The genitive in Farman's Gloss to the Rushworth Gospels[1]

Nieves Rodríguez-Ledesma
Universidad de Sevilla

1. Introduction

1.1. The Rushworth Gospels

The Rushworth Gospels (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auctarium D.2.19) is an Irish Ms produced about 800 AD,[2] with an Old English interlinear gloss added in the late tenth century by two glossators: Farman and Owun.[3] Farman glossed all of Matthew, Mark 1.1 – 2.15 up to *hleonadun*, and John 18.1–3 in a Mercian dialect (Rushworth[1]); Owun glossed the

---

2   It is also called Macregol Gospels, after the name of the main scribe of the Latin text, and Codex Rushworthianus, after John Rushworth, who presented the codex to the Bodleian Library (Tamoto 2011: 40).

3   This information is provided in two colophons. The first is found on folio 50v (Tamoto 2013: 100): farᛗ p*re*sbyte*r* þas boc þus gleosede dimittet ei d*omi*nus omnia peccata sua si fieri po*test* ap*ud* deu*m* 'Farman the priest thus glossed this book; may the Lord forgive him all his sins, if it can be so with God' (translation by Skeat 1878: xi).
The scribe's name contains the rune ᛗ 'man', a common function of runes in Old English manuscripts. For information about their use in Beowulf and other texts, see Smith (2020: 75–80). The second colophon is found on folios 168v and 169r (Tamoto 2013: 334–35):
Đe min bruche gibidde fore owun ðe ðas boc gloesde. Færmen ðæm preoste æt harawuda. hæfe nu boc awritne bruca mið willa symle mið soðum gileofa sibb is eghwæm leofost.
'Let him that makes use of me [i.e. of the MS.] pray for Owun who glossed this book for Færman the priest at Harewood. Have (i.e. see) now a written book: use it with good will ever, with true faith: peace is dearest to every man' (translation by Skeat 1878: xi).

remainder in Northumbrian (Rushworth[2]).[4] There are differences between the two scribes concerning their handwriting, language and relationship with the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels, as summarised by Skeat:

> [Farman] is distinguished by his free use of the thorn-letter (þ), by his original and bold style of translation; by firmer and more angular handwriting, and by the more southern character of his dialect. The latter, Owun, was apparently, a professional scribe, and Farman's inferior, who was merely deputed by the latter to take the Lindisfarne MS. as his guide and to follow it rather closely (Skeat 1878: xii).[5]

Farman's rendition is considered as independent and original, whereas Owun's is regarded as dependent of the Lindisfarne Gospels.[6] Thus, Waring (1865: cx–cxii) gives several examples of mistakes in rendering Latin (L) which are found in Lindisfarne, but not in the section glossed by Farman. For instance, in Mt 10.31 *multis passeribus meliores estis uos* 'you are better than many sparrows', L. *passeribus* 'sparrows' is confused with *passionibus* in Lindisfarne and glossed as *ðrowungum* 'sufferings', wheras Farman gives the correct gloss *spearwas*. Similarly, in Mt 2.18 *uox in rama audita est* 'a voice in Ramah was heard', the name of the town is confused with *ramus* 'branch' in Lindisfarne and glossed as *tuigga*, whereas Farman renders it as *heanisse* 'height', based on the traditional interpretation of the Hebrew name as *excelsum* 'a height' (*DOE* s.v. *heanes*).[7]

Within Rushworth[1] a distinction has been established between Matthew, more independent from the Latin original, and Mark, which follows the Latin text (and the Lindisfarne gloss) more closely. Thus, Murray remarks that Matthew is "not a word-for-word gloss, but a readable idiomatic version" (1874: 562), and the same applies to the three verses in John: "three verses of

---

4 The gloss was added *æt harawuda*, according to the information provided in the colophon on folio 168v. The place may refer to Harewood in Yorkshire or in Herefordshire (Breeze 1996, Tamoto 2013: xcv), although Coates (1997) suggests Lichfield.

5 See Waring (1865: cvii–cviii) and Tamoto (2013: xcv–c) for a list of linguistic differences between Farman and Owun.

6 It is generally accepted that the three glossators (Farman, Owun and Aldred) made use of Latin manuscripts different from those they were glossing. Thus, Ross (1981: 8) remarks that in four cases Aldred's gloss corresponds to a reading recorded only in the Latin of Rushworth: Mt 5.42, Mt 13.19, Mk 16.14 and J 10.20. Similarly, he observes that in some cases "Farman follows the textus receptus as represented in Lindisfarne, though not necessarily the Lindisfarne gloss" (Ross 1981: 9).

7 Conversely, Waring (1865: civ) gives examples of incorrect renderings of Latin words found both in Lindisfarne and in the section glossed by Owun.

fine idiomatic Saxon, not like his [Farman's] Mark a southernising of the Lindisfarne, but like his Matthew a totally independent version" (1874: 562).[8]

One of the similarities between the section of Mark glossed by Farman and Lindisfarne concerns the use of double glosses (Ross 1979). These are frequent in Lindisfarne, but not very common in Rushworth[1]; however, from the beginning of Mark, they become much more frequent in this gloss and seem to correspond to those found in Lindisfarne. One particularly revealing example is found in Mk. 1.22, where L. *stupebant* is glossed by *swigdon* ⊦ *styldon* in Lindisfarne and by *swigadun* ⊦ *stylton* in Rushworth[1], the second verb occurring only in this particular instance in the Mercian gloss, though being very frequent in Lindisfarne. This piece of evidence shows the interconnection between the two glosses and suggests that it was Aldred who influenced Farman (Ross 1979: 194–95). In his comparison of Rushworth[1]'s Mark and Lindisfarne, however, Kotake (2017: 85) concludes that "despite the close textual relationship between Ru1 and Li in this section, they often disagree with each other as regards the use of double glosses", since "only about one third of Ru1's double glosses in Mark (nineteen out of fifty-nine, excluding one triple gloss) appears in identical combination and order with those in Li" (2017: 86–87).

Ross (1979: 196–97) finds similarities between Lindisfarne and Rushworth[1] not only in Mark, but also in Matthew 26–28, and concludes that Farman "obtained access to Aldred's gloss when Rushworth[1] was nearly finished; it was used from Mt. 26 onwards and the process continued with Owun in his making of Rushworth[2]." Kotake (2012), however, studies the similarities between the two glosses in Matthew 26–27 at both the lexical and the syntactic level and concludes that it is Aldred, not Farman, who changes his lexical preference and glossing practice in this section. One of the pieces of evidence he gives to support this conclusion is the rendering of Latin quantifier + *de/ex*-phrase. Lindisfarne is closer to Latin and tends to use the literal translation (quantifier + *of*-phrase), whereas Rushworth[1] has a freer translation in most cases and uses a quantifier followed by a partitive genitive. In Matthew 26–27, however, some instances of the partitive genitive construction are found in Lindisfarne (26.47 and 27.21), showing that it is Aldred who changes his glossing practice in this section (Kotake 2012: 17).

---

8 Murray (1874: 562) remarks that the Rushworth version of Matthew has more in common with the West Saxon Gospels than with Lindisfarne. In a similar line, Ogura notes that "Ru1 often takes the same element order as West Saxon versions" (2008: 65).

1.2. Aims and methodology

The present article studies the genitive construction in Farman's gloss to the Rushworth Gospels (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auctarium D.2.19) in comparison with Aldred's gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, Bristish Library, Nero D.iv), written in Northumbrian in the 10th century. It focuses, on the one hand, on the extension of genitive singular *-es* from the *a*-stems to other noun classes and, on the other, on the word order of adnominal genitives in the gloss. For the study of the analogical extension of *-es*, a quantitative analysis of 28 nouns has been carried out in contexts where they gloss a Latin genitive form. As in previous studies on the glosses to the Durham Collectar and to the Lindisfarne Gospels (Rodríguez Ledesma 2018 and 2022), the nouns have been selected on the basis that their etymological inflection for the genitive singular is other than *-es*, and they consist of feminine nouns (*ō*-stems, *i*-stems, root stems), kinship *r*-stems, weak nouns or *n*-stems and proper nouns.

The second objective is the study of the word order of adnominal genitives in the gloss (preposition vs. postposition) with the aim to determine the degree of influence exerted by the Latin word order and the extent to which Farman innovates and deviates from the original in order to show the native pattern. For this purpose, proper nouns have been analysed first, and then those common nouns which are more frequently attested in the genitive in the gloss, in order to have a comparatively large corpus (247x) and be able to draw conclusions.

The data have been retrieved using the *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* (hereafter *DOEC*), which is based on Skeat's edition (1871−1887), but all the tokens have been checked against Tamoto's edition (2013) in order to detect possible errors or inaccuracies.[9] Because of the wealth of spelling and morphological variants attested in the gloss, the *DOEC* was searched for the Latin genitive form glossed by the nouns which form the basis of the present study: thus, for the feminine nouns *æ* 'law' and *næht* 'night', the terms of search were Latin *legis* and *noctis* respectively. Following the *DOEC*, the examples given throughout the article offer both the Latin text and the Mercian gloss, to which a word-for-word translation has been added. In some cases, the

---

9   Abbreviations, for example, are silently expanded in the *DOEC*.

corresponding Northumbrian gloss found in Lindisfarne is also given for comparison.[10]

The presentation and analysis of the data are organized as follows: the extension of genitive singular *-es* is studied in (2) and is subdivided into four categories: feminine nouns (2.1), kinship *r*-stems (2.2), weak nouns or *n*-stems (2.3), and proper nouns (2.4). Section (3) gives examples of differences between Rushworth[1] and Lindisfarne concerning the genitive inflection which show Farman's independence as a glossator. The word order of adnominal genitives in the gloss is analysed in (4), both with proper nouns (4.1) and with the most frequent common nouns (4.2). Finally, conclusions are provided in (5). In all sections the results are compared with those obtained from the study of Lindisfarne (Rodríguez Ledesma 2016 and 2022) in order to offer a more comprehensive account of the genitive construction in these glosses to the gospels.

2. EXTENSION OF GENITIVE SINGULAR *-ES*

2.1. Feminine nouns

As in previous studies on the glosses to the Durham Collectar and to the Lindisfarne Gospels (Rodríguez Ledesma 2018 and 2022), the feminine nouns analysed comprise *ō*-stems, *i*-stems and root stems.

The following *ō*-stems are attested in the genitive singular in Rushworth[1]: *awoestednisse* 'desolation' (1x), *cennise* 'birthday' (1x), *forgefnise* 'forgiveness' (1x), *hernise* 'hearing' (3x), *hreownise* 'penitence' (1x), *soðfæstnisse* 'truth' (1x); *byrgenn* 'sepulchre' (1x), *hell* 'hell' (4x), *nedl* 'needle' (1x) and *stow* 'place' (1x). All of them take the etymological inflection *-e*, except for *hell*, which presents variation and adds innovative *-es* in one instance:

(1)   MtGl (Ru) 23.14

et cum fuerit factus faciatis eum filium gehenae duplo quam uos

⁊ þon*ne* he biþ gedoan ge doþ hine sunu **helles** twǽ*m* fældu*m* mare þon*ne* eow

'and when he is made, you make him the child of hell twofold more than yourselves'

---

10 The title abbreviations of the Old English texts mentioned in this article are those employed by the *DOEC*.

With regard to feminine *i*-stems, only two are attested in the genitive in Rushworth[1]: *æ* 'law' (2x) and *weoruld* 'world' (7x). The former is uninflected[11] and the latter presents variation: there are two tokens of innovative *-es* as against five of the etymological inflection *-e*. Both forms are found in the same context, glossing L. *consummatione saeculi*, as in the following examples:

(2)   MtGl (Ru) 13.40

   sic erit in consummatione saeculi

   swa bið in endunge **weorulde**

   'so [it] will be at the end of the world'

(3)   MtGl (Ru) 13.49

   sic erit in consummatione saeculi

   swa bið in endunge **weoruldes**

The only feminine athematic noun attested in the genitive in the gloss is *næht* 'night', which takes innovative *-es* in the only example found: MtGl (Ru) 14.25 feorþe þære wacone **næhtes**, glossing L. *quarta autem uigilia noctis* 'and in the fourth watch of the night'.

A comparison of these results with those obtained in Lindisfarne (Rodríguez Ledesma 2022) reveals that extension of *-es* is more widespread in this gloss and is also found with the nouns *hernise* (4x out of 4x), *hreownise* (1x out of 2x), *soðfæstnisse* (4x out of 5x), *byrgenn* (3x out of 3x), *nedl* (3x out of 3x), *stow* (1x out of 1x) and *æ* (17x out of 17x). On the other hand, the three feminine nouns which show extension of innovative *-es* in Rushworth[1] do not present variation in Lindisfarne, but always take this inflection: *hell* (1x), *uoruld* (11x) and *næht* (3x). So the implementation of this analogical process seems to have taken place by lexical diffusion, with some nouns being affected earlier than others.

2.2. Kinship *r*-stems

The etymological inflection of these nouns in the genitive singular was zero. Three nouns belonging to this declension are attested in this case in Rushworth[1]: *broþer* (3x), *fæder* (11x) and *moder* (1x). All of them take the etymological inflection in all instances (and are, therefore, uninflected), except for one example of innovative *fæderes*:

---

11 Cf. Campbell (1959: 244), who notes that *æ* has an indeclinable singular and nominative and accusative plural, genitive plural *æa*, and also accusative, genitive and dative singular *æwe*.

(4)   MtGl (Ru) 21.31

quis ex duobus fecit uoluntaten patris

hweþer þære twegra worhte willan þæs **fæderes**

'which of the two made the will of the father'

By contrast, in Lindisfarne forms in *-es* are dominant with all these nouns: *broþer* (8x out of 10x), *fæder* (30x out of 36x) and *moder* (5x out of 5x) (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016: 217).

2.3. Weak nouns or *n*-stems

The etymological inflection of *n*-stems in the genitive singular was *-an*. In late Northumbrian final /n/ was lost, so that these nouns end in a vowel throughout the singular and in the nominative/accusative plural in these varieties. In Rushworth[1] there is usually loss of final /n/, although forms in *-an* are also found (cf. Campbell 1959: 249, Ross 1976: 497 and Hogg & Fulk 2011: 126).[12]

The following weak nouns are atttested in the genitive singular in Rushworth[1]: *brydguma* 'bridegroom' (1x), *eorðe* 'earth' (7x), *geleafa* 'belief' (4x), *hearta* 'heart' (4x), *heafudponna* 'skull' (1x), *lamwrihta* 'potter' (2x), *lichoma* 'body' (1x) and *witga* 'prophet' (3x). Out of the 23 tokens in this case, none takes innovative *-es*, 21 show loss of final /n/ and end in a vowel, and only two end in /n/: *geleafa* (1x) and *hearta* (1x):

(5)   MtGl (Ru) 14.31

ait illi modicae fidei quare dubitasti

cwęþ to hi*m* þu medmiccles **gelefan** f*or*hwon getwiodestu

'[he] said to him: you of little faith, why did you doubt?'

In Lindisfarne, by contrast, forms in *-es* are attested with all these nouns and are dominant with some of them: *brydguma* (4x out of 4x), *eorðe* (11x out of 13x), *geleafa* (2x out of 5x), *hearta* (8x out of 9x), *heafudponna* (2x out of 5x), *lamwrihta* (1x out of 2x), *lichoma* (9x out of 12x), *witga* (6x out of 8x) (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2022).

---

12 According to Ross, forms without *-n* predominate in the oblique cases in the *n*-stems. The loss of the consonant in pronunciation is proved by the existence of 'inverse' or 'back spellings', i.e. instances of nominative singular ending in *-n*, such as *cuman* 25.43, *lichoman* 26.26, *willan* 18.14, *eagan* 18.9 or *egan* 20.15 (Ross 1976: 497).

2.4. Proper nouns

In Rushworth[1] innnovative *-es* is not found with some proper nouns which show this inflection in the Lindisfarne gloss. They include feminine personal names (*Mary*), names of cities (*Nazareth, Sidon*), but also masculine personal names, such as *Peter*, as illustrated by the following examples:

(6)   MtGl (Ru) 1.16

iacob autem genuit ioseph uirum mariæ

kende iosepe **maria** wær[13]

'[Jacob] begat Joseph, Mary's husband'

(7)   MtGl (Ru) 4.13

Et relicta ciuitate nazareth

⁊ forlet **nazaret** caestrae

'And [he] left the city of Nazareth'[14]

(8)   MtGl (Ru) 15.21

Et egresus inde iesus secessit in partes tyri et sidonis

⁊ gongende þonan se hælend gewat in dæl **tyre** ⁊ **sidone**[15]

'And the Saviour went from thence and retired into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon'

(9)   MtGl (Ru) 8.14

Et cum uenisset iesus in domum petri

⁊ þa cuom se hælend in huse **petrus**[16]

'And when the Saviour came into Peter's house'

3. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RUSHWORTH[1] AND LINDISFARNE CONCERNING THE GENITIVE

Besides not showing widespread extension of innovative *-es*, there are other differences between Rushworth[1] and Lindisfarne concerning the genitive

---

13 Cf. Lindisfarne, which follows the Latin word order and adds *-es:* uutetlice cende wer **maries**.

14 As in the previous case, Lindisfarne follows the Latin word order and adds *-es:* ⁊ forleort ł miððy forleort ceastra **natzareðes**.

15 Cf. Lindisfarne: ⁊ geeade ðone ðe hælend gefoerde in dalum **tyres** ⁊ **sidones**.

16 Cf. Lindisfarne: ⁊ miððy gecuom ðe hælend in hus **petres**.

inflection, which show Farman's independence as a glossator (cf. Menner 1934: 27). In some instances, a noun takes the etymological inflection in Rushworth[1] but is uninflected in Lindisfarne. This is the case of the neuter *a*-stems *gebed* 'prayer' and *hus* 'house', as illustrated by the following examples:

(10) MtGl (Ru) 21.13
      enim quia domus mea domus orationis uocabitur
      *for*þon þ hus min bið **gebedes** hus genemned
      'my house will be called the house of prayer'
      MtGl (Li) 21.13
      hus min hus **gebed** geceiged[17]

(11) MtGl (Ru) 10.6
      sed putius ite ad oues quae perierant domus israhel
      ah mae gaþ to þæ*m* sciopum þe to lore wyrðon **huses** israhela
      'But rather go to the sheep which are lost of the house of Israel'
      MtGl (Li) 10.6
      ah is rehtra gaes to scipum ða losodun **hus** israhel[18]

(12) MtGl (Ru) 15.24
      non sum misus nisi ad oues quae perierunt domus israhel
      ne ic wæs asended nymþe to scepu*m* þæ*m* þe forloren wyrdon **husȩs**
      israheles
      'I am not sent but to the sheep which are lost of the house of Israel'
      MtGl (Li) 15.24
      nam ic gesended buta to scipum ða ðe deade weron **hus** israheles

In other cases, Farman seems to be more independent from Latin influence than Aldred. Thus, in Mt 10.2 L. *apostolorum* is glossed by the same form without any change in Lindisfarne, whereas in Rushworth[1] the noun adds the native genitive plural inflection -*a* (*apostola*):

---

17 Besides the inflection, the word order is also different: Rushworth[1] has preposed genitive, whereas the corresponding form in Lindisfarne follows the order of the original and is postposed.

18 The uninflected form in Lindisfarne may be due to the influence of Latin *domus*, which has the same form in the nominative and genitive cases.

(13) MtGl (Ru) 10.2

Duodecim autem apostolorum nomina sunt

þara twelf **apostola** noma þonne sindun

'the names of the twelve apostles are'

MtGl (Li) 10.2

tuelfe uutedlice ðara **apostolorum** noma sint[19]

Similarly, when glossing L. *oliueti* in the collocation *montem oliueti* 'mount of Olives', Farman translates the proper name and has *oelebearwes*, whereas Aldred borrows the term from Latin and adds the native inflection *-es* (*oleuetes*), as illustrated by examples (14) – (15):

(14) MtGl (Ru) 21.1

Et adpropinquassent hierosolimis et uenissent bethfage ad montem olieti

⁊ þa hiæ nealehctun hierusalem ⁊ coman to beþfage to **oelebearwes** dune[20]

'And when they approached Jerusalem and came to Bethphage, to mount of Olives'

MtGl (Li) 21.1

⁊ midðy geneolecdon ⁊ cuomun ðæm styde to mor **oliuetes**

(15) MtGl (Ru) 24.3

sedente autem eo super montem olieti

sæt þa he on **oelebearwes** dune

'when he was sitting on mount of Olives'

MtGl (Li) 24.3

wæs sittende uutedlice he ł hine ofer mor **oleuetes**

In MtGl (Li) 26.30, however, Aldred translates the proper noun: uteodon on mor ł on duni **olebearuas**, L. *exierunt in montem oliueti* '[they] went out to mount of Olives'. This is one of the lexical items discussed by Ross (1979)

---

19 Nagucka (1997: 188) notes this example and adds the following comment:

> This awkward but easy solution is partly explained by the fact that such a Latin word might not yet have been morphologically adapted to the English requirements of the system in all dialects to the same degree, and partly by the literacy culture of that time when the glossator/translator used Latin while thinking in English.

20 As in example 10, the word order is also different: Rushworth[1] has preposed genitives in both instances, whereas Lindisfarne follows the order of the Latin original.

and Kotake (2012) as examples of similarities between Rushworth[1] and Lindisfarne in Matthew 26–27. As noted in the introduction, whereas Kotake argues that this instance provides evidence that it is Aldred, not Farman, who changes his lexical preference in these chapters (2012: 16), Ross concludes that the similarities between the two glosses in this section arise because of Aldred's influence on Farman (1979: 195).

4. WORD ORDER

The second objective of this article is the study of the word order of adnominal genitives (preposition vs. postposition) in order to determine to what extent Farman follows the Latin structure or deviates from the original and shows the native pattern. Proper nouns are analysed first, and then those common nouns more frequently attested in the genitive in the gloss.

4.1. Proper nouns

In his study on the place of adnominal genitives in Old English, Timmer (1939: 71) concludes that there is a general tendency towards front position in the course of the period and that it is necessary to establish a distinction between the genitive of persons and the genitive of things. According to him, the genitive of proper names was normally placed in front position in both early and late texts. With regard to common nouns, the change from post- to front position began with the genitive of names of persons and then extended gradually to the genitive of names of things, although there are differences depending on the texts and the nouns studied[21] (1939: 72). This tendency towards front position is evident in the West Saxon Gospel of Matthew (c. 1050), as shown by Nunnally's study of adnominal genitives in this text: out of the 299 translations of the Latin Nx + Ng structure using a genitive,[22] 288 (96.3%) have a preposed genitive and only 11 (3.7%) a postposed genitive, the influence for postposing being a partitive meaning or stylistic parallelism (Nunnally 1992: 362).

The texts analysed by Timmer, however, do not include glosses to Latin texts, which tend to follow the word order of the original and have, therefore, the genitive in post-position even in late Old English (10th century). This is the case in Lindisfarne, as shown by Rodríguez Ledesma (2016), which analised the word order of adnominal constructions with the seven personal

---

21 The genitive following *dæl*, for example, is normally found in post-position (Timmer 1939: 72).

22 Nx + Ng structure: Noun in any nongenitive case modified by a single noun in genitive case.

names which occurred more frequently in the genitive in this gloss. Since Rushworth[1] comprises the gospel of Matthew, Mark 1.1 – 2.15 and three verses in John, it was thought necessary to study all proper nouns attested in the genitive in the section glossed by Farman (25), so that the number of tokens was similar to that obtained from the study of Lindisfarne (65x). Table 1 gives the results for Rushworth[1] and shows the position of the genitive in the noun phrase in comparison with the Latin original.

	Preposed *Latin preposed*	*Preposed* *Latin postposed*	*Postposed* *Latin postposed*	*Total*
Abel			1	1
Abraham		1	2	3
Babylon		2	2	4
Christ	1		3	4
David		1	8	9
Esaiah			1	1
Herod		1	1	2
Isaac			1	1
Israel		3	6	9
Jacob		1	1	2
John			3	3
Jonah			3	3
Joseph		1	1	2
Judea		1		1
Mary		1		1
Nazareth		1		1
Nephthalim		1	1	2
Olives		2		2
Peter			1	1
Salomon			1	1
Sidon			1	1
Simon			1	1
Zabulon		1	1	2
Zachariah			1	1
Zebedee		3	3	6
Total	1 (1.56%)	20 (31.25%)	43 (67.18%)	64

Table 1. Word order of adnominal genitives in
Rushworth[1] compared with Latin. Proper nouns

Although the dominant word order is postposed following Latin, almost a third of all the occurrences deviate from the original and have a preposed genitive glossing a postposed one. Comparison of these findings with those obtained from the study of Lindisfarne reveals that Rushworth[1] is much more independent from the Latin original and shows a more anglicised pattern, since out of a total of 65 tokens, 62 (95.38%) follow the Latin word order in Aldred's gloss, and only 3 (4.61%) deviate from it and have a preposed genitive glossing a postposed one (Rodríguez Ledesma 2016: 232). These results are in line with those obtained by Ogura in his study on periphrastic renderings and their element order, where he concludes that, as a rule, Lindisfarne follows Latin order, whereas Rushworth[1] "often uses its own order and form" (2008: 82).

The following are some examples in which Farman deviates from the Latin original and has a preposed genitive:

(16)   MtGl (Ru) 2.21

ioseph accipit puerum et matrem eius et uenit in terram israhel

iosep genom þone cneht ⁊ his moder ⁊ cuo*m* in **israheles eorþu**[23]

'Joseph took the child and his mother and came to the land of Israel'

(17)   MtGl (Ru) 3.1

In illis autem diebus iohannis baptista praedicans in deserto iudeae

In þæm soþlice dagum cuom iohannes se bezera bodende in **iudea woestenne**[24]

'In those days came John the baptist preaching in the desert of Judea'

In some cases, both word order patterns are found in the same context, as illustrated by examples (18)–(19) glossing L. *transmigratione babylonis*:[25]

(18)   MtGl (Ru) 1.12

et post transmigratione babilonis iechonias autem genuit salathiel

⁊ æfter **babilonia fære**

'And after the transmigration of Babylon, [Jechonias begot Salathiel]'

---

23 Cf. Lindisfarne, which follows the order of the original: in eorðo **israheles**.

24 As in the previous example, Lindisfarne follows the order of the original: in woestern **iudeæ**.

25 Both patterns are also found in Rushworth[1] and Lindisfarne when glossing L. *filii dauid* 'David's son': MtGl (Ru) 1.1 dauiðes sunu *vs.* MtGl (Ru) 15.22 sunu dauiðes. Since there are no apparent reasons for this variation, Nagucka concludes, in the case of Lindisfarne, that "the author of the English version felt at ease with Latin and translated it according to his own preferences at a given moment" (1997: 180).

(19) MtGl (Ru) 1.17

ad dauid usque ad transmigrationem babilonis generationes sunt XIIII et ad transmigratione babilonis usque ad christum generationes sunt XIII

from dauiðe oþþe to **færennisse babylonie** feowertene kneo*risse* sint ⁊ from **færennisse babilonie** oþþe to kriste kneorisse sint feowertene

'And from David to the transmigration of Babylon, [there] are fourteen generations, and from the transmigration of Babylon to Christ [there] are fourteen generations.'

Especially significant is the behavior of the proper noun *Zebedee*. In the three cases in which the noun phrase 'sons of Zebedee' is found in Latin (*filiorum/filliis zebedei*), the gloss follows the Latin word order and has the genitive postposed, as in examples (20) – (21). However, in the three cases in which Latin has just the proper noun in genitive case (*zebedei*) and the noun *sunu* 'son' is added in English to gloss it, the genitive is preposed, as in examples (22) – (23):[26]

(20) MtGl (Ru) 20.20

Tunc accesit ad eum mater filiorum zebedei cum filis suis

þa eode to him moder **sunu zebedes** mid sunu hire

'then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons'

(21) MtGl (Ru) 27.56

inter quas erat maria magdalena et maria iacobi et ioseph et mater filiorum zebedei

betwix þæm wæs maria siu magdalenisca ⁊ maria iacobes ⁊ iosepep moder ⁊ moder **sunena zebedeæs**[27]

'among whom was Mary Magdalen, and Mary, the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee'

(22) MtGl (Ru) 4.21

uidit alios duos fratres iacobum zebedei et iohannem fratrem

gesægh oþre twegen gebroþer iacob **zebedeaes sunu** ⁊ iohannem his broþer

'[he] saw another two brothers, James the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother'

---

26 The same situation is found in Lindisfarne (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2016: 234).

27 The other example of this word order is MtGl (Ru) 26.37.

(23) MtGl (Ru) 10.2

simon qui dicitur petrus et andreas frater eius iacobus zebedei et iohannis
frater eius

simon seþe is nemned petrus ⁊ andreas his broþer iacobus **zebedees**
sunu ⁊ iohannes his broþer.[28]

'Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother, James the son
of Zebedee, and John, his brother'

In those cases in which the proper noun in genitive is modified by an
apposition, the gloss follows the Latin word order and has the genitive
postposed, as illustrated by examples (24) – (27): [29]

(24) MtGl (Ru) 16.4

signum non dabitur ei nisi signum ionae profetae

tacen ne bið sald hie nymþe tacen **iona se witga**

'a sign will not be given to it, but the sign of Jonah the prophet.'

(25) MtGl (Ru) 14.8

da mihi in disco capud iohannis babtistae

sele me on disce heafod **iohannes se bezere**

'give me in a dish the head of John the baptist'

(26) MtGl (Ru) 26.6

Cum autem esset iesus in bethania in domum simonis leprosi

mid þy þon*ne* þende se hæl*end* wæs in bethania þæ*m* tune in huse
simonis þæs hreofan

'when the Saviour was in the town of Bethania, in the house of
Simon the leper'

(27) MtGl (Ru) 2.1

in diebus erodis regis

in dagum **erodes þæs kyninges**[30]

'in the days of King Herod'

---

28 The other example of this word order is MkGl (Ru) 1.19.

29 In one instance a split genitive construction is found, but the gloss still follows the Latin word
order and has the proper noun postposed and the apposition preposed: MtGl (Ru) 13.55 *nonne*
hic est fabri filius ioseph, ah þis nis **smiðes sunu iosep** 'Is not this Joseph the carpenter's son?'

30 Cf. the preposed genitive when the proper noun is not modified by an apposition: MtGl (Ru) 2.15 *et*
erat ibi usque ad obitum herodis ⁊ wæs þær oþ **herodes dead** 'and [he] was there until Herod's death'.

Although in the West Saxon Gospel of Matthew preposed genitives are the dominant pattern in these structures, the results are different from those obtained when there is no modifier: out of the 50 translations of this Latin construction, 30 (60%) have a preposed genitive, 8 (16%) have a split genitive, 7 (14%) a postposed genitive and 5 (10%) use a different construction, the total percentage of genitive structures being 81.1% for preposing and 18.9% for postposing (Nunnally 1992: 364-65).[31]

4.2. Common nouns

The study of word order also includes those common nouns which are more frequently attested in the genitive in the gloss, the criterion for selection being those with four or more occurrences in this case. A comparative study has been carried out of Rushworth[1] and Lindisfarne,[32] and the results are given in Table 2:

	Rushworth[1]				Lindisfarne			
	Prepos. Latin prep.	Prepos. Latin postpos	Postpos. Latin postpos	Total	Prepos. Latin prep.	Prepos. Latin postpos	Postpos. Latin postpos	Total
drihten (L. domini)		2	10	12			9	9[33]
eorðo (L. terrae)		1	6	7			6	6
fader (L. patris)			11	11[34]			11	11

31 Nunnally (1992) uses the label Nx + [modifier + Ng], i.e. Latin noun in any nongenitive case modified by a genitive which takes its own modifier.

32 For Lindisfarne the same sections have been studied as those considered for Rushworth: Matthew and Mark 1.1 – 2.15.

33 The three remaining tokens have *hlaferd* instead of *drihtnes* glossing L. *domini*.

34 In nine instances the noun in genitive is modified by a possessive. Latin always has the modifier after the noun, and Farman follows this word order in most cases (7x). In two instances, however, he deviates from Latin and has the possessive preposed:

  (i) MtGl (Ru) 5.45
  ut sitis filii patris uestri qui in caelis est
  þæt ge sie bearn **eowres fæder** þe in heofon*um* is
  'that you may be the children of your father, who is in heaven'

  (ii) MtGl (Ru) 25.34
  uenite benedicti patris mei
  cymeþ gebletsade **mines fæder**
  'come you blessed of my father'.

folc (L. populi)			7	7			6	6
god (L. dei)		15	17	32	2		30	32
hælend (L. iesu)		2	5	7			6	6
heofon sg. (L. caeli)		2	6	8			7	7
heofon pl. (L. caelorum)		14	21	35			35	35
mann sg. (L. hominis)		7	27	34			33	33
mann pl. (L. hominum)		1	5	6			6	6
middangeard (L. mundi)			4	4			5	5
rice (L. regni)			9	9			9	9
sunu (L. filii)			5	5			5	5
toþ pl. (L. dentium)		1	5	6			6	6
Total	0	45	138	183	2	0	174	176

*Table 2. Word order of adnominal genitives compared with Latin
in Rushworth¹ and Lindisfarne. Frequent common nouns*

As was the case with proper nouns, the results clearly indicate that Lindisfarne is much more dependent from the Latin original with regard to word order: out of the 176 occurrences, no example deviates from Latin. These findings confirm Ross's claim that "[o]nly in very rare instances has the order of the Old English words been normalized so that it no longer corresponds with that of the Latin" (1993: 111-12).[35] By contrast, in 45 examples out of a total of 183 (24.59%), Farman innovates and shows an anglicised pattern, with a preposed genitive glossing a postposed one.

As with proper nouns, both word order patterns are found in the same collocations, even in those which are very frequent: thus, out of the 34 tokens

---

The corresponding examples in Lindisfarne follow the Latin word order and have the possessive after the noun:

(iii) MtGl (Li) 5.45 þæt gie sæ suna **fadres iures**

(iv) MtGl (Li) 25.34 cymmeð gie gebloedsad **fadores mines**

Cf. Nagucka, who remarks that reorderings, especially with demonstratives and possessives, are infrequent in Lindisfarne, the regular Latin pattern being followed in most cases (1997: 180).

35 According to Kotake, however, a comparison between Lindisfarne and Rushworth² shows that Aldred deviates from Latin word order more frequently than Owun does (2008: 64).

glossing L. *regnum caelorum* 'kingdom of heaven', 14 have a preposed genitive and 20 a postposed one. Similarly, out of the 9 occurrences glossing L. *filius dei* 'son of God', 7 have the genitive preposed and 2 have it postposed.[36] The following examples illustrate this variation:

(28)   MtGl (Ru) 14.33

uere filius dei es tu

soþlice **sunu godes** þu eart

'indeed you are the son of God'

(29)   MtGl (Ru) 16.16

tu es christus filius dei uiui

þu eart crist **godes sune** þæs lifgenda[37]

'you are Christ, the son of the living God'

(30)   MtGl (Ru) 6.33

querite ergo primum regnum dei

soecaþ þonne ærest **godes rice**

'seek therefore first the kingdom of God'

(31)   MtGl (Ru) 21.31

puplicani et meritrices praecedent uos in regno dei

æwisfirine ⁊ forlegnisse beforan gæþ eow in **rice godes**

'the publicans and the harlots will go before you into the kingdom of God'

(32)   MtGl (Ru) 7.21

non omnis qui dicit mihi domine domine intrabit in regnum caelorum sed qui facit uoluntatem patris mei qui in caelis est ipse intrabit in regnum caelorum

ne ł nallæs æghwilc þara þe cweþ to me dryhten drihten gæþ in **rice heofuna** ah seþe wyrceþ wille fæder mines þæs þe in heofunum is se ł he gaeþ in **heofuna rice**

---

36   Conversely, out of the six examples glossing L. *regnum dei* 'kingdom of God', one has a preposed genitive and five a postposed one.

37   This is an example of a split genitive: *godes* is placed before the head (*sune*) and the apposition (*þæs lifgenda*) after it.

'not every one that says to me, Lord, Lord, will go into the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven, he will go into the kingdom of heaven'

(33) MtGl (Ru) 6.26

respicite uolatilia caeli

geseoþ ł behaldeþ **heofun fuglas**[38]

'behold the fowls of the air'

(34) MtGl (Ru) 8.20

uulpes foueas habent et uolucres caeli tabernacula

foxes hole habbaþ ⁊ **fuglas heofunas** selescota

'the foxes have holes and the fowls of the air nests'

Another structure that shows variation in Rushworth¹ is when glossing a Latin noun modified by a genitive which in turn is modified by another genitive. In some cases the gloss follows the Latin word order, as in examples (35) – (36), whereas in others it alters the position of the two genitives, as in (37) – (40):[39]

(35) MtGl (Ru) 24.30

et tunc apparebit signum filii hominis in cælo

⁊ þon*ne* eaweþ tacen **sune monnes** in heofune

'and then will appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven'

(36) MtGl (Ru) 24.27

ita erit aduentus filii hominis

swa bið æc se cyme **sunu monnes**

'so will be the coming of the Son of man'

(37) MtGl (Ru) 24.37

Sicut enim fuit in diebus noe ita erit aduentus filii hominis

swa þon*ne* wæs in noes dagu*m* swa bið ek se tocyme **monnes sune**

'And as [it] was in Noe's days, so will also be the coming of the Son of man'

---

38 According to Ross (1976: 508), the lack of inflection of *heofun* indicates that this phrase is regarded as a compound, the collocation *heofon-fugol* being recorded elsewhere in Bosworth & Toller.

39 In all these examples Lindisfarne follows the Latin word order.

(38) MtGl (Ru) 24.39

ita erit aduentus filii hominis

swa bið ek se cyme **monnes sunę**

'so will be the coming of the Son of man'

(39) MtGl (Ru) 16.19

et tibi dabo claues regni caelorum

⁊ ic þe selle kægen **heofuna rices**

'and I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven'

(40) MtGl (Ru) 26.64

uidebitis filium hominis sedentem ad dexteram uirtutis dei

geseoþ sunu monnes sittende on þa swiðran halfe **godes mægænes**

'you will see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of God's power'

Although both patterns (preposed and postposed genitives) seem to be in free variation in the gloss, the choice of one or the other may have to do with the particular chapter or section in which they are found. Thus, in his comparative study of word order in several interlinear glosses, Crowley (2000) establishes a distinction within the Rushworth Gospel of Matthew between chapters 2–6 and 26–27 on the one hand, which show a more anglicised word order, and chapters 8–23 on the other, which tend to follow the Latin original. The remaining chapters (1, 7, 24, 25 and 28) show a mixture of both patterns (2000: 134). To check whether this distribution applies to the word order of adnominal genitives, I have focused on those nouns with the highest number of occurrences in this case, namely *god*, *heofon* and *mann* glossing L *dei*, *caelorum* and *homini* respectively. Table 3 shows the results:

	Matthew 2-6, 26-27		Matthew 8-23		Total
	Preposed	Postposed	Preposed	Postposed	
god (L. dei)	12	1	2	13	28
heofon pl. (L. caelorum)	7	0	6	18	31
mann sg. (L. hominis)[40]	2	3	3	18	26
Total	21	4	11	49	85

Table 3. Word order of adnominal genitives in the
Rushworth Gospel of Matthew: god, heofon and mann

40 For this noun, there are no examples of adnominal genitives in chapters 2–6.

The results seem to confirm Crowley's demarcation within Matthew: a more anglicised word order, with preposed genitives, dominates in chapters 2–6 and 26–27 (84%, 21x out of a total of 25x), whereas in chapters 8–23 it is the Latin word order (postposed) that predominates (81.66%, 49x out of a total of 60x).

Finally, in those cases in which a noun is modified by coordinated genitives, the gloss follows the Latin pattern and has the genitive postposed. In the West Saxon Gospel of Matthew this word order is also dominant when translating these constructions, with 80% of postposed genitives (4x out of a total of 5x), as opposed to the 3.7% when a noun is modified by a single genitive (11x out of a total of 299x) (Nunnally 1992: 364).[41] The following instances illustrate this construction in Rushworth[1]:

(41) MtGl (Ru) 4.13

uenit et habitauit in cafarnauum maritimam in finibus zabulon et neptalim

cwom ⁊ geeardade in cafarnaum sæ caestrae in gemaerum **zabulones ⁊ nepthales**

'[he] came and dwelt in Capharnaum on the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim'

(42) MtGl (Ru) 11.25

pater domine caeli et terrae

fæder dryhten **heofunæs ⁊ eorðe**

'Father, lord of heaven and earth'

(43) MtGl (Ru) 28.19

in nomine patris et filii et spiritu sancti

in noman **fæder ⁊ sunu ⁊ þæs halgan gastes**[42]

'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'

---

41 Nunnally considers the weightiness of the coordinated genitives as the probable influence for postposing, although he notes that the examples are too few for definitive conclusions (1992: 364).

42 In the last noun phrase, however, the adjective is placed before the noun in the gloss, as opposed to Latin, where it follows the headword.

5. Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from this study. With regard to the extension of genitive singular -*es* from the *a*-stems to other noun classes, there is evidence of this analogical process in Rushworth[1], although it is not so generalized as in Lindisfarne. In the Mercian gloss it is limited to three feminine nouns (*hell*, *weoruld* and *næht*) and the kinship *r*-stem *fæder*,[43] whereas in Lindisfarne there is widespread extension of -*es* to all classes regardless of gender and declension (cf. Rodríguez Ledesma 2022). These findings highlight the importance of Anglian dialects (Mercian and Northumbrian) in the history of English, since they already provide evidence of linguistic changes that have generally been ascribed to Middle English.

This study also reveals Farman's independence as a glossator. Differences in the genitive inflection between Rushworth[1] and Lindisfarne show, on the one hand, that the former is not dependent from the latter (cf. discussion of *gebed* 'prayer' and *hus* 'house' above) and, on the other, that the Mercian gloss is not influenced to such an extent by the Latin original, as illustrated by the glossing of L. *apostolorum* and *oliueti*. These examples seem to support Kotake's (2012) view that some of the similarities between the two glosses found in Matthew 26–27 arise because of Aldred's change of glossing practice in these chapters, rather than because of Aldred's influence on Farman, as suggested by Ross (1979).

The conclusion that Rushworth[1] is more independent from the Latin original than Lindisfarne is reinforced by the results obtained from the study of the word order of adnominal genitives. Although postposed genitives are dominant in both glosses following Latin, preposed position is much more frequent in the Mercian gloss than in Lindisfarne, both with proper nouns and with common nouns. In the case of proper nouns, almost a third of all the occurrences (31.25%, 20 out of 64x) deviate from Latin in Rushworth[1] and have a preposed genitive glossing a postposed one, whereas in Lindisfarne the percentage is 4.61% (3 out of 65x). In the case of common nouns, no example out of the 176 tokens deviates from the Latin original in Lindisfarne, whereas Farman innovates and shows an anglicised pattern in almost a fourth of all the occurrences (24.59%, 45 out of a total of 183x).

---

43 These findings support Ross's remark that genitive singular -*es* "is not in general extended analogically to other clases" (1976: 498).

Although preposed and postposed genitives are frequently found in the same contexts and collocations in Rushworth[1], there are some constructions which seem to disfavour the preposed position, namely those in which the noun in genitive is modified by an apposition ('of John the baptist') and those in which a noun is modified by coordinated genitives ('lord of heaven and earth').

Finally, my findings confirm Crowley's (2000) distinction within the Rushworth Gospel of Matthew between chapters 2–6 and 26–27 on the one hand, and chapters 8–23 on the other. The former show a more anglicised word order, with a higher percentage of preposed genitives (84%), whereas the latter tend to follow the Latin original and have a preponderance of postposed genitives (81.66%).

References

Bosworth & Toller: Bosworth, Joseph. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Online*, edited by Thomas Northcote Toller et al., Faculty of Arts, Charles University, 2014. https://bosworthtoller.com

Breeze, Andrew. 1996. The provenance of the Rushworth Mercian gloss. *Notes and Queries*. 43(4). 394–395.

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coates, Richard. 1997. The scriptorium of the Mercian Rushworth gloss: A bilingual perspective. *Notes and Queries*. 44. 453–458.

Crowley, Joseph. 2000. Anglicized word order in Old English continuous glosses in British Library, Royal 2. A. XX. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 29. 123–151.

DOE: *Dictionary of Old English: A to I*. 2016. Ed. Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Universtiy of Toronto. http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/

DOEC: *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*. 2007. Ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: University of Toronto. http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/pub/webcorpus.html

Hogg, Richard & R. D. Fulk. 2011. *A Grammar of Old English.* Vol. II: *Morphology.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Kotake, Tadashi. 2008. Differences in element order between *Lindisfarne* and *Rushworth Two*. In Masachiyo Amano, Michiko Ogura & Masayuki Ohkado (eds.), *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, 63–77. Bern: Peter Lang.

Kotake, Tadashi. 2012. Lindisfarne and Rushworth one reconsidered. *Notes and Queries*. 59(1). 14–19. doi:10.1093/notesj/gjr240

Kotake, Tadashi. 2017. Binomials or not? Double glosses in Farman's gloss to the Rushworth Gospels. In Joanna Kopaczyk & Hans Sauer (eds.), *Binomials in the History of English*, 82–97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Menner, Robert J. 1934. Farman Vindicatus: The linguistic value of *Rushworth I. Anglia*. 58. 1–27.

Murray, James A. H. 1874. The Rushworth Glosses. *The Academy*. 6. 561–562.

Nagucka, Ruta. 1997. Glossal translation in the Lindisfarne Gospel according to Saint Matthew. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*. 31. 179–201.

Nunnally, Thomas E. 1992. *Man's son/son of man*: Translation, textual conditioning, and the history of the English genitive. In Matti Rissanen, Ossi Ihalainen, Terttu Nevalainen & Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *History of Englishes. New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*, 359–72. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ogura. 2008. Periphrastic renderings and their element order in Old English versions of the Gospels. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*. 44. 63–82.

Rodríguez Ledesma, Nieves. 2016. *Dauides sunu* vs. *filii david*: The genitive in the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In Julia Fernández Cuesta & Sara Pons-Sanz (eds.), *The Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, Author and Context*, 213–38. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Rodríguez Ledesma, Nieves. 2018. *Zelotes* and *elnvnges*: The extension of genitive singular *-es* in the gloss to the Durham Collectar. *Anglia*. 136 (4). 611–42. https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2018-0061

Rodríguez Ledesma, Nieves. 2022. Changes in progress in late Northumbrian: The extension of *-s* as genitive and plural marker. *English Language and Linguistics*. 26 (4). 697–722. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674321000435

Ross, Alan S. C. 1933. Notes on the method of glossing employed in the Lindisfarne Gospels. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 32.108–119.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1976. Notes on the accidence of Rushworth[1]. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*. 77(4). 492–509.

Ross, Alan S. C. 1979. Lindisfarne and Rushworth One. *Notes and Queries*. 26(3). 194–198. https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/26-3-194

Ross, Alan S. C. 1981. The use of other Latin manuscripts by the glossators of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels. *Notes and Queries*. 28(1). 6–11. https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/28-1-6

Skeat, Walter W. (ed.). 1871−1887. *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Mark (1871), Luke (1874), John (1878), Matthew (1887)].

Skeat, Walter W. 1878. Preface. In *The Gospel according to Saint John. In Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions*, v–xx. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Jeremy. 2020. *Transforming Early English: The Reinvention of Early English and Older Scots*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tamoto, Kenichi. 2011. Palaeographical facts and conjectures about the Rushworth Gospels (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D. 2. 19). In Tetsuji Oda & Hiroyuki Eto (eds.), *Multiple Perspectives on English Philology and History of Linguistics: A Festschrift for Shoichi Watanabe on his 80th Birthday*, 27–54. Bern: Peter Lang. DOI:10.3726/978-3-0351-0120-1/8

Tamoto, Kenichi, (ed.). 2013. *The Macregol Gospels or The Rushworth Gospels*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Timmer, B. J. 1939. The place of the attributive noun-genitive in Anglo-Saxon. *English Studies*. 21. 49–72.

Waring, George. 1865. Prolegomena. In *The Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels*, c–cxxv. London: The Publications of the Surtees Society. Vol. 48.