 *and þa lac wæron in gebrohte* 'and the offerings in were brought [by SOMEONE]' (36, 13)

25 *And þa heafda ealle wurdon gesette on ufeweardan bam geate* 'And the heads all were set on the upper part of the gate [by SOMEONE]' (4, 27-28)

26 *Þat haliern wearð þa geopenod* 'The holy place was then opened [by SOMEONE]' (36, 12-13)

Some beon, wesan, and weorðan verb phrases may also contain intransitive main verbs rather than transitive verbs. In such cases they may be translated as perfect or past perfect verb phrases (*have* plus past participle).

The following three passages illustrate this construction:
The ordering of the elements in these constructions varies. Nearly half of the sixty clauses exhibit Subj - Aux be - Main Verb structure, and a quarter exhibit Aux be - Subj - Main Verb structure. Most of the latter structures may be accounted for by rules governing demonstrative and negative clauses, of which more will be said later.

The construction be - Main Verb + ing is quite common in Modern English as an expression of progressive action, but it occurs only infrequently in Old English. In Old English the present participle is formed by adding -(e)nde or -ande to the stem of the verb. Its primary use in this construction appears to be as a predicate adjective, though, rather than as a main verb expressing progressive action.

In Apollonius this structure occurs only four times:

30 ure ceaster is bearfende 'our city is starving'
   (14, 5-6)
31 ne eart ðu leogende on ðam that'
   (6, 21)
32 ne eart ðu on ðam leogende (6, 23)
33 Mid bi be he bas bingc was sprecende to him silfum
   'While he these things was speaking to himself'
   (18, 2-3)

In the first example, bearfende may be a predicate adjective, translated 'impoverished,' however, 'starving' preserves the present participial force of the verb bearfian 'to starve, to be in need, to want.' But leogende and sprecende function as main verbs in their clauses. The small sampling of present participle constructions in Apollonius renders impossible any valid generalizations about such structures. Yet one will notice that in all four of these structures the be-verbs precede the participles, unlike the behavior of be-verbs in past participial constructions, where they may appear in clause-final position (see example 29).

---

C. **Modal verb - infinitive.**—As in Modern English modal verbs are a special class of auxiliary. The presence of a modal verb influences the accompanying main verb by absorbing the past or present tense inflection and leaving the main verb uninflected. The major members of this class of verb are *mægan* (to be able to, *MAY*), *motan* (to be allowed to), *durran* (to dare), *sculan* (to have to, *SHALL*), and *willan* (to desire, *WILL*). All of these forms appear in *Apollonius*.

34 *hwam he mhte healicost forgifan* 'whom he might most nobly give' (2, 9)

35 *Forðam gif hit gewurðan mæg* 'Therefore if it may be' (14, 4)

36 *bæt bu mote silt to ðam selran becuman* 'that thou may (thy) self to the better come' (22, 24-25)

37 *bæt hæo mote leornian st ðe ða gesaligan laere ðe bu canst* 'that she be allowed to learn from you the delightful arts that you know' (30, 1)

38 *bæt dorste cynges dohtor gewamman ar ðam dege hyre brydgifta* 'that dared a king's daughter defile before the day of her espousal' (2, 27 - 4, 1)

39 *swa bæt he ne dear nahwar gewunian* 'so that he dare not nowhere dwell' (10, 13-14)

40 *bæt hine man scolde ofslean* 'that him one should slay (that he should be slain)' (42, 8)
41. *bu scealt oncnawan bone gesette dom* 'you shall acknowledge the appointed sentence' (6, 31)

42. *and for ūe we woldon lustlice swiltan* 'and for you we would gladly die' (40, 2-3)

43. *ic wille me bedihlian on eowrum e6le* 'I wish to hide myself in your land' (14, 4-5)

Modal verbs such as those above appear fifty-one times in verb phrases throughout Apollonius. Magan and willan are by far the most numerous, magan occurring twenty-six times and willan sixteen times. Sculan and willan may function in two distinctly different ways, one to express an obligation or a wish, the other to express futurity.  

The original function of sculan was to express necessity or obligation. In Apollonius, two sculan verb-phrases, one of which is cited above (41), indeed do express obligation. However, the passage cited as number 40 above expresses futurity, and as such is a rare case of the simple future function of sculan in Old English. The same may be said of willan. Of the sixteen occurrences of willan plus infinitive, only one may with any confidence be classified as predictive:

---

13 Mitchell, p. 114.  
14 Traugott, p. 69.
The frequency of various word-orders in clauses containing modal verbs is overwhelmingly Subj . . . Modal Verb . . . Infinitive, a pattern occurring 75 per cent of the time (38/51 occurrences). By contrast, the pattern Subj . . . Infinitive . . . Modal Verb occurs in only 20 per cent of the clauses (10/51).

Main Verb plus Infinitive.—Certain other verbs in Apollonius appear to exhibit the same function as auxiliary verbs, preceding infinitives as do the modals. Verbs in this class in Apollonius are hatan 'to command,' onginnan 'to begin,' lætan 'to allow,' and biddan 'to bid.' Hatan plus Infinitive verb phrases occur thirteen times in Apollonius, five of which follow:

45 Da het cyngc scipa gegearcian and him after faran 'Then commanded the king ships to prepare and after him to go' (10, 23)

46 Ac hat me nu sillan ba hearpan 'But command now the harp to be given to me' (25, 3-4)

47 Da het Thasia beforan gelædan Theophilum 'Then Thasia commanded Theophilus to be led before (her)' (40, 14-15)
48 sege . . . hwa ðe het me ofslean 'say . . . who commanded you to slay me' (40, 15-17)

49 De het se cyngc hine færlice gelæccan 'Then the king commanded him to be seized suddenly' (42, 5)

These hatan verb phrases illustrate an interesting phenomenon: hatan as main verb takes the entire infinitive phrase as its object; the infinitive phrase itself is a complement, one which may or may not have its own object. For example, in 49 above hine is the object of gelæccan, not of het:

Then the king commanded it.
It: to seize him suddenly

In this infinitive phrase the agent is deleted from the surface structure; the king commanded someone to seize him. This type of structure is usually translated as a passive: Then the king commanded him to be seized suddenly. Thus, the pronouns that would appear to be accusative objects of hatan in these sentences are in the dative case. When the receiver of the command is absent, the clause is passive; when the receiver of the command is present, the clause is active. Hence the difference in structure and meaning among the following clauses:
The foregoing analysis accounts for the apparent exception that appears in the following clause:

56 *Heo . . . het hine gesund faran* 'She bid him to fare soundly'

Here *hine* appears to function as the object of *het*; however, as has just been shown, *hatan* takes a pronoun in the dative case. Thus, *hine* cannot be the object of *het*; rather, one may posit a deep structure *him*: *Heo . . . het him hine gesund faran* 'She . . . bid to him to fare him soundly.' *Him* may then have been deleted because it is the same referent as the object of the infinitive phrase.
Onginnan plus Infinitive is the next most frequent Main Verb plus Infinitive structure in Apollonius, occurring six times:

57  Mid bi be hi ongunnon pa rowan and hi forðwerd wæron on heora weg 'When they began then to row and they were advanced on their way' (16, 15-17)

58  Da agan se cyngc plegan wið his geferan mid bōere 'Then began the king to play against his companions with a ball' (20, 6-7)

59  and sona swa heo hearpian ongan 'and as soon as she began to harp' (24, 27)

60  Da ongunnon ealle ba men hi herian on hyre swegcrafte 'Then began all the men to praise her for her playing-skill' (24, 28-29)

61  and he ba hearpestrengas mid crafte astirian ongan 'and he began to pluck the harpstrings with skill' (25, 12-13)

62  and Apollonius ongan ða spreccan and cweðan 'and Apollonius began then to speak and to say' (36, 13-14)

In all six cases, the infinitive phrase functions as the object of the main verb onginnan. However, in 61 above the word-order of the infinitive phrase is inverted so that the object of the infinitive (pa hearpestrengas) precedes it, a common inversion in Old English. Compare

15 See Traugott, p. 107.
the internal structure of the infinitive phrase in 61 with, for example, that of 60, where the object—the pronoun hi—precedes its infinitive (herian). Note, too, that onginnan may precede its infinitive (57 and 62) or appear in final position (59 and 61) when the clause begins with a coordinating conjunction. The inversion of onginnan and its subject in 58 and 60 derives from the influence of demonstrative pa in clause-initial position.

Three other Main Verb plus Infinitive structures occur in Apollonius. One type is laetan plus Infinitive, which occurs in the following clause:

63 swa he hine nēfre feallan ne let 'so (that) he it never to fall not allowed [so that he never allowed it to fall]' (20, 11)

Laetan retains its accompanying infinitive in Modern English, as in I won't let you (to) do it or I won't allow you to do it. The second Main Verb plus Infinitive structure is the phrase biddan plus Infinitive:

64 and Apollonius hi bad ealle gretan 'and Apollonius bade them all to salute' (16, 14-15)

This clause is translated more smoothly in Swanton's

16 Traugott, p. 107.
Anglo-Saxon Prose as "and Apollonius bade them all farewell . . . ." However, Swanton's translation obscures the infinitive *gretan* by transforming it to 'farewell.'

The last Main Verb plus Infinitive structure is the idiomatic *gehieran* + *secgan* 'to hear say or to hear tell.' It appears once:

65 *Ic gehirde secgan bæt ic ware fordemed. 'I heard say that I may be condemned.'* (12, 28)

This phrase is the ancestor of Modern English "I hear(d) tell that . . . .," a phrase related to "I hear(d) someone say that . . . ."

The Main Verb plus Infinitive structure is also used in other idioms where the infinitive may easily be translated as a present participle:

66 *ba féringa geseah he sumne fiscere gan 'then suddenly he saw a certain fisherman walk'*

(18, 3-4)

67 *ba geseah he ænne nacod cnapan geond ba stræte yrnan 'then he saw one naked youth run through the street'*

(18, 25)

58 *ba at nyhstan comon þær gan ongean hy þry gelærde weras and æpelborene 'Then at last came there (to) walk towards them three learned men and noble-born'*

(30, 9-10)

17 Swanton, p. 163.
In each of the three cases, the infinitive is used to render a description of movement, either walking or running. The first two are structurally the same, although there may be a question as to what the structure is, either $\text{ba} \ldots V - S - (S - \text{INF}) \ldots$ or $\text{ba} \ldots V - S - O - \text{INF} \ldots$.

The question is how to interpret the noun phrase preceding the infinitive. In the analysis of *hatan* plus *Infinitive* above, the infinitive phrase functioned as the object of the main verb. However, in the present structure, *summe fiscere* and *æne nacod cnapan* are both accusative singular noun phrases and consequently cannot function as subjects of the following infinitives. Hence, the infinitives operate as adjective modifiers and are similar to present participial phrases.\(^1\) Number 63 illustrates the idiomatic use of *cuman* plus the infinitive of motion verbs to form a periphrastic conjugation in the past tense. Thus, the clause may be translated as 'Then at last three learned and noble-born men walked towards them.' However, that this usage is similar to the foregoing two may be seen by an alternate reading: 'Then at last came three learned and noble-born men walking towards them.'

\(^1\) Refer to the following discussion of the present participle.
Verbal Phrases

Verbals are of course verb forms that function in ways other than as verbs. In Modern English, for instance, the infinitive, gerund, and participial phrases function as nouns or noun modifiers. In an earlier portion of this chapter, the infinitive was discussed in conjunction with the modal verbs and a small class of main verbs that take infinitives. There it was noted that the infinitive often functions as the direct object of the main verb. Similar in function is the Old English gerund phrase.

The gerund phrase.—The gerund is formed in Old English by adding -enne or -anne to the infinitive stem of the verb and to to the left of the new form. The gerund is historically related to the infinitive and is explained as an inflected form of the infinitive used as a noun. Six of these phrases occur in Apollonius:

69 and bat gefremede man gewilnode to bediglianne.
'and the completed crime (he) wished to conceal.'
(2, 18-19)

In all six cases, the gerunds have been translated as infinitives in order to effect a smooth translation. Yet the gerunds do not function in the same way in these passages. In 69 to bediglianne functions as a direct object of the verb gewilnode. To silenne in 70 functions to complete the sense of the verb habbe. In 71 - 74, however, the gerunds function idiomatically to express purpose:

'for the purpose of asking for my daughter'

'for the purpose of slaying'

'for the purpose of receiving my kingdom'

'for the purpose of fostering (this my daughter)'

As may readily be noted in the four phrases above, the mark of the gerund in Old English is to be translated as it is
in Modern English, with the -ing inflection. Yet often the
infinitive is smoother (69 and 70). Indeed, there is no
consistent translation for gerunds, the interpretation
depending largely upon context.

Present Participle.—The present participle in Old
English is formed by adding -(e)nde to the stem of the
infinitive. Its primary function is as a verbal modifier,
which may occur as a pre-nominal or post-nominal limiter,
as a predicate adjective, and even as a noun substantive.
Less frequently, especially in later Old English, it appears
in tandem with a be auxiliary to express continuing action.
Present participles occur twenty-three times in Apollonius.
The following examples are illustrative of their several
functions:

As a verbal modifier:

75 he asette &a ratels bus cwæðende 'he set the
riddle, thus saying' (4, 18-19)

76 ongean gesænde to ðam plegendan cynge 'again
returned to the playing king' (20, 10)

As a predicate adjective:

20Kispert, p. 91.
77 *ure ceaster is pearfende* 'our city is starving'

(14, 5-6)

As a noun substantive:

78 *Du goda cyngc and earma gemiltsigend, and bu cwen, lare lufigend* 'Thou good king and of wretches pitying [i.e., pitier], and thou queen, of learning loving [i.e., lover]' (28, 7-8)

As a main verb:

79 *Mid bi be he bas bingc was sprecende to him silfum* 'While he was speaking these things to himself' (18, 2-3)

Even in the latter use of the present participle as a main verb, one can perceive the adjectival force—sprecende is at once a description and an action.

The substantives all share the same characteristics. They are viewed as a noun declension derived from the present participle of an action verb and designating the doer of or agent responsible for an action. The translator of Apollonius has indeed employed -nd nouns to translate Latin nouns of agency, signified by -tor inflections added to verb stems. Such nouns are equivalent to Modern English nouns of agency ending in -er. Note the correspondence between the Old English and Latin nouns of agency in the following chart:

\[\text{Kispert, p. 70.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gifendes 'giver' (16, 2)</td>
<td>donatoris 'giver' (17, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manna bereafigend 'depriver of men' (16, 26)</td>
<td>fraudator hominum 'defrauder of men' (17, 20-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsceâsiga beswicend 'deceiver of the innocent' (15, 27)</td>
<td>deceptor innocentium 'deceiver of the innocent' (17, 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earmra gemiltsigend 'pitier of the wretched' (28, 7)</td>
<td>miserorum miscericors 'merciful to the troubled' (29, 5-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lare lufigend 'lover of learning' (28, 8)</td>
<td>amatrix studiorum 'lover of studies' (29, 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the five structures are coordinated appositive noun phrases. It is significant that the two pairs of noun phrases exhibit a consistent pattern exactly opposite to that of the corresponding Latin appositives. In Latin the pattern is **Nominative Noun plus Genitive Noun**, whereas in Old English it is **Genitive Noun plus Nominative Noun**. In Latin two of the genitive nouns (hominum and studiorum) belong to the class of nouns, and two are adjective noun substantives (innocentium and miserorum). The same is true of the corresponding Old English phrases; however, the Old English translator regularizes miserorum miscericors 'to the troubled compassionate,' a **Genitive Noun plus Adjective structure**, to earmra gemiltsigend 'of the wretched a pitier,' a **Genitive Noun plus Nominative Derived Noun structure** consistent with lare lufigend.
Past participle.—The Old English past participle had several functions: joined with an auxiliary verb such as \{beon, wesan, weorðan\}, it formed the phrasal tenses; joined with \{beon, wesan, weorðan\} as main verbs, it functioned as a predicate adjective; joined with nouns, it could appear as either a prenominal or postnominal modifier; and it could appear alone as a noun substantive. The first function has been discussed previously in the material on verb phrases; therefore the focus in this section is on past participles as noun modifiers and substantives.

Past participles functioning as noun modifiers or nouns occur twenty-three times in Apollonius. They appear in five different patterns, although the majority of them fall into only one of the categories. Eighteen past participles appear as prenominal modifiers, such as in the following five phrases:

30 paþ gefremede man 'that completed crime' (2, 18)
31 gedrefedum mode 'in a troubled mood' (12, 27)
32 brþ gelærede weras and eþelborene 'three learned men and noble-born' (30, 10)

83 his ancannedan dohtor 'his only-begotten daughter' (36, 23)

84 fulfremedre ylde 'at a completed (ripe) old age' (42, 1)

In this pattern the past participles occupy the position filled by adjectives and may be preceded by other modifiers, such as determiners, numerals, and genitive pronouns.

Two past participles appear in the pattern of (+ Gen Noun) + Noun + Past Part:

85 byne ceastergewarum of aēlum gebyrdum geborene 'your citizens of noble origin born' (30, 17)

86 Ic grete be nu of helle geciged. 'I greet you now from hell called-forth.' (40, 11-12)

In both instances, the past participle phrase limits the reference of a noun (ceastergewarum) or a pronoun (he) and appears postnominally. In Modern English these phrases are, respectively, 'born of noble origin' and 'called-forth from hell.' The Old English translator may be influenced here by the word order of his Latin source, where in both cases the past participle appears in phrase-final position:

87 Cives tui sumus, nobilibus natalibus geniti. 'Your citizens we are, from noble birth born.' (31, 17-18)

88 Saluto te ego ab inferis revocata. 'I greet you from the underworld summoned.' (41, 12)
The remaining three occurrences include a postnominal modifier (gemildea me nacodum, forlidenum 'pity me, naked, shipwrecked' 18, 5-6); a substantive (bam uncuðan 'to the unknown (one)' 18, 2); and a postnominal modifier of a substantive (Disum eallum ðus gedonum 'All these (things) thus done,' 42, 3). These phrases are all faithful translations of the Latin source and yet, though too few to establish a clear pattern of such uses of past participles in Apollonius of Tyre, they are structures that have survived in Modern English.

Clauses

Old English clauses may be divided into two broad categories: main or principal and subordinate. Principal structures are further divided on the basis of the presence of certain elements within the clause. Hence three clause-orders are present in Old English. Principal clauses may exhibit two clause-orders: Type 1 or common order and Type 2 order, usually present in negative, interrogative, and demonstrative-headed clauses. Type 3 order is usually

23 This structure is also one of the four uses of the dative absolute found in Apollonius. This structure, influenced by the Latin ablative absolute, will be discussed in Chapter III.
present in coordinated and subordinated clauses. In this section of the chapter these three types of clause-orders will be analyzed, particularly as they appear in Apollonius.

**Principal Clauses**

Principal clauses or sentences usually exhibit the structure **Subject - Verb** (- **Object**), as in the normal order of Modern English. These clauses may be either affirmative sentences, main clauses, or the first of a set of coordinates, subject, however, to certain contextual constraints. For instance, if a negative is present within the clause, the word order may be affected (see Negatives, pp. 96-101). Too, if the clause is interrogative, its word order is also different (see Interrogatives, pp. 93-96). Again, if the principal clause appears after a temporal adverb clause and begins with **ba**, its word order will differ from that of an affirmative principal clause. Finally, if **ba** heads a principal clause, one can expect the word order to be the reverse of common order. Thus, the sole fact that a clause functions as a main clause or a principal sentence does not assure that its structure will be Type 1. The structure of such clauses in Apollonius illustrates this point.
Principal clauses are numerous in Apollonius, occurring 158 times in all. Of that number, 104 are basic Type 1 structures, exhibiting some variations, however, depending upon immediate context. The position of the object varies in these clauses: it may occur medially or finally.

There are seventy-six occurrences of the structure $S \ldots (O) \ldots MV \{[O]\},$ where $[O]$ represents noun clause objects. This order too manifests itself in various constructions in the manuscript.

The first type of common order pattern in Apollonius is the most basic one, represented by the pattern $S \ldots V \ldots (V^+ \ldots V).$ Some examples of this type follow:

89  
$\text{beth maken hyre andswerode 'The maiden answered her'}$  
$(2, 23)$

90  
$\text{eft he cwæd 'Again he spoke'}$  
$(6, 12)$

91  
$\text{Apollonius cwæd 'Apollonius spoke'}$  
$(12, 9)$

92  
$\text{After bisum hit gelamp binnon feawum monðum}$

$\text{[beth \ldots ] 'After this it occurred after a few months that \ldots .' }$  
$(15, 10)$

93  
$\text{Leofe dohtog bu gesingodest 'Beloved daughter, you have erred'}$  
$(24, 16)$

94  
$\text{Forðam we comon hider todaeg bus togædere.}$

$\text{'Therefore we (have) come hither today thus together.' }$  
$(30, 16)$
As the clauses above illustrate, the subject noun phrase does not necessarily have to appear in initial position (90, 93, and 94). In most of these clauses the verb is the next element after the subject. However, 89 is an exception to the pattern, since the object hyre occurs between subject and verb. Hyre in this clause functions as a dative object of the verb andswereode, preterite singular of the verb andswerian, which takes its object in the dative case. In Old English, pronoun objects or dative pronouns interpreted as objects as a general rule occurred before their verbs.

The second type of structure, much less frequently occurring, is the pattern (PrepP) S (PrepP) (Dat Pron) V - O, which appears thirteen times.

96 Ic can bone dom 'I know the sentence' (5, 8-9)

97 Ic sille eow soólice hundteontig busænda mittan hwætes 'I (will) give to you truly one hundred thousand measures of wheat' (14, 24-25)


98 We syndon pyne ceastergewaru of ædelum getyrdu geborene. 'We are your fellow-citizens born of noble origin.' (30, 16-17)

99 After hius wordum heo mid modes anradnesse awrat ðær gewrit and ðæt geinsgeglode and sealde Apollonio. 'After these words she with heart's resolution wrote another letter and sealed it and gave (to) Apollonius.' (32, 8-9)

100 Ic grete be nu of helle geceiged. 'I greet you now from hell summoned.' (40, 11-12)

As the examples show, typically the subject noun phrase and the main verb co-occur, although, as 99 illustrates, a prepositional phrase functioning as an adverb of manner may appear between subject and verb. Perhaps the translator was adhering closely to the word order of his Latin original here: amoris audacia scripsit 'of love with courage she wrote (i.e., with the courage of love she wrote)' (33, 5).

Or perhaps he had to choose between the normal post-verbal position of the adverb of manner (mid modes anradnesse) and the consequent problem of separating the object (ðær gewrit) from the verb awrat. Whatever the reason may be, the position of the prepositional phrase here is apparently optional.

A much less frequent pattern is (PrepP) S . . . O - V, a structure which appears only five times in the manuscript.
Hellanicus hine eft sona gegrette 'Hellanicus soon afterwards greeted him' (12, 1)

Adl be fornime '(may) disease take you' (32, 22)

Mid me bu boccraft leornodest 'With me you learned bookcraft' (32, 23)

Ic hine wat. 'I know him.' (34, 1)

Apollonius se cyngc sunu gestrynde be his gemæcan 'Apollonius the king begat a son by his mate' (42, 21-22)

Old English syntax contained a rule determining the ordering of elements within a string that included an object noun phrase. If the object NP was a noun, the normal order was \( S - V - O \); however, if the object NP was a personal pronoun, the order was usually \( S - O - V \). Such is the case in three of the five examples above, where hine and be appear. However, in two of the five cases the object NPs are common nouns, yet they too occur medially rather than finally.

The structure of the Latin source might account for 103:

Mecum litteras didicisti. 'With me scholarship you learned.' (33, 15-17). But the structure of the Latin source cannot account for the ordering of 105. Here one can only

---

postulate the translator’s exercising of an option with regard to word order.

Another pattern is $S \ldots V \rightarrow [O]$, in which a noun clause serves as the object of the principal clause. As noted earlier, pronoun objects normally occur to the left of their verbs, and noun objects may optionally be placed to the left of verbs. However, noun clause objects never appear before their verbs. This pattern is found seven times in Apollonius and is here illustrated by three examples:

106 Forðam ic ðe lære þat þu fleo and beorge binum life. 'Therefore I advise you that you flee and save your life.' (12, 12-13)

107 Ic swerige burh ða gemanan hælo þat ic me nafre bet ne baðode 'I swear by the common salvation that I never bathed myself better' (20, 23)

108 Apolloni. ic oncnawe soðlice þat þu eart on eallum bingum wel gelæred. 'Apollonius, I perceive truly that you are in all things well-learned.' (25, 5-6)

In each instance the noun clause functions as the object of the clause (I advise that . . .; I swear that . . .; I know that . . .).

A second group of principal clause patterns is related to linking verbs, such as beon, wesan, and weorðan.
Twenty-three of these clauses occur, ten with predicate nominative complements and thirteen with predicate adjective complements. The order of these clauses is invariably $S \ldots LV - \{PA\}_{PN}$. Several examples of each follow:

$S \ldots LV - PN$

109 **Se iuniga man be bu after axsodest is forliden man.** 'The young man that you asked after is a shipwrecked man.' (20, 29-30)

110 **Soð is ðat ic eow er sæde ...** 'Truth is what I said to you before ...' (34, 7)

111 **Bu eart se forlidena man** 'you are the shipwrecked man' (38, 9-10)

112 **Pis heo is.** 'This is she.' (38, 12)

$S \ldots LV - PA$

113 **he is afestful for pinum gode** 'he is envious of your goods' (22, 19-20)

114 **Heo wes soðlice borel wlitige** 'She was truly very beautiful' (36, 7)

The examples above illustrate the normal post-verbal positioning of the subject complement in Old English. The predicate nominative structures are particularly noteworthy because of the variety of forms that fill the PN slot in the clause. Two of the ten predicate nominatives are noun clauses, three are proper nouns, four are common nouns,
and one is a pronoun. Of these only the pronoun predicate nominative departs from the normal pattern (see 112 above). Yet it is common in Old English for a pronoun direct object to precede its verb; the same rule must therefore account for the position of the predicate nominative in 112.

Two patterns of principal clause arrangements remain to be noted of the group $S \ldots V \ldots$ which together account for only four of the 104 occurrences of principal clauses in *Apollonius*. The first is the pattern $S - Aux \ldots iV$, which appears in the following two sentences:

117 Pu hafast gecoren bone wer be me wel lica\(\).
'Thou hast chosen the man that me well pleaseth.'
(34, 23)

118 Ic from cildhade was Apollonius genemnod, on Tirum geboren. 'Since childhood I was Apollonius named, in Tyre born.'
(36, 14-15)

In both these instances, the auxiliary (habban and wesan) precedes the main verb. However, the complement Apollonius in 118 occupies a pre-verb position of emphasis, whereas one would expect Ic $\ldots$ was genemnod Apollonius.

The second structure consists of a main verb plus a following infinitive. Here, as is the case with other examples already noted in the discussion of the Old English auxiliary, the infinitive functions as an object of the
inflected main verb. Only two examples of this pattern occur in principal clauses:

119  *Fleon he mag, ac he atfleon ne mag.* 'Flee he may, but he may not escape.' (10, 14-15)

120  *Ic gehirde secgan bat ic ware fordemed.* 'I heard say that I was condemned.' (12, 28)

The pattern of 120 is $S - V - O$; however, this clause presents a great deal of complexity in its complement:

$S \quad V \quad O$

$Ic \quad gehirde \quad [X \quad secgan \quad [bat \quad ic \quad ware \quad fordemed., \quad P.A.]]$

$NC \quad NC \quad NC$

$S \quad V \quad P.A.$

Secgan bat ic were fordemed is the object of gehirde, and within the infinitive phrase the noun clause is the object of secgan. The front-shifting of the infinitive in 119 may derive from the influence of the Latin source: *Fugere quidem potest* 'To flee indeed he may be able' (11, 10).

In both clauses the infinitives precede the main verbs, syntactic behavior quite possible for direct objects, as has previously been shown. The distinction is in the $O - S - V$ structure of the first clause of 119, which here appears to be the result of an optional movement made for the purpose of emphasis.
Principal clauses containing the demonstrative adverb 'then' in other than head position make up a small lot of structures in Apollonius, occurring twenty-nine times. The pattern S - (Adv) - V - (Adv) occurs in twenty-one of these clauses, as the following examples illustrate:

121 Hwæt ðæ Apollonius forlet his bone wurðfullan cynedom 'Lo, then Apollonius gave up his royal rank' (14, 28-15, 1)

122 Se man ðæ eode æfter Apollonio. 'The man then went after Apollonius.' (20, 27)

123 Apollonius ðæ soðlice hyre æræte sælle his gelymp 'Apollonius then truly related to her all his circumstances' (24, 13)

124 Se cyng ðæ soðlice ne mihte ærefnian his dohtor tearas. 'The king then truly might not endure his daughter's tears.' (34, 20-21)

125 Ic ðæ hi mid cynelican reafe gescridde 'I then clothed her with kingly raiment' (35, 25-27)

126 Apollonius hit ðæ ut bær on ðæ stræte and sealde ham cyrge. 'Apollonius then bore it out on the street and gave it to the king.' (32, 9-10)

127 Þæt folc wearð ðæ swa fagen his cystignessa and swa pançful 'The people were then so glad of his generosity and so thankful' (16, 3-4)

128 Hi toeodon ðæ mid bisum wordun. 'They departed then with these words.' (12, 23-24)

129 He bewende hine ðæ to Thasian 'He turned himself then to Thasia' (38, 11)
As the foregoing examples illustrate, there is no fixed position for temporal *ba*; it appears to float freely. In these twenty-eight clauses, moreover, its presence does not affect the relative order of the subjects and verbs, even though it intrudes between them in 122-126. However, when *ba* or *bonne* occur in clause-initial position, in either a main clause following another *ba* subordinate clause or in a principal clause, the word order is generally Adv - V - S.

Principal clauses headed by *ba* are far more frequent than the preceding clauses containing *ba* in other positions, occurring seventy-two times in *Apollonius*. The word order in such clauses is \[ \{ \text{ba} \} \quad - \quad \{ \text{MV} \} \quad - \quad \text{X} \quad - \quad \text{S} \quad - \quad \text{Y}, \] where \( X \) and \( Y \) represent elements other than verbs or subjects.

Andrew labels this structure as type ii—"Demonstrative Order;"\(^{27}\) Traugott labels it as Type 2;\(^{28}\) and Mitchell labels it as V. S.\(^{29}\) This order is typical of the entries in the *Old English Annals*: e.g., *Her for se here east*.

In this year fared the army east' (891); *ba* *gegaderade*


\(^{28}\)Traugott, p. 107.

\(^{29}\)Mitchell, p. 50.
Alfred cyning his fierd 'Then assembled Alfred king his army' (894); Her foroferde Alfhere ealdorman 'In this year passed-away Alfhere aldorman' (983); Da gewendon hi geond bat land 'Then went they throughout the land' (1001); Da com se cyning Ædelred mid fulre fyrde bider 'Then came the king Ædelred with a full army thither' (1014). This structure occurs not only in simple sentences but also in principal clauses preceded by temporal clauses. Following are several examples of this structure in Apollonius:

130 Her onginne6 seo gerecednes be Antioche pam ungesæligan cingce and be Apollonige pam tiriscan. 'Here begins the story about Antiochus the wicked king and about Apollonius the Tyrian' (2, 1-2)

131 Da cwae6 seo fostormodor 'Then spoke the nurse' (2, 27)

132 Da eode bat masden to Apollonio 'Then went the maiden to Apollonius' (24, 4-5)

133 pa dide bat meden swa hyre beboden wes 'Then did the maiden as was commanded of her' (28, 17-18)

134 Da gewendon hie ham mid bissere andsware. 'Then went they home with this answer' (34, 10)

135 pa clipode Apollonius swiœ e hlude 'Then cried Apollonius very loudly' (40, 7)

136 Pa geseah he bone ealdan fiscere 'Then saw he the old fisherman' (42, 4-5)

Da in the passages above is a temporal adverb meaning 'then'
and serves as a narrative transitional word. Its use here is distinct from the use of Da and Da δα heading adverb clauses, where as conjunctions they mean 'when' or 'while.' Moreover, Da in each case carries little semantic weight beyond indicating the sequence of actions, yet its presence at the head of the clause profoundly affects word order.

Another type of δα principal clause occurring in Apollonius, though not frequently, is the subjectless pattern V - Adv - Y. Da is not the headword in the clause, and the subject has been deleted from its normal initial position. This pattern occurs eight times in the manuscript:

137 Eode ba into δam cyninge and cweδ 'Went then unto the king and said' (5, 2)

138 Bewende hine ba to δam cyningle 'Turned himself then to the king' (5, 18-19)

139 Besah ba mid irlicum andwlitan to him 'Looked then with an angry countenance to him' (6, 26)

140 Besah δα to δam brim cnihtum 'Looked then to the three knights' (32, 19-20)

141 Eode δα ut and besah to Apollonio 'Went then out and looked to Apollonius' (34, 23-24)

142 For me ba to Egipta lande feowertene gear on heofe 'Traveled me then in Egypt land fourteen years in grief' (36, 29-38, l)
Pa occurs as the second element in six of the eight passages; in 138 and 142 reflexive pronouns (hine and me) occur immediately to the right of the verb. This subjectless structure always occurs in a narrative context in Apollonius, where the narrator indicates a chronological or spatial transition in the action and where the subject of the sentence immediately preceding remains the same in the following; i.e., the subject is "understood." Example 144 violates this principle, however, because of a scribal error. The understood subject of the clause should be Apollonius, yet the subject of the previous clause is heo, referring to Apollonius' wife (38, 17 and 38, 18). Since the Latin source manuscript has dropped the necessary change in subject, evidently the Old English translator assumed the understood subject in 144 to be the same as in 38, 17 and 38, 18. Hence the Old English translator was obeying the rule of
Old English syntax as he understood it to apply in this situation; his "error" owes partially to an omission in his Latin source.30

Such passages as those above are related to coordinated simple sentences employing the same subjects, as in the case of I read the novel until well past midnight and then turned out the light and fell asleep. Here and then turned out the light and fell asleep corresponds to the Old English pattern, its subject deleted because it would be redundant in this context. That coordination underlies the surface structure of these subjectless sentences is suggested in the Latin text in two cases (137 and 138) where the coordinating suffix -que is affixed to a participial form (Ingressusque → Eode; reversusque → Bewende).

A number of variously-structured principal clauses remains to be considered. These may be grouped into three general classifications: Non-demonstrative V - S clauses; complement-headed clauses; and impersonal principal clauses. However, although their surface structures may

differ from the normal S - V - 0 pattern, most of them are simply variants of the normal pattern. The first of these patterns is the V - S ( -0) clause, which occurs eight times:

145 Leofe fostormodor, nu todag forwurdon twegen ædela naman on bisum bure. 'Beloved nurse, now two noble names have perished in this bower.' (2, 23-24)

146 An Antiochia bare ceastre was sum cyningc Antiochus gehaten 'In Antioch the city (there) was a certain king Antiochus named' (2, 3-4)

147 Swiga ðu 'You shut up' (32, 22)

148 Æisum eallum ðus gedonum eode Apollonius, se mera cyngc, wið ða sæ. 'All these things thus done, went Apollonius, the famous king, on the sea.' (42, 3-4)

In all four examples the subject and verb are inverted in what appear to be optional constructions which foreground normally lesser-stressed elements, apparently for the purpose of emphasis.

The second small group of sentences is composed of complement-headed sentences, either 0 - S - V, 0 - V - S, or PN - S - LV. Six of these structures occur in Apollonius:

149 Scylde ic polige, moddrenum flæsce ic bruce. 'Sin I suffer, mother's flesh I enjoy.' (6, 11-12)
150 *Das cynges rædels by asmeadest and by his dohtor ne onfenge* 'The king's riddle thou solved and thou his daughter received not' (3, 17)

151 *Him answerode se cnapa* '(To) him answered the boy' (10, 4-5)

152 *Eala hu mænful man by eart* 'Alas, how sinful (a) man thou art' (10, 5)

153 *Spœlice swa micelæ lufe hæfde eal seo ceasterwaru to him* 'Indeed, so much love had all the citizens for him' (8, 26)

All of the above examples must be considered not as a special class of structures but as optional variants of the normal *S - V - Comp* pattern. To illustrate, one can compare 151 with *Se man him answerode* (22, 1).

Finally, two impersonal constructions appear among the principal clauses:

154 *be misbinga* 'To-thee (it) is mistaken,' (Or: 'You are mistaken!') (22, 20-21)

155 *Eæge meg gewurðan bat by wite bat ic nat* 'perhaps (it) may be that thou know what I know not' (32, 27-28)

**Summary of principal clauses.** Overall, 229 principal clauses appear in *Apollonius*. They fall into two general groups: those headed by *pa* (Demonstrative Order) and those clauses generally headed by subjects (Common Order).

Altogether, 157 of the latter and 72 of the former occur
in the manuscript. Table II below presents the patterns, frequency of occurrences, and percentages.

**TABLE II**

**PRINCIPAL SENTENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Demonstrative Order</strong></td>
<td>157/229</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S - (O) - V - (O)$</td>
<td>132/157</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V - S - (O)$</td>
<td>10/157</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Subject) - $V$</td>
<td>8/157</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement - $S - V$</td>
<td>5/157</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Constructions</td>
<td>2/157</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demonstrative Order** 72/229 31.4

The overall percentage of $S - V$ principal clauses is just over two-thirds of the total. However, since the Adv - $V - S$ structure is idiomatic and occurs within a predictable context in principal clauses (i.e., in narrative passages), its frequency of occurrence can hardly be construed as out of the ordinary. The demonstrative-ordered principal clause occurs frequently as a narrative device in the chronicles and histories, as well as in Old English poetry. What is significant about the above data is that 84 percent of all non-demonstrative order principal clauses in
Apollonius are S - V in structure, and, once stylistic variants are accounted for, that well over 93 per cent of the sentences are related to the basic S - V (Common) order. Old English permitted the front-shifting of complements, as in *Des cynges raedals bu eamdest* and *Eala hu manful man bu eart*. It also permitted the fronting of objects in the dative case, required by certain verbs, such as in *Him and-swerode se cnapa*. Again, Old English style also permitted the displacing of subjects to post-verbal positions, as in *Antiochia bare ceastre was sum cyninge Antiochus gebaten*. Included in this group of variant structures are also the subjectless verb-headed narrative *ba* sentences whose subjects are "understood" as being carried over from preceding sentences, such as *Eode ba into bam cyninge and owode* and *For me ba to Lepite lande feowertene gear on heofe*. Consequently, *Apollonius of Tyre* is generally unremarkable with regard to the structure of its principal sentences.

**Main Clauses**

In this study main clauses are distinguished from principal clauses according to the nature of the subordinate clauses accompanying them: noun clause, relative clause,
or adverb clause (each of which is discussed below). Noun clauses and relative clauses are embedded structures which appear not to affect word order in their principal clauses. However, main clauses associated with adverb clauses do exhibit certain changes in word order, and thus they are the primary focus of consideration in this section.

Even so, it will be necessary to take note of the structure of main clauses with embedded noun and relative clauses, at least briefly, in order to illustrate the point that the presence of such dependent structures does not affect the word order of the main clause or indeed of another subordinate structure in which they might appear. Hence, the position of the noun clause in the following adverb clause in *Apollonius* does not affect the structure of the enclosing clause: 

```
S V heo gehyrde [bat bat mæden hire deaðes girnde]
```

The noun clause functions as the direct object within the temporal adverb clause, whose structure is $S - V - O$. Noun clauses that function in ways other than as objects do not affect main clause structures as
well: be is soðlice micel bearer bat pu ðe warnige 'For
(there) is indeed great need that you yourself take caution
(or that you yourself warn)' (12, 4). Here the noun clause
functions as an oblique predicate nominative to the dis-
placed subject bearer: 'The great need for thee is that
thou warn thyself.' Even though the subject is displaced,
the noun clause appears in its appropriate position as
predicate nominative. The noun clause may also be a dis-
placed subject in impersonal constructions, as in the
following question: Du gode cyningc, licad ðe wel bat
Apollonius be purh us todæg gegodod is pus heonan fare . . .?
(28, 13-15). Here the noun clause serves as the real sub-
ject of licad: 'that Apollonius (who through us today is
made better) thus fares hence . . . pleases you?' No
matter what the context, then, the presence of noun clauses
within other clauses does not affect the structure of the
dominant clauses.

The same may be said of main clauses with embedded
relative clauses. Since relative clauses are associated
with noun phrases, they exercise no effect on any other
elements in clauses or sentences, usually appearing imme-
diately after the nouns or pronouns that they restrict or
modify. Thus even in Old English the position and word order of the relative clause is easily recognizable to a speaker of Modern English, as in the following complex sentence: *da gesæah hine sum his cuðra manna se waes Hellanicus genemnod, se he ærest bider com.* 'Then saw him a certain one of his known men who was Hellanicus named, he who (had) first thither come' (10, 26-27). Here a relative clause immediately follows *sum his cuðra manna, se* replacing the noun phrase within the subordinate clause. Relative clauses appearing within main clauses that follow adverb clauses likewise do not affect the structure of enclosing main clauses. The following sentence illustrates:

156 *Mid ham be ic becom to fullon andgite, ba nês nan craft, 6e ware fram cynegum began oððe fram æelum mannun be ic ne cuðe.* 'When I came to full awareness, then (there) was no craft, which was from kingly practice or from noble men, which I knew not.' (36, 15-17)

In this example, two relative clauses occur within a demonstrative-ordered main clause (a pattern determined by the temporal adverb clause, however), both of which refer to *craft* and serve to limit its reference. Thus the presence of relative clauses has no effect on the word order in main clauses.
The only syntactically significant main clauses in \textit{Apollonius} are therefore those that are accompanied by adverb clauses. These main clauses are generally of two types: those that contain the demonstrative adverb \textit{pa} and those that do not. Such a distinction is necessary because if a main clause is initiated by \textit{pa} it exhibits Type 3 (Demonstrative) order, such as is shown by principal sentences headed by \textit{pa}. However, if \textit{pa} is not the headword or is not present within the clause, then the clause structure is generally Type 1 (Common).

Main clauses that do not contain demonstrative \textit{pa}, \textit{bonne}, or \textit{bar} occur forty-six times in conjunction with adverb clauses. In addition, there are also six main clauses containing \textit{pa} in positions other than as the initial element. Examples of these clauses follow:

\textbf{Main Clauses That Do Not Contain \textit{pa}}

157 \textit{he mid micclan gefean to scipe gewende} 'he with great joy to (the) ship returned' (10, 9-10)

158 \textit{his andwlita eal areodode} 'his countenance all reddened' (32, 30)

159 \textit{ic for after him} 'I fared after him' (34, 30)
160 he abrac into bam burre bar heo inne læg and het
his hyredmen calle him aweg gan 'he broke into
the bower where she within lay and commanded his
hired men all to go away from him' (2, 14-15)

161 he swiæ irlicum andwitan besæah to bam iungan
ealdorman 'he with a very angry countenance
looked to the young alderman' (6, 6-7)

162 he arn radlice and genealehtæ to əam cyngæ 'he
ran quickly and approached the king'
(20, 15-16)

163 we willæ campian for əinre hælo 'we will fight
for your safety' (14, 17)

164 ic wille me bedihlian on eowrum edele 'I wish
to hide myself in your land' (14, 4-5)

Main Clauses That Contain pa

155 He pa Antiochus se cyningæ gesætte his geban bus
cweðænde 'He then, Antiochus the king, proclaimed
this edict, thus saying' (10, 15-16)

156 Dæt forscildgode wif pa sallum limon abifode
'The wicked woman then in all limbs trembled'
(40, 12-13)

167 he cwæð pa to him sifum 'he said then to
himself'
(8, 16)

168 he bewænde hine pa to əare dohtor and cwæð 'he
turned himself then to the daughter and said'
(24, 15-16)

169 toslat pa his wafels on twa and sealde Apollonige
bone healfæn ðæl bus cweðænde 'he tore then
his cloak in two and gave to Apollonius the half
portion thus saying' (18, 12-13)

170 wænð bonne hider ongeæn 'turn then hither again'
(18, 16)
All of the passages above exhibit Type 1 word order except for 157 and 166. These two clauses are examples of variations of Type 1 order rather than examples of Type 2 (Conjunctive: $\_\_\_\_\_\_$). The effect created is a greater stress on the verbs in clause-final position. Hence, the deviation from Type 1 order here must be seen as the result of an option exercised by the Old English translator rather than as the result of conformity to a general rule. In this situation no specific rule dictates the verb-final position; the context instead calls for Type 1 order.

The same general comment may be made concerning 169, where, in the context of authorial narrative, the translator has chosen to delete the subject he from the main clause, since it occurs in the temporal clause preceding the main clause. The subject is deleted from 170 because the statement is a command; the verb is in the imperative mood.

Thus, in fifty of the fifty-two occurrences of main clauses under discussion, the order of the clauses is unambiguously Type 1 or a stylistic variation of it. Only 169 and 170 depart radically from the pattern.

Pa or bonne initiates main clauses accompanying adverb clauses thirty-four times in Apollonius. In all cases the
order of the clause is Adv - V - S, Andrew's Type ii order.

Six examples of this pattern follow:

171 *æ cliopode heo hi hire to mid liðere spræce* 'then she herself spoke to her with soothing speech' (4, 9)

172 *bonne wearð se to beheafdunge gelæd* 'then was he led to beheading' (4, 26)

173 *ba gewende heo ongean to hire fæder* 'then turned she back to her father' (22, 28-29)

174 *ba beseah heo to Apollonio* 'then looked she to Apollonius' (32, 2)

175 *ba niste he hwilcne forlidene heo nemde* 'then he knew not which shipwrecked (one) she named' (32, 18-19)

176 *bonne sende ic eow word* 'then I will send you word' (34, 9-10)

Thirty of the clauses are headed by *ba*; these clauses are connected to temporal adverb clauses beginning with the temporal adverb phrases *đa* (*da*) 'when, while' and *mid bam be, mid by be, or mid bi be* 'when.' However, this number represents only 60 per cent of the total number of main clauses following adverb clauses: only fourteen of the twenty-four *Mid by r* adverb clauses and only sixteen of twenty-six *đa* (*da*) temporal clauses are completed by demonstrative-ordered main clauses. The other 40 per cent
exhibit Type 1 order. More important, however, is the fact that whenever *ba* initiates the main clause, the order of the elements is always *ba - V - S*.

*Ponne* heads the main clause on four occasions. Unlike *ba*, this adverb is never used in *Apollonius* following or preceding temporal clauses beginning with *da* (*ða*) or

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mid} & \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{bi} \\
\text{by} \\
\text{bam}
\end{cases} \text{ be.}
\end{align*}
\]

In two cases it heads main clauses following conditional *gif* adverb clauses; for example:

177 *Ac gif heora hwilc . . . bone rædels æriht rædde, bonne weard se to beheafðunge gelæd* 'But if any one of them correctly interpreted the riddle, then he was led to beheading' (4, 24-26)

In another case, a *bonne*-headed main clause follows another *bonne*-headed adverb clause:

178 *Ac bonne heo meg hi fram hyre lare geæmtigan, bonne sænde lc eow word* 'but when she may free herself from her studies, then I (will) send you word' (34, 8-10)

In the final case, a *bonne*-headed imperative main clause follows another *bonne*-headed adverb clause:

179 *and bonne bu him to become, bonne acwel ðu hine mid isene ðæse mid attre* 'and when you come to him, then you kill him with iron or with poison' (8, 7-8)

In this instance *ðu* is not deleted from the command; thus the result is an *Adv - V - S* clause pattern.
As a general rule, a clause with the pattern Adv - V - S is either a principal sentence or a main clause following a temporal clause. This type of clause is not usually subordinate. However, as Andrew has shown, exceptions to this rule appear frequently in Old English prose, so that two clauses with demonstrative word order may appear in succession. In such instances, the first of the two may be taken as subordinate to the second. Andrew cites as evidence for this conclusion several Old English translations from Latin, where in the Latin a succession of subordinate and main clauses appears but where modern editors had punctuated the Old English translations as a succession of principal sentences.31 One such instance of this situation occurs in Apollonius, where Goolden has punctuated the Old English as a sequence of a temporal clause followed by a main clause:

180  Da geseah se cyngc bet Apollonius mid rosan rude 
was eal oferbraded, da ongeat he bone cwye 
'When saw the king that Apollonius with rosy red 
was all overspread, then he understood the speech'

(34, 1-3)

That this is not a sequence of two principal sentences may

31 Andrew, p. 10.
be determined by comparing the passage with the Latin original, which has:

Et his dictis videns rex faciem eius roseo rubore perfusam intellexit dictum "When he said these words, the king, seeing his face perfused with rosy red, understood the meaning." (35, 1-2)

In the Latin the first syntactic unit is clearly subordinate to the second (intellexit dictum). The Old English translator has rendered the Latin present participial phrase as an adverb clause, a practice which he frequently employs throughout the manuscript. Regarding this succession of Adv - V - S clauses, Andrew has concluded that in prose this pattern is ambiguous—it can be either principal or subordinate—but that whenever a sequence of two such clauses appears, "the juxtaposition usually demands correlation..." 32

Questions and Negatives

As previously illustrated, Type 1 order is the usual order of affirmative clauses. However, certain contexts require Type 2 order besides the presence of ha or bonne.

32 Andrew, p. 10.
Specifically, interrogative and negative statements call for Type 2 order.

**Interrogatives.**—In *Apollonius*, question clauses occur thirty-one times. Basically, these clauses fall into two categories: clauses beginning with question words (hwa, hwane, hwet, hwam, hwæs, hwilc, hwilcum, hwider, hwar, hwig) and yes/no questions. Clauses employing question words far outnumber yes/no questions, occurring twenty-four times, while yes/no questions occur only six times. One other interrogative clause occurs and will be discussed later.

Yes/no questions exhibit the same structure as their Modern English descendants, namely V - S - O. The following two examples illustrate this structure in different environments:

181 canst ðu bōne dom mynra doktor gifta?  
'understand you the condition of my daughter's marriage?' (6, 7-8)

182 Læreow, ne ofbingð hit ðe gif ic bus wer gecese?  
'Lord, not-grievelth it thee if I thus a husband choose?' (32, 2-3)

These two examples present the classic subject-verb inversion resulting from the application of the yes/no question transformation. In Modern English the inversion of subject
and verb would be blocked and an inserted do auxiliary
would initiate the clause.

Interrogative clauses that begin with question words
in Apollonius use interrogative pronouns hwa, hwat 'who,
what' and their oblique cases; hwilc 'which, what'; and the
interrogative adverbs hwi(g) 'why,' hwar 'where,' and
hwider 'where.' Hwa forms comprise thirteen of the twenty-
four occurrences, whereas hwilc forms occur only three
times. Hwi(g) occurs four times and hwar occurs three
times. Examples of these question word clauses follow:

183 Hwar is se fæder? 'Where is the father?' (4, 5)

184 læreow, hwi gæst ðu ana? 'Lord, why do you come
alone?' (30, 30)

185 hwæt dest þu nu, Apolloni? 'What do you do now,
Apollonius?' (8, 16)

186 For hwilcum intingum hæfð he me fordemed? 'For
what cause has he condemned me?' (12, 7-8)

These clauses illustrate the subject-verb inversion that
takes place when the question word is not the subject-head
of the clause. When the question word is the subject, how-
ever, no inversion occurs:

187 Hwa mihte me fordeman . . . ? 'Who might condemn
me?' (12, 5)
Example 186 above illustrates the inversion of the auxiliary verb in such question word clauses: He hæfð me fordemed for (sum) intingum → For hwilcum intingum hæfð he me fordemed? Here the auxiliary hæfð appears before the subject he. The prepositional phrase has moved to a clause-initial position because it contains the question word, which is always attracted to the beginning of the clause as a result of this transformation.

One of the hwilcum clauses is a reduced question.

When Stranguilio and Apollonius first meet, the following exchange takes place:

188 Stranguilio cwæð: 'Hwa fordemed þe?' Apollonius cwæð: 'Antiochus se cyng.' Stranguilio cwæð: 'For hwilcum intingum?' Stranguilio said: "Who condemned you?" Apollonius said: "Antiochus the king." Stranguilio said: "For what cause?" (12, 29 - 14, 2)

In this exchange both Apollonius and Stranguilio communicate by using phrasal statements—one an answer, the other a question. For hwilcum intingum? is a translation of Qua ex causa? (15, 1), a reduced question in the source, where a deletion rule has been applied as a stylistic option in order to avoid redundancy. This option is also exercised in Old English elsewhere, for example in Ælfric's
Colloquy, where reduced questions occur frequently, sometimes as simply question words alone.\textsuperscript{33}

One interrogative clause contrasts sharply with the other thirty discussed above. When Apollonius first learns from Hellanicus that Antiochus has set a bounty on his head, he asks,

\begin{quote}
189 \textit{Micclum ic eom fordemed?} 'For (how) much I am condemned?'
\end{quote}

This question differs from all the others in both word choice and word order. First, no \textit{hw-} question word appears; \textit{micclum}, dative singular neuter of \textit{michel}, translates \textit{quantum} 'how much.' Obviously \textit{micclum} must function idiomatically in this context as a question word, although \textit{hu micclum} is certainly more likely. More noticeable, however, is the Type 1 structure of this question. One expects at least \textit{Micclum eom ic fordemed?}, a clause in which the auxiliary and the subject have been inverted. Yet the word order is that of a declarative sentence.

\textbf{Negatives}.--Principal clauses in which the entire proposition is made negative also generally exhibit Type 2

word order. Negative particles in these clauses are associated with verbs, always appearing before the verb or auxiliary regardless of the order of the other elements in the clause. The most frequently appearing of these particles is *ne*, which may also be found as a combining form in the adverbs *næfre* (*ne + æfre*) 'never,' *naht* (*ne + wiht*) 'nothing, not,' *nan* (*ne + an*) 'none,' and in certain verbs, such as *næs* (*ne + wæs*), *nabbe* (*ne + habbe*), and *næfð* (*ne + hæfð*). In all, *ne*- or *na*- type negatives occur sixty-seven times in *Apollonius*, while negatives formed by joining the prefix *mis*- to a verb occur three times. Yet most of these seventy negative clauses do not conform to the Type 2 pattern; they are governed instead by other factors. Many exhibit Type 3 (Conjunctive) order because they begin with coordinating or subordinating conjunctions:

189 *and gif ou hæt ne dest* 'and if you do not do that' (6, 30-31)

190 *ac he ne mæg for scame in gan buton scrude* 'but he cannot, for shame, come in without clothes' (22, 7-8)

191 *bonne wast bu hæt bu nu git nast* 'then you will understand what you have not understood until now' (26, 4)
Other clauses contain, in addition to negated verbs, other elements negated as well, yielding double negatives:

193 ac heo næfō hine na wel geisornod 'but she has not well-learned it' (26, 3)

194 bat heo næfre eft Apollonius ne gesawe swa raðe swa heo wolde 'that she never afterwards (would) see Apollonius as soon as she wished' (28, 12-13)

And in still others appear correlative negative constructions, such as the following:

195 na bat an bat we willāð binne fleam bediglian, ac eac swilce . . . we willāð campian for binre hele 'not only will we conceal your flight, but also . . . we will fight for your safety' (14, 15-17)

196 bat bu ne beo hal ne gesund 'that you be not whole nor healthy' (32, 22-23)

Fifty-six of the negative clauses exhibit either Type 3 or Type 1 order. One is a principal clause which ought to employ Type 2 structure but instead employs Type 1:

197 Se cyng ða sölice ne mihte ærfnian his dohtor tearas 'The king then indeed was not able to endure his daughter's tears' (34, 20-21)

Thus only fourteen negative clauses exhibit Type 2 order;
of these just six are principal clauses unaffected by other factors. Three of the fourteen are governed by demonstrative ba, as in

198 ba niste he hwilcne forlidene heo nemde 'then he did not know which shipwrecked (man) she named'
(32, 18-19)

Three others are questions, such as

199 Hwi ne segst pu hit hinum fæder? 'Why do you not say it to your father?'
(4, 4-5)

And two others are influenced by the presence of an imperative, even though one is initiated by and:

200 and ne forseoh ū cyrliscne man 'and don't you despise (a) common man'
(12, 2)

Stronger contextual rules override the presence of ne in clauses such as these.

In spite of the presence of overriding factors in many of the negative clauses, six negative principal clauses exhibiting Type 2 word order are nevertheless present in Apollonius. In each of these clauses the subject and verb are inverted, as the following examples demonstrate:

201 ne eart ū leogende on ńska 'you are not lying in that'
(6, 21)

202 Nat ic hwat he besorgað. 'I do not know what he suffers.'
(22, 31)
All six clauses are direct discourse, and all verbs are in the present tense, as the above examples indicate.

Mis- combines with finite verbs three times to negate propositions. All are listed below:

204 *swa hit be ne mislicyge* 'if it does not dis-please you' (30, 26)

205 *be misbingle*. 'You are mistaken.' (22, 20-21)

206 *and se be hine misræde* 'and he who may mis-interprete it' (4, 20)

Mis- is a Germanic negative prefix that, when applied to verbs, means literally 'in a changed manner' or 'wrongly,' 'badly.' Its primary meaning thus is associated with censure of the manner in which an act is performed, although it may also serve as a "mere" negative prefix.34

Its use in Apollonius, however, is not as a pure negative prefix meaning 'not'; rather, its use is as an adverb of manner. Since its force is negative, the verbs containing it have been included here. In 204, for instance, *swa hit be ne mislicyge* renders *praeter iniuriam tuam* 'contrary

---

34 "Mis-" *Oxford English Dictionary* (1933).
to your insult,' with the sense of 'except that it be a wrong to you.' Here the Old English translator uses an adverb clause 'if it does not displease you' to render a prepositional phrase. In 205 be misbingō 'To you it appears wrongly' ('you are mistaken') translates Male suspicaris 'You suppose wrongly,' thereby closely rendering the original, except for the impersonal construction. Misbingō is a hapax-legomenon found nowhere else in Old English works. In 206, however, misræde is the translation for non invenerit 'does not discover,' and hence mis- preserves the force if not the sense of the Latin negative particle non 'not.'

**Imperatives**

In Old English, the expression of a command to act directed toward a second party is similar to the expression of a command to answer (interrogative), in that it results in a similar structural pattern. Old English imperatives typically delete subjects, leaving verbs in clause-initial position. Yet they may retain their subjects in order to intensify the command. When this situation occurs, the subject always appears after its verb. The result is a
V - S clause pattern similar to that of ba-initiated principal clauses, interrogative clauses, and negative principal clauses.

Imperatives occur sixty-one times in Apollonius, in either subjectless or inverted-structure clauses:

**Subjectless Imperatives**

207 Gehir nu bone rædels 'Hear now the riddle' (6, 10)

208 Gað eow heonon. 'Go yourselves hence.' (20, 14)

209 sege hluddre stæfne hwa ðe hete me ofslean 'say (in) a loud voice who you commanded to slay me' (40, 16-17)

**Retained-Subject Imperatives**

210 gehyr ðu ba onfundennesse 'hear you the solution' (6, 20)

211 Nim ðu, Apolloni, bis gewrit and ræd hit. 'Take you, Apollonius, this letter and read it.' (32, 26-27)

Subjectless imperatives are by far the more numerous in Apollonius, occurring forty-nine times. In three instances the imperatives are accompanied by reflexive pronouns in the accusative, as 208 illustrates. Imperative clauses that retain their subjects occur twelve times, without exception exhibiting Type 2 structure. One of the retained-
subject imperatives merits a brief note, however, because its subject has been restored by emendation. At 14, 22-23, the manuscript has *Wite eac bæt Antiochus se cyngc me aflimed hæfð of minum earde*. Zupitza in his 1896 edition emended the text by inserting *ge* after *wite*, thereby creating a *V – S – O* structure. Goolden accepts the emendation in his edition, and therefore the clause has been included with the Type 2 imperatives in this study.

Three of the subjectless imperatives are likewise the result of Zupitza's emendations. The phrase *wel gesund* occurs three times in the manuscript, once when Apollonius first greets King Antiochus (6, 2) and twice when Hellanicus greets Apollonius (10, 28 and 12, 1). Since *wes gesund* is similar to the common Old English greeting *wes hal* (see *Beowulf*, 1. 407); since at 10, 3 and 28, 8 *gesunde* occurs with forms of the Old English be-verbs (*gesund sy* and *beon ge gesunde*); and since there are no parallels elsewhere in Old English for the use of *wel* with *gesunde*, Zupitza's emendations are well justified. However, there is a difference between the *wel gesund* phrases and the phrases at

---

36 Goolden, p. 45, n. 62.
10, 3 and 28, 8. The former are translations of Latin *ave* 'hail!' or 'be well,' whereas the latter phrases translate forms of *valeo*: *si valeas* 'if you be well' (11, 2) and *valete* 'farewell' (29, 6).

**Subordinate Clauses**

Old English subordinate clauses (noun, relative, and adverb) are similar in function to those of Modern English. In *Apollonius of Tyre* subordinate clauses occur over three hundred times, an average of over twenty subordinate clauses per page.

**Noun clauses.**—Noun clauses occur 120 times in *Apollonius*, functioning as direct objects, appositives, displaced subjects, predicate nominatives, and near-causal modifiers. These noun clauses exhibit some idiosyncracies worth noting, especially when one analyzes them according to their introductory conjunctions. The most common noun clause conjunction is *bat*, which may also function much like a relative pronoun within the noun clause. Another way of forming noun clauses is by using a *hw*-question word or a phrase built around a question word in order to initiate the clause.
Conjunctive *bat* initiates noun clauses in seventy-nine of the 120 cases. Over half of these noun clauses function as direct objects within their enclosing clauses (52/79, 65.8 per cent). The following examples illustrate the typical word order in these clauses:

1. **heo gehyrde [bat bat mæden hire deāes girnde]** 'when she heard that the maiden longed (for) her death' (4, 7-8)

2. **sege him [bat me sy bat heafodfram ðam hneccan acorfen]** 'say to him that my head is cut from the neck' (12, 17-18)

3. **ic gehirde secgan [bat ic waere fordemed]** 'I heard tell that I was condemned' (12, 28)

4. **and sege him [bat se cyngc bit ðe [bat ðu cume to his gereorde]]** 'and say to him that the king bids you that you should come to his feast' (22, 3-4)

In all fifty-two cases the direct object noun clause appears post-verbally, thus exhibiting the order S - V - [O]. Personal pronoun direct objects may often precede the verb, but when the object is other than a personal pronoun—and especially when it is a noun clause—the object appears in final position in the clause. One will also note some common characteristics of the transitive verbs that trigger noun clause objects in *Apollonius*. They are
verbs that refer to communication, perception, and emotion; e.g., secgan 'say' (eight times), biddan 'bid, command' (seven times), gehyran 'hear' (five times), seon 'see' (five times), swerian 'swear,' witan 'know, perceive,' and wenan 'perceive' (three times each). Other verbs used with noun clause objects include myndigan 'remind,' læran 'advise,' and sæcan 'instruct.'

More bat noun clauses occur in Old English than in Modern English, especially when serving as objects of such verbs as those listed above. These verbs in Modern English normally are accompanied by accusative plus infinitive constructions: (for) X to INFINITIVE. Thus 215 is more commonly translated as 'say to him that the king bids (for) you to come to his feast.' The following example illustrates the difference between Old and Modern English in this regard:

215  Nu bidde we be bat by gecese be æne of us brym hwilcne bu wille be to æume habban. 'Now we bid you that you choose yourself one of us three whomever you want to have as a son-in-law.'

(30, 18-19)

This passage may be more efficiently rendered as 'Now we ask for you to choose yourself one of us three...'
Example 217 below may present a better illustration of the evolution of English away from the Verb + Noun Clause construction:

217 ic be lære þæt þu fleo and beorge þinum lif
'I advise you that you should flee and save your life'

(12, 13)

This clause can be cast as 'I advise you to flee and (to) save your life.' However, such translations obscure modal distinctions, reducing to infinitives verbs in the subjunctive, as in the two passages above.

Noun clauses also function as appositives to other noun phrases. Four sentences in Apollonius contain these noun clauses, two of which are appositives to subjects and two of which are appositives to objects. They follow below:

218 Ymbe þæt þu cwæde [þæt þu scilde polodest]
'Concerning what you said that you suffered sin'

(6, 21)

219 and þæt word sprang geond eal þæt land [þæt
Apollonius, se meara cyngc, hæfde funden his wif]
'and the word spread throughout all the land
that Apollonius, the famous king, had found his wife'

(38, 13-14)

220 Nas þæt wel . . . [þæt þu sylf areddest ba
stafas ofer hire birgene?] 'Was it not well
that you (your)self read the letter over her tomb?'

(40, 6-7)
Example 221 illustrates the use of tautologic *æt*, in the words of Bruce Mitchell "the common use of a pronoun to anticipate a noun clause."37 Here the first *æt* serves in a quasi-demonstrative role, somewhere in between 'that' and 'it,' and functions as the grammatical object of *geseah*. However, when compared to the common S - V - [ O ] construction, such as that found in *æt* he *geseah* *æt* ealle bas bingc belocene wæron 'When he saw that all these things locked were' (10, 2), the first *æt* in 221 is clearly redundant, since the noun clause functions quite well as the object of *geseah* when raised from appositional status.

*æt* noun clauses also function as predicate nominatives in Apollonius, though they occur relatively infrequently, just five times:

222 *æt* is soðlice micel hearf *æt* bu ðe warnige 'For you (there) is indeed great need that you take care for yourself' (12, 4)

223 *æt* gewurde *æt*, hlaford, *æt* ic mede nime at ðe for bisum bingum 'May it not be, lord, that I (should) take reward from you for this thing' (12, 21-22)

---

37 Mitchell, p. 64.
Min willa is bat bu ðe wer geceose bar bu silt wille. 'My will is that you choose yourself a man wherever you (your)self wish' (32, 6)

Soð is bat ic eow ðæt sæde bat ge ne common on gedafenlicre tide mynre dohtor to bidanne. 'The truth is what I said to you before, that you come not at a suitable time to ask for my daughter' (34, 7-8)

The worst thing (that) you did (was) that you warned me' (12, 15-16)

The predicate nominative function of the bat-clauses in each of the examples above is clear, despite some irregularities in syntax in 226, where both the relative particle be and the copulative verb wesæn are absent. In 223 above, the noun-clause may function as the realization of tautological bat (Ne gewurðe bat), according to an alternate interpretation. Viewed in this light, the noun clause serves as either an appositive to bat or may be interpreted as the underlying subject of gewurðe: '[That I should take a reward from you for this thing] should not be.' In this interpretation bat serves the same function as existential it in Modern English, such as in It may be seen that Apollonius was gracious ( <That Apollonius was gracious may be seen).
Det noun clauses also appear in miscellaneous constructions not easily categorized. In one construction, a noun clause follows the conjunction buton:

227 *Hwæt is nu mare ymbe buton bot cyningas æghwanon coman and ealdormen* 'What is now more to say about it except that kings and aldermen came from all sides' (4, 21-22)

In another, a *but* noun clause follows *on sam*:

228 *He blissode on sam but he his agenre dohtor wer* 'he rejoiced in it that he was to his own daughter as a husband' (4, 15-16)

Goolden translates *on sam but* in the glossary of his edition as 'because,' thus creating an adverb clause. Yet *on sam* is an idiom which can mean either 'therein,' 'in that' (with an accompanying particle *be*), or, literally, 'in it' or 'in that.' In 228 the noun clause appears to function as an appositive to *sam*, which itself appears to be tautologic, related to the fact in the Modern English phrase the fact that.

Three noun clauses appear to serve a quasi-causal function in their sentences:

---

38 Goolden, p. 70.

229 panca Gode baet He me fliman hider to eowrum gemærân geledde 'thank God that He led me a fugitive hither to your territory' (14, 10-11)

230 ic blissige swiðor bat bu miht ... be sili on gewrite gecyðan hwilcne heora bu wille' 'I (should) rejoice more that you might ... yourself in a letter make known which of them you desire' (32, 4-5)

231 and se cyng blissode on his ylde bat he geseah his nefan mid hire were 'and the king rejoiced in his old age that he saw his niece with her husband' (40, 29)

In 229, the noun clause answers an unstated question "why?"

It is thus related to the use of forðam ðe 'because' clauses, which are used to express cause or reason. In 230, the noun clause may express cause ('I will rejoice more because . . . .'), or it may express a condition ('I will rejoice more if . . . .'). Indeed, Michael Swanton treats it as a conditional clause in his translation of Apollonius in Anglo-Saxon Prose (p. 168). In 231, the noun clause is used again in a causal sense ('and the king rejoiced because . . . .'). Therefore, in these instances noun clauses are employed with adverbial functions, whereas in Modern English the normal practice is to use adverb clauses, as indeed the translations indicate.
In addition to *bat*-headed noun clauses, other noun clauses appear in *Apollonius* without conjunctions:

232  *ic secge be ic hine forleas on sæ*  
*I say to you [that] I lost it at sea*  
(24, 9)

233  *and baðon hig gesunde beon*  
*and (they) bade [that] they be sound*  
(28, 6)

234  *ic secge ðe to gōdan bone forlidenan man ic wille*  
*I say to you, truly [that] I desire the shipwrecked man*  
(32, 13-14)

235  *we sædon æfre ðat ... and for ðe we woldon lustlice swiltan*  
*we said ever that ... and [that] for you we would gladly die*  
(40, 1-3)

All four examples demonstrate the common practice of *that*-deletion from noun clauses, which in Old English relates to Mitchell's contention regarding the evolution of tautologic *bat* and *hit*. 40 These passages employ verbs of communication (*secgan* and *biddan*) and may thus be viewed as indirect quotations. The following analysis illustrates the contention:

232a  *'I say to you: I lost it at sea.'*

233a  *'and they bade: they be sound.'*

234a  *'I say to you: I desire the shipwrecked man.'*

235a  *'We said ever that ... and: we would gladly die for you.'*

40 Mitchell, p. 64.
Obviously, a different context applies to 235, where the second *bat* may have been deleted as the result of an attempt to avoid redundancy, the first *bat* governing both noun clauses to follow. However, 232-234 are illustrative of either a random simplifying of syntax by deleting repeated items or a random appearance of fossilized structures dating from an earlier period before the evolution of the conjunction *bat* as an initiator of noun clauses. Since *bat*-initiated noun clauses far outnumber [*-bat*] noun clauses, the conclusion must be that the latter clauses are the Old English translator's options and are indicative of change in the language.

The primary use of *bat* in noun clauses is therefore as a conjunction whose sole purpose is to link clauses. And yet in thirteen other noun clauses *bat* functions as part of the clause itself. When used in this way, *bat* must be translated as 'what, whatever.' These clauses also function in positions where single-word nouns may appear, as the following examples show:

As direct object (5/13):

236 bonne wast bu bat bu nu git past 'then you will know what you have not understood until now' (26, 4)
As predicate nominative (2/13):

237  *bæt bu were bæt se fæder is*  'that you were what
      the father is'  (12/9)

As displaced subject in impersonal constructions (2/13):

238  *Da ða bæt mæden gehyrde bæt hire was alyfed from
      hire fæder bæt heo ar hyre sylf gedon wolde*
      'When the maiden heard that it was permitted to
      her by her father what she herself already wished
to do'  (24, 19-20)

As object of preposition (2/13):

239  *Ymbe bæt bu cwede*  'Concerning what you said'
      (6, 20)

As clause joined by a correlative (1/13):

240  *Mid bi be he naht elles ne onfunde buton bæt he
      ar ge onte*  'When he found nothing else but what
      he earlier thought'  (8, 15-16)

As appositive (1/13):

241  *Da ða se cyngc bæt gehyrde bæt he his willes
      gehyran nolde*  'When the king heard it, what he
did not wish to hear of his own will'  (6, 5-6)

In all six of the examples above, *bæt* occupies a functional
slot within its own clause. In fact, *bæt* functions as
either a direct object or object of an infinitive in eleven
of the clauses, as a predicate nominative in the other two.
One might interpret *bæt* in these instances as demonstrative
'that' accompanied by unstated *he* 'which,' thus meaning
'that which.' Since these clauses are related in sense to relative clauses, one may also perceive the relationship of *bat* in such clauses to *batte* 'what, that which' (*bat* *be*), also used elsewhere in Old English in noun clauses.

Question words may also introduce noun clauses. These are the interrogative pronouns *hwilc* 'which,* *hwet* 'what,* and *hwa* 'who.' These question-word noun clauses occur fifteen times in *Apollonius.* Six employ *hwilc;* the following two illustrate their use:

242 *bat* *bu* *geceose* *be* *ænne* *of* *us* *prym* *hwilcne* *bu* *wille* *be* *to* *aðum* *habban* 'that you choose yourself which one of us three you desire to have yourself as a son-in-law' (30, 18-19)

243 *Mid* *hī* *be* *se* *cyngc* *ne* *mihte* *findan* *hwilc* *heora* *forliden* *ware* 'when the king might not find which of them was shipwrecked' (32, 25)

In five of the six clauses, *hwilc* is the direct object and is inflected in four instances, as in 242. In addition, all five of these clauses serve as objects of the verbs in the dominating clauses, as 243 illustrates. In 242, however, even though *hwilcne* is indeed the object of the clause verb *wille,* the noun clause is itself appositional to *ænne.*

---

41 Mitchell, p. 76, number 5.
Hwilc also appears in the phrase *swa hwilc man swa* 'whoever,' which may introduce this type of noun clause. *Swa hwilc man swa* noun clauses appear three times in the manuscript:

244  *Swa hwilc man swa minne rædels riht araede, onfo se mynre dohtor to wife* 'Whoever rightly interprets my riddle, he will receive my daughter as wife'  
    (4, 19-20)

245  *Swa hwilc man swa me Apollonium lifigende to gebring&. ic him gife fifti punda goldes* 'Whosoever brings to me Apollonius alive, I will give to him fifty pounds of gold'  
    (10, 16-17)

246  *Swa hwilc man swa ðe lifigende to him bring&. onfo se fiftig punda goldes. *Whosoever brings you to him alive, he will receive fifty pounds of gold.*'  
    (12, 10-11)

These three passages provide occasion for brief commentary on two linguistic points. First, *swa hwilc man swa* functions as the subject in the constituent or dependent clause in all three cases. Second, the constituent clause would in Modern English function as the subject of the matrix or independent clause in 244 and 246, and as the indirect object of 245. Instead, the translator has echoed the noun clause (also called an indefinite relative clause) in

---

42 Mitchell, pp. 77-78.
the independent clause by employing an echoic pronoun, *se* in 244 and 246 and *him* in 245. He does this likewise with *swa hwæt swa* later in the story when he writes

247 *swa hwæt swa ēu on se forlure ic ġe hæt on lande
gestægelige* 'whatsoever you lost at sea, I will
restore it to you on land' (30, 3-4)

Here *hæt* in the independent clause is echoic of the entire
noun clause preceding it. This practice is attested else-
where in Old English, for example in the Anglo-Saxon Chron-
icle, in which appears the following:

248 *ond swahwaswa hit tobrecod, ha gife ic him Godes
curs* 'and whosoever breaks it, then I will
give to him God's curse'

(963E)43

Thus, noun clauses headed by indefinite pronouns serve as
appositives to the echoic pronouns in the examples above.

The interrogative pronoun *hwæt*, neuter of *hwa*, appears
singly, introducing noun clauses four times, and in the
idiom *swa hwæt swa* 'whatsoever' five times. Two examples
of each follow:

249 *Ga and gewite hwæt se iunga man sy be me todæg
swa wel gehìrsu modé. 'Go and learn what the
young man may be that today so well obliged me.'*

(20, 26-27)

43 Vol. I, p. 117.
As 249 and 250 show, all four hwæt noun clauses function as direct objects of verbs in dominating clauses. In addition, hwæt functions either as predicate nominative or as direct object in the dependent clauses. Hwæt-initiated noun clauses may be compared with bæt noun clauses in which bæt also functions as an element within the dependent clause. In Apollonius such bæt noun clauses outnumber hwæt clauses thirteen to four, but these pronouns differ slightly in meaning. Bæt translates Latin quod eleven times in contexts where quod 'what' introduces noun clauses. In one other case, bæt translates quicunque 'whoever, whatever' (sy bæt bu sy for quicunque es, 18, 5); and in the last case, bæt is present where no corresponding form appears in the Latin (nis naht bæt bu segst for nichil dicis, 7, 19). On the other hand, hwæt is the Old English translator’s choice for the Latin interrogative pronouns
quid and quis 'who, what' and the relative pronoun qui 'what.' Hwæt introduces an indirect dependent question in three of the four clauses; these clauses are found in direct discourse in contexts in which the speaker expresses a desire for information. Hæt noun clauses, however, rather than expressing a desire for new information, state ideas already known as facts. The lone exception to this analysis is one hwæt clause:

253  se him ær cydde hwæt Antiochus cync be him gедemed hæfde 'who earlier said to him what Antiochus king had decreed about him'

(42, 16-17)

Here one might expect hæt, since the information is recounted rather than questioned. The Latin is instructive here: in the other three occurrences of hwæt clauses, hwæt translates interrogative quis or quid. However, in 253 there is no corresponding Latin word for hwæt; it is understood in the phrase de Antiocho: qui ei de Antiocho nunciaverat 'who to him from Antiochus had announced' (43, 14-15).

Underlying the clause must be a phrase such as 'that which Antiochus had decreed': 'who announced to him that which had been decreed from Antiochus.' The translator's selection of hwæt is a departure from his own practice, although
hwæt performs non-interrogative functions elsewhere in Old English, such as in the following passage from The Wife's Lament:

254 Ic hæt secgan mæg
hwæt ic yrmæ gebad sibban ic up weox
niwes obbe ealdes, no ma bonne nu. . . .
'I that may say
what I of hardships endured since I grew up
of new or of old, no more than now...'.

Examples 251 and 252 illustrate the form and function of swa hwæt swa noun clauses. The phrase means 'whatsoever' and functions within its clause as direct object four of five times. In 252 swa hwæt swa functions as the subject of its clause. In all five instances the noun clause functions as the direct object of the verb of the independent clause.

Other hw- interrogative forms which introduce noun clauses and function as elements within their clauses are

hwam 'whom,' dative singular (twice); hwæne 'whom,' accusative singular (once); hwa 'who,' nominative singular (once); and hwilcum 'what, which,' dative singular (once). In all five occurrences these noun clauses function as direct objects within the dominating clauses.

Noun clauses are, therefore, used most frequently in *Apollonius* as direct objects (69.2 per cent) and appositives (14.2 per cent), less frequently as predicate nominatives (5.8 per cent) and as displaced subjects in impersonal constructions (5.0 per cent). Conjunctive *bæt* heads two-thirds of all the noun clauses, far surpassing the use of functionally significant *bæt* and interrogative pronoun-initiated noun clauses, which occur in 30 per cent of the cases.

Relative clauses.—Adjective or relative clauses, serving either to limit antecedents or to add descriptive information to antecedents, occur sixty-eight times in *Apollonius*. Although *bæt* ('that which') clauses, which were discussed in the preceding section as noun clauses, are considered relative clauses by earlier Old English grammarians, in the present study they have not been classified as such and hence are not numbered in this section. Indeed, the questions regarding the syntax of Old English relative clauses and the various uses of the

---

45 See Andrew, pp. 35-47; Mitchell, pp. 76-77, number 5.
relative pronouns are as yet unresolved. The focus in this section of the present study is, however, restricted to the use of the relative pronouns and the word order of the clauses in *Apollonius*.

Two types of relative pronouns are used in *Apollonius*—indeclinable *be* and declinable *se, seo, bet*. In the latter case, the pronouns may also be accompanied by indeclinable *be*. Their use in *Apollonius* is in accord with that of standard late West Saxon.

Indeclinable *be* occurs in forty-six of the sixty-eight relative clauses, in every instance introducing the clause. This trait of relative pronouns is now called in transformation-generative analyses relative pronoun attraction, the process by which a relative pronoun is "attracted" to the antecedent noun or pronoun in the dominating clause which it replaces in the relative clause. This process also affects prepositional phrases containing relative pronouns. Examples of relative clauses containing the particle *be* appear below:

As subject of its clause: \(\frac{24}{46}\)

---

\(^{46}\) Mitchell, p. 77, number 7.
255 **cyrlicscne man he bið mid wurðfullan peawum gefrætwod** 'a common man that is adorned with honorable manners' (12, 2-3)

256 **ðone weg be him getæht was** 'the way that was shown to him' (18, 23-24)

257 **min lærow, be me lærdæst** 'my lord, that taught me' (38, 9)

As object of its clause: 15/46

258 **and þæt wyrð be he mid ham hwæte genam** 'and the price that he received for the wheat' (16, 2-3)

259 **man þe ic lufode na for galnesse ac for wisdome** '(the) man that I loved not for lust but for wisdom' (38, 10)

As object of preposition in its clause: 6/46

260 **to þam wurðe be ic hit gehoffset on minum lande** 'at the price that I bought it for in my land' (14, 25-26)

261 **Se iunga man be bu æfter axodest is forliden man.** 'The young man that you asked after is a shipwrecked man.' (20, 30)

As an adverbial in its clause: 1/46

262 **pa hwile be he lifede** 'the while that he lived' (42, 15)

Indeclinable *he* is usually employed as the relative pronoun in a restrictive relative clause, in the same manner as that functions in Modern English:

---

47 Andrew, p. 35.
Restrictive: The young man that you asked about is a shipwrecked man.

Non-restrictive: Apollonius, whom you asked about, is a shipwrecked man.

However, in Apollonius be is often employed in non-restrictive clauses where one would expect forms of the inflected relative pronoun: se, seo, bæt. Thirteen be relative clauses comprise this group, though differing circumstances account for this number. Four of these clauses appear in the first two-thirds of the manuscript (pp. 131-140), whereas nine appear in the last third (pp. 141-145). Of the four cases of be non-restrictive relative clauses that occur in the first two-thirds of the manuscript, the antecedent of one is a Determiner+Adjective+Noun phrase (266), the antecedent of another is a modified noun phrase (267), and the antecedents of the other two are proper nouns (268 and 269):

263  bam healfan scicilse ðe he on hæfde 'the half cloak that he had on' (20, 1-2)

264  and fela fægæra binga þæra teah, be bam folce ungiçnawen was and ungewunelic 'and many a fair thing there related forth that to the people was unknown and unusual' (26, 17-18)

This division of the manuscript into two parts will be clarified in Chap. IV.
265 Apollonius be burh us todæg gegodod is
'Apollonius, who through us today enriched is'
(28, 14-15)

266 Gode bancigende ðe him ne forwyrrnde cynelices
wurðescipes and frofres 'thanking God who had
not denied to him royal honor and consolation'
(28, 19-20)

Of the nine departures from the standard practice
which occur in the latter third of the manuscript, five
occur in contexts in which one would expect non-restrictive
se forms:

267 bonne wite bu ðæt ic hæbbe burh weax aboden, ðæ
nane scame ne can, ðæt ic sylf ðæ for scame
seogan ne mihte 'then know you that I have
declared through wax, which knows no shame, what
I myself cannot tell you for shame' (32, 15-17)

268 and bas mine dohtor, be ic beforan ðæ, Diana,
geandweardod hæbbe 'and this my daughter, whom
I before thee, Diana, have presented'
(36, 25-26)

269 and bu eart Apollonius, min lærest
'and you are Apollonius, my lord, who taught me'
(38, 8-9)

270 bis is min tacenbora, be me nacodne underfenc
and me getæht ðæt ic to be becom 'this is my
standard bearer, who received me naked and
instructed me that I should come to you'
(42, 10-11)

271 And heo gesette hyre gingran be hire folgode to
sacerde 'And she appointed as priestess her
deputy who followed her' (38, 17)
The antecedent in each of the five cases above is specified sufficiently so that the relative clauses are non-restrictive rather than restrictive. Two of the other four cases are somewhat more marginal, their antecedents (bone forliden man, 34, 18 and nan craeft, 36, 16) perhaps perceived by the translator as further limited by the relative clauses. The other two cases are the result of Peter Goolden's punctuation of restrictive relative clauses as if they were non-restrictive:

272 ðæt þu miht burh þa lære, þe þu æt me underfenge, þe sílf on gewrīte cyðan hwilcne heora þu wille 'that you could through the studies which you received from me make known yourself in a letter which of them you desire' (32, 4-5)

273 Da was hyre gecyd, þe ðær ealdor wæs 'Then it was made known to her, who was elder [in authority] there' (36, 1)

The limiting nature of the relative clauses in both instances rules out the need for commas in the edition. Thus, the grammar of these two passages conforms to the usual Old English pattern, even though the modern punctuation does not.

In summary, then, thirty-five of the forty-six beheaded relative clauses are clearly restrictive, while four
more are marginal, following noun phrase antecedents that include some kind of limiting modifier, such as an adjective or possessive pronoun. Thus, in 84.8 per cent of the occurrences be heads restrictive relative clauses, and in only 15.2 per cent of the occurrences does it head non-restrictive clauses.

Se, seo, baet, which function as definite articles and as demonstrative pronouns, also are employed as relative pronouns. They may appear alone or with the indeclinable relative particle be. These relative pronouns, always declined according to person and number, take their case from their function within the relative clauses in which they appear. In Apollonius twenty-two relative clauses employ se, seo, baet relativizers. They exhibit all the case forms, both singular and plural. Ten examples follow, five of se alone and five of se with be:

Se, Seo, baet alone as relativizer: 14/22

Nominative: 8/14

49 Mitchell, p. 74, number 5.
'a certain young man who was very wealthy and wise and was alderman of the people in Tyre, who trusted in his wisdom and in the scholarly studies' (4, 30-32; 6, 1)

'three learned men and noble-born, who for a long time had desired the king's daughter' (30, 10-11)

'a son ... whom he placed as king over the kingdom of Arcestrates, his grandfather' (42, 22-23)

'And Apollonius soon met another familiar man walking toward him whose name was called Stranguilio' (12, 25-26)

'This king's queen, by whom he had a very beautiful daughter of unbelievable fairness, was departed from life.' (2, 5-6)

'I am Apollonius the Tyrian, to whom you gave half your cloak.' (42, 13-14)

These examples are illustrative of the usual co-occurrence
of *se* relative pronouns with nominal antecedents, for in all fourteen cases in *Apollonius* these forms refer to noun antecedents. In addition, thirteen of the fourteen clauses are non-restrictive in function, the only exception being that found in 274. In this case, the clause limits the noun phrase *sum iung man*, itself appositive to *Apollonius*.

Se + be as relativizer: 8/22

Se be relatives: 7/8

280 *and se be hine misræde, sy he beheafod* 'and he who misinterprets it, may he be beheaded' (4, 20-21)

281 *and him fram adryfan ba be hyre girndon to rihtum gesyncipum* 'and drove from him those that desired her for rightful marriage' (4, 17-18)

282 *Se be him bringe bin heafod, onfo se hundteontig punda goldes.* 'He who may bring him your head, he receives one hundred pounds of gold.' (12, 11-12)

283 *and gewrite on ciste alegde bet se be hi funde hi wurölice bebirigde* 'and laid a letter in the coffin so that he who found her would bury her honorably' (36, 28)

Sebe relative: 1/8

---

50 Anita Dowsing, "Some Syntactic Structures Relating to the Use of Relative and Demonstrative *æt* and *se*, in Late Old English Prose," *Neuephiologische Mitteilungen*, 80 (1979), 292-93.
Then a certain one of his familiar men who was named Hellanicus, who had come there first, saw him. (10, 26-27)

In 280-283 are examples of the demonstrative plus relative particle construction, called the "epanaleptic relative" by Andrew. They are easily translated 'he that' or 'he who,' se corresponding to 'he' and the particle be serving as the relativizer. As 280 and 282 demonstrate, moreover, the stressed demonstrative may sometimes be recapitulated when the relative clause is embedded between se and its predicate in the enclosing clause.

One may make a case for se be in 280 and 282 as being what Andrew calls "pleonastic se be" if the relative clause is viewed as subordinate to its following principal clause: 'may he (se) who (se be) misinterprets it be beheaded' and 'he (se) who (se be) brings to him thy head will receive one hundred pounds of gold.' Although such wrenching of syntax may do for a translation of the two passages, it runs counter to the law of Old English grammar which requires that the relative pronoun appear subsequent to its

---
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antecedent, either immediately following or removed by an intervening phrase (see 276, 277, and 278). Thus only se be rather than se be may appear in such cases. This recapitulation of subject may be compared, moreover, with a similar practice occurring with swa hwilc man swa in 244, 245, and 246 earlier in this study. In fact, 245 presents both subordinating pronouns side-by-side in coordinated clauses:

245 Swa hwilc man swa me Apollonium lifigendne to gebring6, ic gife him fifti punda goldes, and bam be me his heafod to gebring6, ic gife him c punda goldes. 'Whoever brings to me Apollon- ius alive, I will give to him fifty pounds of gold, and to him who brings his head to me, I will give to him one hundred pounds of gold.'

(10, 16-18)

Notice that here the first him repeats swa hwilc man swa in the same way that the second him repeats bam in bam 6e. The similarity between the two subordinating pronouns also suggests that, like swa hwilc man swa, bam 6e may be translated as 'to whoever.' Indeed, all seven se be constructions may be rendered as 'whoever' or 'whomever' without blurring meaning. In five of the seven cases se be translates relative qui 'who, which, that,' whereas in the case of relative se only five of fourteen occurrences translate
The word order of these three types of relative clauses is instructive of the basic differences between se and be relative clauses. The fourteen se clauses all exhibit Type 1 clause order, whereas the be clauses are almost equally divided between Type 1 (23/48) and Type 2 (25/48). Not counted among the Type 2 structures are seven clauses of the order S - Pron Obj - V, which typically exhibit verb-final order because of the presence of the pronoun object. These clauses have therefore been included among the Type 1 structures as variants of the pattern S - V - Obj. Of the se be, sepe relative clauses, three exhibit Type 2 structure (including the one sepe clause at 283) while the others exhibit Type 1 or variant S - Pron Obj - V word order. As Anita Dowsing has shown in her study of relative se, the order of relative clauses headed by se is normally
that of principal clauses (Type 1). Therefore the usage of the Old English translator of *Apollonius* follows this general practice. Relative clauses, however, are less restricted to either Type 1 or Type 2 order exclusively.

**Adverb clauses.**—The third major type of subordinate clause in Old English is the adverb clause. These clauses behave much like their modern English counterparts by expressing the usual temporal, spatial, conditional, causal, concessional, comparative, and resultant relationships with independent clauses. Thus the traditional categorization of such clauses will do quite well as a means of organizing the discussion of them as they appear in *Apollonius*. However, though their function is the same as that of Modern English adverb clauses, they differ from Modern English adverb clauses with respect to their subordinating conjunctions, word order, and the frequency of their use of verbs in the subjunctive mood.

*Apollonius of Tyre* contains 160 adverb clauses, more than either noun clauses or relative clauses. These clauses
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express all the relationships between clauses cited above, although four types predominate. They will be discussed in the order of their frequency, from most to least frequent.

A. Temporal clauses.—By far the most frequent and diverse of the adverb clauses in Apollonius are the temporal clauses. Seventy-two of them appear in the manuscript, and they are initiated by nine different conjunctions expressing various time relationships:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ær} & \quad \text{'before'} \\
\text{sona} & \quad \text{swa} \quad \text{'as soon as'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{swa} & \quad \text{rače} \quad \text{swa} \quad \text{'as soon as'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oð} & \quad \text{bæt} \quad \text{'}until'
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mid} & \quad \text{by} \quad \text{} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{'}when'
\end{align*}
\]

Temporal clauses headed by șa (şa), mid \{by \{bæt \\} be\}, and bonne account for fifty-five of the seventy-two clauses. șa (șa) clauses occur twenty-six times, five of which follow below:

285 șa șa se cyng bæt gehyrde bæt he his willes gehyran nolde 'When the king heard that, what he did not wish to hear of his own will' (6, 5-6)

286 șa he geseah bæt selle pas bingc belocene waron 'When he saw that all these things were locked' (10, 1-2)

287 șa he șa gewrita oferrated hæfde 'When she had read-over the letters' (32, 1-2)
These five clauses show most of the traits of δα (δα) clauses. First, such clauses may begin with either δα or with δα δα—seventeen begin with δα δα while nine begin with δα. Apparently the number of δα's makes no difference in meaning, because the conjunction in all of these temporal clauses means 'when.' Secondly, the word order of the δα (δα) clauses is varied. These clauses should show Type 3 (S . . . V) order, which Andrew has labeled "conjunctive order." However, only six of the clauses are clearly conjunctive, as 287 above shows. Another seven are ambiguous because they contain pronoun objects. Seven more clauses contain noun clause direct objects, which always follow the verb, as 286 above demonstrates. Altogether, fifteen clauses exhibit S . . . V structure, the slot following the verb filled by a prepositional phrase when anything occurs after the verb.
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Included in the count of $\delta$a-clauses here is the first of the two $\delta$a-clauses in succession at 34, 1-3, and already discussed on pp. 91-92 as example 180. At this point it is important to recall that this is the only case of Type 2 order for a temporal clause anywhere in Apollonius, yet a succession of two Type 2 $\delta$a-clauses is often simply a subordinate followed by an independent clause.

The next most numerous temporal clause connectives are the phrases mid $\text{bi be}$, mid $\text{by be}$, mid $\text{bam be}$, and mid $\text{bi}$, which occur twenty-four times in the text. Mid $\text{bi}$, which occurs but once (4, 29), carries the meaning 'while,' whereas mid $\text{bi be}$, mid $\text{by be}$, and mid $\text{bam be}$, employing the indeclinable particle be, usually mean 'when.' Five examples of these subordinators follow:

290 and mid by be he smeade ymbe $\text{bat ingesthyd}$ 'and when he (had) deliberated about the meaning' (6, 16-17)

291 Mid by be se cyninge gehirde bat Apollonius bone reedsels swa rihte arædde 'When the king heard that Apollonius had so correctly interpreted the riddle' (6, 24-25)

292 Mid bi be Stranguilio bat gehirde 'When Stranguilio heard that' (14, 13-14)

293 Mid bam be heo bat gehirde 'When she heard that' (36, 3)
When I came to full intellect (36, 15-16)

These examples present evidence of a variety of orders. Only ten of these clauses exhibit Type 3 structure; however, five of these are clauses with pronoun objects (as in 292 and 293) and thus cannot be counted as genuine Type 3 clauses. Thus, just five of these clauses display unambiguous Type 3 order. Of those clauses containing noun objects, the following two are examples of unambiguous Type 3 structure:

When he nothing else discovered (8, 15)

When the king these words spoke (22, 46)

In these typical Type 3 clauses, the direct object occupies a slot before the verb, which is usually in clause-final position, unless an adverbial modifier is present. Five more clauses contain noun-clause objects, which, it will be remembered, always appear after the verb. However, Type 1 structure occurs in eight clauses, two of which are headed by conjunctions (and and ac). One of these clauses follows:

But when he came into the king's hall (42, 8-9)
Here the structure should be Type 3, since the clause begins with both a conjunction and a subordinating adverb. Therefore, the only conclusion that can be drawn concerning the structure of temporal mid \(\{\text{bī} \over \text{bāy} \}\) be clauses in Apollonius is that it varies, employing both Type 1 and Type 3 order.

The third type of temporal clause begins with the conjunction bonne 'when,' which heads five clauses. Two examples of this type of clause follow:

298 *Gif ic be ne gebence bonne me bet bīb* 'If I do not thank you when it is better for me'

(18, 21)

299 *bet bu mage freedom onfon bonne bu ongean cymst* 'so that you may receive freedom when you come back'

(8, 9)

bonne might appear at first glance to be a stylistic variant used in place of ða (ða) and mid \(\{\text{bī} \over \text{bāy} \}\) be; however, there are some fundamental differences between bonne-clauses and the previously discussed temporal clauses. First, these clauses appear after their independent clauses in three of the five cases, whereas none of the mid-clauses and only one of the ða (ða) clauses appear after their independent clauses. Furthermore, the two bonne-clauses
that appear before their independent clauses (8, 7-8 and 34, 9-10) are correlated with another bonne-clause in a sequence that translates 'when . . . then . . . .' Third, bonne seems to be confined largely to dialogue—four of the five bonne-clauses occur within direct discourse. In these four cases, the clause verb is in the present tense and refers to a future action. Thus, bonne in these contexts appears to mean 'whenever' or 'when' with future reference. In contrast, ða (ða) and mid clauses contain preterite verbs and are used exclusively in narrative. The lone exception to these rules is at 28, 23:

300 and na leng heo ne gebad bonne hit dag was 'and she endured it no longer when it was day'

In this instance bonne is used in a narrative passage with a preterite verb (was). Whenever bonne is used with a preterite verb it is usually a frequentative, whereas ða is used only of a single completed act. However, in this case bonne with preterite is used to refer to a single completed act. Therefore, bonne in this context must be translated 'when' and not as frequentative 'whenever.'
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Next in frequency after the 'when' clauses are the 'as soon as' clauses, headed by the subordinating phrases *sona swa*—which occurs five times—and *swa raðe swa*, which appears once. Three examples follow:

301  **Thaliarcus sona swa he bæt gehyrde**  'Thaliarcus, as soon as he heard that'  (8, 9-10)

302  **and sona swa heo hearpian ongan**  'and as soon as she began to harp'  (24, 27)

303  **bæt heo nefre eft Apollonium ne gesawe swa raðe swa heo wolde**  'that she never afterwards (would) see Apollonius as soon as she wished'  (28, 12-13)

Four of the five *sona swa* clauses precede their main clauses, while the only one that follows its main clause actually occurs following the first of coordinated verb phrases:

304  **ac eode sona swa hit leohht wæs and gesæt beforan hire fæder bedde**  'but went as soon as it was light and sat before her father's bed'  (28, 23-24)

A general tendency in word order in these clauses is difficult to discover because two of the clauses contain noun clause objects and one consists only of a subject and a verb (303). However, two of the remaining three (302 and 304) exhibit Type 3 word order. Number 301 is ambiguous because it contains a pronoun object occupying the slot between the subject and the verb.
One of the five *sona swa* clauses results from a mis-translation of a Latin phrase and so calls attention to itself here. Double subordinating conjunctions begin a temporal clause at 18, 8-9:

305  *Da sona swa se fiscere geseah bat se iunga man at his fotum lag*  'When as soon as the fisherman saw that the young man lay at his feet'

So the translator renders *Piscator ut vidit prima specie iuvenem pedibus suis prostratum*  'The fisherman when he saw a youth of most distinguished appearance at his feet prostrated'  (19, 8-9). Obviously the Old English translator has mistranslated *prima specie* 'of first (or most distinguished) appearance' as *sona swa* 'on first appearance' or 'as soon as.'  Consequently, *sona swa* ought not to be in this passage at all.

*Bat*  'until' is the next most frequent temporal clause conjunction, occurring five times in the text. In each case it heads a subordinate clause that follows a main clause. Example 306 below illustrates the structure of this type of temporal clause:
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306 *Da* Apollonius *bat* gehyrde, he *bam* gehyrsumode and eode forð mid *bam* men oð *bæt* he becom to ðæs cynges healle. 'When Apollonius heard that, he obeyed it and went forth with the men until he arrived at the king's hall.' (22, 4-6)

*Sídən* 'after, since' occurs twice as a temporal clause conjunction, in both cases the subordinate clauses following the main clauses:

307 forðam *de* Apollonius *se ealdorman* færinga nahwar ne ætywe *sídən* he ongean com fram Antiocho *bam cyninge* | 'because Apollonius the alderman suddenly disappeared since he came back from Antiochus the king' (10, 7-9)

308 *ða cwen* se cyningc to his mannon *sídən* Apollonius *agan was* | 'Then spoke the king to his men after Apollonius was gone' (20, 22-23)

*After* *bam* *be* is another temporal clause conjunction meaning the same as *sídən*. It heads one clause in Apollonius:

309 *Sōlice* *after* *bam* *be* Apollonius *afaren was* | 'Indeed, after Apollonius was departed' (8, 3)

*At* *bam* *be* | 'before' also introduces one temporal clause:

310 *ac* hit *wæs* lang *er* *bam* *be* *ða scipa* *gegearcode weron* | 'but it was long before the ships were prepared' (10, 24)

*Nu* is also used as a conjunction introducing temporal clauses twice in the manuscript, but its use constitutes a special case. *Nu* appears to combine the ideas of time
('now') and cause when used as a conjunction, meaning variously 'now that, since, because.' Indeed, in one passage it appears to mean 'now,' but in the other it appears to mean 'because.' A comparison of the Latin with the Old English versions of both passages reveals the versatility of this conjunction:

311 and nu ic minnes fæder leafe habbe 'and now that I have my father's leave' (24, 22)

et quia patris mei indulgentia permittit 'and because my father's indulgence permits' (25, 17-18)

312 nu bin mildheortnesse me leafe sealde bat ic silf moste ceosan hwilcne wer ic wolde 'since your kindheartedness (has) given me leave that I (my)self might choose which man I desired' (32, 12-14)

quoniam clemenciae tuae indulgentia permittit mihi dicere quem volo 'since the indulgence of your mercy allowed to me to say whomever I wish' (33, 8-9)

In these passages, nu is the translator's choice to render both quia 'because' and quoniam 'since.'

One will note that several of the temporal clause conjunctions under scrutiny in this section employ phrases composed of prepositions plus accusative or dative forms.

---
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of the neuter definite article. These phrases include _ar_ bam be, _after_ bam be, _mid_ bam be, and _of_ bat. To the first three forms have been affixed indeclinable be, an addition which changes phrasal prepositions to subordinate clause conjunctions. The operation of be in these phrases is similar to its operation in relative clauses—i.e., it is a subordinating particle. Applied to the three phrases under discussion, it distinguishes them from ambiguous _ar_ bam (either 'before that' or 'before'), _after_ bam (either 'after that' or 'after'), and _mid_ bam (either 'with that' or 'when, while'). Mitchell suggests that the nearest we can come to approximating the force of be as a subordinating particle is to translate it as 'namely.' _of_ bat is a phrasal conjunction composed of the preposition _of_ 'until' plus bat. In this case _of_ governs the accusative of neuter bat, whereas the previous constructions govern either the dative or instrumental cases of bat.
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Since *de* already has the meaning 'until,' *bat* here functions as a subordinator very much in the manner of its function in noun clauses. What results is literally 'until that,' a phrase similar to Modern English dialect variants of adverb clause conjunctions such as *how that, when that.*

B. **Clauses of place.** Related to temporal adverb clauses are the locative adverb clauses, those that make reference to spatial relationships. Such clauses, introduced by *par* 'where,' occur only six times in *Apollonius.* Three of them follow:

313  *he abrac into bam bure par heo inne læg*  
    'he broke into the bower where she lay within'  
    (2, 14)

314  *Min willa is bat bu ðe wer geceose ðar ðu sylf wille.*  
    'My will is that you should choose yourself a husband wherever you yourself may desire.'  
    (32, 6)

315  *to Antiochian, par Apollonio was bat cynerice gehealden.*  
    'to Antioch, where the kingdom was held for Apollonius.'  
    (38, 19-20)

*Par* functions in these contexts as a subordinating adverb which may be translated phrasally as 'to the place where'

---

61. See, for example, the first line of the General Prologue to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales:* "Whan that Aprill with his shoures soote..."
or 'whither.' It may serve in a restrictive capacity, as with bure in 313, or in a non-restrictive capacity, as with to Antiochian in 315. In five of the six clauses, the clause-verb is a preterite indicative, a circumstance that provides strong evidence for regarding the force of bar not as a question word ('where,' suggesting unknown information) but rather as a reference to a specific location. Indeed, four of the six clauses have specific antecedents while one contains the antecedent in bar:

316 and gesæt bar him getæht waes 'and sat in the place where (it) was shown to him' (22, 10-11)

bar, hwar 'where,' and hwanon 'whence' are used to begin subordinate clauses in Apollonius. What distinctions, if any, exist among these forms? The following two clauses illustrate some important differences between the use of these adverbs in subordinate clauses:

317 Hæt him findan hwar he hine mege wurðlicost gerestan. 'Bid him to find where he may most honorably rest himself.' (28, 16-17)

318 Nat ic hwæt he is ne hwanon he is 'I do not know who he is nor where he comes from' (24, 2-3)

A comparison with the Latin source of both of these passages reveals that both clause-verbs in Latin are in the subjunctive (quiescat 'he may rest,' 29, 13; and sit 'he may be,' 25, 2). Thus the adverbs that introduce the clauses (unde 'whence' and ubi 'where') are question-words, implying unknown or unsure information in both cases. The Old English translator preserves the subjunctive in 317 with the use of the modal verb; however, he departs from his source by using the indicative is instead of subjunctive sy or beo in 318.

Two important distinctions between bar and the hw-question-words therefore become clear. First, the hw-clauses cited above are not adverb clauses at all; rather, they are used nominally in these passages as direct objects. And second, they refer to unknown or unsure information; hence the question-words. However, bar refers to a place already specified, performing this function in five of the six passages in Apollonius, the same five that employ preterite indicative verbs. The lone exception is 314, where bar initiates a clause employing a present subjunctive verb (wille). The statement is thus the expression of a
doubtful outcome—Apollonius' desire that Arcestrate select a husband from wherever she may wish. One therefore might expect hwar in this context. However, since the Latin has a present indicative verb (desiderat), the Old English translator appears to be doing no more than faithfully rendering his source at this point.

C. Conditional clauses.—Clauses of condition are next in frequency in Apollonius, occurring twenty-three times. All begin with gif, although six are preceded by by the conjunctions and or ac. Gif translates Latin si, nisi, or sin in twenty-one of the cases. In one of the other two cases, the Latin has quod nubo 'because I marry' (33, 2) where the Old English has gif ic bus wer geceose 'if I thus choose a husband' (32, 3). The other case is contained in the epilogue original in the Old English (42, 30). The rest are illustrated by the following five clauses:

319 and gif bu péet ne dest 'and if you do not do that' (6, 30-31)

320 gif ge minne fleam bedigliæ 'if you conceal my flight' (14, 13)

321 gif ȝu wilt bisum pingum gehyrsum beon 'if you will be obedient in this thing' (30, 2)
As one can see from these examples, the tendency in these clauses is towards Type 3 order. When an object is present (319 and 320) it is usually before the verb.

D. **Purpose and result clauses.**—Purpose and result clauses are considered together in this section because, in the words of Mitchell, "a result is often a fulfilled purpose and a purpose a yet-to-be completed result." In general, purpose clauses take the subjunctive while result clauses take the indicative, and both types of clause may even be introduced by the same conjunctions—**bat, bætte, swa bat, and swa ... bat.** Twenty-seven of these clauses occur in *Apollonius*, eighteen of result and nine of purpose. The following examples illustrate both the structure and the range of subordinating conjunctions used in these clauses:

**Purpose**
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324 bat bu bebence ðone radels ariht 'so that you may consider the riddle correctly' (6, 29)

325 ac bi læs be þe tweenige bare spræce 'but lest you be uncertain as to the speech' (34, 19)

326 Ic arædde Antiochus radels þes cynges to bon bat ic his dohtor underfenge me to gemæccan
'I read the riddle of Antiochus the king in order that I should receive his daughter to me as a wife' (36, 17-19)

Result

327 swa bat se heaf swegde geond eall ba ceastre 'so that the grief resounded throughout all the city' (8, 25-26)

328 bat bu ne beo hal ne gesund 'so that you be neither whole nor sound' (32, 22-23)

bat is the most frequent conjunction introducing result clauses, appearing sixteen times. Swa is used once (20, 11) and læs be 'so that' once (18, 7). Only four of the result clauses employ subjunctive verbs, but they are close translations of the Latin. Example 328 above is one of these. All nine of the purpose clauses, however, are consistent with the generally-held view that such clauses employ subjunctive verbs. The conjunctions introducing these clauses are to þam bat, to ðon bat 'in order that,' four times; bat 'so that,' three times; and bi læs be and be læs be 'lest,' two times.
E. Cause.—Causal clauses employing forðam be 'because' and nu 'now that' as conjunctions occur fifteen times in Apollonius. Forðam be is by far the more frequent, appearing thirteen times, while nu is used just twice. Examples follow:

329 forðam be ðu eart forðedem 'because you are condemned' (12, 4-5)

330 forðon ðe we poliað bone heardestan hungor and bone reðestan 'because we suffer the hardest hunger and the severest' (14, 7-8)

331 Nu forðam be he gehyrsum was buire hæse and minum willan 'Now, because he was obedient to your command and my desire' (34, 29)

332 and nu ic mines fæder leafe habbe 'and now that I have my father's leave' (24, 22)

Examples 329 and 331 illustrate the variety of forðam be forms. Forðon ðe appears twice, and a split form—forðam be—occurs three times, while the other eight occurrences are forðam be forms. This connective is formed by adding indeclinable be to forðam 'therefore.' The resulting subordinating conjunction most often renders Latin qui, quia, quis, quod, all meaning 'because' in these contexts. However, in five instances causal conjunctions are absent from the Latin, the Old English translator inserting forðam be.
One example will illustrate. When Stranguilio explains the suffering of Tharsus to Apollonius, he speaks the words cited in 330. In the Latin this statement is in the form of a coordinated clause: *sed crudelissima mors ante oculos nostros versatur* 'but the cruelest death hovers before our eyes' (15, 7).

*Nu,* which initiates the other two causal clauses, combines cause with time and is most normally translated as 'now that' or 'since.' These two clauses have already been discussed on pp. 142-43 with the temporal clauses, but they are repeated here because they are also causal in force.

**F. Comparative.**—Clauses of comparison occur seven times in *Apollonius.* They make use of two conjunctions: *swilce* (five times) and *swa . . . swa* (two times). Examples of each follow:

333  *na swilce he cuma were ac swilce he his aȳum were*  
     'not as if he were a guest but as if he were his son-in-law'  
     (34, 12-13)

334  *swa same swa se ȳe hine ariht ne rǣdde*  
     'just the same as him who did not interpret it correctly'  
     (4, 26-27)
G. Concession.--Clauses of concession occur only four times in the manuscript, all introduced by beah (be) 'though.' All four appear below:

335 and to hire fæder willan gebuge, beah ọe ọe geneadod wære 'and bow to her father's will, though she were compelled' (4, 10-11)

336 beah he hit silf forswige, his gegirla hine geswutela. 'Though he himself may suppress it, his garment reveals him.' (22, 2)

337 and Apollonius nan ingen ne ast, beah ọe ọe oøre men aton and bliōe wæron 'and Apollonius ate nothing, though all other men ate and were happy' (22, 12-13)

338 beah ọu stille sy and unrot, beah ic ọe æelborennenesse on ọe geseo. 'Though you may be silent and sad, yet I see your noble birth in you.' (24, 5-6)

Three of the clauses contain verbs in the subjunctive mood, thereby following a general practice of beah concessive clauses "nearly always" being used with the subjunctive. 65 Only 337 employs indicative verbs--atton and wæron. The structure of the clauses, however, is invariably Type 3.

Summary.--In Apollonius of Tyre the ordering of elements within subordinate clauses is therefore almost evenly
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split between Type 3 order, which Andrew has labeled as "conjunctive order," and Type 1 order, characteristic of principal clauses. However, as has been shown, variations occur in the percentages of each type of word order, depending on the type of subordinate clause.

Word order in noun clauses is almost evenly split between Type 1 and Type 3 order, with Type 3 clauses occurring only three times more than Type 1 clauses (52 to 49). Clauses exhibiting $O - S - V$ structure occur sixteen times. However, many of these latter clauses employ *swa hwilc man swa* or *swa hwæt swa* pronouns functioning in their clauses as objects and thus being attracted to clause-initial position in the same manner as relative pronouns. Three other clauses exhibit Type 2 structure. The almost equal number of Type 1 and Type 3 order among these clauses testifies to the developing tendency in late Old English prose away from Type 3 clauses and toward the dominance of principal clause structure in these subordinate clauses.

In relative clauses, however, the division between Type 1 and Type 3 structure is sharp. Of the 68 relative clauses, 44 or 64.7 per cent exhibit Type 3 structure, whereas only 24 or 35.3 per cent exhibit Type 1 structure.
Adverb clauses employ Type 1 structure in 70 cases or 43.3 per cent, whereas unambiguous Type 3 structure occurs in 81 cases or 50.6 per cent. In nine other cases the clauses end with either infinitives or prepositional phrases.

Thus, with the exception of the relative clauses, Type 3 order exhibits itself in just barely over half of the occurrences of the subordinate clauses, with Type 1 order not far behind in frequency. Perhaps the translator exercised his freedom to vary clause structure in order to achieve a suitable prose style. That the relative clauses exhibit a strong preference for Type 3 structure evidences the translator's apparent lack of freedom to vary structure as much with these clauses as with the other two types. Indeed, in twenty-one of the twenty-four occurrences of be as subject of its clause, the order is Type 3, and, in the case of the other three clauses, two of them contain noun clause objects which must always appear in clause-final position.

The result is that, although Type 3 order is most frequent in the subordinate clauses, it is by no means
predominant. The high percentage of Type 1 clauses (143/348 or 41.1 per cent) places this manuscript well within the transitional period of maturing Old English prose (ca. 1000-1150) which eventually saw the recession of Type 3 word order in subordinate clauses. 66

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to present a sketch of the order of phrases and clauses in Apollonius of Tyre. Some matters of stylistic variation from general rules of Old English word order have been noted along the way, although the focus has been on the ways in which, in general, the Old English translator has abided by the common practice of his day. And indeed, as Peter Goolden has stated, the language of the manuscript is classical Old English of the late West Saxon period, with few remarkable features and few dialect forms appearing. 67 Even so, the style of Apollonius of Tyre is "as lucid as anything else in Old English prose." 68 The chapters which
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follow will focus on certain key features of that style, especially as they relate to the Latin source.
CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROSE STYLE IN APOLLONIUS

The preceding syntactic analysis of the Old English Apollonius indicates that it conforms generally to the rules of late West Saxon, with some allowable variations in word order. No major departures in syntax can be detected, nor are exclusive dialectal variants (for instance, from Northumbrian or Kentish) present in the work. It remains, then, to focus upon the matters of style detectable within the Old English work and to consider the translator's handling of the Latin source as he sought to render the classical romance into a pleasing English idiom. That such a task was often regarded as imposing may be seen by reading the misgivings of other would-be translators from about the same period of time:

... ond nu bit ... alce hêra be hês bôc
rêdan lyste bet he ... him ne wite gif he
hit rihtlicor ongite bonne he mihte ... .
'... and now [he] bids ... everyone who desires to read this book that he blame him
(Alfred) not if he understands it better than he (Alfred) could. . . ."¹

... we ne durron na mære awritan on Englisc bonne ðæt Leden hæfð, ne ðæ endebyrndynsse awendan, buton ðam anum, ðæt ðæt Leden and ðæt Englisc nabbað na ðane wisan on ðære spræce fadunge. . . .

'. . . We dare not write more in English than the Latin has, nor the word order change, except insofar that the Latin and the English have not the same manner in the order of language. . . .'²

The trepidation of some scribes at the task of turning Latin into good Old English prose is explained in a Latin letter addressed to Wulfstan, then bishop of London, written by a scribe who pleads his relative inability when compared to his accomplished master: *impotens sum patrare* 'I am powerless to accomplish [it].'³ This concern of translators is echoed in the epilogue of Apollonius, where the translator bids that the reader blame him not for the translation, but that he hele swa hwat swa bar on sy to tale 'conceal whatever may be blameworthy therein' (42, 31).

---


As mentioned previously, the Old English translation of Apollonius stands out among extant works of Old English prose as the only extended prose narrative. In its own right it is a lively story, and it well deserves a place among the works of Alfred, Ælfric, and Wulfstan as one of the greatest works of Old English prose. Yet when the Old English version is compared with its probable Latin source, the differences between the two versions become apparent. Only by comparing the two versions in parallel editions such as those produced by Raith and Goolden does one discover that the translator apparently did not set out to reproduce a word be worde version. The translator clearly fluctuated between a word-for-word and sense-for-sense approach, the end result of which is a large number of additions, omissions, and paraphrases, as well as some mistranslations. The discussion which follows will consider


5 Alfred in his famous preface to the Cura Pastoralis mentions both word be worde and andgit of andgiete 'word by word' and 'sense by sense' modes of translation (see Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader, p. 28).
each of these areas in turn as it seeks to extract the features of the Old English translator's style.

Additions

Except for his addition of a brief epilogue following the end of the narrative (42, 29-31), the Old English translator followed his source rather closely. Nevertheless, he did depart at times from the Latin and added a host of words, phrases, and even clauses, apparently in order to achieve greater coherence for his audience, who might be unfamiliar with some aspects of the classical background or who might profit by expansion and clarification. In other cases it appears that the translator used rhetorical commonplaces native to the Germanic tradition, and in a few cases he simply lost track of the narrative or misunderstood some aspect of it.

In the interest of making all things clear for his audience, the translator added several pre-nominal adjectives and other similar clarifying phrases and clauses. Pre-nominal adjectives occur in several instances:
1 Antiochus se walreowa cyningc 'Antiochus the cruel king' (4, 29)
   rex Antiochus 'king Antiochus' (5, 21)

2 Eala bu sz Neptune 'Oh thou sea-Neptune' (16, 26)
   O Neptune 'Oh Neptune' (17, 20)

3 ham healfan scilise 'of the half-cloak' (20, 1-2)
   tribunario 'of the cloak' (21, 1)

4 he ham folce ungecnaen wæs and ungewunelic
   'which to the people was unknown and unusual'
   et inauditas actiones expressit 'and he portrayed unusual actions'

5 his ancænnedan dohtor 'his only-begotten daughter'
   filium eius 'his daughter' (37, 19)

6 Eala bu eadige cwæn 'Oh thou blessed queen'
   Domine mea regina 'Lady my queen' (43, 9)

In 1 above the translator appears to be drawing walreowa from crudelitatem 'cruelty,' a noun which occurs immediately before rex Antiochus but not, of course, as a modifier. In fact, it appears that the translator has created a stylistic redundancy—a close repetition of similar words—within the following temporal clause: Mid bi soðlice Antiochus se walreowa cyningc on bysse walreowanesse burhwunode ... (4, 29-30). The additional limiting modifiers in 3 and 6 appear to have been inserted for the
purpose of simple clarification of detail implied but not expressed in the Latin. Examples 2 and 6 are vocative phrases to which pre-nominal modifiers have been added. Of course, sae in 2 is a noun which has the effect of compounding Neptune to 'sea-Neptune'; however, sae occupies a slot usually filled by an adjective such as, for example, eadige in 6. The vocative structure bu-ADJ-NOUN is idiomatic to Old English; occurring eighteen times (out of a total of fifty-one vocative phrases), it is then always an expansion of the Latin. This expansion is accomplished by either one of two means: by the addition of bu (or, in some cases, ge--14, 19-20 and 38, 26-27) or by the addition of an adjective, as in 6. For example, Bone rex 'good king,' a vocative of polite address used to refer to both evil king Antiochus and virtuous king Arcestrates, is always translated bu goda cyningc 'thou good king' (see 6, 19; 26, 1; 28, 7; 28, 13-14; 32, 11; 34, 1; 34, 17).

The translator also expands on his Latin source by repeating phrases, apparently in an effort to keep details of the narrative before the eyes of his readers. For example, the addition of punda goldes (10, 18) to the Latin
G (11, 13) recalls the phrase from 10, 17 (Latin *talenta auri*, 11, 13) and creates full parallel structure in Old English where parallelism is but implied in the Latin. In 22, 9 *and het hine* 'and bid him' is added to achieve clear parallelism with earlier *Da het se cyngc* (22, 8), whereas the Latin does not repeat the verb *iussit* (23, 5-6). The dependent clause *hwæt he sy* has also been added to *witan* 'to know who he may be' at 24, 3, recalling *hwæt he is* (*Quis autem . . . sit*, 25, 2) from earlier in the line. The same motivation explains the addition of the number *dry* 'three' at 30, 11, which has been taken from the first reference to the three suitors at 30, 10. Finally, at 32, 21 the translator has added *eom forliden* to the simple Latin pronoun *ego*, thereby expanding the suitor's answer into a full clause. The expansion is well justified, however. Here King Arcestrates has just asked 'Which of you is shipwrecked?' because his daughter has written in a note that she loves *bone forlidenan man* 'the shipwrecked man' (32, 13-14). Ardalius' bare-faced lie receives more emphasis in the Old English version when he answers fully *Ic eom forliden* 'I am shipwrecked.'
Additional prepositional phrases and single-word adverbs have also crept into the translation. Once again, their presence indicates that the translator has attempted to clarify or add to his source. The first of these phrases occurs in the two-line introduction to the story and may record the translator's fascination with the early material in the narrative. Whereas the Latin has *Incipit Historia Apollonii Regis Tyrii* 'Here begins the story of Apollonius King of Tyre' (3, 1), the translator has the following:

> Her  onginne5 seo gerecednes be Antioche bæm unge-
> sæligan cingce and be Apollonige bæm tiriscan.
> 'Here begins the story about Antiochus the wicked king and about Apollonius the Tyrian.' (2, 1-2)

This addition indicates perhaps a misinterpretation on the translator's part. The Antiochus material is but the first episode of the narrative, yet because of its nature it assumed more importance than it deserved. The Antiochus episode, which concerns the evil king's crime of incest and consequent cover-up, disappears after chapter 16, where Apollonius tearfully recounts his sorrow to Arcestrates. However, the last active presence of Antiochus is in chapter 8, where he commands ships to fare after Apollonius.
The translator appears to be impressed by Antiochus' unnatural sin and further evil, so much so that Antiochus receives undue emphasis in this introductory sentence. This emphasis anticipates the fourteenth-century treatment of the story, where Gower includes it in Book VIII of *Confessio Amantis* with the other examples of incest. It is probably to Gower's version that the Man of Law refers in the *Canterbury Tales*, praising Chaucer for choosing not to write of "Tyro Appolonius":

> How that the cursed kyng Antiochus
> Birafte his doghter of hir maydenhede,
> That is so horrible a tale for to rede
> When he her threw upon the pavement.  

Other added adverbial words and phrases are more justified. At 12, 16 the translator inserts *at me* 'from me' to clarify the source of the money, the Latin having simply the verb *accipe* 'take' (13, 13). Several lines later *at de* is added to Hellanicus' reply, evidently echoing the earlier additional phrase. The translator also adds on *sam floce* 'in the crowd' (20, 4) to *non invent*.

---

'he did not find' (21, 3); of _am eagum_ 'from the eyes' (24, 14) to _lacrimas fundere coepit_ 'tears began to pour' (25, 12); directional to _Apollonio_ (24, 20-21) to _ait_ 'said' (25, 17); to _soðan_ 'in truth' (22, 13), to _illum voulo naufragum_ 'I desire that shipwrecked (man), (33, 9-10); and _after his earfoðnesse_ 'after his hardship' (42, 26) to _omnes tempus regni sui_ 'all the time of his reign' (43, 22-23). In addition to the above prepositional phrases, single-word adverbs have been added in several places. For example, _hu_ has been added at 10, 5, where _O hominem improbum_ 'O perverse man!' (11, 3) becomes _Eala hu manful man bu eart_ 'Alas, what a perverse man you are.' At 30, 15 the translator has added a time modifier _gefirm_ 'long ago' to _Petentibus nobis filiam tuam_ 'beseeching for ourselves your daughter' (31, 15). And at 40, 11 he has added _hlude_ 'loudly' to _ait_ 'said' (31, 11). Evidently here he is recalling _clipode_ . . . _swiðe hlude_ 'cried out . . . very loudly' (40, 7), a phrasal translation of _exclamavit_ (41, 7). The addition at 40, 11 is not therefore justified if one expects a word-for-word translation, although it certainly adds a dramatic intensity to the scene.
Further significant single-word additions to the translation include two occurrences of Eala 'alas' or 'Oh!' in vocative phrases: Eala lareow (32, 7) for magister (33, 5) and Eala in example 6 above. Two others are birig 'town' following to Pentapolim se ciriniscan (16, 12), for ad Pentapolim Cirenam (17, 9) and the addition of freond to the vocative phrase at 14, 10 for Stranguilio mihi carissime 'Stranguilio my most-beloved' (15, 8).

Other clarifiers are somewhat longer. These include additional bes weges (plus the attached restrictive relative clause) at 20, 21, for post hac discessit 'after this he departed' (21, 15). The adverb clause pat we magon us gerestan 'so that we may rest ourselves' (28, 11) is an unnecessary explanatory statement added to Apollonius' command to his servants to seek out their bedchambers (29, 8-9).

The translator also displays a tendency toward doubling single elements in his Latin source. For example, for Puella ait at 3, 21 he provides Heo hyre andwirde and cwe® 'She (to) her answered and said' (2, 26). Other cases of doubled verbs appear below:
8 that he might there hidden be and there dwell
'bæt he mihte bar bediglad beon and bar wunian'
(16, 13)

so that he might lie hidden there
'ut illic lateret' (17, 10)

9 declare to me thy name and thy fortune tell me'
'sege me pinne naman and pin gelymp arece me'
(24, 8)

proclaim to me your name and your misfortune'
'indica mihi nomen tuum et casus tuos'
(25, 7)

10 Then there was quiet and silence inside the hall.'
'Da wearð stilnes and swige geworden innon ðare healle.'
(26, 11-12)

And then when it was silence'
'Atque silentio facto'
(27, 9)

11 and they wept then all and also rejoiced'
'And hig weopon ða ealle and eac blissodon'
(38, 12)

And they all wept among themselves'
'Et flebant ad invicem omnes'
(39, 11-12)

12 cried out Apollonius very loudly and said'
'Da clipode Apollonius swiðe hlude and cweðan'
(40, 7)

'Apollonius called out'
'Apollonius exclamavit'
(41, 7)

In 8 and 9 one Latin verb has been split into two Old English verbs, in both cases involving verbs of communication such as occur also in 2, 26 above. As a matter of fact, in Apollonius of Tyre clipian alone never introduces direct discourse, and andswarian alone introduces direct discourse only once (2, 23). Cweðan is always coupled to them as the verb introducing the dialogue. Other similar
doublings occur at 10, 4-5 (Him andswerode se cnapa and bus cwæð for Cui ait puer, 11, 3); at 22, 1 (Se man him andswerode and cwæð for Famulus ait, 21, 22-23, 1); at 30, 14 (Da andswerode heora an and cwæð for Unus autem ex illis ait, 31, 15); at 32, 21-22 (Se oðer andwirde and cwæð for Alius ait, 33, 15); and at 38, 7 (Heo ða micelre stafne clipode and cwæð mid wope for et illa cum lacrimis voce magna clamavit dicens, 39, 5-6). The doublings in these passages achieve a rhythm lacking in the Latin, yet the passages remain close to the original. For instance, in the last-cited passage, clipode translates clamavit, and cwæð raises dicens from a present participle in Latin to a parallel verb in Old English. The doubling cited in 8, moreover, splits two senses of the Latin verb latere 'to lie hidden, to be concealed,' which is also used in some contexts to refer to living in obscurity. 7 Goolden suggests that the doubling at 11 may owe to the translator's difficulty with ad invicem, which may mean either 'mutually' or 'alternately.' This latter sense, he writes, "attached

to *flebant*, may have implied the extra sense of rejoicing to the translator."^8 Yet it is just as plausible to assume that the translator is consciously expanding the Latin passage to include both the emotions of crying and rejoicing. After all, father, mother, and daughter are reunited here after a twenty-year separation; the occasion seems to call for rejoicing, for weeping tears of joy.

Other doublings include the expansion of *quaeritur* (9, 21) to *was... gesocht and geacsod* (8, 23); *Qui dum navigaret* (17, 12) to coordinated temporal adverb clauses (16, 15-16); *ingenui et servi* (19, 25) to *frige and beowe, ædele and unaædele* (18, 30); *gemmae* (37, 4) to *mid golde and mid gimmon* (36, 5); and *organa disponuntur* (39, 14) to *and ða organa wæron getogene and ða biman geblawene* (38, 14-15). Goolden explains *ædele and unaædele* at 18, 30 as the translator's elaboration of *ingenui et servi*, a mistake in the Latin for *liberi et ingenui* 'free and free-born,' because slaves would not be invited to the baths."^9 *Mid golde* at 36, 5 is a justifiable invention on the part of the translator for two reasons. First, gold and jewels are often

---

^8 Goolden, p. 61, n. 38, 12.  ^9 Goolden, p. 51, n. 18, 30.
mentioned together as tangible proof of wealth (cf., e.g., Beowulf) and, in this particular scene, they are most appropriate as part of the trappings of the priestess of Diana. Second, the translator appears to be aiming at both recurring rhythm and alliteration with the addition of mid golde to mid gimmon. Indeed, many of the doubled elements in the Old English translation may owe to the translator's sporadic attempts to impose artistry on his somewhat bare Latin source.

The translator also added transitional clauses and clarifying relative clauses to the material in his source, with the result that the Old English narrative has a greater frequency of connections between earlier and subsequent references to the same material. The principal ba-clause is one means of achieving narrative transition. Many of these clauses occur in the Old English version as equivalents of transitions in the Latin. Yet the Old English translator has also invented two more principal ba-clauses where there are no equivalents in his Latin source:

13 Da gelamp hit sarlicum gelimpe 'Then occurred it with a grievous misfortune' (2, 8)
14 *Da dide bat maedon swa hyre beboden wass* 'Then did the maiden as was bidden to her' (28, 17-18)

15 *Da se cyngc bat geseah* 'When the king saw that' (32, 30)

These transitional clauses illustrate the translator's regard for coherence. The transition in 13 prepares the reader for the shocking details to follow, while 14 refers to a just-completed conversation. These two additional clauses are therefore justifiable; however, the temporal clause in 15 creates a "wrong impression." The clause just prior to this is *his andlwita eal areodode* 'his face all reddened.' Hence the sequence of these two clauses creates for the moment the impression that the king has noticed Apollonius' blushing and therefore knows that he is the man to whom his daughter's letter refers. Yet Arces-trates does not learn the truth until, after a subsequent exchange of dialogue, he first notices that Apollonius is blushing:

*Da geseah se cyngc bat Apollonius mid rosan rude wass eal ofer-breaded, ba ongeat he bone cwyde* 'When the king saw that Apollonius with rosy red was all overspread, then he perceived the meaning' (34, 1-3)

It is therefore not until this point in the Latin (and in

---

10 Goolden, p. 58, n. 32, 30.
the Old English) that Arestrates really knows the truth. The Latin source for 15 is instructive on this point. It has *Rex vero apprehendit Apollonii manum* 'The king indeed took Apollonius' hand' (33, 22-23), which the translator renders word for word as a main clause following the additional *ba*-clause. Evidently the translator misunderstood the reason for the king's taking Apollonius by the hand, but he might have corrected his error after translating 33, 22-23. Thus this transitional clause misleads rather than aids the English reader.

The purposes of the additional relative clauses are also to restate and clarify. Eight such clauses have been added, the following three of which illustrate their purpose:

16 *he hine unscridde bam healfan scicilse &e he on hæfde* 'he undressed himself of the half-cloak that he had on' (20, 1-2)  
*exuens se tribunario* 'stripping himself of the cloak' (21, 1)

17 *Se iunga man be bu after axsodest is forliden man.* 'The young man that you asked about is a shipwrecked man' (20, 29-30)  
*Juvenis ille naufragus est.* 'That youth is shipwrecked.' (21, 22)
Se forlidena man is cumen be ou after sandest
'The shipwrecked man is arrived that you sent after'
(22, 7)

Naufragus adest 'The shipwrecked man approaches'
(23, 4)

The additional detail supplied by the relative clause in 16 is perhaps unnecessary. **Healfan** here is a detail recalled from 18, 12-13, where the fisherman tears his cloak in twa (in duas partes, 1912), although it is an idea not found in the Latin. Likewise, the relative clauses in 17 and 18 are recapitulatory expansions implied in the Latin context. All eight of these clauses appear in pp. 131-140, the last one occurring at 28, 18-19.\(^{11}\)

Coordinated clauses introduced by **and** also have been added to the source material. At 12, 17 the translator adds and far to Antiocho ham cynge to the sequence of instructions given by Apollonius to Hellanicus. Although not in the Latin, the passage is justifiable as an expansion of the source, where this instruction is apparently understood as lying somewhere between Accipe 'Take' and dic Antiocho 'Say to Antiochus' (13, 13-14) Its addition in the English

\(^{11}\)The other additional relative clauses are found at 18, 15-16; 20, 21; 22, 22; 28, 4; and 28, 18-19.
therefore clarifies the sequence of actions by establishing for the benefit of the reader the logical order of actions necessary for Hellanicus to carry out Apollonius' instructions. The other and-clause addition is a somewhat more important contribution to the story as it stands in the Old English version. At the point in the narrative where Apollonius relates his story to the priestess of Diana, whom he does not recognize as his long-lost wife, he describes the woeful preparation for the burial of his wife years ago:

19 *Ic ba hi mid cynelican reafe gescridde and mid golde and gewrite on ciste alegde* 'I then clothed her with royal raiment and with gold, and laid a letter in the coffin' (36, 26-27)

The parallel Latin passage reads:

*Quam ego regio indui habitu et in loculo cum XXti sexterciiis auri deposui* 'Whom I clothed with royal dress and placed in a coffin with twenty sesterces of gold' (37, 23-24)

Some changes in detail and syntax may be noted between the Latin and the Old English, such as *hi* for *quam* and the coordination of *mid golde* with *mid cynelican reafe* as adverbials of *gescridde*, for *cum XXti sexterciiis auri*, which is an adverbial accompanying *deposui*. The Old English
omits the specific amount of money, and the translator adds a detail at this point about a letter (\textit{gewrite}) laid in the coffin.

A number of clarifying appositive phrases are also original with the Old English translator. These phrases include the appositive \textit{bam ungesæligan cingce} found in 7 above, as well as the following eight:

20 \textit{to Antiocho bam cyng} \hspace{1cm} (12, 17)
\textit{Antiocho} \hspace{1cm} (13, 14)

21 \textit{ic Apollonius se tirisca ealdorman} \hspace{1cm} (14, 20)
\textit{ego Apollonius Tyro} \hspace{1cm} (15, 16)

22 \textit{ac bat he ware Apollines ðara hæðenra God} \hspace{1cm} (26, 11)
\textit{sed Apollinem} \hspace{1cm} (27, 8)

23 \textit{Apollonius, se mæra cyngc} \hspace{1cm} (38, 13)
\textit{Tyrium Apollonium} \hspace{1cm} (39, 12)

24 \textit{se cyning siðcan, Arcestrates} \hspace{1cm} (40, 30--42, 1)
\textit{(implied as pronoun in the verb \textit{moritur} 43, 1)}

25 \textit{Apollonius, se mæra cyngc} \hspace{1cm} (42, 3)
\textit{Apollonius} \hspace{1cm} (43, 4)

26 \textit{Apollonius se cyng} \hspace{1cm} (42, 12)
\textit{Apollonius} \hspace{1cm} (43, 11)

27 \textit{Apollonius se cyngc} \hspace{1cm} (42, 21)
\textit{(implied as pronoun in the verb \textit{genuit}, 43, 19)}

Although Antiochus is never referred to within the Latin narrative by more than \textit{rex Antiochus} or \textit{Antiochus rex},
certainly *impiissimus* 'most godless' (5, 8) and *crudelitatem* 'cruelty' (5, 21) are used to refer to his unholy deed. Hence *bam ungesæligan cingce* is a suitable addition to the prologue of the narrative. And the titles applied to Apollonius in 23, 25, 26, and 27 are additions that emphasize the *wela* 'joy' of Apollonius after he assumes control not only of the throne of Tyre but also of Cyrene and Antioch (42, 1-2 and 42, 23-25). The appositive in 22 clarifies the reference to Apollo for an audience likely to be at least partially ignorant of the Roman pantheon and thus unable to appreciate the pun created at 26, 10-11 (27, 8 in Latin) involving the similarity between *Apollonius* and *Apollines*. Se *maræ cyngce*, the appositive cited in 23 and 25, is reminiscent of the formula *maræ beoden*, used fifteen times in *Beowulf* and representative of the tendency of Old English toward certain stock epithets and formulae idiomatic to the language. Comparable to these epithets are additional *ic sece be* at 24, 9 and 32, 13 and *wite bu bæt* 'know thou that' at 24, 10, making solemn, formal proclamations of what appear to be normal responses to questions in the Latin version.
Perhaps the most noticeable sign of the native influence on this Mediterranean story is the addition in the Old English version of transitional *soðlice* and *hwat*. *Soðlice* 'indeed, truly, certainly' appears in the Old English version twenty-one times, nine of which are translations of the following Latin terms: *nam* 'for' (once); *itaque* 'and so, therefore' (once); *enim* 'indeed, truly, certainly, namely, for instance' (three times); and *vero* 'really, indeed' (four times). *Soðlice* appears in dialogues a total of seven times, three of which are original with the translator, and fourteen times in narration, nine of which are original. In all three cases of additional *soðlice* in dialogues, the term operates as an affirmative adverb meaning 'truly' or 'certainly' (4, 6; 12, 4; 25, 5).

In narration *soðlice* is usually linked with temporal adverbs, four times occurring with *þa* 'then' (5, 15; 28, 4; 34, 21; 37, 22), once with *þa þa* (4, 3), once with *m¿d bi* 'while' (4, 29), and once with *after ham be* (8, 3). *Soðlice* also occurs twice unaccompanied by temporal adverbs (4, 12 and 38, 5).
Hwaet 'Lo! Behold!, an exclamatory term that directs attention to a following statement, occurs three times in Apollonius, each time in tandem with pa 'then.' Swanton translates it as 'well' at 2, 16 and 14, 28, and as 'so' at 40, 17. In the last two cases pa translates Latin tunc 'then,' but both hwaet and pa are additional at 2, 16, where the translator has heavily paraphrased his source.

The last two substantial additions in the Old English text are editorial insertions by which the translator makes his presence known, even more so than in the passages cited as examples 7, 13, and 23. In these passages an English reader would be unaware of the additions without the Latin source to compare with the Old English version. However, in the following two passages the translator in effect steps forth from his translation to acknowledge his role as translator:

28 'Scelere vereor, materna carne vescor.' paet is on englisc: 'Scylde ic bolige, moddrenum flæ sce ic bruce.' Eft he cwað: 'Quaero patrem meum, meae matris virum, uxoris meae filiam nec invenio.'


pat is on englisc: 'Ic sece minne fæder, mynre modor wer, mine wifes dohtor and ic ne finde.'

(6, 10-15)

'Scelere vereor, materna carne vescor. Quaero patrem meum, meae matris virum, uxoris meae filiam nec invenio.'

(7, 7-8)

29 Her endað ge wea ge wela Apollonius pæs tiriscan, ræde se be wille. And gif hi hwa ræde, ic bidde bæt he pæs awænednesse ne tale, ac bæt he hele swa hæt swa þæt on sy to tale. 'Here ends the woe and weal of Apollonius the Tyrian, let him who wishes read it. And if anyone read it, I bid that he blame not this translation, but that he conceal whatsoever may be as blameworthy in it.'

(42, 29-31)

Explicit liber Apollonii. 'Here ends the book of Apollonius.'

(43, 26)

The Old English translation of the first half of the Latin riddle in 28 above is actually a four-line marginal gloss to the left of line 38, p. 132 of MS. 201, where flæsce ic bruce begins the line. However, the second half of the Latin riddle is followed immediately by the Old English translation. This practice of employing transitional pat is on englisc is common in Ælfric's and Wulfstan's sermons, where both writers expound on Latin scripture. For example, in his sermon on the Antichrist, Wulfstan writes "Anticristus is on Læden contrarius Cristo, pat is on Englisc, Godes wiðersaca* [Antichrist is in Latin
contrarius Cristo, that is in English, God's enemy].

When expounding the Latin scriptures one had to be careful to translate accurately, and therefore it was appropriate to provide the Latin text with its translation and exposition. Yet such ought not to have been the case with a secular work such as Apollonius. Number 28 is the only part of the narrative where the translator directs attention to the Latin source before translating it. Perhaps the reason for this is that the passage is a riddle. Just as the scriptures in the Latin contain "truth" difficult to find words for in the vernacular, so also may a riddle contain a "truth" completely understandable only in the original language. At any rate, the translator has seen fit to provide both the original and the translation, thereby calling attention within the narrative to his role.

The "Epilogue, cited as 29 above, is almost entirely original with the Old English translator. The first clause is a paraphrase and expansion of the Latin epilogue, ge wea

14 Bethurum, p. 116, ll. 7-8.

15 Yet the riddle in the source manuscript is corrupt. See Goolden's edition, p. 45, n. 5, 11 and his article, "Antiochus' Riddle in Gower and Shakespeare," R.E.S., n.s. 6 (1955), 245-51.
ge wela for liber. Following this clause is an apology and a plea to the reader to conceal the "blameworthy" parts of the story, probably in reference to the material with which the translator feels uncomfortable: King Antiochus' incestuous union with his daughter and the brothel scene, now lost from the Old English version. If this be the case—that the epilogue refers to these passages—then such an epilogue is only to be expected of writers "trained as or by clerics," as Morton Donner has stated. A tendency of Old English literature is to ignore or tone down explicit references to sexual matters, which Donner contends is due to the "prudery" of the scribes (p. 91). However, the reason for the epilogue may just as well be the translator's humility regarding his work. One need only note the apprehensions of Alfred and Ælfric cited at the beginning of this chapter to perceive a similar theme in all three passages. An even earlier precedent for asking the reader's indulgence had been set in the prologue to the Anglo-Latin Life of St. Guthlac, written ca. 735 by one Felix for

16 "Prudery in Old English Fiction," *Comitatus*, 3 (1972), 91. Subsequent references will be cited in the text.
Alfwald, King of the East Angles. There Felix writes, "Wherefore I entreat and beseech the learned and faithful that if he find any ridiculous phrase here he blame us not for it." It is therefore safe to assume that both motives lay behind the composition of the epilogue: first, that it was customary to write a self-abasing prologue or epilogue and, second, that the strong sexual immorality which would in Gower's *Confessio Amantis* place the story among a group of horrible incest accounts called for an apology of some kind.

**Omissions**

Perhaps more revealing about the character of the Old English translator is the number and nature of the passages he omitted. Many of these omissions are "minor economies," and although they do not detract significantly from the flow of the narrative, their tendency is to reduce particularity and detail. Several of these omissions may owe to the presence of a monkish hand responsible for censorship of references to certain human passions and to pagan religion.

---

17 Swanton, p. 39.  
18 Goolden, p. xxi.
Indeed, this presence has prompted Morton Donner's article on the evidence of "prudery" in Apollonius, cited above. Donner's contention is that the translator tempered the passages that describe sexuality and love. As evidence he cites the heavily paraphrased early material concerning King Antiochus' incestuous union with his daughter (2, 9-4, 2); Princess Arcestrate's love-sickness for Apollonius, which is omitted entirely from the Old English (31, 4-9); and two other passages referring to Arcestrate's love for Apollonius—31, 28 (30, 29) and 33, 6 (32, 8). 19

Certainly monkish attitudes may account for the omissions and paraphrases of passages describing love and lust; however, the translator also exercised good critical judgment in rejecting corrupt passages in his source manuscript. Finally, some omissions suggest his unfamiliarity or difficulty with at least two Latin terms.

The process of translating may often involve difficulty in rendering terms in the source language, or outright unfamiliarity with them. The Old English translator encountered difficulties in several places (see

19 Donner, pp. 93-95.
Mistranslations below); however, in three places he apparently chose to omit Latin terms rather than to find equivalents for them. Two of the passages in question contain the troublesome *triclinium* 'dining-couch, dining-room,' and the other includes the phrase *liquore Palladio*:

30 *Ingressus Apollonius in triclinium* 'When Apollonius came into the dining-room' *(23, 6-7)*
   *Da eode Apollonius in* 'Then walked Apollonius in' *(22, 10)*

31 *introivit triclinium* 'he went into the dining-hall' *(27, 7)*
   *and in eode* 'and in he went' *(26, 9)*

32 *utitur liquore Palladio* 'he used olive-oil' *(21, 2)*

OE: omitted

*Triclinium* was a troublesome word for the translator. It appears three times but is turned into Old English only once, by *bure* at 28, 2. As Goolden notes, *bure* usually translates *cubiculum* 'bedroom,' as it does in three places elsewhere in *Apollonius*. But at 28, 2 the translator uses *innon bure* for *in triclinium*, where the feasters are reclining after the meal. The two earlier appearances of *triclinium* must have troubled the translator, for he

---

20 Goolden, p. 56, n. 28, 2.
appears to have avoided finding an equivalent, opting instead for directional in. This option is hardly noticeable, however. At 22, 10 the phrase to sam gereorde 'to the feast' is the antecedent of directional in in the following sentence (number 30 above). And at 26, 7, where the scene is still the triclinium, Apollonius ut eode 'out went' before he in eode, as recorded in number 31.

The translator's omission of liquore Palladio in 32 is obviously due to his ignorance of the meaning of the reference, as Goolden explains in a note on this passage.21 This explanation is certainly valid, given a northern European's unfamiliarity with culturally specific references such as expressed in the phrase. Palladius derives from Pallas, the Greek goddess Athene, who brought the olive to Greece. Had the Latin used oleum 'olive-oil' here instead of liquore Palladio, the translator no doubt would have used ele or one of its compounds as an Old

21 Goolden, p. 51, n. 21, 2.

English equivalent, as he did at 18, 26-27:

sett was mid ele gesmerod 'who was with oil anointed'
oleo unctum 'with olive-oil anointed' (19, 22-23)

Even though the translator was unable to handle the obscure phrase liquore Palladio, his successful handling of another obscure reference demonstrates his linguistic capability. Tribunarium at 19, 12 and tribunario at 21, 1 are the only two forms of the word in all of Latin literature. This term, derived from Greek τριβανάριον, diminutive of 'cloak,' must have presented great difficulty for the translator. However, although he did not have the benefit of a gloss for this rare word, he correctly read the contextual clues and rendered the term in Old English as wæfels 'cloak' at 18, 12 and scigilse 'cloak' at 20, 2.

The translator's critical judgment is also evident in the numerous omissions of details that he may have perceived as unnecessary. Some of these omissions are "minor economies" which involve the omission of only single words or short phrases. Others, however, are more substantial.

---

24 Goolden, p. 51, n. 19, 12.
25 Goolden, p. xxi.
and are therefore less justifiable. Thirty of these omissions have been catalogued, some of which are barely noticeable upon comparing both versions, such as the dropping of the discourse introducers et dixit ei (9, 4) and et Stranguilio ait (13, 21-22) from the Old English version. The result of both omissions is, however, a rather abrupt transition to dialogue in both passages:

33 Antiochus se cyninge him to gecigde his dihtnere se wæs Thaliarcus gehaten: "Thaliarce, . . . ." 'Antiochus the king called to himself his steward who was named Thaliarcus: "Thaliarcus, . . . ."' (8, 3-5)

34 And Apollonius sona gemette oðerne cuðne man ongean hine gan þæs nama wæs Stranguilio gehaten. "Hlaford geong Apolloni, . . . ." 'And Apollonius soon met another familiar man coming toward him whose name was called Stranguilio. "Lord young Apollonius, . . . ."' (12, 25-27)

Less noticeable is the dropping of Tyrius from the titular phrase Apollonius Tyrius in three contexts—all of them direct discourse—10, 16 (11, 11-12); 38, 9 (39, 8-9); and 38, 27 (39, 25). In another (narrative) context the phrase Tyrius Apollonius is reduced to simply se cyninge (42, 9; 43, 8). However, the translator has retained the full
title in two other cases: Apollonii Regis Tyrii (3, 1) is rendered by Apollonige tam tiriscan (2, 2), and Tyrius Apollonius (19, 7) becomes Apollonius se tirisca ealdorman (18, 7-8). More noticeable upon comparison of the texts is the omission of *generositas* in the Old English version of the following passage:

35 *generositas tamen nobilitatem ostendit* 'your bearing, however, reveals your nobility' (25, 6)

*beah ic pine ægelborennesse on æe geseo* 'nevertheless I see thy nobility in thee' (24, 6)

The Old English version shifts the emphasis from Apollonius' bearing as the agent of revelation to the onlooker's perception, represented by the pronoun *ic*. In the process of shifting the emphasis, however, the translator has dropped the direct reference to Apollonius' regal bearing, which displays itself in spite of his poverty and distress.

Several vocatives have also been dropped from discourse. These number five in all: *famuli* 'servants' (29, 7); *et pater optime* 'and the best father' (29, 10); 28

---

27 However, *tiriscan* at 2, 2 is an emendation supplied by Zupitza to fill the erasure of half a line. See p. 2, n. 2, 2 and p. 44, n. 2, 2.

28 However, this Latin phrase has been retained twice elsewhere as *min se leofesta fader* (22, 29-30 and 32, 11).
domina 'lady' (29, 13 and 41, 8); and Apolloni (29, 24). These few omissions do not mean, however, that the translator tends toward dropping vocatives; indeed he has retained fifty-four of fifty-nine. Curious is the fact that four of the five omissions occur in the second half of p. 140, within twenty lines of each other in the manuscript. It seems almost as if the translator experienced a brief but insistent urge to excise vocatives at this point and then returned to his practice of translating them thereafter. Twenty-one vocatives are faithfully carried over from Latin to the Old English from p. 141 to the end, with the exception of Domine at 41, 8. This brief departure is therefore baffling.

In an earlier section of this chapter nine appositive phrases were cited as additions in the Old English text. The translator also deleted one appositive phrase, apparently because he judged it as superfluous:

36 et Dionisiadi, uxori eius 'and Dionisiade his wife' (41, 5) and Dionisiade 'and Dionisiade' (40, 45)

In all probability the translator viewed the appositive here as optional and thus chose to drop it. Dionisias' role as jealous foster-mother is so important that the
appositive near the end of the narrative is not necessary. Even so, the result is an editorial omission of a phrase rather than word-for-word translation.

Evidence of further editing abounds in other areas. In all, at least twelve phrases and five clause-level sequences have been omitted in the process of translation.

37 *Postera vero die in civitate sua quaeritur* 'Indeed on the next day he was asked after in his city' (9, 21)

*bæ by æftran dæge wæs* *Apollonius gesoht and geacsod* 'Then on the next day was Apollonius sought and asked after' (8, 23-24)

38 *Resaluta* 'Greet in return' (13, 2)

OE: Ø

39 *et audi forsitan quod nescis* 'and hear perhaps what you do not know' (13, 3-4)

*Ac gehyr nu fram me bat bu silfa nast.* 'But hear now from me what you yourself do not know' (12, 3-4)

40 *propter famem duram saevamque ... et sterilitatem annonae* 'because of a famine hard and cruel ... and sterility of crops (barren harvest)' (15, 5-6)

*forðon ðe we boliæd bone heardestan hungor and bone reðestan* 'because we suffer the hardest famine and the cruellest' (14, 7-8)

41 *intuensque mare tranquillum* 'and beholding the peaceful sea' (17, 20)

*and beheold ba sæ* 'and beheld the sea' (16, 25)
42 quid est hoc quod praeter consuetudinem tuam tam mane vigilasti? 'why is this that, contrary to your usual habit, you are awake so early in the morning?' (29, 20-21)

for hwi eart 0u bus arwacol? 'why are you thus awake early?' (28, 25)

43 cum lacrimis mihi narravit inter alia dicens, adiurans me et ait 'with tears she told me, among other things saying (the following), swearing to me, and said' (35, 21-22)

da arhehte heo me mid wope betwexe oere sprea pas bingc bus cweænde 'then with tears she related to me these things, among other words, thus saying' (34, 25-26)

44 cum XXti sexterciis auri 'with twenty sesterces of gold' (37, 23-24)

mid golde 'with gold' (36, 27)

45 et constituit regem loco suo Athenagoram 'and appointed as king in his place Athenagoras' (39, 19-20)

and gesette bar Athenagoras ... to cynge 'and set there Athenagoras ... as king.' (38, 21-22)

46 Puella de post tribunali capite velato processit 'the girl from behind the judgment seat came forth with a veiled head' (41, 10-11)

pat meden 0a forð eode 'the maiden then came forth' (40, 9)

47 sed interveniente Thasia non tangitur 'but Thasia intervening, he was not touched' (41, 19-20)

ac Thasia him bingode 'but Thasia interceded for him' (40, 20)

Six of these omitted phrases function as adverbials, three of which are adverbials of place (37, 45, and 46 [de post
tribunali] and one of which is an adverbial of manner (46, capite velato). The loss of the place adverbials is regrettable, for all provide particularity within narrative contexts. Furthermore, the omission of praeter consuetudinem tuam in 42 sacrifices an interesting reference to the girl's character. In addition, adjective modifiers disappear from 41, 43, and 44 (tranquillam, adiurans me, and XXti as well as sextercius, respectively). Tranquillam may have seemed illogical to the translator: The sea which had just raised a violent storm that destroyed the ship and all of Apollonius' crew is now described as tranquillam. And yet the term's use here underscores the capriciousness of the sea and the suddenness of its fury. The sum of gold described in 44 might have been beyond his power to render exactly into Old English; hence the omission. However, he successfully translated talentus as pund at 10, 17 and 18 (11, 13) and at 12, 11-12 (13, 10). Thus, unfamiliarity with the term sestertius is a likely cause of the omission. The

29See Goolden, p. 50, n. 16, 25.
translator chose to drop the specific reference and replace it with *mid golde*.

The two omitted verbs at 38 and 47 are minor economies with different degrees of success. *Resaluta* at 38 is insistent and reflects the indignation of *Hellanicus* at being ignored by *Apollonius*. *Hellanicus* chides *Apollonius* for snubbing him by saying *ne forseoh au cyrliscne man be biō mid wūrfullum beawum gefrætwod* 'and don't you scorn a humble man who is graced with honorable manners' (13, 2-3). In 47 *non tangitur* is implied in *him bingode* 'she interceded for him' (40, 20), which is itself a translation of *interveniente* 'intervening' (41, 19). However, this translation loses the focus on the power of *Thasia* over the crowd: she intervened so that he was not touched. Finally, the omission of the noun phrase *et sterilitatem annonae* 'and sterility of crops' at 40 is scarcely noticeable because this phrase may be understood as the cause of *bone heardestan hungor* and *bone reðestan* 'the hardest famine and the cruelest.'

More substantial and therefore more noticeable upon comparison are the omissions of a number of clauses from the Latin:
48 Prostravit se illi ad pedes profusisque lacrimis ait 'He prostrated himself to that one's feet and with lavish tears said' (19, 4-5)
to bám he beseah and bus sarlice cweó 'to whom he looked and thus sorely said' (18, 4-5)

49 exuit se tribunarium et scidit eum in duas partes aequales 'he took the cloak off from himself and tore it in two equal parts' (19, 11-12)
toslät ba his wafels on twa 'he tore then his cloak in two' (18, 12-13)

50 Forsitas dum cognoveris, misereberis illi. 'Perhaps when you find out, you will have compassion on him.' (25, 3-4)
OE: Ø

51 Interposito pauci temporis spacio, cum non posset puella uilla ratione amoris sui vulnus tolerare, simulato infirmitate coepit iacere. Rex ut audivit filiam suam subitaneam valitudinem incurrisse, sollicitus adhibuit medicos, et illi temptant venas, tangunt singula membra corporis, nullas causas aegritudinis inveniunt. 'After the passing of a brief period of time, when the girl was unable by any account to endure her wound of love, she began to lie as if in sickness. The king, when he heard his daughter suddenly afflicted by an infirmity, called in the doctors, and they felt her pulse and examined every part of her body, but they discovered no causes of her sickness.' (31, 4-9)
OE: Ø

52 Adveniens ut filiam meam peterem 'Coming back so that I might ask for my daughter' (39, 1)
Da ic ongean com 'When I came again' (38, 1)

Apollonius' prostration is omitted in 48, although just four lines later it is referred to as if already stated:
Then, as soon as the fisherman saw that the young man at his feet lay† (18, 8-9). This passage translates *Piscator ut vidit prima specie invenem pedibus suis prostratum* 'the fisherman, when he saw a youth of striking appearance prostrate at his feet' (19, 8-9). Except for a mistranslation of *prima specie* as a modifier of time rather than of degree, this Old English passage preserves the description of the Latin, a situation which causes one to wonder why the earlier reference was omitted. It is unlikely that the translator overlooked the Latin passage in working from the original to the Old English, an explanation which may account for the longest omission in the work (example 51). Its deletion is therefore likely the result of a conscious decision. Either the translator was economizing here, knowing that a reference to Apollonius' prostration was shortly to follow and would therefore do as a single description covering two passages, or he may have attempted to moderate the extremity of passion in the scene. After all, here is a prince throwing himself at

---

30 Goolden, p. 51, n. 18, 8.
the feet of a lowly fisherman and with 'lavish tears' narrating his sad lot.

_Exuit se tribunarium_, cited in 49 and deleted from the Old English translation, is a clause that could have been deleted without any loss in general description. However, a particular detail has been lost: a first reference functioning as a transitional description leading toward the key point, which is that a very poor man tears his cloak in two to share it with a destitute stranger. The Latin therefore employs a nominal antecedent and a determinative-descriptive pronoun _eum_ whereas the Old English deletes the antecedent clause and raises Latin _eum_ to nominal _wefels_. The result is a rather more abrupt introduction of an action in the Old English than in the Latin.

Number 50 catalogs the omission of the closing sentence of King Arcestrates' conversation with his daughter concerning the newly-arrived Apollonius. One wonders why the translator chose to omit this sentence. Again, careless oversight seems not to be the reason. As with the

---

_Eum_ is loose grammar for _id_. See Goolden, p. 51, n. 19, 12.
previous clause, however, so with this one: the omission of the statement does not detract much from the conversation, although it does sacrifice a detail that should have been carried over into the translation. In addition, the reference to 'pity' or 'compassion' of a young maiden for a young man might have been offensive to a monk charged with the responsibility of translating. Once again, one can only speculate as to the loss of this passage and others like it.

Example 52 catalogs the omission of the explanation for Apollonius' return to Pentapolis. Here the explanation seems to be clearer: *Da ic ongean com* certainly implies the reason for coming again, given the main clause which follows: *ba sædon hi me bat min dohtor waere forðfaren* (38, 1-2). Therefore the loss of the explanation 'so that I should ask for my daughter back' does not affect the sense of the passage. Once again, Peter Goolden notes, "[C]lose translation would have been preferable." 32

The omission of the passage cited at 51 is the most substantial of all. The Old English translation completely

---

32 Goolden, p. xxii.
overlooks a forty-one word passage covering over five lines in the printed edition. Two completely different explanations have been offered for this omission. Goolden has argued that the reason for the omission is a scribal error: "After taking in Interposito pauci temporis spacio on lines 4-5 the eye returned to the similar phrase post paucos dies on line 10. The phrase binnon feawum tidum translates the first of these two phrases." The latter phrase takes up the narrative at the point where the Latin has post paucos dies. This explanation is quite possible, since such skipping of lines occurs frequently enough among even present-day writers, especially those involved in copying from a source. It is therefore plausible that a translator, weary of his work, might make such a mistake, even one that is so substantial. However, Morton Donner suggests that this passage has been consciously omitted because of the "prudishness" of the Old English translator who demonstrates "a tendency to de-emphasize the passionate and emotional qualities of the narrative." After listing several passages from Apollonius, Donner concludes:

33 Goolden, p. 57, n. 30, 7.
It looks as though the English writer, even though he is translating a story about love, prefers not to mention the word. His description of the love affair, in consequence of the kinds of changes he makes, displays less emotional intensity than the original. He seems no more willing to confront the emotional realities of love in this episode than he was to confront the physical realities of rape in the opening one. He reacts prudishly to both love and lust, to sexuality whether in word or deed.\(^3\text{4}\)

These omissions may be the result of the monkish sensibilities of the person or persons charged with the task of translating this pagan story. Yet Donner does not consider Goolden's explanation; rather he makes this substantial omission the chief cornerstone on which to build his argument concerning the deletion of the details of the princess' "love-sickness." However, the fact that the passage describes the symptoms of love-sickness provides more than circumstantial evidence in view of other such omissions.

A sizable number of omissions indeed appear to derive from a tendency to temper references to extreme emotion and also to pagan religious practices. Fourteen passages describing emotions have been excised from the Old English version, while five referring to pagan religion have been

\(^{34}\text{Donner, p. 94.}\)
dropped. Some of these omissions may be circumstantial; however, the rather large number merits a closer look.

Three omissions make references to marriage. The phrase *in matrimoniun* disappears from the English version at 2, 7-8 and 30, 11. In both cases the Old English scribe has translated the verbs involved (*postulabant* 'they claimed,' 3, 6 and *petierunt* 'they courted,' 31, 13) by *gyran* 'desire eagerly.' However, the Latin specifies the type of desire (for marriage) whereas the Old English drops the reference. In addition, at 35, 20-21 the Latin has the phrase *quid . . . desideret nuptiarum causa* 'what . . . she should desire for the interest of marriage.' In dealing with this passage, the Old English translator omits *nuptiarum causa* and substitutes the less specific phrase *minre dohtor modes willan* 'the desire of my daughter's heart' (34, 25).

References to love and sex are also omitted or tempered, as noted above. In addition to the long passage at 31, 4-9, four other passages have been dropped from the translation. Two of these concern the incest of Antiochus and his daughter, and the other two concern Princess Arcestrate's love for Apollonius:
et coepit eam aliter diligere quam quod patrem oportebat 'and he began to love this girl otherwise than what was befitting for a father' (3, 9-10)

OE: Ø

Sed ille ei foedissima sorde sociatus . . . per impietatem coniunx effectus est filiae suae. 'But he joined himself with the foulest filth . . ., through unfilial conduct made a wife of his daughter.' (37, 16-17)
Ac he silfa wass mid ham fulestan horwe bar to gebeod 'But he himself was with the foulest filth thereto joined' (36, 19-20)

Filia enim mea studiis vacat et pro amore studiorum inbecillis iacet. 'Truly, my daughter devotes her time to study and because of her love of learning lies feeble.' (31, 20-21)
Min dohtor is nu swiðe bisy ymbe hyre leornunga 'My daughter is now very busy with her studies' (30, 20-21)

Puella ut vidit amores suos 'The girl when she saw her own love' (31, 28)
Mid ham be bat maden geseah Apollonium 'When the maiden saw Apollonius' (30, 29)

Examples 53 and 54 refer to the same situation, though separated by twenty years in time. The former is authorial narrative while the latter is a reference to this unfortunate happening as related by Apollonius to the priestess of Diana, whom he does not recognize as his wife. The subject matter must have taxed the translator's sensibility, and hence he may have sought for ways to temper and generalize
the specifics of this most unholy of passions. The heavy paraphrasing and omissions of the Latin description of Antiochus' unfilial desire at 3, 8-16 suggest the translator's anxiety over the particulars of the incident. Indeed, two corrupt passages at 3, 8-9 and 3, 10-11 (to be discussed later) may have been dropped gladly because of the subject matter as much as the bad Latin grammar. The Latin passage cited at 55, containing the deleted phrase *imbecillis iacet*, is related to 51 above, the long passage either overlooked or consciously dropped, because of its reference to the girl's lovesickness. The deletion of the reference to the girl's feebleness would seem to make all the more convincing the contention that 31, 4-9 is consciously omitted. Had the scribe puzzled over the presence of the phrase at 31, 21, he would surely have noticed his oversight at 31, 4-9. Having done so, his dilemma would have been whether to erase all intervening work as written or to continue with the business of translating. If this was his dilemma, then apparently he chose the latter. The fourth expurgated reference to love or sex is innocent enough: the substitution in Old English of the name *Apollonius* for *amores suos* 'her lover.' In view of the
other omissions, the motivation for the substitution here is probably a desire to tone down a reference to passion rather than to particularize the reference of a noun phrase.

Four other passages in the Latin which contain references to emotions are omitted from the Old English version. Since none of these passages mentions love or sex, it is curious that they have been omitted as well. Yet they may have been judged as offensive in some way. These four passages follow:

57 Quae dum singulos oscularetur 'And this girl while she kissed all of them' (23, 19)
OE: ø

58 Apollonius cum gemitu . . . gratias egit. 'Apollonius with a groan . . . expressed his thanks.' (25, 18-19)
Apollonius hire bæs bancode 'Apollonius thanked her for this' (24, 22-23)

59 irrupit in cubiculum patris seditque super thorum 'she burst into the bedroom of her father and lay upon his bed' (29, 18-19)
eode . . . and geset beforan hire fæder bedde 'she went . . . and sat before her father's bed' (28, 24)

60 Quid, . . . magister, . . . singularis cubiculum introisti? 'Why, . . . master, . . . do you enter my bedroom alone?' (31, 28-29)
Læceow, hwi gæst ðu ana? 'Master, why do you come in alone?' (30, 30)
The Latin cited in 57 serves as a transitional adverb clause, referring to the preceding clause *et dedit osculum patri, deinde discumbentibus amicis* 'and she gave a kiss to her father, and next to her friends reclining at the table' (23, 18). This clause has been translated into Old English (*and cyste hyre fæder and ǽa ymbsittendan* 'and kissed her father and those sitting around the table' 22, 27-28); therefore the omission of the transitional clause which follows may not be due to censorship. Perhaps its deletion owes to the translator's sense of economizing: the description had just been given, and there was no need for a second reference so closely following the first. Yet the translator has himself added several transitional phrases and clauses, those discussed earlier. Perhaps the nature of the passage in Latin—a reference to kissing as a sign of affection and friendship—made the second reference to the action all the more questionable, on spiritual as well as rhetorical grounds. The translator's omission of *cum gemitu* from the Old English version of 58 is less defensible, however. Apollonius' impassioned reaction to the beneficence of King Arcestrates' daughter appears to be a most normal response from a prince who has been pursued
as an outlaw and who has just survived a powerful sea storm, who is now bereft of possessions and companions and washed up on the shore of a strange land. The Latin source manuscript describes Apollonius' response in even more intense terms than expressed in Goolden's conflated Latin: Apollonius cum gemitu et uercundia gratias egit. 'Apollonius with a groan and a feeling of modesty expressed his thanks' (n. 25, 19). Apollonius' vulnerability before a beneficent maiden inferior to him because of age and sex—important details—is moderated by the more general clause Apollonius hie re bas bancode.

Passages 59 and 60 contain references to the violation of one's privacy, represented in the Latin by cubiculum 'bedchamber.' The scribe fails to translate cubiculum in these two contexts although he does translate the term by būr in three other passages: at 2, 14; 2, 21; and 2, 24. The reason is unclear for the scribe's retention of būr at 2, 14—the rape scene—and the omission of it at 28, 24—where the princess hurries into her father's bedroom early in the morning—and at 30, 30—where the

---

35 See Goolden, p. 56, n. 28, 2.
princess is surprised by the sudden intrusion of Apollonius into her bedroom. However, all three scenes describe the surprise of the occupants at being caught off-guard in the one room where it is supposed that they could be themselves. Hence they were vulnerable upon sudden intrusion. In the latter two cases, locative adverbial phrases serve where bur would have been preferable: beforan hire fader bedde in 59 and to bare cynelican healle just prior to 60. In fact, the omission in 60 leaves a narrative gap between Apollonius' going to "the kingly hall" and the maiden's surprise at seeing him in her room: Da nam Apollonius ba gewrita and eode to bare cynelican healle. Mid bam be bet maden geseah Apollonium, .... To be sure, this gap exists in the Latin as well, but it is filled by cubiculum in her startled question recorded in 60. The absence of its equivalent in Old English results in the loss of the specific reference to place. In neither context—28, 24 and 30, 30—was there a problem such as the translator experienced in finding an equivalent for triclinium.

Several references to pagan religion have also been deleted in the process of turning the Latin narrative into
readable Old English prose, leading one to suspect censorship. The appositive phrase *bara heallocated God* following *Apollines* (26, 10-11) has already been cited as an Old English addition. This phrase may have been added primarily for clarifying the reference to Apollo; however it also connotes disapproval. The omissions likewise add shades of meaning to temper or strike positive associations from Latin passages referring to the Roman gods. Five such passages have been thus "censored" in this fashion. For example, *Tartaream domum* 'Tartar an abode' (41, 9) is paraphrased as *bat cwicsuslene hus* 'the house of hell' (40, 9). Goolden cites the paraphrase as a "felicitous" translation in the "Introduction" of his edition, where he says of it that "it keeps the grammar of the Latin and offers a good Old English equivalent for the classical idea." In the "Commentary," however, he notes that *cwicsuslene* here is the only occurrence in Old English of the adjective form of *cwicsusl*, a commonly-used word for 'hell.' It is frequently used as a noun in homiletic texts, and therefore the translator's phrase would bring

---

36 Goolden, p. xxiii.
powerful associations as an equivalent for Tartaream domum. In addition to the omission of neutral Tartaream, two references to the name or title of Diana are modified. In templo Dianae Ephesiorum 'in the temple of Diana of the Ephesians' (43, 24) becomes on sam temple Diane (42, 27-28), and the vocative magna Diana 'great Diana' (37, 21) is translated as simply Diana (36, 25). The omission of Ephesiorum from the Old English version is probably due to stylistic economizing. However, the omission of magna 'great' from the vocative phrase in Latin appears to be the result of censorship. In the Latin Apollonius addresses the priestess of Diana, who looks as though she were Diana herself (36, 11), in this respectful manner, but in the Old English the reference is tempered by the deletion of the adjective. The phrase mori cupienti filiam reddidisti 'when I was longing for death you restored my daughter' (39, 2-3) is lost in the translation, for little apparent reason, it would seem. However, in this passage Apollonius makes Diana the agent who restored his daughter to him. Perhaps the translator could not

37 Goolden, p. 61, n. 40, 8-9.
tolerate the ascription of benevolent power to a pagan
goddess. Finally, the translator dropped *sacerdotum* from
the phrase *maiori omnium sacerdotum* 'chief of all the
priestesses' (37, 2), translating it with *he ðær ealdor
wæs* 'who was elder there' (35, 1). In the Old English
version, ðær replaces *sacerdotum* and thereby makes a gen-
eralized reference of a specific one. In view of the
foregoing omissions, the reason for the deletion here is
apparent: the reference is to the retinue of priestesses
serving a pagan goddess. One can sense the translator's
insistence on blurring the specific reference to pagan
religion by comparing the two versions of this passage.

Altogether the evidence suggests that the Old English
translator censored both major and minor violations of his
strict moral and religious code, sparing the reader the
temptation to inflame his passions or to dwell too long
on the existence of heathen gods and goddesses. It is too
much to assume that these omissions are due to simple
scribal carelessness, since the omissions occur repeatedly
and predictably in contexts describing extremes of passion
or heathen religious beliefs.
Even though the translator may have deleted some passages on extra-textual grounds, he also omitted eight corrupt Latin passages, omissions which suggest a measure of critical judgment. All of the following deleted corrupt Latin passages are documented and annotated in Goolden's edition. The first two of the eight are particularly interesting because the motivation for omitting them cannot be clearly established:

61 cogente iniqua concupiscentia crudelitateque flammeae incidit in amorem filiae suae (3, 8-9)
Rl: cogente iniqua cupiditate, flamma concupiscentiae 'with a compelling, excessive passionate desire, a flame of concupiscence';

fra gefeol his agen mod on hyre lufe mid unrihtre gewilmunge 'then fell his own thoughts on love of her with unrighteous desire' (2, 9-10)

62 Qui die luctatus cum furore pugnae cum dolore vincit amorem (3, 10-11)
Rl: Qui cum luctatur cum furore, pugnat cum dolore, vincitur amore 'He struggled with his passion, he fought with his madness, but he was overcome by love.'

to dam swide bat 'so excessively that . . . .' (2, 10-11)

---

38 Goolden, p. 44, n. 2, 10-13. Rl is Goolden's designation of a group of reliable versions of the Apollonius story. These and R2, another such group, are used to compare with readings in the Latin source closest to the version likely before the translator.

As may be determined by comparing G, the reconstructed source manuscript, with R1, the group of most reliable manuscripts, the translator was faced with the problem of several obvious mistranscriptions which violated in some way the rules of Latin grammar. In 61, mid unrihtre gewilnunge corresponds to cogente iniqua concupiscentia, but crudelitateque flammae has no equivalent in Old English. This phrase, notes Goolden, "is presumably missing from [Old English] since it is corrupt."\textsuperscript{40} That is, the phrase violates Latin grammar, since crudelitate is ablative and hence cannot serve as a genitive to flammae, which should be flamma if it is to be parallel with concupiscentia. In 62 the translator reduces the corrupt clause Qui . . . amorem to a generalized phrase in order to correct a linguistic problem created by several mistranscriptions. Of course, in both passages above, the translator has also avoided some details of an unpleasant account of a man's falling prey to an unnatural passion. Thus, two motivations may account for the rejection of these two passages.

\textsuperscript{40} Goolden, p. 44, n. 2, 10-13.
The other six corruptions were obviously rejected solely on linguistic grounds. To illustrate, at 19, 4 the Latin has _granago sordido circumdatum_. This passage was rejected because of a mistranscription. There is no such Latin word as _granagum_. Comparing this passage with the same in R1 reveals the error, for the latter has _grandae-vum sago sordido circumdatum_ 'a very old man clothed with a dirty garment.' The copyist of the manuscript before the eyes of the Old English translator apparently lost his place and therefore combined _gran-_ of _grandaevum_ with _-ago_ of _sago_. The result was a hopeless confusion to the Old English translator, who elected to drop the entire phrase rather than attempt to restore its sense.

Latin mistranslations have also led to four other omissions. At 13, 2 the Latin manuscript has the sequence _Ave, inquit Apolloni rex_. _Inquit_ is a mistranscription for _inquam_ 'I say,' but this insistent and annoyed remark of Hellanicus to Apollonius has been lost in the transfer to Old English. The translator also omitted an entire

---

41 Goolden, p. 50, n. 18, 4.

42 Goolden, p. 27, n. 12, 1-2.
sentence because of corruption in the Latin. At 41, 3-4 the Latin manuscript has *Pro hoc statuam a nobis positam in iugam testatur*. However, the inflections of *stataum* and *positam* are incorrect; they should read *stataua* and *posita*: 'A statue (erected) by us, (of you) positioned in a chariot, testifies of this (beneficence).'</p>

These words should be nominative singular in form rather than accusative singular. Yet omitting the entire sentence because of two incorrect inflections appears to be a rather extreme act, one which ought to have been the last of options from which the translator could choose. His choice to delete here is therefore puzzling. The phrase *mirtomque minatur* at 17, 16-17 is also presumably corrupt. It appears as the final phrase in the following sentence:

*Tunc sibi unusquisque rapit tabulas mortemque minatur*  
'Then every single one snatched at the boards (of the ship) and threatened death.' The sense is obviously illogical. This passage is troublesome because of a mistranscription, as a comparison with other Latin versions of the *Apollonius* story reveals. One of the better versions has

---

43 In the next chapter an explanation which accounts for the deletion will be suggested.
morsque nuntiatur 'and announced death,' but Goolden postulates mortemque moratur 'delayed death,' meaning that the sailors kept death away for a time by clinging to the wreckage of the ship. None of these readings is satisfactory to modern readers, as one modern translation of the Historia Apolloni makes quite clear by adopting nuntiatur: "Everyone snatched at planks and predicted death." The last word-level mistranscription is a confusion of two similarly-spelled monetary units (aureus and aes) at 15, 21 and 15, 22, where Apollonius announces to the people of Tarsus that he will sell them 100,000 measures of grain at the price which he paid for it in Tyre. The Latin has aureis 'gold piece' in both places; however, a comparison with R1 shows that aureis at 15, 21 should be aereis 'copper piece.' Otherwise the sense is completely

44 Goolden, p. 17, n. 15-17.
45 Goolden, p. 50, n. 15, 22.
46 Zoja Pavlovskis, trans., The Story of Apollonius, the King of Tyre (Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1978), p. 35.
47 The term commonly used to refer to copper money was ass, assis; however, aes, aeris was also widely used. It is this latter term that appears in the R1 and R2 versions, perhaps influenced by the form of aereus 'made of copper.'
changed: The Latin has Apollonius offering to sell grain at eight aureii per measure, the price he has paid in Tyre. But the citizens of Tarsus had been paying one aureus per measure, an already exorbitant price yet one expected of merchants selling food to a starving city. As Goolden notes, "so far from getting a bargain the citizens are being charged [by Apollonius] eight times the standard rate."\textsuperscript{48} They therefore should have had no cause to be happy, as the story says they became. As a matter of fact, an aureus was worth 250 asses;\textsuperscript{49} thus the citizens of Tarsus were paying over thirty-one times the price per measure that Apollonius offered to them. The Old English translator completely obscures the point, however. He has Apollonius proclaim the following:

\begin{verbatim}
63 Ic sille eow scollice hundteontig pusenda mitten hwates to 5am wurde pe ic hit gebohte on minum lande. 'I will give you indeed one hundred thousand measures of grain at the price that I bought it for in my country.' (14, 24-26)
\end{verbatim}

Evidently the translator was confused by the logic of his

\textsuperscript{48} Goolden, p. 49, n. 14, 26.

corrupt source, just as his readers would have been had he carried the error over into Old English.

The final rejected corruption appears to be due to a Latin copyist's loss of place, an oversight similar to that committed by the Old English translator at 31, 4-9. The passage follows:

64 Nata dulcis, noli de aliqua re cogitare, quia talem concupisti ad quam vero ego consentio tibi, quia et ego vero et amandus factus sum pater.

'Beloved daughter, do not worry, since you have chosen the very man with regard to whom I share your feelings, because I too have been made a father to be loved.'

Rl: noli de aliquâ re cogitare, quia talem concupisti quem ego, ex quo sum vidi, tibi coniungere optavi. Sed ego tibi vere consentio, quia et, ego amando factus sum pater. 'do not worry, for you have chosen the one whom I, from the moment I first saw him, have wished to join to you. Indeed, I give you consent, because I have been made a father through love.'

Leofe dohtor, re ondræt bu ðæ ængiges binges. bu hafast georene bone wer be me wel licat. 'Beloved daughter, don't you fear yourself anything. You have chosen the man that pleases me well.'

The Latin copyist evidently lifted his eyes from the page while writing the first ego, then picked up the passage following the second ego, and so lost ex quo eum vidi.

---

50 Goolden, p. 58, n. 34, 22-23.
tibi coniungere optavi. Sed . . . . He also changed amando 'through love' to amandus 'to be loved.' Goolden writes, "This is muddled logic and the translator gave up."51

The number of rejected corruptions does not mean that all corruptions were recognized, however. Indeed, the translator has retained some corruptions which create illogical statements hardly unnoticeable to alert readers. For instance, near the end of the narrative, when Dionisias attempts to defend herself against King Apollonius' charge, she protests: Bene, domine, quod tu ipse titulum monumenti eius legisti? (41, 5-7). This is translated accurately as: Nas  bast wel, hlaford, bæt bu silf aræddest ba stafas ofer hire birgene? 'Was it not well, lord, that you yourself read the inscription over her tomb?' (40, 5-7). The statement, however, contains a paradox: it cannot be "well" that a grieving father should read the inscription on his daughter's tombstone. Comparing the Latin source with R2 reveals the corruption in this passage: bone domine, quid? tu ipse titulum

51 Goolden, p. 59, n. 34, 22-23.
legisti monumenti 'Good sir, how so? You yourself read
the inscription on the monument.' Yet the translator
apparently did not notice this problem.

Almost every omission involves the consequent loss of
detail, regardless of the translator's motive. Where
words, phrases, or sentences were deleted in the Old Eng-
lish version, the results are more abstract, more vague
descriptions. In some cases these less-particularized
passages may have resulted from unfamiliarity with Latin
terms; in others they may have resulted from "prudery";
and in still others, they may have resulted from confu-
sions over corruptions. These omitted details seem to
balance the translator's additions of material not found
in the Latin, however. Yet more detail has been lost than
has been gained, and the result is a translation generally
lacking the detail of the original.

Paraphrases

Many of the deficiencies of style in the Old English
version of Apollonius appear in the numerous paraphrases

52Goolden, p. 61, n. 40, 5-7.
sprinkled throughout; these are especially obvious when compared with their originals. The Old English translator usually managed to elaborate or multiply words, but rarely attempted to clarify, if indeed clarity was a purpose of his paraphrasing at all. Many of the paraphrased translations are more general and vague than their Latin counterparts, and constitute the largest group of thirty-three identified paraphrases. The next largest group comprises those paraphrases which change emphasis in some way.

By far the largest group of paraphrased material results from the translator's blurring of specific details, replacing them with more general references that result in the loss of word-pictures. This type of paraphrase occurs thirteen times. The heavily-paraphrased description of King Antiochus' struggle with incestuous passion is an example of such revision:

65  *Die repugnanti nodum virginitatis erupit*  
*although resisted for a long while, he broke open the bond of her maidenhood*  
(3, 15-16)  

*Hwæt he  They are manfullan scilde abigode and ba ongeanwinnendan faemnan mid micelre strengde earfo61ice ofercom*  
*Lo, he then engaged in the wicked sin and with difficulty overcame the resisting girl with great strength*  
(2, 16-18)
Here the translator has expanded five concise Latin words into a ponderous seventeen in Old English. In doing so he has completely obscured *nodum virginitatis erupit* in his first coordinated clause and expanded the phrase *Diu repugnant* in his eight-word second coordinated clause, whose verb *overcom* echoes *abissgode* and hence expands and tempers *erupit*. The motive for the paraphrase appears to be the same as that responsible for several of the omissions: the desire or duty to expunge references to potentially offensive actions. In this case the act of incestuous rape appears to have driven the translator to temper the description. The result is a general reference to the act of deflowering a maiden daughter, one which spares the reader the force of the Latin verb.

Most of the thirteen paraphrased passages are not so easily explained as 65, yet all involve the same process.

53 In R1 the verb is *eripuit* 'deprived, took by force' (from *eripere*) rather than ms. *erupit* 'broke open' (from *erumpera*). The distinction does not matter in the Old English version, however, since the predication 'the {broke open} {took by force} her maidenhood' disappears in the paraphrase.
of multiplying words and generalizing. The following examples illustrate the difference between the two versions:

66 nusquam comparuit 'he has appeared nowhere'
   (11, 9)
   swa þæt he ne dear nahwar gewunian 'so that he dare not stay anywhere'
   (10, 13-14)

67 Et cum hortatur iuvenem 'And while he was exhorting the youth'
   (23, 17)
   Mid þi be se cyning bas word gecwæð 'While the king spoke these words'
   (22, 26)

68 At ubi accepit 'But when she took (it)'
   (25, 22)
   and sona swa heo hearpian ongan 'and as soon as she began to harp'
   (24, 27)

69 Post haec deponens liram induit statum comicum et inauditas actiones expressit. Deinde induit se tragicum. 'After this, putting down the lyre, he assumed the role of a comic and acted out unusual stories. Then he assumed the tragic role.'
   (27, 11-12)
   After bisum forlet Apollonius ba hearpan and plegode and fela fægara hinga þæs forð teah, be þam folce ungecnawen was and ungewunelic 'After this Apollonius laid down the harp and played and brought forth there many a fair thing, which was unknown and unfamiliar to the people'
   (26, 16-18)

70 Rex . . . tenens Apollonii manum forum civitatis ingreditur et dum cum eo deambularet 'The king . . . taking Apollonius' hand entered the forum of the city, and while he was walking with him'
   (31, 10-11)
   þæt Arcestrates se cyngc heold Apollonius hand on handa and eodon swa ut on þære ceastre stræte 'that Arcestrates the king held Apollonius hand in hand, and they went thus out on the city street'
   (30, 8-9)
71 *Iuvenis, epulare nobiscum et meliora de deo spera.* 'Young man, feast with us and hope for better things from God,' (23, 16)

*Du iunga man, beo bliðe mid us and gehiht on God bat bu mote silf to ðam selran becuman.* 'Thou young man, be happy with us and trust in God that you may yourself come to the better.' (22, 24-25)

72 *animumque accommodat arti* 'and he applied his spirit to his art' (27, 9-10)

*and he ba hearpestrengas mid crafte astirian ongan* 'and he began to stir the harp-strings with skill' (26, 13)

In 66 the Old English expands the subordinate clause, employs a different main verb (*gewunian* for *comparere*), and adds a modal auxiliary (*durran*). In 67 the translator drops the specific reference of *hortari* 'to exhort,' replacing it with the general *cweðan* 'to speak.' He also omits the object *iuvenam*, replacing it with a *pas word*, with the result that the predication is completely different.

In the Latin the king is 'exhorting the youth,' but in the Old English he is merely 'speaking these words.' In 68 the translator drops the intermediary step of the girl's taking the harp before she plays it. Whereas in the Latin version she commands the harp to be brought forth, takes it, and then plays it, in the Old English she commands it to be brought to her, then plays it. In 70 the Latin
present participial phrase tenens Apollonii manum becomes an independent clause in the Old English. In addition the singular verb deambularet is changed to a plural in Old English (eodon). And finally, in Latin the clause in which deambularet occurs is subordinate, whereas in Old English it is coordinated with the independent clause preceding it. Thus the emphasis in Old English is different, a result of less complex sentence structure. The paraphrase in 69, however, involves quite a substantial generalizing of a specific Latin passage. This paraphrase also envelopes a significant erasure. Between the d of plegod and and fela fagera binga on the next line is an erasure of the last third of the line. Plegod has been emended to plegode in all printed editions. The erasure may indicate the translator's problem with his source, which describes the dramatic mime show that Apollonius presented. The Old English therefore loses the specific references to the comic and tragic presentations by leveling them as fela fagera binga. The verb plegode may be intended as a translation of induit statum comicum, as

Goolden asserts, yet it appears that this verb generalizes the two dramatic presentations that are specified in Latin, which are in turn referred to in the Old English version by the most indefinite references—\textit{fela f\textael{reg}a binga} and \textit{\textael{le}c bara binga}. In 71 the translator has taken \textit{epulare} to mean \textit{beo bli\textael{de}}, a phrase that echoes the coordinated verbs \textit{\textael{at}on} and \textit{bli\textael{de} waron} used in 22, 13 to translate \textit{epulantibus} at 23, 8. The Old English translator therefore perceived a feast as an occasion for both food and pleasure. In addition to this change he rendered the four-word coordinated Latin clause by an eleven-word coordinated clause which includes an eight-word noun clause complement. This paraphrase is clearly more ponderous than the corresponding passage in Latin. The final example, cited as 72, is a "weak paraphrase" of what appears to be an unknown quotation. Perhaps the translator could make no sense of the passage; he chose instead a paraphrase that certainly fits the context, even though

\begin{itemize}
\item[55] Goolden, p. 55, n. 26, 17.
\item[56] Goolden, p. 55, n. 26, 13.
\item[57] Pavlovskis, p. 101, n. 17.
\end{itemize}
it strays from the original version. The result is, however, a reading that "loses the force and brevity" of the Latin, as Goolden notes.58

Several of the paraphrases involve changes in words, phrases, or clauses or changes in emphasis, in some cases dictated by the motivations cited above, but in other cases seemingly unmotivated by conscious artistic or moral principles. For example, at 5, 4 Antiochus' daughter cries out Nomen patris penitus periit in me 'The name of father has perished deep within me.' This statement is translated as So6lice on me earmre is mines fader nama reowlice forworden 'Truly in me, wretched, is my father's name cruelly perished' (4, 5). The Old English passage adds earmre and deletes penitus, thus emphasizing the girl's own feelings more than does the Latin version, which emphasizes 'the name of father.' Several other passages exhibit this same shift of emphasis, such as the following:

73 et non sustines amorem 'and not restraining her love' (29, 18)
and na leng heo ne gebad bonne hit dag wes 'and no longer she abode when it was day' (28, 23)

58 Goolden, p. xxii.
Rex vero ait: Non apto tempore me interpellastis
'The king indeed said: You have interrupted me
at an unsuitable time' (31, 19-20)
Da cwæd se cyngc: Nabbe ge na godne timan
aredodne 'Then said the king: You have not hit
upon a good time' (30, 19-20)

quod non apto tempore me interpellastis 'that
you have interrupted me at an unsuitable time'
(35, 5-6)
bæt ge ne comon on gedafenlicre tide mynre
dohtor to biddanne 'that you came not at a
suitable time to ask for my daughter' (34, 7-8)

Et ostendit ei Thasiam et dixit 'And he showed
her Thasia and said' (39, 11)
He bewaende hine ba Thasian and cwæd 'He turned
himself then to Thasia and said' (38, 11)

In all four paraphrases above, a key word, phrase, or
clause has been changed. The resulting variations seem
pointless, however, when compared with the Latin, and they
are less specific. For example, in 74 and 75 interpellas-
tis conveys the irritation of King Arcestrates, but in the
Old English this idea is replaced by aredodne. The mo-
tivation for the paraphrase cited at 73 is likely the
translator's censorious compulsion; however, there appears
to be no discernible motivation for the variation at 76.59

The changes in emphasis between the Latin and the Old
English versions are more worthy of note because some

59 Goolden, p. xxii.
of these variations derive from the differences between cultures or scribal backgrounds. An example is 29, 3 (28, 3-4), where the following appear:

77 Laudant omnes liberalitatem puellae 'They all praised the liberality of the girl'
   and ealle ba men hire gife heredon be hig
gesawon 'and all those men praised her gifts who saw them'

Concerning the difference Goolden writes, "In the Latin Arcestrate's generosity is applauded. In E the applause is characteristically switched to the gifts themselves." 60

This passage is reminiscent of the description of Hrothgar's gifts to Beowulf after his victory over Grendel:

Swa manlice mære þeoden
h常德-þeard hæleþa heathorðas geald
mearum ond mædum, swá hy næfre man lyhð,
se þe secgan wile sō ðæter rihte.
[Thus manfully the famous prince, hoard-guard of heroes, repaid the battle rushes with horse and treasure, so that never will man fault them, who wishes to say the truth according to what is right.] 61

The emphasis in this passage is on the gifts themselves (hy) rather than Hrothgar, the giver. The gifts are

50 Goolden, p. 56, n. 28, 3-4.
concrete testimony of the lord's character, just as they are testimony of the maiden's character in the Old English Apollonius. Another variation in style involves a shift from a passive to an active relationship, such as is illustrated in the following:

78 *Et ambulans in litore visus est a quodam Hellanico nomine* 'And walking on the seashore he was seen by a certain man by the name of Hellanicus'

He sume dage eode he be strande. Pa geseah hine sum his cuðra manna se wass Hellanicus genemnod

'Then on a certain day he walked by the strand. Then a certain one of his known men who was named Hellanicus saw him'

Here a number of changes have taken place in the Old English version, notably the converting of a present participial phrase to an independent clause, a common practice in this manuscript; the addition of his cuðra manna; the expansion of Hellanico nomine to a relative clause; and the metamorphosis of the passive visus est . . . nomine to the active *pa geseah hine . . . genemnod*. Five other significant paraphrases of this type follow below:

79 *induit coniugem* 'he assumed the role of husband'

'and gewiðnode his agenre dohtar him to gemæccan' 'and desired his own daughter to himself as a mate'
80 tabulae beneficio in Pentapolitanorum est littore pulsus, hoc est Cyrinorum 'by the favor of a plank he was pushed to shore at Pentapolis, that is of the Cyrenians' (17, 18-19)
to Pentapolim eam ciriniscan lande and bar up eode on eam strande 'to Pentapolis the Cyrenian land and there went up on the beach' (16, 23-25)

81 generositas tamen nobilitatem ostendit 'your noble bearing, however, reveals a noble origin'
beah ic bine ægelbornesse on ðe geseo 'yet I see your noble origin in you' (24, 6)

82 Et dimisit eos a se. 'And he dismissed them from himself.' (35, 7)
Da gewandon hie ham mid þissere andswære. 'Then they returned home with this answer.' (34, 10)

83 quam coram te, magna Diana, repræsentare are iussisti 'whom in the presence of you, great Diana, you have commanded me to bring back'
be ic beforan ðe, Diana, geandwearðod habbe. 'whom I before thee, Diana, have presented' (36, 25-26)

The directness and brevity of 79 is replaced in Old English by a ponderous clause, evidently written to clarify the relationship between father and daughter, which in Latin is indicated by paratactic coordination with the preceding clause oblitus est esse se patrem 'he forgot himself to be her father.' The change in 80 is a clear departure from the Latin. In the original, Apollonius
is washed up on shore clinging to a plank of the broken
ship. But the Old English version has him arriving mid
sunde 'by swimming.' Moreover, the Old English version
adds to the picture of Apollonius' heroic physical stamina
by having him 'walk' up on the beach. In 81, an omission
accompanies a change in emphasis. The noun generositatis
disappears in the Old English version, and consequently
the king observes Apollonius' nobility, whereas in the
Latin Apollonius' noble bearing reveals his nobility.
This same type of shift in emphasis also occurs in 82,
where in the Latin the king dismisses the three suitors,
while in the Old English they return home. The strong
suggestion of the king's annoyance with the suitors thus
is completely obscured in the Old English. Finally, in
83 magna disappears from the Old English version, and the
emphasis is once again shifted, this time from the agency
of Diana, who has issued a command, to that of Apollonius,
who has presented his daughter to the priestess.

A final small group consisting of two paraphrases
exhibits noticeable changes in sentence construction, the
paraphrase resulting in each case in a less pointed
reading. For instance, at 27, 1-2 the Latin has *dicam quod sentio* 'I will say what I think,' which is then followed by a principal sentence. For this the translator has *ic secge bat ic ongite bat* 'I will say that I perceive that,' which is followed by a noun clause (26, 2). At 35, 3 the Latin version has *quod filia mea te cupit, et meum votum est* 'because my daughter chooses you, and it is my wish.' The coordinated second clause has been converted in Old English, however, to a relative clause: *for ðam be min dohtor gewilmð ðæs ðe min willa is* 'because my daughter chooses that which is my wish' (34, 4-5).

All of these paraphrases under discussion are of course noticeable only when read side by side with the Latin source. The periphrasis, indirectness, and unnecessary variations, as well as the additions and omissions, are exposed upon comparison with the Latin, where it will be noticed that the style is direct, brief, and descriptive. Otherwise, however, the Old English version is quite readable on its own, and the confused passages usually derive from corruptions in the source. Recall,
for example, that the Latin is corrupt where the Old English has Apollonius say to Thasia "Hlaefdige, næs git yfel wif" [Lady, not yet an evil woman] (30, 29-30) and where Dionysias pleads with Apollonius in her own defense "Næs pæt wel, hlaford, pæt ðu silf æraddest ða stafas ofer hire birgene?" [was it not well, lord, that thou thyself read the inscription over her tomb?] (40, 5-7). Even so, the Old English translator mistranslated several passages.

Mistranslations

Nineteen mistranslations complete the picture of the translator's role in turning Apollonius of Tyre from Latin to Old English. They fall into two general categories: mistakes in interpreting meanings of Latin terms and mistakes in syntax. Goolden discusses four examples of mistakes in meaning on pp. xxii-xxiii of his edition. They include the failure to recognize the special meaning of vota (7, 2) as 'vow, promise' at 6, 3; the mistake of taking abiecto habitu 'in a poor garment' (23, 4-5) as buton scrude 'without clothes' (22, 8); the careless transformation of perrexit 'she continued' (27, 20) to Heo . . . ut eode 'She . . . went out' (26, 26-27); and
the error in taking *comitem* 'count' (43, 18) as *geferan*
'companion' (42, 20). Seven other mistakes of the same
kind appear below:

84 *luctatur cum sapientia*  'he struggled with it
with wisdom'  (7, 10)

he *hit gewan mid wisdome*  'he obtained it with
wisdom'  (6, 17-18)

85 *Apud enim bonos homines amicicia praemio non
comparatur*  'Truly, among good men, friendship
cannot be bought with a reward'  (13, 17-18)

foróon *he mid godum mannum nis naðer ne gold ne
seolfor wif godes mannes freondscipe wiðmeten*
'because between good men neither gold nor
silver is compared with a good man's friendship'
(12, 22-23)

86 *Quam partem petam?*  'In what direction can I go?'
(19, 2)

Hwaes *mæg ic biddan?*  'What may I ask for?'
(18, 1-2)

87 *et docta manu ceroma refricuit*  'and with skill-
ful hands he massaged him with an ointment'
(21, 12-13)

and *mid gelæredre handa he swang bone top*  'and
with skillful hands he whipped the top'
(20, 16-17)

88 *sed cum tempus adfuerit, mittam ad vos*  'but when
the time comes, I will send to you'  (35, 6-7)

ac *bonne heo mæg hi fram hyre lare geæmtigan,
bonne send ic eow word*  'but when she may dis-
engage herself from her studies, then I will
send you word'  (34, 8-10)
89 Et flebant ad invicem omnes. 'And then they wept all among themselves.' (39, 11-12)

And hig weopon 5a ealle and eac blissodon
'And they wept then all and also rejoiced'
(38, 12)

90 Quem manumissem incoluinen abire praecipit
'This freed man she advised to go away safe and sound'
(41, 22)

Neo ræhte ba soðlice hire handa him to and het hine gesund faran 'She extended then truly her hands to him and bade him to go away sound'
(40, 22)

In 84 the translator misinterpreted luctatur, perhaps as a result of anticipating the following clause, which contains the verb inventi 'he solved.' In 85 compare 'to arrange,' with its special meaning 'to buy,' was confused with a similar verb compare 'to compare.' Consequently praemio 'price,' an ablative of means, was split into ne gold ne seolfor and converted into the first element of a comparison, completed by wið godes mannes freondscipe.

A similar mistake occurs in 86, where the translator extracted the wrong sense from petere, which here means 'to go' although it may also mean 'to ask.' This mistake having taken place, there was then no place in Old English

52 Goolden, p. 46, n. 5, 17-18.
for partem 'direction'; hence it was dropped. Numbers 89 and 90 also are the results of similar misunderstandings. In 89 the translator evidently mistook invicem 'in turn, alternately, mutually' for the alternating emotions of joy and sorrow. Such an interpretation may, however, actually come closer to the normal human response in family reunions after a long separation; therefore this "misinterpretation" is felicitous—an improvement on the original. Manumissem in 90 was mistranslated likely as the result of separating the components into manu and missem, which indicate a gesture of the hand, rather than interpreting the word as deriving from manumittere 'to set free.' The mistake of top for ceraoma 'ointment' at 87 bespeaks an unfamiliarity with the Latin term. The result is a serious flaw in logic: the Old English has Apollonius whip the top (instead of massage with ointment) in such an expert manner that the king thought himself to be restored to his youth.

63 Goolden, p. 50, n. 18, 1-2.
64 Goolden, p. 61, n. 38, 12.
Finally, the translator's misunderstanding of tempus at 88 as a reference to 'time for studies' rather than 'time for marrying' results from careless reading. The subject of the discussion between the suitors and the king is the marriage of the princess. CCC 318, the manuscript nearest the Latin source, verifies this point by containing the phrase nubendi tempus 'the time for marrying.'

This concludes a catalogue of a sizable number of mis-translations. With the exceptions of 85 and 87 and the mistake in rendering abiecto habitu as buton scruide, these misinterpretations do make sense when read apart from the Latin. In addition to these errors of word meanings, six other passages contain noticeably defective syntactic relationships, which become apparent upon comparison with the Latin version. For example, favente deo 'through the favor of God,' an ablative of cause (15, 19) is wrongly translated as gefultumigend Gode, which Zupitza emended to gefultumigendum Gode. However, a corruption in the Latin

66 See Goolden, p. 52, n. 20, 14ff for a full explanation of this troublesome passage.

67 Goolden, p. 35, n. 35, 6 and p. 58, n. 34, 9.
may be responsible for this error, deo having been introduced into the group *vestra felicitate favente* (R2: 'through the agency [favor] of your good fortune'). As Goolden explains, *vestra felicitate* was converted to *for eowre gesælð* 'for your happiness,' a dative of advantage, in order to avoid the awkward Latin construction. Another example of syntactic confusion is at 19, 8-9 where the Latin has *Piscator ut vidit prima specie iuvenem* 'the fisherman, when he saw a youth of first rank (striking appearance).' The translator took *prima specie* as 'at first sight' or 'as soon as' (*sona swa*), completely losing sight of the fisherman's recognition of Apollonius' nobility.

The remaining four mistranslations are further examples of similar shifts in grammatical relationships. They follow:

91 *et dum decurrentem [ms. currenti] sustulit pilam* 'and while it was falling he kept up the ball' (21, 6-7)

and *ynende bone ðoðer gelæhte* 'and running, he caught the ball' (20, 8-9)

---

70 Goolden, p. 51, n. 18, 8.
et sciebat se in lusu parem non habere 'and he knew himself not to have an equal in the game'
(21, 9-10)

Se cyngc 5a oncneow bæs iungan snelnesse bæt he wiste bæt he nafde his gelican on bam plegan 'The king, when he realized the youth's swiftness so that he knew that he [Apollonius] had not his match in the game' (20, 11-13)

Quos ut vidit rex subridens ait illis 'And when the king saw these smiling he said to them'
(31, 14)

Da smercode se cyng and heom to besead and bus cwæð 'Then the king smiled and looked at them and thus said' (30, 12-13)

modo vestra pietas non defendisset 'only your loyal affection would not have defended [me]' (41, 21-22)
bonne ne becom ic to bissere are 'then I would not have attained to this favor' (40, 22)

In 91, the emended inflectional suffix -em links decurren-tem to pilam, making it the ball that is falling or 'running down.' However, in the Old English version Apollonius is doing the running. Of course, the Latin manuscript has currenti 'running,' which may be taken as an ablative of manner. Since the Old English translator's source manuscript might well have read currenti, his version is an adequate translation. The pronoun se in 92 is reflexive and thus refers to the king, who knew that no one else in the bath was his equal. Yet the translator
interpreted se to refer to Apollonius, having used a bat
result clause to introduce the noun clause bat he nafde
his galican on ban plegan, he here referring to iungan.71

In 93 the translator took subridens as part of the sub-
ordinate clause rather than as part of the main clause,
thereby creating a reversal of items:

Latin: The king saw them. The king smiled and
said . . .
O.E.: The king smiled. The king looked at them
and said . . .

The result is a minor shift in sentence style. And last,
in 94 the translator misunderstood the time reference of
the Latin passage. In the source, Thasia declares to the
citizens of Tarsus that their loyalty, for all its inten-
sity, could not have saved her life years ago, when the
mercy of Dionysias' servant Theophilus had spared her life.
The translator failed to recognize the time reference of
defendisset and thus made the passage refer to the present
rather than to the past.72

This catalogue of errors reveals some weaknesses in
the ability or the concentration of the Old English

71Goolden, p. 52, n. 20, 12.
72Goolden, p. 52, n. 40, 22.
translator. In his defense, the quality of his source was less than satisfactory at several points, containing corruptions that altered the sense of several passages and may have led to some of the errors. Yet some errors, as already noted, bespeak lack of close attention to detail, while still other errors reveal the translator's unfamiliarity with some terms encountered in his source. The result is that by comparison with the Latin they "give the appearance of carelessness and obscurity where all was once clarity and coherence." When these mistranslations are then added to the catalogues of additions, omissions, and paraphrases, one can see clearly that the translator's aim was not to produce a word-for-word version—the inflammatory nature of some of the narrative details precluded this objective—but rather a sense-for-sense translation generally following the Latin source and yet exhibiting a distinctive Old English prose style. Thus, as an Old English narrative, the story is quite successful.

Peter Goolden has described in some detail the general features of the distinctive Old English style of Apollonius

---

73 Goolden, p. xxiii.
of Tyre, a discussion which may be found on pp. xxiii—xxv of his edition. Those features which Goolden notes as well as other features noted in passing in earlier portions of this study will be discussed in this final section of the present chapter, where five major differences between the style of the Old English and Latin versions will be identified.

The most noticeable difference between the two versions is in the number of participles present. In his 1893 study of the Old English treatment of Latin ablatives absolute in Apollonius, Frank H. Chase recorded forty-four occurrences of this characteristically Latin construction, only six of which are retained in the Old English version. An example of the Latin construction and one of the six retentions in Old English follows:

95 si quando deo favente dignitati tuae redditus fueris 'if ever by the favor of God you shall have been restored to your noble rank' (19, 16-17)
gif hu fultumiendum Gode becymst to binum erran wurðmynte 'if you with the aid of God [aiding God] arrive at your earlier honor' (18, 18-19)

Here the Latin ablative absolute participle deo favente

74 Frank H. Chase, "The Absolute Participle in the Old English 'Apollonius,'" Modern Language Notes, 8, viii (December, 1893), 244.
'God favoring' is turned into a dative absolute, a typical transformation elsewhere in Old English. Of the six Latin ablative absolutes carried over into Old English, five become dative absolute constructions and one becomes a "crude" or uninflected present participle construction, emended by Zupitza (ms. gefultumigend Gode → gefultumigendum Gode, 14, 23-24). On the other hand, thirty-eight of these Latin absolute participles are studiously avoided in the Old English, replaced by subordinated finite verbs in sixteen cases, twelve of which are in temporal clauses; by coordinated finite verbs in ten cases; by prepositional phrases in eleven cases; and by a single-word adverb in one case. One passage from this group of thirty-eight illustrates the difference:

Thaliarcus hoc audito 'This having been heard, Thaliarcus [when Thaliarchus heard this]' (9, 9)
Thaliarcus, sona swa he bæt gehyrde 'Thaliarcus, as soon as he heard that' (8, 9-10)

Emily Helming's 1930 study of absolute participial constructions in Apollonius identifies eighty occurrences

---

76 Chase, p. 244.
of these structures in the Latin version. Of these, sixty are converted to other structures in Old English, forty-seven of which are independent clauses and only ten of which are dependent adverbial clauses. Only six of these eighty are carried over into Old English, and fourteen are omitted. Of the six retained participial constructions, three are *thus saying,* for *dicens.* However, the translator has also created such constructions where none exist in Latin. One is at 2, 8, where *offering many wonderful things* translates *cum magna . . . dotis quantitâte* 'and with a great quantity of gifts' (3, 6). Another occurrence is at 28, 19, where the Old English has *and went therein, thanking God,* for *he expressed thanks to God' (29, 14). Yet, in spite of occasional original uses of the present participle and a few more cases of carrying over participles from Latin, the tendency of the translator is away from such constructions and toward clause structures (in over 71

---

77 Emily Helming, "The Absolute Participle in the Apollonius of Tyre," *Modern Language Notes,* 45 (March 1930), 177-78.
per cent of the passages) or toward dropping them (in nearly 18 per cent of the passages).

A second difference between the two versions is the Old English translator's treatment of the ablative case, which is usually (but not always) converted to the dative. An example of this distinction is *swiðe irlicum andwlitan* 'with a very angry countenance' for *irato vultu* 'with an angry expression' (7, 4). This Latin phrase occurs again at 7, 17, where it is translated periphrastically by *mid irlicum andwlitan* (6, 26). In both cases the Old English instrumental case would be *irlice andwlitan*, but the Old English translator's practice is to use the dative case, confirmed in the second passage by the use of *mid*, a preposition which governs noun phrase objects in the dative case.

A third major difference between the two versions is the translator's practice of doubling several single-word elements, a topic discussed earlier in this chapter. To reiterate, he expanded single-word Latin items such as *quaeritus* (9, 21) to *gesoht and geacsod* (8, 23) and *silentio* (27, 9) to *stilnes and swige* (26, 11).
And finally, two other major differences between the two versions are the Old English version's abundant ba-headed narrative principal clauses and the frequent use of ba-headed main clauses following adverb clauses, both of which have been discussed earlier in this study.

Taken altogether, these differences produce a distinctive translation of a story rooted in classical Mediterranean ground. The Old English tendency toward periphrasis is hardly noticeable apart from the more direct and concise Latin source, and hence its additions, omissions, paraphrases, and mistranslations are virtually invisible. However, the personality and prejudices of the translator flash forth occasionally by means of the aforementioned editorializations about heathen religion and his censorship of material concerning love and sex. It is therefore obvious that a priest or probably a monk working in a scriptorium somewhere in the south of England performed the task of translating with a great degree of skill and, in some cases, with conscious artistry. For instance, several of the doublings already cited exhibit alliteration:

78 Goolden, p. xxxiv.
To these may be added the alliterative doubling contained in the translator's original epilogue *Here endah ge wea ge wela Apollonius hæs tiriscan* (42, 29) and the alliteration in the original clause *De gelamp hit sarlicum gelimpe* (2, 8) and the original sequence *On bism bingum soliche burhwunode* (4, 12). Finally, some of the Old English expansions create alliteration, such as *bam healfan scicilse ðe he on hæfde* (20, 1-2) for *tribunario* (21, 1), *findan on hæm flocc* (20, 4) for *invenit* (21, 3), and *nam ba hearpan on his hand* (26, 8-9) for *acciplies liram* (27, 5-7). These examples give evidence of no mere amanuensis but rather of a translator with an ear sensitive to the rhythm of his native language. It will be the purpose of the final chapter of this study to suggest a location
for the execution of the translation and, so far as is possible, to identify the translator or translators.
A close study of a translator's work usually raises questions concerning his identity and location. Unfortunately, very little can be said with certainty about the identity of the translator of Apollonius because of the lack of verifiable data. Neither the manuscript nor the dialect is unique. The manuscript is written in the common insular hand of the early to mid-eleventh century, and the dialect is late West Saxon, the "Standard Old English" spoken in Wessex and predominant among the surviving Old English texts. No illuminated letters appear in the manuscript, and although the first letters of sentences are filled with red, not all sentences and speeches begin with capital letters. All but two capitals are small,
approximately twice as tall as lower case letters. The two large capitals, placed in the left margin and drawn four lines high, are the A in An, which begins the narrative on p. 131, and the H in Her, which begins the last line of p. 140.  

4 The origin of the manuscript has not been determined; all that is known of its history is that it was in the library of Edward Craddock, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1575-94. Later it was acquired by Archbishop Parker, perhaps as a gift.  

Manuscript evidence indicates that the text of CCCC 201, pp. 131-45, is a scribal transcription of an earlier manuscript, now lost. Since pp. 6-145 of CCCC 201 are in the same hand, one scribe was responsible for copying the complete text of Apollonius. Thus the scribal mistakes are "clearly errors of transcription." The Wulfstan material in the earlier part of the manuscript cannot be dated before the early eleventh century, and the style of handwriting indicates a transcription a generation later. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the scribe copied

---

4 Goolden, p. xxxiii.  
5 Ker, p. 90.  
6 See Goolden, p. xxxiv for several examples.
the work sometime within the second quarter of the eleventh century. Additionally, the heavy predominance of $ for West Saxon $ before nasals (e.g., sānde for W. S. sende, gewende for gewende, etc.) suggests an association with Essex, and therefore on this evidence it has been assumed that the scribe hailed from Essex or actually worked in a scriptorium there.

However, this speculation is not accepted by Helmut Gneuss, who takes issue with Peter Goolden's method of determining the provenance of the manuscript in his recent study of "Standard Old English." Because Old English manuscripts "afford only insufficient evidence on the dialects of the Anglo-Saxon period," philologists have resorted to using data extracted from Middle English dialects, about which more is known, and have applied those facts to Old English manuscripts in order to determine dialect traits. Such has been Golden's method in arriving at an Essex

7 Ker, p. 90; Goolden, pp. xxxiii-iv.
8 Goolden, pp. xxx-xxxi, xxxiv; Ker, p. 90.
location for the transcriber. Concerning this method, Gneuss writes:

The criterion which is used to locate the dialect is reasonably trustworthy with regard to Middle English; but it fails in the case of Old English, a fact which can be proved by a number of texts and manuscripts, which although they display the very same phonological or orthographical feature, quite definitely come from other parts of England--Kent, for example. So much for the method of determining Old English dialects by means of a comparison with Middle English. . . .

Goolden has discounted Kentish influence, however, on the basis of the consistent use of æ for West Saxon ə (from ã) before nasals, a trait of Essex speech, whereas Kentish would have æ for ə in other contexts as well.¹¹

Therefore, it is not absolutely certain that the copyist was located in Essex or even spoke the dialect of Essex, although the evidence seems to indicate this. Regrettably, the copyist's mistranscriptions and his use of æ for the i-umlaut of a before nasals are the only linguistic evidence of his work. However, more tangible evidence remains of the copyist than of the translator, about whom only inferences can be made.

¹¹ Goolden, pp. xxx-xxxi.
The same "clear, round hand"\textsuperscript{12} is responsible for transcribing Apollonius, but such tangible evidence as style of handwriting cannot be used as a tool for determining the identity of the original translator or the scriptorium in which he worked. In fact, although it is assumed that one person created the Old English version of Apollonius, a close analysis of internal stylistic evidence suggests that at least two translators worked on the project. Furthermore, it is possible to identify the place at which the change in translators occurs because numerous alterations in style appear after the two-thirds point in the manuscript. In the last third of the narrative, significant changes occur in word order, morphology, and usage.

One noticeable shift in style is the word order of main clauses that follow temporal clauses beginning with Ṛa or Ṛa Ṛa. Beginning with p. 141, the order of such main clauses changes from a free variation between Type 1 (common) and Type 3 (pa-V-S) to pa-V-S exclusively. Of the twenty-six unambiguous temporal clause-main clause

\textsuperscript{12} Goolden, p. xxxii.
sequences, nineteen occur within pp. 131-40, and the remaining seven occur from midway through p. 141 to p. 145.

Ten of the first nineteen main clauses exhibit common S-V-O order; the other nine begin with ba and exhibit V-S order.\(^\text{13}\) All twenty-six of these clause-relationships are represented below by means of the first elements in each sequence, rather than by means of the complete sentences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ba } & \text{ ba se fader bohte . . ., ba gefeof } \text{ his agen mod } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(2, 9-10)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ he of slaape awoc . . ., he abrec } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(2, 13-14)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba se cyngc gehyrde . . ., ba cliopode heo } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(4, 8-9)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba se cyngc bat gehyrde . . ., he } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(5, 5-6)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba pas bingc } \text{ bus gedone waieron } \ldots \ldots, \text{ ba becom se fores} \text{d} \text{a Thaliarcus } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(8, 29-30)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba geseh } \ldots \ldots, \text{ ba cwar} \text{d he } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(10, 1-2)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba Thaliarcus bat gehyrde } \ldots \ldots, \text{ he } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(10, 9-10)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba his geban bus geset waes, ba waeron } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{beswic} \text{mena bat an his find} \quad \text{ba } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(10, 18-19)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba bat folc bat gehirde, hi waeron bli} \text{e gewordene } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(14, 26-27)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ git he wolde } \ldots \ldots \text{ gecyr} \text{an, tos} \text{lat ba his w} \text{afels waieron bli} \text{e} \quad \text{(18, 11-12)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba Apollonius bat gehirde he hine unscri} \text{de } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(20, 1)} \\
\text{se } & \text{ cyngc ba oncneow pas iungan snelnesse } \ldots \ldots, \text{ ba cwad he } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(20, 11-13)} \\
\text{ba } & \text{ ba Apollonius gehyrde . . ., he arn radlice } \ldots \ldots \quad \text{(20, 14-15)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{13}\) See the discussion of main clauses in Chap. II, pp. 82-92.
And ba §a he ut eode • • •, he hine lædde • • • .
(20, 18-19)

Da Apollonius bæt gehyrde, he bam gehyrsumode • .
(22, 4-5)

Da ba he bis sæl mid sarnesse beheold, ba sæt
sum • • ealdormen • • .
(22, 15-16)

Da heo becom • • •, ba gewænde heo • . . .
(22, 28)

Da ba bæt møden gehirde • • •, ba cwæð heo • • .
(24, 19-20)

Da ba Apollonius bæt gehyrde, he onfengc • . . .
(30, 4-5)

Da heo ba gewrita oferræd hæfde, ba besæah heo • • .
(32, 1-2)

Da ba se cyningc hæfde bæt gewrit oferræd, ba niste
he • • • .
(32, 18)

Da se cyningc bæt geseah, ba nam he • • • .
(32, 30-31)

Da geseah se cyngc • • •, ba ongeat he • • .
(34, 1-3)

Da ic ongean com, ba sædæn hi • • • .
(38, 1-2)

Da ba hi gebrohte wæron, ba cwæð he • • • .
(38, 25-26)

Da ba se fiscere bæt geseah • • •, ba wende he • • .
(42, 5-7)

Note that, beginning with the sequence at 32, 1-2, the last
seven main clauses exhibit Type 3 (ba-V-S) structure.

Before the "turn" at 32, 1-2, no more than three Type 3
main clauses appear in succession in such contexts. Seven
consecutive repetitions of Type 3 order therefore suggest
a change in style occurring between 30, 4-5 (the last Type
1 main clause) and 32, 1-2.

Another shift in style suggesting a change in trans-
lators concerns the morphology of the periphrastic temporal
conjunction **mid bi be**. This conjunction occurs twenty-four times throughout the manuscript in three forms: **mid bi be** (12); **mid by be** (5); and **mid bam be** (7). **Mid bi** be forms are used exclusively the first fifteen occurrences, from pp. 131-39 in the manuscript; however, when the conjunction appears again, on line 20 of p. 141, it is as **mid bam be**, employing the dative rather than the instrumental inflection. The next occurrence is a return to **mid bi be**, but the final six occurrences are **mid bam be** forms. The chart below lists all the occurrences of these forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mid bi be</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mid by be</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2, 5-7)</td>
<td>(22, 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4, 29)</td>
<td>(24, 14-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (5, 16-17)</td>
<td>(24, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6, 24)</td>
<td>(26, 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8, 12)</td>
<td>(30, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14, 13)</td>
<td>(32, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16, 15)</td>
<td>(36, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18, 2-3)</td>
<td>(35, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18, 25)</td>
<td>(36, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20, 3)</td>
<td>(36, 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20, 27)</td>
<td>(38, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22, 17)</td>
<td>(42, 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lone **mid bi** be interrupting the pattern beginning with 30, 29 is puzzling, as also are the five **mid bam be** temporal clauses on one manuscript page (p. 143—pp. 36, 3-38, 4). Thus, although it may be suggested that the first
occurrence of mid $am$ **be** at 30, 29 signifies a change, the return to mid $bi$ **be** at 32, 25 presents a problem. However, it is certain that the change has taken place by 36, 3, and it is also noticeable that the first occurrence of mid $am$ **be** is at 30, 29. One may therefore assume that the return to $bi$ at 32, 25 represents either a lone variation in the new translator's style or a later scribal change.

A third change in style occurs in the distribution of gerund phrases, which appear only six times:

- **to bediglianne** 'to conceal' (2, 18-19) **celare** 'to conceal' (3, 16)
- **to sillenne** 'to offer' (18, 14) 0
- **to bidanne** 'to ask' (34, 8) 0
- **to ofsleanne** 'to slay' (36, 20) **occidere** 'to kill" (37, 17)
- **to onfonne** 'to receive' (36, 24) **percipiendum** 'receiving' (37, 20)
- **to fedanne** 'to raise' (36, 29) **nutriendam** 'raising' (37, 25)

Four of the six gerunds occur after p. 141, for three different contexts in Latin: for an infinitive (37, 17); for gerunds (37, 20; 37, 25); and, in the case of **to biddanne**, for an idea implied rather than expressed. Three of the four latter occurrences appear on p. 143, within ten lines of each other (ll. 18-27). Thus the close compaction of four gerunds in the latter part of the
manuscript contrasts sharply with the two isolated occurrences in the earlier portion.

The remainder of the stylistic changes are presented hereafter according to the type of syntactic unit, as the above examples illustrate: namely, single-word, phrase, and clause structures. Taken together, the changes illustrated in these three areas provide evidence that different translators were responsible for pp. 131-40 and 141-45.

The bon/šam distinction appears to be significant in the four occurrences of to (šam) bêt 'in order that.' Within pp. 131-40, to šam bêt occurs twice, at 4, 16 and at 10, 1. However, this phrase appears twice within pp. 141-45 as to bon bêt, at 35, 18-19 and at 40, 15-16. Because the data is extremely limited here, it may perhaps be a coincidence that the two latter phrases employ bon rather than šam, but since the shift occurs after p. 141, a change of translators may explain the change in form.

Of greater interest, perhaps, is the all but complete absence of present participial forms from pp. 141-45. -and forms occur twenty-three times throughout the manuscript, though they are by no means used as participles in
all cases. Seven -end forms are agent nouns formed from the present participle; all seven appear within pp. 131-40, five of them as translations for Latin agent nouns:

- *gifendes* (16, 2) for *donatoris* (17, 1)
- *bereafigend* (16, 25) for *fraudator* (17, 20)
- *beswicend* (16, 27) for *deceptor* (17, 21)
- *ymsittendan* (22, 28) for *discumbentibus* (23, 18)
- *ymsittendan* (26, 9-10) for *omnes discumbentes* (27, 7)
- *gemiltsigend* (28, 7) for *misericors* (29, 5)
- *lufigend* (28, 8) for *amatrix* (29, 5)

No other -end agent nouns occur in the Old English version. Of the seventeen participial forms that remain, fifteen appear in the first section of the manuscript and only two—*bus cwe6ende* at 30, 25 and 34, 26—appear in the second section. In both cases, however, *cwe6ende* translates Latin present participles (*dicens*, 31, 25; *dicens* and *adiurans*, 35, 21-22). At the same time, the translator of pp. 141-45 avoided twenty-one other Latin present participles, including three other occurrences of *dicens*. In the first section, however, the translator on two occasions used present participial forms for other Latin constructions:

- *Gode francigende* (23, 19) for *egit gracias deo* (29, 14)
- *lifigendne* (10, 16-17) for *vivum* (11, 12). Such creativity as that displayed by the first translator at 10, 16-17 is
apparently beyond the range of the translator of the latter section.

Another difference between the styles of the earlier and later material is the translators' use of the relative particle \( be \), which normally functions as a restrictive relative pronoun, equivalent to the function of Modern English \( that \). Of the eleven \( be \)-relative clauses used non-restrictively, nine are clear departures from "standard" practice and two are "marginal."\(^1\) Seven of the eleven departures occur in pp. 141-45.

Another indication of a change in translators is apparent at 30, 7, where the sequence Hyt gelamp \( ba \) occurs. Variations on this phrase occur in only two other places, at 2, 8 (Da gelamp hit) and at 16, 10 (After bism hit gelamp). The pronoun hit also occurs in narration at 2, 20 (Da gewearl hit). Although \( i/y \) are interchangeable vowels in many words in Old English, even throughout Apollonius, nevertheless Hyt at 30, 7 may be a significant change, since elsewhere without exception the form is hit. Other occurrences of hit are at 6, 17; 6, 25; 10, 24;

\(^1\) See the discussion of relative clauses in Chap. II, pp. 121-33, especially pp. 124-25.
This regularization of the vowel also extends beyond the *Apollonius* manuscript as a feature of the scribe's style. In her discussion of the peculiarities of the ms. CCCC 201 version of Wulfstan's homilies, Dorothy Bethurum has noted the tendency of the scribe to unround early West Saxon *y* to *i*, thus accounting for the rather irregular occurrence of *y*-forms within the manuscript. \(^{15}\) Hence, frequent notes in her edition comparing readings in all the Wulfstan manuscripts reveal this manuscript's *i* for the *y* which occurs in other versions. In fact, throughout all seventeen of Wulfstan's sermons contained in ms. CCCC 201, *hit* is the exclusive form.

Why, then, can this one occurrence of *hyt*, after which the translator returned to *hit*, be regarded as significant? Either a translator or a copyist could have been responsible for this change. Yet another "mistake" occurs at this same point, an error that lends support to the contention that there was a change of translators and that, furthermore, 30, 7 is the point at which the

translators changed. This mistake is the apparent scribal oversight of five lines of Latin, represented by the gap in material between 30, 6 and 30, 7 in Old English, the line which also begins a new paragraph in the manuscript.

The supposition that the translators changed at the end of p. 140 provides a logical explanation for the loss of 31, 4-9 from the Old English version. Goolden has suggested that the translator's eye slipped from *Interposito pauci temporis spacio* to the similar *Rex post paucos dies* in the process of moving back and forth between the source and the translation. This explanation assumes, however, that the translator, who was quite familiar with his material by this point, failed to notice the mistake or, noticing it, failed to correct it. Most of the other omissions have been accounted for in this study as due to either censorship or oversight; however, the oversights have been of sequences a line or less in length. Too, even though the lost passage at 31, 4-9 concerns the psychosomatic lovesickness of the princess and thus may have been offensive to a Benedictine monk—as Morton Donner contends—

why would the translator excise this passage when he has preserved the earlier material describing Antiochus' rape of his daughter, albeit in a heavily paraphrased version? These two explanations are plausible, but they may be discarded in favor of the theory of a second translator. If the translators did indeed change at the end of p. 140, the arrival of a new hand was then heralded by four points of stylistic change: first, by the setting off of a new paragraph—the second and last of such in the manuscript; second, by the large capital H—the second and last large capital in the manuscript; third, by the use of Hyt to begin the sentence—the only use of this spelling in the Apollonius story; and last, by an oversight of several lines of the Latin story—likely owing to the new translator's initial unfamiliarity with the text.

After the critical point at p. 30, l. 7, other sequences exhibit changes in structure or frequencies of occurrence. For example, inverted prepositional phrases diminish. All of these inverted structures are directional,

---

17 The paragraphing is indicated in the manuscript by a blank space of one-quarter of a line after the sentence-ending period on line 40. Two-thirds of the large capital H of Hyt in line 41 is in the left margin.
and most of them are \( \text{to} + \{NP_{\text{Pr}}\} \). Thirteen inverted prepositional phrases occur in the narrative, ten of which appear in pp. 131-40 (Part A) and only three of which appear in pp. 141-45 (Part B). The translator of Part A displays a variety in his choice of inverted prepositions, using \( \text{after} \), \( \text{fram} \), and \( \text{ongean} \) in addition to using \( \text{to} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hire cwað to} & \quad (2, 22) \\
\text{cliopode heo hi hire to} & \quad \text{him after foran} (10, 20) \\
& \quad (4, 9) \\
\text{him fram adryfan} & \quad \text{hiom cwað to} (28, 9-10) \\
\text{him to secige} & \quad \text{him to cwað} (28, 29) \\
\text{him to become} & \quad (8, 8)
\end{align*}
\]

The structure of each phrase is \( \text{Pron} \ldots \text{Prep} \), with the verb following in seven cases. These structures occur much less frequently than the order \( \text{Prep} \ldots \{NP_{\text{Pr}}\} \) although both may appear in the same sentence: \( \text{He beseah eac to dam mannum be bæt mæden him forgifen hæde and heom cwað to} (28, 8-10) \). However, after 30, 7 only three inverted Prep phrase structures appear, all employing \( \text{to} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{heom to beseah} & \quad (30, 13) \\
\text{him to cwað} & \quad (40, 15) \\
\text{ræhte ba soðlice hire handa him to} & \quad (40, 23)
\end{align*}
\]

The same diminishing of frequency is found with regard to two aspects of relative clauses. First is the
distribution of the nine relative clauses which occur in the Old English version. However, none of these relative clauses appear after p. 140. This sharp difference may therefore be taken as another indication of a change in translators. Second is the distribution of Old English relative clauses for Latin phrasal constructions. The Old English translators generally used clauses to render such phrasal Latin structures as absolute and participial constructions. Adverb clauses often substitute for absolute constructions, and relative clauses often render participial phrases. Sixteen conversions to relative clauses occur in Part A, but only three occur in Part B. These three follow:

se be hi funde (36, 28) for ubi inventa esset (37, 24)
de was burh ungelymp beswicen (34, 13) for a fortuna deceptum (35, 13)
be bu at me underfenge (32, 4-5) for percepta (33, 4)

Two of these relative clauses convert Latin past participles, and one transforms a passive to an active clause. All other relative clauses in Part B are literal translations of Latin relative clauses. This reduction may also be interpreted as significant.
The word order of principal clauses also shows a change after 30, 7. One area in which change is apparent is the position of object nouns and pronouns in such clauses, a subject discussed in Chap. II, p. 58. Generally, noun and noun clause objects appear after verbs, and pronoun objects appear before verbs. As illustrated on pp. 67-68 of Chap. II, five of seventy-six simple sentences exhibit S - O - V structure; however, two of this number have noun objects, which should appear after the verb rather than before it. Significantly, both of these objects occur in Part B:

*Mid me bu boccraft leornodest* (32, 23)
*Apollonius se cyngc sunu gestrynde be his gemaecan* (42, 21-22)

In addition to this variation in noun objects, a violation of the S - Pron. Obj. - V rule occurs at 40, 11-12, where Apollonius cries out to Thasia: *Ic grete be nu of helle geciged.* *Be* in this clause is the only occurrence of a pronoun object in post-verbal position in all of Apollonius. Again, this "violation" occurs in Part B, and, even though the data is limited here, it indicates a tendency away from the practice of the translator of Part A.
Principal sentences incorporating the adverbial *ba* 'then' also exhibit changes in Part B. These shifts occur in two types of clauses, and, while the evidence in these areas is not overwhelming nor the changes marked, together they suggest two translators who differed in the way they handled *ba*. The first type exhibiting change is the headless adverbial clause, in which *ba* occurs in other than the initial position. Three of these clauses appear in Part A:

- *Eode ba into bam cyninge (6, 2)*
- *Bewænde hine ba to 5am cyninge (6, 18-19)*
- *Beseah 5a mid irlicum andwitan to him (6, 26)*

This type of structure occurs, however, five times in Part B:

- *Beseah 5a to 5am brim cnihhtum (32, 19)*
- *Eode 5a ut and beseah to Apollonio (34, 23-24)*
- *For me ba to Egipta land (36, 29-38, 1)*
- *For 5a siðdan to Tirum (38, 21)*
- *For 5a scólice banon to Tharsum (38, 22)*

Thus the distribution of such clauses is heavier in Part B in an almost inverse relationship to the length of text contained in each section.

The other type of adverbial clause which changes in Part B is the *S - V - ba* principal clause, illustrated in
Part A by *Hi toedon ba mid bissum wordum* (12, 23-24). This sentence is in fact the only occurrence of a *$S - V - ba$* principal clause in Part A. However, this structure occurs five times in Part B, beginning with the pivotal *Hyt gelamp $ba$* sentence at 30, 7. The others follow:

- *Seo for $ba$ mid me* (35, 24)
- *He bewænde hine $ba$ to Thasian* (38, 11)
- *Heo ræhte $ba$ sodlice hire handa him to* (40, 22-23)
- *He wunode $ba$ par six monæs* (40, 26-27)

In addition to the changes illustrated in these two types of adverbial clauses, *$S - ba - V$* clauses occur fourteen times in the first ten manuscript pages and ten in the last five. These are sentences of the type *Se man $ba$ eode* after *Apollonio* (20, 27). The frequency increases from 1.4 per page to 2.0 per page.

As a matter of fact, principal clauses employing *$ba$* increase by nearly fifty per cent in Part B. Of the 149 *$ba$*-clauses in *Apollonius*, 86 occur in Part A, an average of 8.5 per page. In Part B, however, this average increases to 12.6 per page (63 occurrences). Less than forty of these *$ba$*-clauses correspond to something similar in the Latin version; therefore, since the majority of them represent changes in syntactic relationships in the
text, the frequency and number of occurrences in each part of the manuscript was optional with the Old English translators. For example, of the 105 Adv-V-S clauses in Apollonius, 58 have no 'then' equivalent in Latin. Et 'and then' is the Latin connective most frequently translated as ːba in the Old English version (twenty-five times, fifteen of which occur in Part B.) The data therefore indicate a different translator for Part B, one who tended to use ːba in narrative contexts more frequently than other equivalents, such as and.

A final area of difference between Part A and Part B is the treatment of imperatives. The typical imperative structure is subjectless except when the command to act is stressed, in which case the subject pronoun is retained (see Chap. II, pp. 102-04). The presence of the subject pronoun is apparently optional, since it does not occur in imperative structures in the Latin text. Therefore, the distribution of the subject pronoun could be a test of the validity of the hypothesis under study. These structures exhibiting the order Imp-V-S occur five times out of a total of forty-four imperatives in Part A, but they
occur seven times out of seventeen in Part B. Examples follow:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bonne acwel } & \text{ au hine (8, 8)} \\
\text{ne ondræt } & \text{ pu } \text{æ} \text{miges binges (34, 22-23)}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the latter example contains a negative, and a subject pronoun, and a reflexive pronoun. The percentage of total occurrences is nearly four times higher in Part B than in Part A (7/17, 41.2 per cent to 5/44, 11.4%) and may therefore be explained by hypothesizing a different translator of Part B.

To summarize, the evidence of several shifts in matters of style suggests that two translators may have worked on the Old English version of *Apollonius*. Since the manuscript is the work of one copyist and since the stylistic changes are subtle and were probably of little consequence to that copyist, it is unlikely that he was responsible for them. Goolden speculates that the surviving manuscript is not too far removed from the original translation, judging by the good state of the text. The descent of the manuscript may be something like the following:

\[^{18}\text{Goolden, pp. xxxiv.}\]
Another hand may have been involved in the process of copying—CCCC 201, pp. 131-45 may be a copy of a copy—and, indeed, another translator may very well have been involved in the original work, one whose work was lost forever in the missing chapters (the last half of Chap. 22 through the first third of Chap. 43). What remains of the manuscript creates the impression that Translator A did twice as much work, but Translator B would probably have been responsible for Chaps. 19-51. Unfortunately, over twenty-five chapters of his work—if they were completed—have disappeared, a substantial amount of material which could confirm this supposition or refute it. However, the evidence that remains suggests that the translators changed at the end of p. 140.
What of the translators themselves? Is it possible to suggest a location for their work? It is likely that the translators were Benedictine monks working in the scriptorium of a monastery. In The Monastic Order in England David Knowles describes the unvarying regimen of Benedictine monks, their days divided into alternating periods of devotion and work. A portion of this work was done in the scriptorium. Knowles writes that "the copying of manuscripts was the fundamental claustral employment of the black monks; that is to say, it was the one regular work which all were capable of performing. . . ." In a scriptorium most of the monks were employed in the hackwork of writing and copying works of minor importance, writing Bibles and service-books, and filling in initial letters and capitals in colors or gold. Those with artistic talent painted and illuminated designs and miniatures; those with outstanding literary talent composed and transcribed original work or compiled chronicles. The

---


20 Knowles, p. 518.

21 Knowles, p. 519.
translators of Apollonius would have fallen into the last group; they were not mere hacks. Those who later transcribed their work, however, probably possessed less literary and artistic talent, a fact verified by the several mistranscriptions.  

The almost complete lack of ornamentation, except for the red-filled first letters of sentences, testifies to the relative importance of the Apollonius story when compared with works deemed deserving of ornamentation and illumination, such as the Bible and various religious works. Goolden speculates that Apollonius survived because it happened to be bound together with the copious Wulfstan material, the Institutes of Polity, the confessional and penitential texts, and the laws, which together comprise MS. CCC 201.  

Considering the strict discipline, self-denial, and the call for a complete retreat from the world found in the Sancti Benedicti Regula, one wonders how and why Apollonius was translated and transcribed by the monks. Certainly the story was popular,

---

22 Goolden, p. xxxiv.

23 See Ker, pp. 82-90, for brief descriptions of the contents of this volume.
and perhaps Apollonius was perceived as a type for all good Christians to follow, his story showing that the good man will endure. Indeed, the story is entitled "Of Temporal Tribulation" as Tale 153 of the Gesta Romanorum.  

Apparently, then, the moral value of the story outweighed the incestuous relationship of King Antiochus and his daughter and the lost description of the bordello where Thasia is imprisoned. The story cannot have been given a high priority for translation or copying, however, when more important books needed to be done. Apparently, however, some preceptor somewhere made the decision to translate it, and others later made similar decisions to transcribe it. But where? And by whom?

Sadly, these questions cannot be answered, although suggestions may be made. Goolden has placed the manuscript somewhere in the south of England, on the evidence of the lack of exclusively Anglian or Northern forms. He favors an Essex location but cannot state his belief with certainty. However, the evidence of vocabulary choice may be

---

enlightening on this question. Specifically the *hapax legomena* and a few other characteristic words may place the manuscript within the influence of one major scriptorium—that located in the abbey at Winchester and directed by Æthelwold.

Helmut Gneuss has proposed the origin of "Standard Old English"—the late West Saxon of the period of the Benedictine Renaissance—to be Æthelwold's school at Winchester, basing his contention on vocabulary choice and Æthelwold's heavy personal influence on the rebirth of learning in the second half of the tenth century. Æthelwold, who likely spoke the West Saxon dialect, was the only one of the three Benedictine reformers—Dunstan and Oswald are the other two—who expressed a keen interest in the English language. Gneuss cites the following passage from the life of Æthelwold as evidence of this reformer's influence on the Old English language:

He always took great pleasure in instructing the young men and boys, in explaining Latin books to them in the English language, in teaching them the rules of grammar and metre, and exhorting them gently to strive for greater things. And so it was
that many of his pupils became abbots, bishops, and even archbishops in England.\textsuperscript{25}

King Edgar asked Æthelwold to translate the Benedictine Rule into English, and he may have authored all or part of the \textit{Regularis Concordia} (in Latin) and helped to set in motion a revival of the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}, among other achievements.\textsuperscript{26} In 963 he received the episcopacy of Winchester, which he held until his death in 984. However, his legacy was his influence on his pupils Wulfstan and Ælfric, whose own prose works represent the high-water mark of late Old English.

Æthelwold established a school at the Old Minster in Winchester where, as noted above, he presided over the instruction of young men in grammar, metrics, and the great books of Latin. Gneuss' hypothesis is that this center of vigorous activity radiated the West Saxon dialect and led eventually to the dominance of West Saxon over Mercian, Northumbrian, and Kentish. This hypothesis may be tested by analyzing some vocabulary items of

\textsuperscript{25}Gneuss, p. 73, translated from Chap. 31 of the life of Æthelwold.

\textsuperscript{26}Gneuss, p. 74.
"Standard Old English" and comparing them with those of the school at Winchester in order to determine the degree of influence, if any. Thus, Gneuss identifies a restricted group of texts "written in close connection with Winchester" that display "a remarkable uniformity in the choice of expression within certain groups of synonyms." These "Winchester words" distinguish Winchester texts from non-Winchester texts and, although they represent only a small fraction of the entire vocabulary, they may be used to place *Apollonius* within one of these two broad groups. Of course, many of the optional synonyms do not apply in the case of *Apollonius* since most of these are religious terms. Yet a small number of non-religious terms are listed in Gneuss' study, thereby providing some basis for judgment.

For instance, for Latin *discipulus* the Winchester group prefers *learningcniht* to other formations and compounds. In *Apollonius*, *discipulus* occurs only once, as the feminine form *discipulae*, which is translated by

---

27 Gneuss, p. 75.
28 Gneuss, p. 76.
the compound lærinægmadene (30, 22), a form similar to lærinægniht. This word is obviously patterned after the neologism lærinægmann 'disciple,' which is found in the Old English translation of the Benedictine Rule. Perhaps a connection exists between Æthelwold and Apollonius if one word counts for much. In addition, however, the Winchester group prefers sunu 'son' in place of bearn 'son, boy' and cnapa 'boy' in place of cniht, in the sense of 'boy.' Although dohtor appears frequently in Apollonius (because two daughters have important roles in the story), sunu appears only once (42, 21), for filium, the sole occurrence of the word in the Latin manuscript. That sunu was used instead of bearn may therefore further link Apollonius to the "Winchester group." The same may be said of the choice of cnapa or cniht for puer: the Latin term occurs three times, at 11, 1; 11, 3; and 19, 22; in all three places it is translated by cnapa (10, 3; 10, 5; and 18, 6).

30 Gneuss, p. 76.
The Winchester group usually translates Latin corona in its secular sense by cynehelm rather than by beag or any of the other possible Old English equivalents.\(^{31}\)

Corona, which appears once in the Latin version of Apollonius (27, 6), in the sense of 'garland,' is translated as cynehelm at 26, 8. Two other preferences of the Winchester translators are êlœodig or elfremed instead of fremde 'foreign' and (ge)blissian instead of (ge)fægnian 'to rejoice.' Once again, usage in Apollonius agrees with this general tendency: blissian is used exclusively in Apollonius, e.g. at 4, 15; 10, 12; 24, 23; 28, 28; 34, 4; 38, 12; and 40, 29. Êlœodige appears once, at 18, 30, as a translation of peregrini (< peregrinus) 'foreign.'

This small group of "Winchester words" may connect Apollonius in some way with Æthelwold's school; however, the evidence is insufficient for certain judgment. Besides, two non-Winchester words found in Apollonius illustrate the weakness of a clear identification with Winchester. The Winchester group uses utanydan rather than adrifan 'to drive out' and almost always uses gylt.

\(^{31}\) Gneuss, pp. 76-77.
'sin' while Alfred and some late Old English texts usually employ scyld. Apollonius, however, uses adryfan rather than utanydan at 4, 17 and scyld instead of gylt several times (2, 17; 4, 4; 5, 11; 6, 21). Perhaps these two words are evidence of scribal individuality, or perhaps they indicate a location somewhat removed from Winchester, where the influence of Æthelwold's school was less strong.

Gneuss' hypothesis remains to be proven because of the present state of disarray in Old English vocabulary studies. Distinctive Winchester words comprise a small set of items, and it is often difficult to separate Winchester words from the main body of characteristic late West Saxon words. To complicate matters further, most of the Winchester words occur elsewhere in late Old English works. Yet the revision of Werferth's translation of Gregory's Dialogues, Oxford Bodleian Hatton 76, written in the first half of the eleventh century, differs considerably from the other two copies extant and bears a close relationship to the definite Winchester manuscripts. Therefore, there is some validity to the hypothesis and

Gneuss, pp. 80-81.
likewise some reason to connect Apollonius to the influence of Æthelwold.

The evidence provided by læringmædene, which was created by analogy with læringmann, a word found in Æthelwold's translation of the Benedictine Rule, lends support to this belief. læringmædene is one of thirteen hapax legomena which appear in Apollonius. These unique words are listed below in order of occurrence:

ongeanwinnendan 'resisting' (2, 17) for repugnanti (3, 15)
eastnorderne 'northeast' (16, 20) for Boreas (17, 14)
eæfosteful 'envious' (22, 20) for invidet (23, 13)
missbingo 'it is mistaken' (22, 21) for Male suspicaris (23, 14)
swegcraft 'art of playing music' (26, 3) for artem musicam (27, 2)
hearpennægl 'plectrum' (26, 12) for plectrum (27, 9)
hearpesstrengas 'harp-strings' (26, 13) for ø
slace 'delay' (30, 21) for differe (31, 21)
lærincgmædene 'female student' (30, 27) for discipulæ (31, 26)
unforwandigendlice 'without shame' (32, 15) for impudenter (33, 10-11)
cwicsuslenæ 'infernal' (40, 8) for Tartaream (41, 9)
ofstændon 'they stoned' (40, 19) for lapidaverant (41, 18)
nefe 'granddaughter' (40, 29) for neptem (41, 28)

These hapax legomena do not appear to be particularly revealing of either the translators or the place of translation. Seven of the thirteen occur in Part A, six in
Part B. The distribution therefore does not seem to be significant, except for two points that deserve notice. First, since Part B is half the size of Part A, the ratio per page is higher in Part B than in A (1.2 to 0.7), a figure which would be statistically significant were there a higher number of rare words in Apollonius. Secondly, these words are not evenly distributed; rather, they are clustered together in four contexts. The words æfestful and misbingo appear on succeeding lines of p. 138. Swegcraft, hearpenæl, and hearpestrengas occur within ten lines of each other on p. 139. Slacone, lærincgmadene, and unforwandigendlice all occur on p. 141, and cwicsuslene, ofstændon, and nefe occur on p. 144.

A few of these words are happy choices, even improvements on the Latin. For instance, misbingo economically translates male suspicaris 'you suppose wrongly,' and swegcraft performs the same service for artem musicam. Cwicsuslene, built from cwic 'living' and susl 'torment,' words common in ecclesiastical texts, is an apt choice which both preserves the sense of the original (Tartaream)
and provides a built-in commentary on heathen religion.\textsuperscript{33} Unforwandigendlice 'shamelessly,' translating \textit{impudenter}, is related to two similar forms appearing in the \textit{Cura Pastoralis}: unforwandodlic 'unhesitating, fearless' and unforwandodlice 'unswervingly.'\textsuperscript{34} Indeed, most of these words are built from terms found in religious texts. Alfric and Alfred are frequently cited as sources of the related words. Apart from \textit{lærincgmedene}, however, none of these forms can be connected with Winchester or with \textit{Æthelwold}. Therefore, no definite conclusions can be made concerning the \textit{hapax legomena} of \textit{Apollonius}.

As noted at several places throughout this study, although certain passages in the Old English version exhibit literary artistry even within the confines of translation, the style cannot be linked with any individual writer of the late Old English period. Wulfstan may be ruled out on the basis of vocabulary and dialect, although his preference for two-stress pairs may be seen in the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{33}Goolden, p. xxiii, p. 61, n. 40, 8-9.
  \item \textsuperscript{34}"Unforwandodlic,' \textit{Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary}, p. 375.
\end{itemize}
several doublings found in *Apollonius*. Wulfstan's dialect is difficult to fix because of the association of the most important manuscripts of his work with the Worcester scriptorium which he presided over at one time. The Worcester scriptorium developed a literary patois containing some Mercian, Anglian, and Kentish features, which it imposed on all its texts. Since *Apollonius* preserves no exclusive Anglian forms, it cannot be connected closely with Worcester, and therefore not with Wulfstan.

The absence of any color illumination in CCCC 201 generally rules out a close association with Winchester, which was a center of this art, suggesting instead a center that showed little interest in such work. Worcester was just such a center and may have failed to develop any interest in such a pursuit as the result of Wulfstan's lack of interest in art, as Bethurum has pointed out. Wulfstan the moralist can hardly have had time for such peripheral matters when England was so in need of reform. Yet, as pointed out above, the absence of any distinctive

\[35\] Bethurum, p. 50  \[36\] Bethurum, p. 62.
features of the Worcester patois would seem to rule out this scriptorium.

Neither may *Apollonius* nor CCC 201 be connected with Ælfric of Eynsham, the greatest prose stylist of the late tenth century. No linguistic evidence exists to identify the manuscript with Ælfric; besides, the Wulfstan material bound up in the early portion of the manuscript would seem to argue against an identification with Ælfric. Since Ælfric was educated at Winchester as a pupil of the great monastic reformer Æthelwold, one would expect his vocabulary to reflect the practice of Winchester to a degree, which in fact it does. Yet Ælfric seems to prefer *gylt* to *scyld*, a non-Winchester word used in *Apollonius*, and perhaps on this ground one should reject a close association with the hand of Ælfric.

To summarize, then, all that may be said beyond mere conjecture is that apparently two translators were employed in rendering *Apollonius* into Old English, that they worked in a scriptorium located somewhere in the south of England, and that they executed the translation sometime

---

37 Gneuss, p. 75.
around 1000 A.D. This work was later copied, and possibly recopied, until it was bound together ca. 1025-1050 with the Wulfstan sermons and various other ecclesiastical and legal works into the manuscript later catalogued as CCCC 201. It is ironic that this popular medieval narrative should remain shrouded in mystery and that only one copy of the Old English version should survive, a manuscript containing barely half the story. However, like Beowulf, the product of an earlier anonymous scribe, this narrative survived almost surely because of its utility as a mirror for princes, instructing by the example of right conduct. Its moral is that a righteous man will endure and be rewarded, though he may suffer for a time. This moral is probably its redeeming quality, overriding the accounts of sexual misconduct. Although it would be tempting to link Æthelwold, Wulfstan, or Ælfric with Apollonius of Tyre, such a connection cannot yet be made with certainty. Nevertheless, the evidence suggesting that at least two translators produced this work can provide the basis for a renewed critical interest in the transmission as well as the content of this unique Old English
romance. However, the questions regarding authorship and location still call for answers.
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