CHAPTER FOUR: PROBLEMS OF CLASSIFICATION

At the end of Chapter 1 the basic kinds of particle use—adverb, preposition and prefix—were distinguished and defined. In Chapter 2 a classification of group-verbs in OE was set up. Before I proceed to a history of group-verbs which makes use of these distinctions, I wish to dispose of some borderline cases and problems of description in earlier stages of the language. The first section of this chapter deals with OE, the second with ME, the third specifically with the *Ormulum.*
Terminology

A recent and authoritative discussion of particle usage in OE is that of Mitchell. He provides a survey of earlier work on the subject, sometimes pointing out errors, sometimes confirming results obtained by others from a limited corpus, and he gives a valuable summary of particle syntax in OE. There are some telling examples of usages which defy neat classification, the impossibility of which is a recurrent theme. The title mentions six technical terms, and the conclusion of what he calls a 'desperate discussion' includes four of them: '... we have reached the boundaries where the kingdoms of the preposition, the adverb, the separable prefix, and the inseparable prefix, meet and melt into one another' (p.256). This is misleading, for it implies a homogeneous system of linguistic classification which happens, as luck would have it, to leave an irreducible overlap between classes. But the terms here cannot form a single system, because they are based on different sorts of criterion—on the relationship between particle and possible object in a given sentence (preposition, postposition, adverb); on the relationship between particle and verb (separable prefix, inseparable prefix); on the potential for different functions in different sentences (prepositional adverb). Any attempt to ignore this point is bound to result in more anomalies, uncertainties and overlaps than are necessary. What is needed is a selection of compatible terms, even at the risk of giving a partial picture. For a complete picture of all the


2Dr Mitchell's discussion is less 'desperate' than his conclusion suggests, since he does not actually make much use of the term 'separable prefix'; see his pp.247-48.
patterns and inter-relationships in OE—if such were possible at all—one would have to look at the language in turn from different points of view and give a succession of analyses of the same facts.

My selection of terms is as follows, chosen with an eye to the subsequent development of the language. For a neutral cover-term I prefer 'particle' to 'prepositional adverb', as it is in common use in OE grammar, shorter, and more appropriate for items which are exclusively adverbial (or prefixal, or prepositional).\(^3\) Adequate coverage of most possibilities is given by the terms 'prefix', 'adverb' and 'preposition', which are defined in Chapter 1 in relation to a particular occurrence of a particle and not to that particle in general. The terms are mutually exclusive and exhaustive of all particle occurrences, so long as two assumptions embodied in the definitions can be sustained, namely that the indivisibility of a word and the government of an object are clear-cut matters. In fact, of course, there is some indeterminacy in both cases, and so there is a residue of particle occurrences which cannot safely be assigned to a single category.

**PREFIXES AND COMPOUND VERBS**

The definition of the prefix is prior to the other two. There is no doubt attached to it when the particle concerned exists only as a bound morpheme: thus ə-, əf-, əg-, un-.\(^4\) Nor is there any problem when the existence of a related nominal compound shows that the particle in question is the unstressed form of a bound morpheme, as certain occurrences of of-

\(^3\)In A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), p.30 note 1, the term 'prepositional adverb' is said to denote 'words which can be readily used in both a prepositional and an adverbial function', though bound morphemes like ə- and əf- are apparently included in the category. Mitchell, 'Prepositions etc', pp.243-44 extends the term to include un, ut, est and onwer.

\(^4\)The examples are taken from Campbell, *OE Grammar*, pp.30-31.
(cf. *cf*), *on* (cf. *and*), *ob* (cf. *ub*), *wib* (cf. *wiber*). These items only occur in preverbal position. More caution is needed with forms that do occur elsewhere as independent words. An influential study by Harrison of seventeen such particles concluded that none of them was wholly inseparable—that is, in all circumstances. But certain verb–particle combinations are invariably found in the form of an unbroken string particle–verb. As Mitchell writes:

There is no doubt that some of these prep. adverbs sometimes serve as inseparable prefixes. This is most obviously demonstrated by the existence of compounds of prep. adv. + verb for which there is no corresponding use of the simple verb + the same prep. adv., e.g. *utlacian 'to outlaw' and combinations of to- = Latin *dis- (OE *to- prefix 2) such as *toæwdan 'to forbid' and *toæsdan 'to disperse' [footnote omitted], or which differ in meaning from combinations involving the simple verb and the same adv. prep. [sic], e.g. *ChronA 70.7 (870) & *pa Deniscan sige namon & bone cyning ofslogan but *E 32.124 *be tuægon *be habægan bone halgan to algece and *mid anum awengor slogan him of *bet heafod. ('Prepositions etc', p.246)

He goes on to argue that the placement of *ne or infinitive-marking to before a particle-verb string is, in a majority of cases, 'decisive evidence that the combination is an inseparable compound', but that 'very occasional examples go against the rule' ('Prepositions etc', p.246). He cites one such example, implying that there is no inseparable verb onbecuman despite the word-order in *wæsttu nu bet be anum bellecu hweafung & billecu unrotnes on becum & nanum oðrum mode swelc ne on become, ne mæt be ne after be? (Be (B) 20.17). In other words, ne on become is unexpected: on ne become might have seemed more likely. One

---

5 As note 4.


7 The presence of the repeated conjunction *ne in the next clause may conceivably have confused the issue (the conjunction, unlike the adverb, need not precede the verb immediately). But it is much more likely that the word-order results from a desire for parallelism andcontrastive emphasis, so that *ne on become*, with displaced, stressed *ne*, contrasts with *on become*. A PE analogy can be found in the relative order of *to and not* before an infinitive: compare the normal I don't want you to go/I want you not to go with the contrastively emphatic I didn't say I wanted you to go, I said I wanted you to Not go. Harrison also calls the *Be* example 'an exceptional instance' (*Sep. Prefixes*, p.32).
should not expect any linguistic test to be 'watertight': natural language is always untidier than the classifications of linguists. An occasional exception does not invalidate the test, whether it arises from a special effect like contrastive emphasis or from clumsiness or even error on the part of author or scribe. In fact Dr Mitchell wrote to me that he was not aware of any other exceptions to the rule that adverbial ne immediately precedes the verb (personal letters, 25 January and 15 October 1980).

Another disruptive force is the influence of Latin syntax on Anglo-Saxon translators. For example, while collocations of in and ut with gen, gencon and feran usually behave like other verb-adverb collocations, certain usages in Gospel translations and glosses suggest the formation of a nonce compound. De la Cruz compares & ge-ned to in-geonganne (Luke(L1)14.23) with & gined in to conganne (Luke(Ru2)14.23) and puts forward the possibility of interpretation of the former as an extreme case of Latin "calque". 8

The function of a prefix can be described as 'adverbial' or 'prepositional' if one takes into account a difference in transitivity—or absence of one—between compound verb and simplex. Mitchell proposes this ('Prepositions etc', p.244). Thus of- in ofaslean 'kill' would be adverbial, because both elean and ofaslean are generally transitive; I have deliberately chosen an example in which the prefix resembles a free particle morphologically and even semantically. In this trivial sense there would be overlap between the class of prefixes and those of both prepositions and adverbs. But since ofaslean is syntactically a single and (normally) indivisible item, 9 it is not helpful to give a separate syntactic description of the prefix.

8J. M. de la Cruz, 'Context-Sensitivity in Old and Middle English', Studia Anglica Poznańsenia, 8 (1976), 3-43 (p.20, note 17). A second example which he gives has me before particle and verb. Of course, glosses are not a safe guide to natural usage.

9Risto Hiltnen has pointed out to me that the 'inseparable' ofaslogan in the clause & hi deur ofaslogan mycel wel (ChronE 127.18 (992)) corresponds to ofgeslogan in MS C (ed. Thorpe, 240.9) and similarly MS D.
'SEPARABLE PREFIXES': AN UNNECESSARY COMPLICATION

What of the term 'separable prefix'? Most observers agree that OE verb–particle combinations can behave rather like the modern German separable verb; Smithers also compares Dutch and Afrikaans. There is disagreement over details. For example, Harrison's study of 'separable prefixes' was confined to early OE texts; Campbell simply locates the phenomenon 'in OE' (OE Grammar, p.32), as do most handbooks; whilst for Smithers, surprisingly, a system of separable prefixes begins only in late OE and 'is first clearly traceable soon after the Conquest' (EMEVP, p.xxxiii). Variation during the OE period is still in need of proper study; the latest work on the subject offers statistics on OE as a whole, lumping together everything from early WS to the Final Continuation of the Peterborough Chronicle.

---

10. EMEVP, p.xxxii.

11. I assume this statement to be based on the increasing regularity in late OE with which principal and subordinate clauses are distinguished by word-order; see Barbara M.H. Strang, A History of English (London, 1970), p.349.

12. I refer to Robert L. Hilliard, 'A Reexamination of the Separable Verb in Selected Anglo-Saxon Prose Works' (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1972). This work gives useful information on the frequency of co-occurrence of certain verbs and adverbs but is less helpful on verb-preposition combinations and on word-order. Hilliard takes a wider selection of OE prose and a longer list of particles than Harrison. He defines 'compound verbs' (i.e., separable or inseparable) as 'those having a composition of two or more morphemes forming a unit' (p.2). The vague concept of 'unity' is an important part of the work, and tests for it include comparison with ModS and ModE, the analogy of a single-word substitute, frequency of co-occurrence, conversion into a noun (pp.19-20), and the formation of a 'thought unit' (p.20) or 'sense unit' (p.23). Detailed criticisms I have include the classification of utlagerian as separable (p.4) on the grounds that it is not one of the inseparable prefixes listed on p.2, and a badly confused discussion of edem + to which is ruined by ignorance of the well-known principle of weight-ordering in OE (p.155)—Hilliard even appears to relate the different positions of noun and pronoun to the modern class 2 combination.

More serious is the fact that statistics on the degree of separability of different particles (e.g. adun vs. aven, p.37) are compiled without reference to the finiteness of the verb or its position in the clause. Class 3 combinations are practically ignored unless they display the order object–(x-)particle-verb: much space is devoted to clauses like and him (emiglice after ferde mid feowan geeferum (ELS 30,32): are they to be analysed as compound verb + dative object or simple verb + prepositional phrase? Amongst the criteria employed, one is based on a misunderstanding of Charles Carlton, Descriptive Syntax of the Old English Charters (The Hague,
Harrison emphasised the individual character of the various particles and combinations which he studied. He did feel able, however, to formulate the following generalisations on the basis of his Alfredian corpus:

1. The separable prefix in normal order most frequently follows the verb.
2. In inverted order (including imperatives) the particle regularly follows the verb.
3. In transposed order the particle precedes the verb immediately (in which case it has often been written combined) or, less frequently, separated.
4. With participles and infinitives the particle regularly precedes the verb, and is written combined in a larger proportion of cases than in transposed order.
5. The particle regularly precedes the negative ne, and to with the dat. inf.

These statements have gone generally unchallenged for OE as a whole, although nos. 1 and 2 are often stated in terms of the type of clause—namely principal—rather than the order of subject and verb, and no. 3 is similarly related to the subordinate clause. However, many OE scholars then include and-, an- and other clauses introduced by conjunctions in the heading 'subordinate clause', because they too tend to occur in transposed order. This suggests that Harrison was wise to relate the position of the particle to the position of the other primary elements in the clause; he wrote that 'there is so little difference, as far as the idiom discussed is concerned, in the word-order of principal and subordinate clauses that

1970), pp.135-86. Carlton simply notes that in his corpus an object (unless a relative pronoun) always comes immediately before a preposition which precedes a verb. Hilliard understands this to mean that a particle which follows a noun phrase with some other element intervening cannot form a prepositional phrase with it: the particle must therefore be compounded with the verb (pp.117ff.).

13. *Sep, Prefixes, pp.57-58. 'Normal' order means that verb follows subject directly; 'inverted' order has verb before subject; 'transposed' order means that the verb follows the subject but not directly and is clause-final (p.12). S. C. Andrew replaces the terms by 'common', 'demonstrative' and 'conjunctive' order respectively, in 'Some Principles of Old English Word-Order', ME, 3 (1934), 167-88. Yet another system is employed by O. Funke, *Some Remarks on Late Old English Word-Order, with Special Reference to Alfric and the Maldon poem (about 991)*, ME, 37 (1956), 99-104, although some of the terms are the same. All three, and others like them, are trying to describe basic word-order by means of the relative and absolute positions of subject and verb, and all use terms which imply that subject-verb order is unmarked.
all distinction between them has been disregarded to avoid useless complication' (Sen. Prefixes, pp.12-13).

The only strongly dissentient voice is that of Meroney, who describes Harrison's work as 'ill-conceived and poorly executed'. His major contribution is the observation that particles may be associated as closely with prepositional phrases as with verbs, a fact which goes some way to explaining why the particle does not precede the verb under the conditions of nos. 3 and 4 as predictably as in ModE. Since the point affects adverbs only, I shall discuss it in Chapter 5. Meroney also tries to show that the particle precedes the verb more often than not even when the rules predict the opposite. Here he is less convincing. His examples of preverbal placement come largely from clauses introduced by conjunctions, from Latinate texts like glosses and Ælfric's Grammar, and from verse (OE 'upp', pp.37-38).

The apparent regularities of behaviour which Harrison described largely transcend the distinction between adverb and preposition, lending some support to the notion of separable prefixes. The frequent writing of particle and verb as an unbroken sequence may also indicate some feeling on the part of scribes that they formed a unit, although word-division in OE manuscripts is notoriously unreliable as an indicator of (what modern scholars regard as) the actual boundaries between words in the spoken language.

14 Howard Maxwell Meroney, Old English 'upp', 'uppe', 'uppan' and 'upon'. Chicago doctoral dissertation (Chicago, 1943), p.2. Meroney takes the upp group of particles as representative of all OE particles and takes as his corpus almost everything then available in print.

15 The conventional statement which he is here attacking is in the article on qu- [prefix] in OED, which he quotes on p.35.

There is very little else to be said in favour of the term. So-called separable prefixes are not proclitic, being stressed and readily separated from the verb stem.\textsuperscript{17} Semantically they are just like particles in ordinary adverbial or prepositional use. Taking the adverbs first, we find that they rarely take on any idiomatic meaning when in collocation with verbs and they can be modified by \textit{swa} or \textit{to} even when in preverbal position.\textsuperscript{18} The prepositions, it is true, can be non-spatial in meaning and subject to narrow selectional restrictions—in OE as in other periods and languages. There is no gain in giving them the label separable prefix. And there can be real disadvantages. The collocations \textit{sp(x)can after 'lay claim to'} and \textit{sp(x)can on 'make a claim against, sue'} are both used in OE;\textsuperscript{19} both would be described as separable verbs by proponents of the term. But both particles can be used together: \textit{& spec bar on his spec moder after sumon dale Landes (Ch 1462 R 152.4).}\textsuperscript{20} Are they both separable prefixes in this clause? It does not seem possible to envisage a usage in which both could be joined in sequence to the verb. It is possible to find two adverbs in sequence before a verb, either of which by itself might have been regarded as a separable prefix, as e.g. \textit{up Ford timbre} (GenA 1692): again we are faced with pointless difficulties. Finally in this context I give four examples of typical OE usage, each of which could be multiplied.


\textsuperscript{18} On meaning see Bülbring, op. cit., p.30, Hilliard, \textit{'Reexamination'}, p.11. Hilliard's sole example of an idiomatic adverbial combination is \textit{giefan up 'yield'} from the Final Continuation of the \textit{Peterborough Chronicle}: it will be shown in Chapter 5 that this combination does not behave as a separable verb. On modification by \textit{to} see e.g. Visser, \textit{Syntax}, i, 599.

\textsuperscript{19} See BT s.v. \textit{sprecan VI} for examples.

\textsuperscript{20} This charter is printed in \textit{Sweet's Reader} as X11B.
many times: monæg fælbe ge ænælæd ofer hæofden (or 67.3), ðæt salond... ðæt we or ut of concende wæron (Bede 384.26), æ hæ hæm wæræd for (Chrona 66.9 (855)), ðæ hine gesundne æf tænan brohte (Bo 102.19). In the first of them ofer is if anything selected by the noun ænælæd rather than the verb hæbæn; as for the second I have yet to see ut of considered a separable prefix: their preverbal position is the normal one for any preposition governing a relative pronoun. In the third and fourth examples we find hæmæræd and ðænan preceding a verb, a common position for a spatial adverb when the verb is clause-final. Hilliard notes that the particles ending in -æn and -æræd can probably be safely eliminated from his study as not forming sense-units with verbs ('Reexamination', p.26). This is no doubt true, but semantic cohesion has almost no bearing on the positional syntax, unless more than one particle is, as it were, jockeying for position. The generalisations of Harrison and others are in great measure properties of all non-prefixal particles, an extension which would weaken the notion of separable prefixes almost to vacuousness. Thus I suggest that the most economical and informative description of a particle + verb string in OE will be that it is either a compound verb (i.e., inseparable) or a particular arrangement of preposition or adverb and verb.

**Doublets**

There are some verb-particle combinations in OE which show two sorts of behaviour, sometimes appearing in two-word form, sometimes appearing as a compound even in syntactic patterns which would normally split a verb-adverb or verb-preposition collocation. If the meanings differ, there is

21 This example, like the previous one, is borrowed from W. van der Gaaf, 'The Passive of a Verb accompanied by a Preposition', ES, 12 (1930), i-24 (p.3). Gaaf quotes from ES 0 of Beale, which has the more usual relative he rather than ðæt.
no problem: the two forms of combination are quite distinct. The troublesome cases are those in which the meaning is the same. *Beowulf* contains a good example of a doublet, *wīðon/feon wīð*. Each form occurs once. The separated use is straightforward: *sc ic mid grae sceal / fon wīð feonde* (*Beo* 438). Klaeber glosses the verb 'grasp, grapple, seize'. 22 The compound occurs in the following passage: *Gemunde ba se rōda, wēg Higelaces, / mēnesprēce, uplang astod / ōnd him fæste wīðfeng* (*Beo* 758). Contextually the meaning is very similar—Klaeber glosses *wīðfeng* by 'lay hold on'. Since *wīð* comes at the end of a line in the MS, and the dictionaries provide no other references for a compound *wīðfeng*, why cannot we read *ōnd him fæste wīð feng*? After all, it is normal for a finite verb to appear at the end of a subjectless *and*-clause; 23 it is common for a preposition to follow its personal pronoun object; and in those circumstances the particle will almost always come directly in front of the verb. We may compare from the same poem such clauses as *ōnd him tōgenes feng* (1542), *sc him tōgenes reō* (1893), *Symle ic him on fedan beforan wolde* (2497), *be ic her on starie* (2796)—the comparison with *tōgenes feng* is particularly apt. Yet all the twentieth century editions I have consulted print *wīðfeng* as one word, and the reason must be a metrical one. According to Bliss's elaboration of the theories of Sievers and Kuhn, a finite verb is a 'particle' (in the metrical sense) in OE verse and carries full stress if displaced from the cluster of unstressed elements next to the first stressed element of the clause. 24 Since there is an unstressed pronoun before *fæste* in *Beo* 760, the verb is displaced and hence stressed. But if *wīð* were a preposition, it too would


carry positional stress. Such a half-line would not scan and would, presumably, be unmetrical. Therefore *wid-* must be an unstressed prefix and the line a regular type 3B*1b. Or, neglecting the niceties of Bliss's analysis, we may say that the line is similar to other half-lines of Sievers' type B which end with compound verbs, such as *byr him hel onfeng* (852), *hine fyren enwed* (915), *no in his hwa georne etsealh* (963), *da hie se for begere* (1063). The metrical evidence seems to be strong enough to show that *widfeng* is not a mere re-arrangement of *feng* and *wid*, in that it is a genuine compound. (*Wiðgripan* (2521) is a similar formation.) Thus we have a doublet. A similar doublet is illustrated in *awylce rodoræ hrof rume sceondwitan / ymb heaife cezwone* (Christa 60) vs. *Wlat ha swa wisfæt witæ sceond beondland* (Christa 306). Another case would be the very common *forfæran 'die' vs. ferde he ford on Brectone* (Bede 42.15), which is a verb-adverb combination.

Various reactions to the existence of doublets can be envisaged:

(i) retain the system of description outlined above and admit the existence of synonymous doublets, e.g. *wiðfæn, forfæran vs. fon wið, feræn foræ*;

(ii) retain the terminology but regard 'compound' and 'collocation' as extremes on a cline of particle behaviour, rather than strict alternatives;

(iii) abandon the proposed description altogether. (Note that the notion of separable prefixes would not help.) The problem, of course, is purely one for the linguist—we have no reason to believe that an Anglo-Saxon found anything odd or difficult in this feature of his language, unless the variations in biblical translations signify some awkwardness. From the syncronic point of view I incline towards the second solution, believing

---

25 No OE verse ends with two consecutive full stresses.

26 J. C. Pope's system of analysis gives similar results here: see The Rhythm of Beowulf (New Haven, 1942), pp.190, 282.

27 The separated example is taken from de la Cruz, 'Osc Phrasal Verb', p.92.
that wiðfon and fon wið are different manifestations of the same thing, despite the presumed difference of stress distribution when the latter occurs in particle-verb order. But from the diachronic point of view, (i) seems to me a permissible simplification, which may even represent the intuitions of Anglo-Saxon speakers. After all, there are incipient tendencies in OE towards different behaviour in word-order; stress distribution is already different; and eventually the (inseparable) compound and the verb-particle collocation do come to be quite separate phenomena. Since compound verbs and collocations in OE are easily distinguished in most cases, it is convenient to distinguish also between a compound wiðfon and a collocation fon wið, even though that case and others like it suggest a blurring of the demarcation. 23

PREPOSITIONS AND ADVERBS

I turn now to the distinction between adverb and preposition. The form of a particle is rarely a decisive criterion. For example, both in and inn are used adverbially, whilst inng serves both as adverb and as

26. The majority of doublets seem to be class 3, verb + preposition, in their two-word form; cf. also oferhlifian (Phoen 121) and hlifian ofer (Phoen 604). A parallel for the procedure adopted here can be found in OE grammar. It is widely agreed that transitive phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs (my classes 2 and 3, respectively) are to be distinguished, yet a few items seem to be found in both classes with almost the same meaning, e.g. read through, run over; see p.34 above. Thus the same morphemes can combine in different syntactic forms to give the same total meaning, neutralising but not invalidating a syntactic distinction.

We cannot use the modern distinction between compound verbs and group-verbs as an analogy for doublets in OE, as it is impossible (I think) to find genuine synonymy in such pairs as bypass/pass by, offset/set off, overfly/fly over, uplift/lift up, and Lipka's example unroot/root un (Semantic Structure, pp.164-65). I have deliberately chosen examples where there is only a small semantic distinction for the clear syntactic difference. In earlier ModE true doublets may have existed. Cf. also this curious ?nonce usage: 'It might be more difficult to outlaw the possibility of ...' (B. Whitelock, PBA (1962), 76).
postposition (preposition placed after its object). Likewise the distinction between bi(e), for on the one hand and be, for on the other is apparently one of accent rather than transitivity: only the former are used as adverbs and in postposition. Conversely, although the use of be or for is probably decisive evidence against adverbial status, they usually occur in pre-NP position and obviously belong to a prepositional phrase, so the information is superfluous.30

Most prepositions in OE are easily identified, even when in postposition. For discussion of the latter see Wende, Nachgestellte Frôp., and Mitchell, 'Prepositions etc', pp.246-55. Problems arise when there is no expressed object for a particle but a strong sense that one is 'understood', or when there is a possible object but no certainty that it is governed by the particle. I consider each type in turn.

Elliptical prepositions

In OE nearly every free particle can be used without an expressed object. There seems to be a scale of 'adverbiality', as it were: highest would be those like for which never take an object; lower would come ut, which shows sporadic evidence of prepositional use;31 then particles like of which occur freely both as adverb and as preposition; lower still those like aid which seem never to appear without an expressed object unless one can be readily understood from a nearby clause; and lowest of all the

29 On any see J. E. Wülfling, Die Syntax in den Werken Alfredes des Grossen, two parts (Bonn, 1894-1901), ii, 257; ET(3) s.v. ut de la Cruz, 'One Phrasal Verb', pp.90-91. On inne see Wülfling, Syntax, ii, 257, 389-90.

30 The variant forms of the particles are discussed in F. Wende, Über die nachgestellten Präpositionen im Angelsächsischen, Palaestra, 70 (Berlin, 1915), p.14. Both be and for have homonyms serving as unstressed verbal prefixes. Hence, for example, bestendan 'surround; attend (the dead)' is distinguished from bi(e)+ stendan 'stand by' by the form of the particle, in addition to the differences of meaning, of separability and of case-government.

31 See Wülfling, Syntax, ii, 600.
particle **of**, for which I have no adverbial examples.\(^{32}\) We may loosely define an elliptical preposition as one which has no expressed dependent noun phrase within its clause but which could have been followed by one in the same construction. (The wording is chosen to exclude cases like Seo *neamhigone is wundoric ybe to smeagene* (\textit{WNon} 6.142), where non-expression is quite regular and there is a systematic correspondence with full prepositional use. Such particles are regarded as prepositions in this work; see pp.14-15 above.) The object of an elliptical preposition can be understood from a nearby clause, from the general context, or from fixed idiom.

Examples are too familiar to need detailed treatment here; Wulfing notes examples for a number of prepositions at the end of the respective sections in his *Syntax*, vol. ii.\(^{33}\) It is unwise to insist on the fact of omission or non-expression of an object *pronoun*, as is sometimes done.\(^{34}\) Clearly, non-expression is commonest when a specific referent has already been introduced, in which case a further reference would typically be by means of a pronoun, but sometimes the noun phrase which is left out cannot be regarded as pronominal. I give three examples: *fæh òber to* (\textit{Beo} 1755), cf. the idiom *fæn to ríc* and note that the previous mention of *ríc* in the poem is over twenty lines earlier (1733); *Hérf ðer ðerða Wulfstan errebiæc* & *fæn Elfric to* (\textit{ChronE} 157.3 (1023)), cf. & *be fæn Fædsige biseæc to bæm*

\(^{32}\) Apart perhaps from some rare compound prepositions, I have found adverbial or elliptical instances of every free particle except **of**. Hilliard, 'Reexamination', p.100 also claims that *uðran* and *tofaran* are never adverbial: for *uðran* see Wulfing, *Syntax*, ii, 263 and Meroney, OE *upp*, pp.62-63; for *tofaran* see *ChronE* 231.22 (1095).

\(^{33}\) De la Cruz gives some half-dozen examples in 'Con Phrasal Verb', p.82 and 'Context', p.15 note 14. In the former case he writes of 'the full adverbial development of prepositions' and in the latter he cites 'elliptical usages'. Visser has examples from charms and from *Leechdomes* (Hist. *Syntax*, i, 535).

Elliptical prepositions are related to prepositions on the one hand and to adverbs on the other. There is an obvious syntactic divide between the preposition and the elliptical preposition, but it would be futile to try to draw a strict boundary between the elliptical preposition and the adverb. This is a case where discrete categories cannot do justice to the facts.

**Preposition/adverb indeterminacy**

In the second type of problem there is a possible object for the particle within the clause, but the actual syntax of the clause is in doubt—this difficulty is in addition to any limitations imposed by the terminology. One set of examples involves *ber* or *her* followed by a particle, directly or not, with the alternative analyses adverb + adverb and object + preposition. A few instances are sufficient: *Per by niht on reason beth* ... (Bo 41.28), *neaxon his neber ne berinne mete ne berute freond* (Or 52.21), *Ne sealle ber leafe leaf* (Horn (Warner) 146.32). Another case results from the uncertainty surrounding *ut*: *oð he eft cynd to ðem ilcan swelme be he ar ut fleaw* (Bo 53.7). Mitchell discusses the arguments for and against regarding *ut* as a preposition here ('Prepositions etc', p.243); cf. also *honne orn ber bled ut* (Or 123.17). A third and interesting set is exemplified by Mitchell using *Ba abraw Petrus bealdlice his sword, and gealok heere anum ber swidre car eare of* (ACHom ii. 14.92) and *a sibban him mun aloeg be handa of* (Or 90.14). Of the latter he observes that 'we say either that *him* and *of* go together or that *of* is an adverb and *him* is a dative of disadvantage' ('Prepositions etc', pp.255-56). Similar uncertainty attaches to the following: *obbe weteres bet his mehten him burst of edriccan* (Or 46.16), *see*
even het ba erna wynne het headed of asecrfae (Or 45.6), perhaps Ac raf his non hennu awint of ba glæces (Bo 111.20), and so on. Mitchell's caution is justified by the fact that the same collocations can often be found elsewhere in unambiguous syntactic patterns, both in adverbial and pre-VP prepositional arrangements of the particle. The meanings are not in doubt, though, and it is perhaps the meaning which gives the impression that these particles are to be taken not as propositions but as 'effective adverbs'. A brief excursus on this term is necessary.

'Effective adverb' is borrowed from Curme by Visser (Hist. Syntax, i, 597). Visser uses it to help locate a different borderline in OE, that between adverbs and prefixes:

Particles preceding the verb are adverbs, and not prefixes, when a) they are movable: 'ic of asecræf þet lim', 'ic asecræf of þet leum', 'ic asecræf þet lim of'—this excludes utlagian—, b) when they at the same time have effective value, i.e. refer to a state or condition in consequence of the action ('the limb is off') (Hist. Syntax, i, 599)

Effective value is a common enough property of adverbs in OE, but it is a sufficient, not a necessary, condition. Taken literally it would imply that locative particles might be prefixal, as in lyft up geswearc (Ex 462), for example, as well as excluding from consideration as adverbs particles which could not collocate with 'to be' in a given meaning. Visser shows that he does not rely on his criterion too rigidly by listing as adverbs from in gif ge forby me from adyraf (Coll 200) and up in gewinn up ahofof (Chron 230.3 (1094)). The notional concept of effective value may conflict with the syntactic evidence of the placement of ne or to, especially in works whose syntax is Latinate. One of Visser's examples of an adverb is

35 Further examples listed incidentally by Visser, Hist. Syntax, i, 632.

36 These questions are subjective. I notice that Wulfing takes of in Bo 111.20 to be a preposition (Syntax, ii, 424, 683), whilst de la Cruz cites of in Or 90.14 as having no expressed object ('Gmc Phrasal Verb', p.32). Neither expresses any doubt.
the first in in & me inled mail in constangs (Matt[Li] 6.13). This is less
a criticism of Visser's criterion than an indication of the mechanical
method of glossing; see p.52 above.

If effective value is a useful indicator of adverbial status, it is
at best of limited use in the present context, that of distinguishing
adverbs from prepositions. I mentioned above my subjective impression that,
for example, of in Seo ovem het ha ñam cynnac hut heafod of acceorfan is
essentially an effective adverb, but it cannot be denied that the head is
as much 'off the king' as just 'off' as a result of the stroke. Cf. the
discussion of goal-value in Chapter 1. So although it may be possible to
resolve some of the equivocal cases, a number will probably have to remain
indeterminate, a residue belonging neither to the adverb nor to the prepos-
ition.
PREFIXES AND COMPOUND VERBS

The problems of classification in ME are broadly similar to those already met with. In some respects the distinction between prefixes and other particles becomes more complicated, as there is a measure of interchange between compound verbs and verb-particle collocations: the elements of some old compounds begin to appear in two-word form, whilst the language of translation often creates new, apparently compound forms in imitation of Latin or French originals. I leave further discussion to the next two chapters, where it can be integrated into the histories of classes 1-3. There is evidence of uncertainty in the ME period as to the syntactic status of some prefixes—a fact no doubt related to the general decline and instability of the prefixal system. For example, sporadic separation of for- and mis- is found in ME, in contrast to their invariably prefixal use elsewhere. And there are signs of a blending of prepositional and prefixal uses of for and of before past participles, notably in the much-discussed *very forwardred* constructions. Samuels observes that 'the widespread habit, in ME MSS., of spacing preverbs as separate words [footnote omitted] would suggest that preverbs were at this period regarded as similar in weight and function to prepositions' (ME "very forwardred", p.312).

37. Dubislaw notes some five examples of separation in Cursor Mundi and York Plays: 'Studien zur mittelenglischen Syntax III', Anglica, 45 (1921), 51-75 (p.61). It may be significant that mis- is stressed in OE (Müllberg, Aa. Elementarbuch, p.27), unusually for an inseparable prefix; association with ong may also play a part. See also OED s.v. mis- prefix for ME and early ModE examples of separated use.

PREPOSITIONS AND ADVERBS

As for the adverb/preposition boundary, certain usages continue to be difficult to interpret, although the him mon slog ba hands of type, technically ambiguous in OE, no longer poses any problem. This is due in part to a gradual obsolence of the dative of disadvantage, and more to the increasing regularity of pre-NP position for prepositions governing personal pronouns and nouns.\(^3\) We may safely classify of as an adverb in Vor Sir William Mautrauers, bonk nabbe he non. /Carf him of fet and honde, and is limes manion (Robert of Gloucester, EHET V.72).

Quasi-ellipsis

There is a new development on the border between adverb and preposition which, although apparently short-lived, may have played a significant part in the history of the class 3 group-verb. The development in question is of a quasi-elliptical function of non-spatial of, hovering between the prepositional and the elliptical, together with an elliptical use.\(^4\) It is most evident in All and the 'Katherine Group' texts, with signs of similar usage in other texts of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries and with particles other than of. Quasi-ellipsis occurs most frequently in particles which precede an infinitive clause, occasionally a finite clause. On one reading the particle is a preposition and the clause resembles an NP-object; on the alternative reading the particle is elliptical and the clause is either an adjunct or directly dependent on the verb of the principal clause. Quasi-ellipsis has a long history on the margins of the

\(^3\) On the dative of disadvantage and the sympathetic dative, See Muston's, ME Syntax, pp.77-79.

\(^4\) An example of the latter is Ne hunche he na wuc of (MH 32.530), cited in NED s.v. of adv 5.
English particle system, but with non-spatial of it seems to appear and disappear again in a short time. Why this should be not is not clear, though it is perhaps simply one unsuccessful experiment amongst the particularly widespread changes undergone by of in the course of the ME period—witness the many new functions taken on and the incipient differentiation of strong and weak forms, later recast into a distinction between (broadly speaking) spatial and non-spatial meanings. The development that I have alluded to has not been noticed before, as far as I know, so I present the evidence in some detail.

The first point to establish is that not all particles preceding clauses are quasi-elliptical: most are pure adverbs, whilst others are wholly prepositional and govern the clause as object. The latter is not always recognised and needs to be demonstrated for early ME. The prep + inf/tinf construction is discussed by Rinencel and Visser, amongst others. Some examples from AM are: To unwreast mid alle he is be mi wid to heaven up hire broc finnes: ouercumen hire fa & ne haste for slade (79b.4); Habbed beh to ever bionce his litle loante ende, of alle cuhe swynen, as of rude... of sitten longe ed hurl... of scheide

Visser, wishing to demonstrate semantic cohesion in class 3 group-verbs, quotes four examples of particles followed by clauses (Hist. Syntax, i, 730), two of them borrowed from Caaf; 'Passive', p.15. In the first the particle is simply a preposition governing a how-clause (cf. p.70 below), but the rest show an equivocal relation between particle and clause akin to what I have been calling quasi-ellipsis. Visser's examples range from the late fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries.

The ME functions of of are reviewed by Mustanoja, ME Syntax, pp.395-99. For the off/off distinction see e.g. Jespersen, MEG, i, 200 and OED s.v. of.

E. Rinencel, 'Die Entwicklung des englischen Gerundiums', Anglia, 38 (1914), 1-76 (pp.66-67); Visser, Hist. Syntax, ii, 1031-35. Visser erroneously rejects he is ever uma to arereen sume wrasde (AR (Hero) 194.5), confusing it with the quite different dreadful on to loke type (p.1032): it would have made more sense if he had used the same reason as he used to reject he about + tinf, namely that about is adjectival (p.1032 note 1); in this connection cf. beod basic to haben schirhearts (AM 104b.6). But as I shall show below, about and uma retain prepositional properties in these constructions in early ME.
cromen oder ale. of lecta binges mubelin (93a.5); NiS her nu benne butter bolien glendliche (97a.20, sim. 97b.23, 105b.22, etc);\(^{44}\) his article of wel to beo bitunde (15a.9); Vre meistre haued irwiten us as in heast to halden, bet we tellen him al (69b.19); bet tu burh nart to leosen forsakest swouch bigete (108a.13). The prep + that-clause construction is common in early ME. Examples from AW include tis uuel of dyna com nart of bet ha seh sichen emores sune (14a.28); swiftnes aseines bet ha beoð nu swa bipinet (24b.19); burh bet he mule sweaten (97b.26); after bet ha best neil be leafdi rible seruin (115a.19). As Jespersen points out, the string prep + that may come to be regarded as a conjunction.\(^{45}\) A different prep + that-clause construction, with pronominal that equivalent to 'that which', is current in early ME,\(^{46}\) but there are no comparable examples in which the preposition shows signs of quasi-ellipsis. As for other kinds of finite clause governed by a preposition, it is difficult to find clear examples in any numbers in early ME. Prep + interrogative clause occurs in Orm, as Jespersen notes (MEG, iii, 46), but he suspects Danish influence because of the long interval before his next examples in later ModE. Preusler shows that the gap is narrower than that,\(^{47}\) and we may adduce from early ME bet al folc wundreden on: whecones com swa feir mon (Lay. Brût A 3514), which is from outside the Danelaw area and so more likely to be native idiom. It could be held to illustrate quasi-ellipsis, however. Jespersen also gives

\(^{44}\)Bute may be a conjunction rather than a preposition.

\(^{45}\)MEG, iii, 27-28. Preposition/conjunction indeterminacy is not discussed further in this chapter: the particles concerned nearly always introduce an adverbial clause of time, purpose, result, etc, and are too weakly linked to the main clause verb for them to form a group-verb. Of in my first example is therefore unusual.

\(^{46}\)Visser's earliest citation is from Malory (Hist. Syntax, 1, 548), but there are much earlier examples, such as Aw 3a.18, 30b.17, 95a.2, 104b.25.

\(^{47}\)Walther Preusler, 'Keltischer Einfluss im Englischen', Anglia, 66 (1942), 121-28 (pp.127-28), also in Revue des langues vivantes, 22 (1956), 322-50 (pp.339-40).
late ModE examples of prepositions governing relative clauses beginning with *when, where, etc.*, with the comment that 'they do not seem to be very old in the language' (NEGG, iii, 70). In fact they are attested in *Orm* and in late *ME*, e.g. *herfore wake see, & benke onne hou bi bre see nyxt & day y cesessed not bi teris monestrye ilche of zou* (*Wyclif, Eng. Wks.* 300.3),

see also *OED* s.v. *when 5, where 6*. Two examples from *AW*, not wholly convincing as showing prep + clause, are *bute hwen ge feasto* (6a.12) and *he wat be castel is his; & geað baldeliche in bor he sid i riht up swucche baneres as me ded i castel* (96b.5).

In general, prep + clause is fairly uncommon in *ME* and ModE, because verbs which normally collocate with a preposition when the complement is a NP often dispense with it when followed by a clause. An early *ME* illustration of the two sorts of complementation with one verb is *He houte of his swevne; & hou he ladji him aside / mid muchelre lufe* (*Lay. Brut* A 630).

Having established that prepositions can govern infinitive clauses, finite *that*-clauses, and (less certainly) finite interrogative and relative clauses in early *ME*, we may now look at evidence for quasi-elliptical particles in front of clauses. For convenience the material is arranged by verb–particle collocation, with examples numbered within each sequence.

Ben abuten

(1) *Pa ðe waren eure abuten pisse worlde echte* (*Poema Morale* L 267; sim. *AW* 29b.7, 39a.16)
(2) *ah ðe gode Ich am bisiliche abuten* (*SM* 31.34)
(3) *godes engel pe is . . . bisiliche abuten to eggin us to gode* (*AW* 39b.23)
(4) *Forse brokhe pis hus efter pis tresor þet Godd bohte mid his deas ant lettre lif o rode is moni þeof abuten, ba bi dei ant bi niht* (*SM, MEVP* XIX.30)

---


49 See e.g. *Jespersen, NEG*, iii, 50-52; *Visser, Hist. Syntax*, i, 133-34; Randolph Quirk et al., *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (London, 1972), pp.299-300. A contact clause dependent on a preposition is *Bot benkkes on hit be brefte what bynk so ze make* (*Cleanness* 819).
(5a) satan is georne abuten forte ridli pe ut of mine icorene (AW 63b.5) 50
(5b) satan is georne abuten pe for to ridli pe ut of mine corne (AR Cleopatra) 102.17 51
(6) Inoh ich wes abuten (AW 22b.24)
(7) al georne wes abuten, hu he mihte aseinnen. pat he weoren binnen
(Lay. Brut A 6269)

In (1) and (2) abuten is evidently a preposition: cf. note 43 above. In the same way, therefore, we could regard the infinitive clause in (3) as a prepositional object. In (4), however, the marker forte and the fronting of the infinitive might suggest rather that abuten is elliptical and the infinitive clause an adverbial clause of purpose. 52 Likewise in (5a) there is both the use of forte and the variant reading of (5b)—where abuten is of course transitive but not with the infinitive as object—to point to an elliptical interpretation of abuten. In (6) abuten is almost certainly elliptical. And so in (7) abuten is quasi-elliptical: the analogy of the preceding examples allows us to regard the hu-clause either as object of a preposition abuten or as in some looser construction with non-prepositional abuten. (Examples (3) – (5a) could also be called quasi-elliptical.)

Men umben

It is convenient to take this idiom next, as it is very similar to the previous one both in syntax and in meaning.

(1) ant hwet se he wriht becód umben to schrapien hit of cleanliche
(2) Sum he is umben to maken se swís fleon monne froure (AW 61a.14)
(3) ah þu hehe healent, beo umbe me to helpen (SM 16.9)

50 Similarly AR (Nero) 104.28, Pepys 107.5.
51 Similarly Titus 78.26.
52 Neither fact positively rules out an analysis in which prepositional abuten governs the infinitive clause—there are cases where an infinitive marked by forte behaves as a noun phrase—but the two facts cumulatively weigh against it. The preferred analysis is supported by comparison with such examples as bisampled lornge abuten; forte beo het ilesuet, hwen hit alles kime ó ford (AW 22b.21).
I have not come across a clear example in AR or the Katherine Group texts of *umben* + nominal prep. There is one at *Orm* 1538, and see also Hall, *HM*, ii, 406 (note to IX.229) for further examples in late OE. In the examples quoted here, it is not clear in (1) to (3) whether *umbe(n)* governs an infinitive clause, a noun phrase (*hwet* se *he* *writ*, *sum*, or *me*, respectively), or neither. In (4) *umben* is separated from the tinf by an adverbial phrase which one would not expect to find between a preposition and an ordinary nominal prep. *Uaben* appears to govern a tinf in (5), although previous examples put it in some doubt, and in (6) it is certainly elliptical. In (7) it is unclear whether or not *umben* governs the *bet*-clause: intervention of *souches weis* makes it somewhat unlikely. It can be argued, then, that all but (6) demonstrate quasi-ellipsis.

**Bringen (sb.) on**

(1) *bringt* hire on to gederin. & geouen al earst to pour (AW 60b.10)
(2) *be* stude. & te *time*. *be* mahten bringe *be* on/mis forte donne (*HM* 16.232; *OED*)

*HM* has examples of a construction *bringen (sb.) on (a state) s.v. bringen* v. 2a, though none with an action noun as prep. I do not know whether the infinitive clauses in the examples quoted are to be regarded as prepos

53 When a preposition precedes its regimen in OE, it is uncommon for any other element to intervene. One exception to this rule is *to daly with derely your davnte wordes* (Caw 1253); a few others are noted by G. Dubislav, "Studien zur mittelenglischen Syntax IV", *Anglia*, 46 (1922), 239-56 (pp.246-47).

54 Thus the *bet*-clause would be a purpose clause. Cf. *et sei entremet en toutes manieres ce ele leime tendrement...* (AR (French) 144.17), and *ac modia omnibus satagit ut ipsa cum intime et corditer diligat* (AR (Latin) 78.19).
of on: there is a stronger case to be made for (1) than for (2). Both examples can be held to demonstrate quasi-ellipsis, however.

Holden on

(1) geft bu haldest her on (SJ 11.109)
(2) haldest tu getten up o bi guhelunge (SJ 51.541)
(3) hald harfudliche on þet tu hauuent bigunnen (SK 677)
(4) halden on longe ne leasun ge neuer (SJ 22.196) 55
(5) & he held on to heryn his heðene maunze wið misliche lakes, long time of þe deie (SK 453; sim. HM 40.700)

(1) to (3) demonstrate prepositional on, (4) adverbial on, and (5) can be analysed either way: on is quasi-elliptical.

Ben drede of

(1) Gastelich fondunce þet is mare dred of. mei beon for þe perl ileopet brest wunde (AW 51b.11)
(2) Sum is aid & ædelich & is þe leasse dred of (AW 2a.13)
(3) get is meant dred of hwem þe sweke of helle æggæ to a þing þet puncheð swide god mid alle (AW 60a.19)

It seems to me that of is prepositional in (1), elliptical in (2), and quasi-elliptical in (3).

Ben mought (litel, etc) of

(1) Par beoð þa heðene men. þe were lage lieœe. / þe nes naht of godes bibode. ne of godes hese (Poema Morale E 291)
(2) lutele me is of over luœe. leasse of over laðoe. & of þes pretes riht noht (SJ 23.224)
(3) þe deade nið namære of scheome pen of menæe. of hærde: þen of nesche (AW 95b.14; sim. 59a.26)
(4) þe deade nið noht of; þah he ligge unburiet. & rotie buuen eorte (AW 95a.17)
(5) Ant ne beo ham nawt of hwem þe feond blawe (AW 116a.20)

Examples (1) to (3) with prepositional of are selected from a huge number of instances in early ME: it is a common idiom. In example (4) of is presumably elliptical, as a þah-clause cannot logically be a prep of

55 MS B has Haldeð longe . . . . (23.231); d’Ardenne’s reconstructed text of B reads Haldeð on longe . . . .
And in (5), of is quasi-elliptical.  

Leten (litel, etc) of  

(1) Vana gloria.  pe is hwe se let wel of ei bing pe ha deō oōer seie (AW 52a.27)  
(2) lutel waldestu leoten of ower laelese lehen (SJ 18.160; sim. 20.178, 67.725, AW 91b.16)  
(3) pe tu leetest lutel.  of al pe tu schuldest luniei (SJ 13.137; sim. SK 354)  
(4) In his hali nome ich schal leten lihtliche of al pe tze cumnen kasten again me (SK 942)  
(5) Ac se kymge let lihtlice of oō pe t com to Englalonde (ChronD 211. 34 (1076))  
(6) ha walde awilgin elles oōer to wel leoten of? & swa to noht iurōen (AW 47b.1)  
(7) al is vana gloria.  pe let eawilt wel of.  & walde habben word prof (AW 52b.4)  
(8) ant heo let wel of & leapeō in orhel (AW 60b.17)  
(9) lure ow is to leosen ower swinkea lan, pe leoteō se lutel of, & sparied ower speche (SK 804)  
(10) & tah ha makie semblant & muche nurō wiō wengen? opres nawt hiren.  pe is leote of as pah ha fluhe.  & were an hali ancre (AW 36a.17)  

Cleopatra has no punctuation between of and beah (169.15); Nero has a  
point (159.11).  

Cleopatra has no punctuation between of and hwen (197.1); Nero has  
punctus elevatus (194.15).  

This is a little earlier than the other examples. The MS is dated in  
the twelfth century in EHR, ii, 107-108.  

There is interesting variation in this passage. Tolkien's note claims  
'hirc secluen omitted', but Dobson's note to Cleopatra 73y.15, the  
equivalent passage, reads: 'After of [scribe] D adds carst . . . and  
writes hirc seluin above (cf. Nero, Latin, Trinity, Pepys); but [scribe]  
A's text agrees with Corpus [i.e. AW], Titus, and Vernon.'  

Not in other published MSS, which have the construction of example (1).  
AW has some extra matter between the extracts I have quoted as (1) and (7),  
and (7), with its repetition of let of, leads to a resumption of the  
common text.  

Sim. Titus, Cleopatra, but cf. let wel herof (Nero 100.4 and sim. Pepys  
102.4).  

Sindenkel observes that 'there is hardly any construction in this the  
following sentences'. A point of incidental interest is that MS B has  
lihtliche instead of lutel.
(11) & heo schal beo grestre ibollen. leafdilukr leoten of þen a leafdi of hames (AW 29a.7) 63
(12) af ful wel he let of whwen ei seid þet he made þem to sunegyn (AW 32b.17) 64

The meaning of examples (1) to (8) and (12) is that given by MED s.v. leoten v. 15.(c), 'look upon (sb. or sth. in a certain manner), regard'. MED notices the use of leoten wel of without object and glosses it 'be proud'; perhaps the same ellipsis of reflexive pronoun has occurred in example (9). Example (10) is cited under sense 16.(b), 'act as though'. Example (11) probably belongs under sense 17.(b), 'behave (in a certain manner), act', although MED does not record collocation with of for that sense, and gives this example under 15.(c); see note 63. The examples divide differently as far as syntax is concerned. In (1) to (4) of must be a preposition. In (5) to (8), probably (9), and (10) and (11), of is elliptical or adverbal. And in (12) of may be taken either way: it is quasi-elliptical.

There is a fair spread of evidence for quasi-ellipsis in this deliberately restricted set of texts, including three idioms which involve the particle of---four if different meanings are counted. The texts are all South-Western or South-West Midlands and mostly from the beginning of the

63 A number of scholars have taken this example to be passive--wrongly, as I now think; I am grateful to Dr Anthony Warner for the observation that leoten looks like an infinitive. The equivalent passages in the French text and in the Vernon MS have been identified by E. J. Dobson, in 'The Affiliations of the Manuscripts of Ancrene Wisse', in English and Medieval Studies: Presented to J. R. R. Tolkien on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, edited by Norman Davis and C. L. Wrenn (London, 1962), pp.128-63 (pp.153-55). The French reads Chose deplaisante ..., est ce une recluse enoynte ..., doit estre plus grosse enfleu, plus contenir sey come dame, ce vne grande dame de terres (50.15), the crucial portion meaning 'behave more like a lady'; I am grateful to Dr Jane Taylor for help with the Anglo-Norman. Professor Dobson reconstructs the text of AW on the basis of the Vernon and French texts, deleting & heo at the beginning of my example (11). He suggests that the English exemplar of the French had 'wrongly' inserted a reflexive pronoun after of: I would argue that if a pronoun had been inserted, it would have been the sort of variation illustrated in note 59 above, and that the French text correctly represents the meaning of the original. See d'Ardenne, SJ, p.247 on the morphology of the verb.

64 Cleopatra has a point between of and hyen (138.10); Hero has a different idiom (137.3); Pepys has ac wel wel he leteb here of whan ... (130.14).
In the case of leten of 'look upon' in elliptical or quasi-elliptical use there is an indication of restricted currency and rapid obsolescence, in that every such example in A is modified or omitted in at least one other manuscript: see notes 59, 60, 61, 64 above. Much more research would be needed to determine the geographical and chronological range of the idioms, however.

I have used the term 'quasi-ellipsis' as a provisional label for a number of similar-looking constructions. There is no need to regard it as a new kind of syntactic structure. A satisfactory interpretation is that the distinction between adverb and preposition is neutralised in such examples. Another, more recent concept is also applicable, namely that quasi-ellipsis demonstrates the existence of a gradience between preposition and adverb, the quasi-elliptical examples falling somewhere between the two extremes. The idea that prepositions may undergo different degrees of 'adverbialisation' is not new—it is a commonplace in traditional descriptions of English prepositions not literally in pre-position. The novelty here would be to apply it to particles with a possible object following.

Returning to the collocation leten of, we may regard it as a type of class 3 group-verb with an obligatory manner adverbial, at least when used

---

65 I have consulted ENBT, ENBVP, and MED 'Plan and Bibliography' on the provenance of the ME texts. A Worcester or Evesham provenance is suggested by several scholars for ChronD (ENP, ii, 107-108), though Professor Whitelock prefers York; see The Peterborough Chronicle (the Bodleian Manuscript Laud Misc. 636), edited by Dorothy Whitelock, EEMF, 4 (Copenhagen, 1954), p.28.

66 Dr Warner has made some useful comments on this point (personal letter, 13 October 1980). He points to the prevalence of hwen-clauses in my examples of quasi-ellipsis and asks whether this indicates some fact about hwen. In A the majority of hwen-clauses are adverbial clauses of time. Apart from the instances under discussion, I can adduce the following evidence that hwen-clauses display some nominal properties: bet an is hwen he ne feled nort his ahne mechenese (AW 48a.3; sem. 48a.12, 78b.13, 78b.22, 113a.4); ah lokis bet each of ow icname wil hwen he speka8 i be Vuele monnes tunge (AW 69b.17).

67 See pp.15-16 above.
in the sense 'look upon'. In *Am* and elsewhere, as has been shown, *laten* of displays unusual syntactic behaviour in the active voice. *Latet* of also appears in several of the early examples of the prepositional passive. I shall argue in Chapter 6 that the two phenomena are related.

The use of *wel*, *lihtlice*, etc in some instances implies that *litel*, *sawiht*, etc in others are adverbial rather than nominal; cf. also the variation between *lihtliche* and *lutel* mentioned in note 62 above. Visser is inconsistent about this. He lists *litel* as he loud or late by (PP1. A XI.29)—by later replaces of in the idiom—in Hist. Syntax, iii-2, 2123, on the implicit assumption that *litel* is adverbial, and again on p.2169, on the assumption that it is nominal.
The last section of this chapter deals with the classification of particle use in Orm. First come the tests for identifying prefixes and compound verbs, then the adverb/preposition distinction is discussed, then there is an exhaustive review of particles which introduce infinitives, and finally a list of the particles found in Orm.

PREFIXES AND COMPOUND VERBS

Most of the p-v strings in Orm are compound verbs and can be identified as such with reasonable certainty. Once a particular occurrence has been identified as a compound, all other occurrences of the same combination are assumed to be so too, unless there are particular grounds for doubt. The spacing of words in the MS is not an adequate criterion, and other indications must be used.

Particle not used independently

The prefix a- is not used as an independent word—the words a in the senses 'one', 'always' and 'ah!' are all evidently different morphemes. A- is found in the compounds abidenn and abigenn. The prefix annd- (again easily distinguished from ann 'and') occurs in annetenn and ann(d)sverenn. The prefix as- occurs only in the past participle form

69. It is not unusual to find separate words run together in the MS: e.g. bin ville (D12), shown in facsimile in WH following p.lxxxvii. Conversely, what are undoubtedly prefixes are sometimes separated by a space from the verb stem, e.g. tobaellen and toblawenn (COCCO), especially the latter, and burheekenn (printed thus in WH note to 9531-34), which occurs at the bottom of Col. 230, though not in the main hand(s).

70. Line-references are unnecessary here, as the WH glossary gives adequate page-references, often complete for the less frequent words.
zechatenn, which alternates with hatenn,71 and in iastanedd (x 1) beside
stanedd (x 2). The prefix miss- is found in *missdon and misslikenn.72
The prefix unn- is found in unnbindenn, unnhilenn, unnsperenn, *unnwarr-
ben, and otherwise only in past participles. (All of these prefixes are
used with non-verbal elements too, but that is not my concern here.)

Prefix to be distinguished from homonym acting as free particle

The prefix att- is found in *attfleon, *attribenn, attwindenn, in
each case conferring a sense 'away' or something similar. This is quite
different from any senses of the preposition att. The prefix bi- is used
in various ways, but very rarely is the spatial meaning of the free parti-
cle bi perceptible in compound forms. This helps to identify as compounds
*bideleenn, bididdrenn, *bifindenn, *bifrosenn, *birinnenn, *biprinnenn,
*bisatenn, *bhidenn, *bihatenn, *bihofenn, *bikaschenn, bilofenn,
bilimmenn, bilokenn, *biminnenn, *birefenn, birco(was)enn, bisennkenn,
*bishinenn, bisiwikenn, bitacnenn, bitacwenn, bitellemn. The remaining
bi- forms (*bihennenn, *bilappeenn, *bileggenn, *bilukenn, *bisetenn,
bibennkenn, *bibirinenn, *bivakenn) arguably contain bi- in the senses
'around' or 'concerning', although both senses are probably obsolete in
Orm for the preposition bi.

The prefix forr-, usually having an intensive effect and often impart-
ing a 'bad' sense or the meaning 'to destruction', is semantically quite
unlike the preposition forr/forr. It occurs in the compounds *forrbedenn,
*forrbindenn, forrblendenn, forrbuchenn, *forrollincenn, *forrdillchenn,

71 Both in the sense 'called, named'. Otherwise the simple verb occurs
only once, in the sense 'promised'.

72 The forms of infinitives can generally be reconstructed with certainty
in Orm, in which case they are given as citation forms even if not
attested.
*forradon, forradedd, *forradedef, forraderd, *forraart, *forraillenn, forradownnedd, *forrazenn, forraifenn, forrandenn, forrochenenn, *forrochenn, forrohunngred, forrolatenn, forrolanegg, forrolasenn, *forrolin, forrolitat, forrohat, *forrosakenn, forroson, forroshanedd, *forrostringenn, forrowranredd, forrowegenn, forrowchh, forrowrandred, *forrowrppenn. In *oferrbedemn, oferr- apparently has the sense 'in or to excess', a function of the prefix rather than the adverb in modification of verbs: see OED s.vv. over adv 11 and prefix 27. The prefix off- is semantically quite close to forr-, but meaning is not a safe guide to the syntax of off-V strings, because of the theoretical possibility that adverbial off might be used in similar senses. (In fact off does not occur in Orm at all as an adverb, apart perhaps from the collocation blinnenn off.)


Position of to

To as infinitive-marker comes immediately in front of its verb, except

73 Past participle form—full conjugation probably lacking; see OED and (where applicable) MEED s.vv.
74 Part participle—form of infinitive uncertain.
sometimes before the second of two coordinated infinitives. A particle intervening between infinitive-marking to and verb stem must therefore be compounded with the verb. The test applies to biginnenn (9539), bigripenn (9752), bijaldenn (15663), bireowwaenn (8800), biewikenn (12476), bitacenn (1747), bitellemn (7302), forrbuxenn (5253), forrgillenn (2619), forrcifenn (4962), forrlasenn (18411), forrwarpenn (1544), burhlokena (1693), burhaekenn (167), umabesherenn (4132), umabindenn (10387), umanderrfannenn (17979), umanderrfenn (12936), umanderrfen (2527), umanderrfannpenn (10661), umanderrstanndenn (2951), and wibbatandenn (16143).

Position of ne

When a finite verb is negated, ne is almost always amongst the negating words and then invariably right in front of the verb, sometimes coalescing with it. So the strings ne bilimmpphib (18277) and munanderrstanndeast (17108) may be taken as showing that those verbs are compounds.

Form of object-pronoun

Prepositions are not found governing personal pronouns when the referent is non-human or abstract: typical pro-words in these circumstances


76 In this and subsequent tests, only one line-reference is given for each verb.

77 Negative clauses without ne are found at 224, 415, 431, 3124, 5262, 7396, 7553, 9622, 8659, 9827, 710356, V211.

78 On the apparent exception at 16581 see Burchfield, 'Language', p.37. For ME in general see Kastanoja, ME Syntax, p.399. An interesting variation is hit ne ouwerwenen (AW 39a.5) vs. ne hit ouwerwenen (AW 39a.7); cf. p.51 above.
are lex, her, or who before the particle, bisa or bätt after it. The forms forswife (5446), forshall (2473), burthasáken (242), umabébenkebb (10190), underrfannkenn (1523), underrfo (18326) and underrständenn (2006) are preceded by it or heem as object with an abstract or non-human referent, which implies that the particles concerned lack any prepositional character. It should be noted that the simplex heenkenn is elsewhere construed with the preposition umba, whilst rekenn could in principle be construed with prepositional burrrh. None of the four particles here is otherwise used adverbially in Æran. This test is an indication (no more) that the particles concerned are prefixal, a fact confirmed by previous tests for all but umabébenkebb.

Prefixation by um

The morpheme um- is used only prefixally in Æran (and generally), often attached to past participles and never prefixed to free particles. When um- is found prefixed to a p-V string, therefore, the implication is that that string is a compound verb. The test applies to umbirurnnenn (10574), umfornlexenn, unantbrittnedd (11179) and unntodeledd (11513).

'Linked' verbs

I coin the term 'linked verbs' for conjoined verbs which share

---

79. The same is generally, although not invariably, true of other early ME texts: see Kostanoja, ME Syntax, pp.130-31 and 424-25.

80. In a shot forshall wibb alle menn it is evident that it (for itt) does not refer to the child: see 2463-70 and 2471-72.


82. One might be cautious about extending the implication to the rest of the conjugation if the same particle and verb-stem were ever used in two-word form—which of course they are not. But an adjectival participle might conceivably exist as a compound even though finite parts (and infinitive?) did not: cf. PE upstretched vs. stretch up. See Jespersen, MEC, vi, 172.
subject and complement. It seems a priori likely that linked particle-verb strings should possess similar internal structures, especially if they conform to the same metrical stress pattern and even more so if they utilise the same particle in similar semantic functions. This test can do no more than corroborate previous tests, since although it seems to me intuitively reasonable, I see no way of validating it except negatively, by finding counter-examples. 83 If it is accepted, then one known compound can serve to establish another. I present three lists of linked particle-verb strings—finite parts, infinitives, and past participles 84—with at least one member known to be a compound in most cases.

Finite parts: biswiökenn & biliæfenn, 85 Forrletenn & forryræmenn (7502), Forrætæbb & forryræreb (2965), Forræcæchenn & forryræpen (3645), Forrletenn & forryræpen (13151), Forrætækcæbb & forryræcæbb (17307), all forryræpen & forryrn (17779), 86 all forryræ & oferræomm (16964), Vibbætænn & wibbaexæenn, / & all forryræpen (17626), oferræomm & oferrætræpp (12492), Totwinæbb & toshæreb (19060), Towarræset & tosægæresæt (16199).

Infinitives: Forræblændenn & bididdænn (15392), Bibernæenn & bilokenn (2917), Forræcæchenn & forryræpen (7514), Forræcæchenn & forryræpen (3959), Omæpæn & unndæræstænænn (12106), Toðælænn & tosæhænn (19862), Wibbæstænnæn & wibbaexæenn (7646).

83 Consider for example & all himmæræenn fæt & heog Toðælænn & toðlæwæn (8079). If OE is correct to state that bell v. and tobell v. are intransitive, whilst blow v. (sense 22) and toblow v. are transitive, then the compounds could only have been 'linked' as past participles and are not syntactically equivalent in their external relations—cf. gom swan be fullhæm wæs & sticæhæn upp o strænde (11154)—which perhaps casts doubt on the claim that their internal structures are equivalent. As it happens, the compound status of both verbs is quite certain.

84 It is possible, in the light of OE, that these three behave in different ways. In general, the behaviour of finite parts is the most reliable indication.

85 From Burchfield, 'Ormulum: Words Copied', p.98.

86 I have included some examples with the metrical filler all, and one with æc, even though technically they violate the stipulation about shared complements.
Past participles: Bididdreadd & forrblendedd (14323), all Bididdreadd & forrblendedd, / all forrbrunndenn & forrdon (19137), all Bilokenn & bilappeedd (14266), Forrbrunndenn & forrblendedd (13775), Forrbrunndenn & forrbrunngenn (6169), Forrfrreadd & forrfrreadd (659), Forrshameadd & forrshameedd (2194), Forrbrisat & ec forrhummeredd (5679), Forrlistenn & forrrwortppenn (3119), Fullurobbi & all fullforbbedd (15597), 87 Tobollem & tollabwenn (6080), Todolled & tobbrittneadd (9468), Toskiled & todaleedd (18652), Todrifenn & toskesgaredd (16277), Toxorroppenn & toskegaredd (16277), Unnbededd & unnhopedd (17061), Unmamedd & unmwenneedd (14735).

Dictionary evidence

If the major dictionaries (BT(3), MED, OED) provide no evidence of a combination ever having been used in two-word form, or at least not in the given meaning and in the early ME period, that too is valuable evidence of compound status. It also supplements other tests (for example the claim that certain particles are bound forms) by reducing the dangers of arguing from negative evidence in a limited corpus.

Most of the compounds in Orm can be identified by one—or more than one—of these tests. Many of the remaining p-V strings can be shown to be arrangements of verb-adverb or verb-preposition collocations. Only a handful of examples remain in doubt, and most can be classified as compounds with a fair degree of confidence. The verb amfannamenn/amfon is shown to be a compound by the frequency and consistency of its occurrence in p-V order, and by the fact that its meaning, 'receive, accept', is different from that of the collocation for on, for which MED records such senses as 'seize', 'attack'. (The collocation is not found in Orm.) In the cases of *oferrfallenn, *oferrworrppenn, hurchcan and *hurhseon the OED vouches for their existence as compounds at this date, whilst the

87 Full-compounds, like those of un- are included for completeness: they are not really part of the particle system.
occurrence of an object after the p-V string makes it unlikely that the particle could be a preposition. *Oferrflowenn and *untpspringenn are more likely to be compounds than class 1 collocations on dictionary evidence, though the latter might be a doublet; cf. *springenn ut/*utspringen (V447). Finally, the verb ummbebennkenn is probably a compound in most of its occurrences: four times it governs the object pronoun itt (cf. the test on pp.81-82 above), and in Joemp wass hochefull & mikell ummbebohhte./

Off whatt hima were bennst to don (2902) the prep off is used in addition to the particle ummbe, which is therefore almost certainly a prefix. However, one instance of ummbe + bennkenn is without doubt a class 3 collocation: & tatt cho legode itt aamenn all To bennkenn a33 bar ummbe (9103).

Here I think we have to recognise a doublet.

As it happens, then, intuitive notions about which particles inOrm are prefixal can often be buttressed by supporting evidence of some kind; only *untpspringenn remains genuinely doubtful. It must be acknowledged that the tests vary in nature and in the weight which can be placed on them. For example, reliance on semantic dissimilarity (pp.79-80) makes tacit use of two facts: (a) that few group-verbs in Orm use a particle in a sense quite different from its usual one (untrue, say, for ModE), and (b) that one would not expect an idiomatic group-verb to occur consistently in uninterrupted p-V order. The assumptions are valid in practice but not above criticism logically.

PREPOSITIONS AND ADVERBS

Prepositional objects

The typical prepO in Orm is the NP—a pronoun or noun with its

88 WH print burrh gen (12860) as two words. There is a small if inconclusive gap between them in the MS, and no word-division stroke. Modification by all also militates against interpreting burrh as a preposition. ORD cites the example s.v. throughgo.
modifiers. Other sorts of prep do turn up, however. There are adverbs: fra bibufenn (17970), fra whebennwarrd (16668), till nu (14066), till ba (437), for example. There is an adverbal clause in Till affterrr batt tatt hallscie child Wass borenn her to manne (erased text following 2084; see WH note). There are interrogative and relative clauses: to fraconenn Crist Off where he wass att inne (12922), & swa mann barr batt fule lic Till bmr he bedenn halfde (8183). Prep + that-clause is extremely common in Orm, with the string prep batt often equivalent to a conjunction. The following strings of this type are found: affterrr batt (tatt), biforenn/biforr batt (batt), butan/buttan batt (tatt), forr (all) batt (tatt), fra batt (batt/tatt), i batt (tatt), off batt (batt/tatt), onygnen batt (tatt), tekenn batt (tatt), till batt (tatt), hurrr batt (tatt), wibbutenn batt.

An example which neatly demonstrates the equivalence of an ordinary NP and two sorts of finite clause is the following:

... forrhbi batt itt was... writenn uppo boc Off Cristess firste come, / Off hu sop Godd wasu wurrjenn mann... / & off batt mankninn perrh hiss dey Wass lesadd ut off helle, / & off batt he wisalike ras Pa briddle da33 off debe, / & off batt he wisalike stah Pa sihbenn upp till hefft, / & off batt he shall cuwenn efft To demenn alle pece, /... / Off all bisu god usu bringepp word & errnde & god ti'ennen / Godspell (D159).

Preposition + verbal noun in Orm may be treated as an ordinary prepositional phrase, as the verbal noun is wholly nominal:89 thus e.g. hurrr

89Verbal nouns often have both verbal and nominal properties in NE generally; for a summary see Mustanoja, ME Syntax, pp.574–76. But in Orm verbal nouns in -ing and -ung are not modified by a following directional adverbal (gunetichinga (10755) is probably a compound noun); nor do they take direct objects. W. van der Gaaf gives the following as an example of a verbal noun with a dir0: & sc Judea tacenbb uss missedeess annugetinnge (15026); see 'The Gerund Preceded by the Common Case: A Study in Historical Syntax', ME, 10 (1926), 35-41 and 65-72 (p.38). Although missedeess could be the common case plural, it could equally be gen. sg. or pl. in Orm; cf. Annugetebb hiss missede (13633, 13661) for a clear example of that noun as dir0 of a finite part of the verb. It seems to me that missedeess annugetinnge bears the same sort of relationship to annugetebb... missede as dredung off Godd (5610) does to to dredenn Drihhtin (5600); in any event it is the only such example in Orm.
fanding off be deofell (11622). Preposition + plain infinitive does not occur at all, apart of course from the to-infinitive itself. Prep + tinf is quite common and requires detailed treatment: I shall briefly postpone the topic, discussing it below as part of a survey of particles which introduce infinitive clauses.

Preposition/adverb indeterminacy

The borderline between prepositions and adverbs is much more troublesome than that which separates prefixes from other particles in ORM. Certain collocations of here and here with particles are equivocal in structure: adv + adv or prep0 + prep. Examples include Swa suum icc habbe surnwedd her Biforem o biss lare (4344), Pa birrb be steanndern her onnonen, & vere nn Cristess becress (5304), i bat huss . . . . Per be brec kinc ess comenn inn . . . (6930). And certain prepositional phrases can be analysed, at least in principle, as consisting instead of an adverb and a NP which is independent of the particle. Consider, for example, Pa luchess batt him comenn to . . . (8081). Him . . . to is probably a prepositional phrase, given the frequency with which comenn is accompanied by a to-phrase. However, cumenn also occurs with an indirect object, e.g. at 2946 and 8341, raising the possibility that to in 8081 might be an adverb. Similarly, onnonen be deofell is almost certainly a prepositional phrase in Alles iff be Laferrd 3affe Huss Anndarew onnonen be deofell (12015)—the word-order can hardly be interpreted in any other way—but it is possible to find other arrangements of very similar elements in which onnonen is not a preposition: & sone himm jaff Natangal Anndarew Huss oonnwnes (12784), & Crist jaff till Natangal Anndarew onnonen (12812). It happens that the allegedly doubtful examples, both of which are probably prepositional, can be distinguished from non-prepositional examples on semantic grounds. Cumenn + ind0 usually means 'befall' rather than 'come', whilst rifenn anndarew onnonen in 12015 seems to carry the connotation of refuting somebody's case, in addition to the more neutral sense of response found in the
other examples. Too much weight should not be attached to the latter, merely contextual interpretation.

Quasi-ellipsis before finite clauses

Consider the following variants, all meaning much the same:

(1) Time comm/wass cumenn batt . . . (688, 3494, 9656)
(2) Time comm/wass cumenn to batt . . . (701, 5202, 10087, 12842)
(3) Time comm herto batt . . . (63, 79, 7571)
(4) Iitt comm batt . . . (9549) 90
(5) Iitt cumepp to batt . . . (10528)
(6) Iitt comm herto batt . . . (19609)
(7) Pa wass cumenn to batt . . . (9897, 10071)

The particle to does not govern the batt-clause in (3) or (6) and is dispensed with altogether in (1) and (4). Therefore it may well be elliptical in the remaining examples, (2), (5) and (7). Equally it could be prepositional, governing the batt-clause. In other words, to is quasi-elliptical in those three examples. A similar use appears in & forbi wass ber
lannge to Ar benn itt wass all forbedd (16286), although the presence of the conjunction ar benn suggests that to is on the elliptical/adverbial side of the borderline.

Rather less convincing as examples of quasi-ellipsis are the following: & sifenn bissne off batt te birrb . . . (1230, sim. 2637); & binnke

rúv nan wunnderr off Patt te bree kingess cumenn . . . (6962, sim. 8936, 11807, 12085, 16658). The evidence for an elliptical reading of off is that both constructions occur without the particle at all: Forr be to

sifenn bissne, / Patt te birrb . . . (1239, and passim); & tatt nees

wunnderr bwerr ut nan Patt he wass . . . . (9327, 10245). In addition there is a metrical pause after off in three of the five wunnderr examples. On the other hand, it seems quite adequate to regard them as examples of

90 Example (4) actually reads & sibbenh comm itt set [WH set] terto. Patt
witt tu wel to sone, /Patt . . . . The context suggests that set terto is an adverbial phrase meaning 'yet in addition to that', so that terto does not belong with cumenn as in (6).
the conjunction **off batt**.

**PARTICLE + TO-INFinitive**

I collect together here all the examples in **Orm** of a particle introducing an infinitive, apart from **to** + plain inf. This is a general expression which covers a wide range, whose various grades are set out below. What it does not include is the merely fortuitous occurrence of a particle in front of an infinitive, e.g. **att** in *Forrniss nan mann batt uses birrb att Forrhynchenn godto lernenn* (13282). Nor does it cover those particles which are part of the complement of the infinitive, e.g. **onn** in & Crist iss babe—sstrans wibb hannd, & luffsumm onn to lokenn (3584). There are several reasons why particles introducing infinitives are of particular interest: they include some striking examples of adverb/preposition indeterminacy and hence of quasi-ellipsis; they include most of the idiomatic particles in group-verbs in **Orm**; and they provide important data for theories of diachronic syntax which concern the status of the tinf in **Wh**.

---

91 **Att** governs the relative pronoun as part of the complement of **lernenn**. The example was mistakenly identified as an **att**-infinitive by F. Weyel, *Der syntaktische Gebrauch des Infinitivs in Ormulum*, Beilage zum Bericht der städtischen Realschule in Heiderich, 1895-96, pp.10, 57-58; the error was repeated twice in a review by C. Glaude, *Sttn*, 27 (1906), 137-39; and from these sources, presumably, comes Mustanoja's erroneous statement that the **att**-infinitive is 'occasionally found in **Ormulum**' (**NB Syntax**, p.315). It is not. Nor, incidentally, does the **till**-infinitive occur in **Orm**; Weyel discusses one at 11435 (*op. cit.*, pp.42, 57), but the reading is an error of White's edition which was corrected in **Wh**.

92 For example, David Lightfoot has suggested that the tinf, originally a noun phrase, was re-analysed as a verb phrase; see his *The Base Component as a Locus of Syntactic Change*, pp.25-27 (details in Bibliography) and *Principles of Diachronic Syntax* (Cambridge, 1979), pp.186-95. Most of his examples and those of his critics are taken from Visser, *Hist. Syntax*, who is neither reliable nor complete in his discussion of particles preceding infinitives in **Orm** (11, 1031-35).
The simplest type is *p-tinf*, where the particle is a preposition governing the infinitive. Only three particles belong here: *forr*, *off* and *wibb*. *Forrr-tinf* is very common in Old English and in Middle English generally, and a complete listing of examples would serve no purpose. The prepositional nature of *forr* can be demonstrated by examples in which a tinf is used side by side with an ordinary nominal prep0, e.g. Cristess posstless, /hatt forr be sone lufe off Crist & ec off Cristess beowwess, / & forr to rexnæunn Crisstænndum, Full blibelike swulitenn (5517, sim. 9991). And there are no adverbial examples of *forr/fore*. However, we cannot use the argument that *forr* is a preposition because it 'serves to bring its object into relationship with a third element' (cf. p.13 above), because it is not essential in an infinitive clause of purpose—indeed it even appears before some other infinitives as mere metrical padding. Some examples to illustrate the variation: To wurrhean fullhtnedd att hiss hand, & forr to takenn shrifte (9261); & twozenn landess warann himm Bitahhte forr to geatenn (8281), cf. & himm be land off Galileo Wasa all bitahht to geatenn (8277); Forr nollede nohtte to lafferrd Crist Biginnenn forr to spelenn, / Ne forr to shewnenn ohht mang menn Off hiss godccunnnde mahhte (10886), cf. he ... bigann ... to spelenn (771).

*Off-tinf* appears in hæmm hwerrt ut nohtht miss off To betenn here winness (5594, sim. 4074, 11705, 11711, 11719, 15530, 16136, 16683, 16971). These examples of the idiom *ne ben nought of*, with a tinf immediately following the particle, are matched by two examples, at 6193 and 7983, where the prep0 of *off* is an ordinary nominal prep0; there is also a positive variant: & mare issa be her off batt bing Pann off Drihtinesse wille (4659). However, just as with *forr*, we cannot assert that *off* is

93 WH print *bewoff*, which makes no sense. That *off* must govern *batt bing* is clear from the clauses which follow the quoted extract, and from the other, negative occurrences of the idiom cited above, plus perhaps V462. Palmatier misunderstands the idiom (Deser., Syntax, pp.91-92).
essential, because there is a related construction—though different idiom—What was nuw saw to seeken me. What was nuw saw to serrocheun? (8949). There are another five examples of off-tinf in Vliet's text, with parallel off-phrases in the same sentence: pe3 gëfen bins of al bat is / God helpe to the sawle / Of sobfast bilt of sob meclæxe / ... Of to 
forwerpen mokoegæs etc. / ... pe3 gëfen bins of mett & mæb / I metes 
& i drinches / & of to shilden be fra kald / ... Of to forwerpen 
swikend / ... / Of to forwerpen ille unhw / ... Of to ben buhsum to 
be prest ... (v329). 94

Wëbb-tinf is found once: & him biirbb geornenn acc batt an. His 
Drihtin wel to cwenenn / Wëbb dagwasang & wëbb uhtennsang. Wëbb mesess 
& wëbb beness. / & wëbb to leatenn awircenn himm. Pe bodic saw to pinenn. 
/ Wëbb faastang ... Wëbb oenling & wëbb vecche (6358). Once again, 
ordinary nominal prep0s occur in parallel with the tinf.

Prep-x-tinf

A variation of the preceding type permits a part of the infinitive 
clause to come between preposition and tinf. Only forx is commonly found 
in this pattern: & mikell folle was her wëbb himm. Forx himm to sen & 
hereenn (5376); batheastre batt te Leoford Crist Comu till, forx her to 
brieenn (8479). A curious example in which forx is apparently repeated is 
& her I gaddre stikkes twa ... Forx to min sune & forx to me. To 
ûrrkenn batt to fode (8651). And an example which shows the equivalence 
of forx-x-tinf and forx-prep0 is Pusa birbb himm forx be lufe off Godd, & 
forx hiss woh to betenn, / O fife wise pinenn her. His bodig & hiss

94 The strokes in the quotation indicate the lination of Ker's transcript, 
which follows Vliet's MS: one line of this text is generally equivalent 
to a half-line of the main text. The construction gifenn bins does not 
occur with off + tinf in the main text, but only as gifenn bins + off + 
prep0 (4667, 6653), as gifenn bins + tinf (851, 9068), and as gifenn bins 
+ (off +) batt-clause (see p.83 above).
sawle (7963).

To find another particle in this pattern we must have recourse to Vliet's text, where off-x-tinf occurs twice. The passage concerned is part of the section headed 'De XII Patriarchis' and continues the long extract already quoted on the previous page, so that the infinitive clauses occur in a sequence which also contains ordinary prepositional phrases:

Of læselig to liden be / sem hine leghe swexness / Of axë to filestmen wrecche men / O swillke wise gefen us / Be Pat. [so. Patriarkes] òsene (v358).

Prep-NP-tinf, syntax uncertain

I turn now to a set of examples in which a NP which is logical dir0 of the infinitive comes between a preposition and the infinitive, and where there are two possible analyses: either the preposition governs the whole infinitive clause (as in the previous set of examples), or the preposition governs the NP and the infinitive is an adnominal adjunct—what Jespersen calls a 'retroactive infinitive' (MRC, v. 221-33, esp. p.224). Both analyses are a priori plausible, the former because unequivocal examples of it have already been discussed, the latter because there are other cases which certainly involve retroactive infinitives, as for example fægær to bihelden (15662) and tiss is tunnderstamenden (16329). Sentences are discussed in this section if the deletion of the tinf would apparently leave them well formed. The particles concerned are forr, g, off, burth and wibb.

The two examples with forr are Patt whase, forr be lufe off Crist & ec off Cristess beowwess, / Sab forb to swelleten blibelis forr Crisstenndom to reygseenn . . . (5324) and & sibben, whanne it comm herto. Patt ure Leferrd wold, / C rode bolenn deb, forr us. To lesemn ut off helve . . . . (19809). The structure forr + prep0 + retroactive tinf is not very plausible for either example, and comparison with forr to
reynanen Cristendom (5320, quoted above, p.90) makes the analysis untenable in the former case.

The example with o is Forr nase hies mahht o ba To xifenn, ge to sellem (12189). The two syntactic readings are represented by the translations 'for he had no power over these things, to give or to sell them' and 'for his power was not in giving or selling these things' (i.e., 'did not extend to giving ...'). The closest parallels in Oyn are the many examples of mahht + tinf (e.g. at B241, 2559, 7979, 9406, 11308, 19359) and one example of mahht + off-phrase (12212). It is not clear to me whether o represents off or oyn.

The example with off comes at the end of the following extract:

Forh hebenndom & heben nhif & hebenh folekess herste / Iss harrd . . . . & stunt & stidiz, all & alaw To sekenn sawless scollhe, / & dumh, & def, & blind off Godd To onawenn & to cuwen (9877). It is common enough for a tinf to be used in construction with an adjective so that the (implicit) head of the adjective and subject of the infinitive are the same: thus slaw to sekenn (in the extract above), full to winenn (10221), god to verenn (13738). It is also possible for blind to be construed with an off-phrase, e.g. blind off hefenlike lene (16310). But the syntax of the passage in question is difficult.95 We may argue either that off governs the whole infinitive clause Godd to onawenn & to cuwenn, or that off governs Godd, which is followed by retroactive infinitives. Support for the latter analysis comes from a passage which does not permit the former kind of analysis: Patt he waass magystre off all mannkinn, To wissenn & to leren (12932). Returning to the example in question, an interesting comparison can be made with bliss of herte bet comb of god to

95 It is interesting that MHD uses this quotation selectively s.vv. def adj., 2,(b) 'unwilling to hear' and dumh, dumh adj., 4.(a) 'unenlightened . . . .', in the first case with, and in the second without the infinitives to onawenn & to cuwenn.
louie (Avemb. 93.17) and 'ylblised byeb be het habbeb honger and borat of
r-utilynnesse' het is of god to servu and to louie (Avemb. 183.22). 96

Although The Avenbite of Inwyt is not by itself a safe guide to ME idiom,
it would be a remarkable coincidence if both Orm and Dan Michel had inde-
dependently imitated a foreign construction or left the same anacolutha in
their texts. It would seem that the various sentences discussed in this
section represent genuine ME idiom.

The example with hurth is forr batt he molle willethenn: / He forrhenn
hurth an idell word To wrathenn her o life (624). This gives good sense if
glossed as 'because he did not wish to transgress, not even by uttering an
idle word in this life'—that is, with the whole infinitive clause dependent
on hurth. It happens, though, that similar clauses are found without any
infinitive next to word: Swa batt he hurth an idell word Ne sholld he imm
nobht forrwillten  (3202, 9143). That might suggest that the infinitive is
retroactive. A third possibility in this case is that to willethenn actually
goes with molle, the tinf being used because of the wide separation from
the auxiliary verb: such usage would be unique in Orm but not unusual
elsewhere in ME. 97

The example with wibb is & wha sitt ies batt takaeb wibb. His
witness tunderrflanegen. / He settebe merrke off...  (17960). Since
the collocation takaeb wibb is frequently found with abstract prep0s (e.g.
lare (104)), there is no intrinsic reason why hiss witness should not be
pre0 of wibb in the quoted example. In fact this is not likely, because
agreeing to accept is being contrasted with disdaining to accept, expressed
in the previous clause as follows: & niis man mann batt kepebb ohht His
witness tunderrflanegen (17978). Kepenn in this sense does not take a

96 The examples are given by E. Einenkel, 'Entwicklung', pp.66-67 and
Visser, Hist. Syntax, ii, 1054; they are not the only ones in Avemb.
97 See for example Mustanoja, ME Syntax, p.522.
diro inOrm. Therefore *wibb* must be governing the infinitive clause.

None of the six examples discussed presents any serious problem of meaning, but those involving *off* and *burgh* seem to me to pose syntactic problems. There is no evidence that they might be ungrammatical or unidiomatic: on the contrary, the variety of examples, including parallels from another text, implies that they are normal. Further justification may be found in closely analogous examples which have the string *trans. V-NP-tinf* instead of *prep-NP-tinf*, again with an ambiguity of structure:

1. *Purhh bätt witt hafenn takenn ba An reddellboc to folgennenn (97)*
2. *Siff bätt tu lufesset weorelæbing To winnenenn ohht wibb sinne (4668)*
3. *& husam till his a lallermann. Pat hæfebb hima to setenn (5904)*
4. *Till alle pa bätt lufennitt [ac. Godess laren], & lernennitt to lernenn (7418)*
5. *To winnenennitt [ac. heffness bissae] to brukenn (14151)*

*Particle-tinf, syntax uncertain*

In the previous section I discussed particles which were clearly prepositional, but whose object was open to question. In this section I consider particles which may be prepositional and governing a *tinf*, or which may instead be intransitive. The particles involved are *inn, off, onn, til, to, uppenn, and wibb.*

*Stanndenn + inn + tinf* is one of the commonest verb–particle idioms in Orm, occurring thirty-five times in the WH text. Given that *stanndenn* on its own may be construed with a *tinf* (e.g. at 972, 3894, 9870, 10331), and so too *stanndenn upp* (16138), the obvious analysis of *stanndenn inn* is that *inn* is an adverb conferring an idiomatic sense on *stanndenn*, and this is what OED chooses, s.v. *stand v.* B.95a 'to strive, continue insistently'. But whereas the only quotations under this heading come from Orm, there are a number of examples dated a1300 to a1632 of

98. 9297, 1404, 1954, 2149, 2259, 2617, 2695, 3794, 3977, 4241, 4412, 4510, 4652, 5684, 6346, 6521, 7178, 7965, 7985, 8030, 9007, 11152, 11182, 11135, 12540, 13226, 13448, 13636, 13654, 15266, 15342, 15716, 15728, 15742, 17739. There are further examples at V320, V326.
stand + in + prepO in senses like 'persevere in etc.' (B.72b), which suggests the possibility that the idiom in *Orm* actually involves prepositional *inn* with a dependent infinitive. Four reasons can be given for rejecting the possibility. *Inn* is separated from the tinf in at least three cases by manner adverbials which go with *stàndenn (inn)* and not with the tinf (1404, 2149, 11182): the only elements found elsewhere between a preposition and a dependent tinf have belonged to the infinitive clause; see appropriate examples in the previous two sections. The particle always has the form *inn*, which is typically adverbial in *Orm*—never *a.* The position of *inn* seems to be very tightly constrained: the string *stàndenn inn* is never inverted and only once interrupted—by *itt* (3977)—whereas idiomatic class 3 group-verbs can allow greater positional variation. For example, preposition precedes verb in instances of *fàllenn + till* (13582), *hàldenn + wibb* (8406), *lefenn + (uppo)(inn)* (3853), whilst in *takkenn + wibb* (1380) prep comes well after verb. Finally, a crucial example in Vlist's text is difficult to reconcile with the hypothesis that the tinf depends on *inn*: Birb standen in a nimen gom / To folgen al be biune / Of all bat halge *Floec* (V326). Here the same tinf complements both *standen in* and *nimen gom*. *Nimen gom* cannot take a dir0, only a clausal complement or a prep0 (e.g. 5086), so the to of *to folgen* retains some 'prepositional force' (cf. Sustencoja, *ME Syntax*, p.514). If *in* were a prepositional particle, then the to of *to folgen* would presumably be a non-prepositional marker of the

99The form *a* is normal for the preposition in pre-NP position before consonants, though usage before *a* varies. *Inn drinniking* (19063) is an exception. Conversely, the adverbial particle is regularly *inn*, at 1076, 14550, 14504, 14910, and in *inn till* (massin), *inn to* (635, 8706), and *inn wibb* (16373). There is perhaps one exception, *Butt iff mann zafe *a* mare* (10182).

100It is not certain that the difference is due to the fact that *inn* is adverbial: it might be to do with a greater degree of idiomaticness, or the fact that the collocation is followed by a tinf.
infinitive. Of course, Vlist sometimes conflated passages in order to illustrate concisely the meaning of a word (Kor, 'Unpublished Parts', p.3) and the cited passage is not a complete sentence, but it is coherent and metrical as far as it goes. The weight of evidence, then, is that steannenn inn is a class 1 combination, with inn adverbial.

Blinnenn + off + tinf occurs twice: Siff bätt tegr poht he blinnenn off To fellsenn Godess ville (10047), Patt te deofell wefre / Ne blinnenn off to scranenn hinn Patt haffenn himm forswynenn (11466).

Blinenn + tinf seems to mean the same, 'cease to do sth.', and occurs at 4505, 14565, 15138, possibly 12843, and V99. The reference books indicate that the common constructions of the verb blinnen are

1. V + inf (OE only)
2. V + tinf; V + for + tinf
3. V(intr.) + of + NP (where the NP can be a verbal noun)
4. V(tr.) + NP

We may add V + of (Cleaneness 440). The pattern V + of + tinf is found only in Orm. It could be a blend of (2) V + tinf and (3) V + of + NP, given Orm's noun-like use of the tinf. Unfortunately, blinnenn is only ever used in Orm with a tinf, never with a nominal complement, with or without off.

Semantically the nearest equivalent is lesteen, which is construed with an off-phrase: & ter zihht ter I let off himm Per wile I nu biginnenn (9125).

So it is plausible that off in the quoted examples should be a preposition governing the to-infinitives, but it cannot be ruled out that off is adverbial: the evidence is insufficient. If off is in fact adverbial,

101. Another way of stating the same thing is to say that the infinitive clause headed by to folgen must be a NP if it is dependent on prepositional in, but cannot be a NP as complement of nimen com. Therefore in is not a preposition.

102. BT(S) s.v. blinnen; MED s.v. blinnen; OED s.v. blin, blinn; and Visser, Hist. Syntax, iii-1, 1385 and iii-2, 1900-01.

103. The syntactic ambiguity has been recognised by others. Weyel writes: 'Bei blinnen off und lesteen off ist off augenscheinlich in Übergang zum Adverb begriffen, vgl. me. leave off' (Synt. Gebrauch, p.57). Visser, discussing Orm 10047, writes: 'But this off may be an adverb belonging to blinnen [sic]', as. rather than a preposition (Hist. Syntax, ii, 1034 note 1). Palmetier takes off as a preposition which is a marker of the progressive (Descr. Syntax, pp.91-92); cf. note 93.
then it would presumably have an Aktionsart value, as in the later example
Bed blynne of be ravn (Cleanness 440). This may be equivalent to (and a
replacement of?) the OE prefix a- seen in . . . ne abldin to asendenne . . .
(AChom ii, 5, 54). 104

Letenn + adv + off + tinf occurs once: . . . Drihtiness micole
teness. / Acc forrbi batt mann illke ser. Hemm seb onn ane wise. / Forrbi
mann lastep litell off To wundreom ohht tarenne (15471). Since an earlier
section paid particular attention to leten of, it is appropriate to list
all the sixteen examples in Orm for the light they throw both on the
earlier discussion and on the present example:

1. Peg33 shulem letenn hæpelig Off unknorr swinne (D79)
2. Te birrb . . . letenn swiðe unornelig & litell off be sellfenn
   (3743)
3. & bett tu lasteset off batt ping Pann off Drihtiness wille (4660)
4. Patt tu well swiðe unornelig A33 off be sellfenn la-te (4858, 4886)
5. Forr swa þu lasteset lasse off pe, Swa lastep Drihtin mare (4896)
6. Pa þatt letenn hæpelig Off Godess halgehe laire (7408)
7. Uss birrb letenn unornelig & litell off uss sellfenn, / & letenn
   wef off opræ menn (7525)
8. & swa þeg33 letenn wel off batt Patt Abraham hemm streonde (9821)
9. Crist let wel off Natanael (13608)
10. Forrbi mann lastep litell off To wundreom ohht tarenne (15474, as
    already quoted above)
11. & Jesu Crist wel unnerestod All þeg3re wicke trowwhe, / . . . & let
    lihtned þeroffe (15514)
12. Pa þatt lastenn wel off Crist & off hiss halghe laire (18210)
13. Forrbi þeg33 letenn mare inoch Off Johan þeg3re maegstre, / Pann off
    pe Laferrd Crist (18244)
14. Puss letenn þeg33 off Jesu Crist Purrh þeg3re depe sine (19707)

The length of the list confirms the frequency of the idiom c. 1200. The
coupling of unornelieg and litell in (2) and (7) suggests strongly that
litell, lasse, mare, etc in this construction were apprehended as adverbs
by Orm; cf. note 68 above. Most of the examples have off governing a nomi-
nal object, though in (8) the object is a finite clause and in (10), appar-
ently, an infinitive clause. There is an alternative analysis of the
latter, however, based on the fact that Letenn + adv may take a tinf without

104 Also in Sweet's Reader XIII. 54 and AChom (Thorpe) ii. 74. 10.
the intervention of off: Forr whatt he let full hembeli. To lefenn & to
trowwenn, / Patt . . . (11593; sim. V513), Patt he ne let nohht hembeli;
Hiss gunngre forr to follshenn (13272). In the light of these examples,
(10) could be analysed as a blend of two constructions:
Mann l esteemed (Drihtiness miccle tacness)
to wannrenn ohht onn (Drihtiness miccle tacness)
Given the two plausible analyses of example (10), it provides a good in-
stance of quasi-ellipsis.

Brinnenn + dirO + onn + tinf occurs seven times, e.g. Forr swa to
brinnenn marnkinn onn To acornenn affter litell (3702); the other occur-
rences are at 7717, 10360, 11455, 12340, 12486, and 12498. The meaning is
approximately 'persuade sb. to do sth.' A similar idiom is found with
dragshenn: Forr swa to dragshenn folle upponn To follshenn bezre lare
(15364); upponn is evidently a mere variant of onn metri cause, as so often
in prepositional function. The idiom turns up once with a reflexive dirO:
Patt tecx ne drache nohht henn onn To follshenn ille bewesse (6850). In
all nine cases the particle precedes the tinf directly, but across the mid-
line break. Both verbs are used elsewhere with a dirO and tinf but without
particle—brinnenn at 10021 and 13229, dragshenn at 18156 and perhaps
10115—which is an argument for analysing onn as an adverb, but the point
cannot be pressed too hard; cf. the discussions of blinnenn off, p.97
above, and bringen on, pp.72-73 above.

There is one example of takenn + onn + tinf: Per zho toc onn full
aldei. To fraggnenn Godess emgell, / All hu zho shollde . . . (2553).
Synonymous expressions used in the same context are bigenn to fraggnenn
(2291) and toc . . . to fraggnenn (2199). In fact takenn + tinf meaning
'begin to do sth.' is very common altogether. There is only one other
example of takenn onn in the sense 'begin', and there onn is clearly
adverbial: & ziff hu takeest onn att en & tellesst forb till fowvre
(11260). All this makes it highly probable that onn is an adverb in 2553.

The particle till presents special problems because of its near-
synonymy with to. That till can be adverbial is shown by such usages as
Gab till, & garrkebb Godess wæs (9199); there are altogether ten occurrences of *gen/genngenn till* in the sense 'get going'. When *till* precedes a tinf, we may distinguish three possibilities: (A) there is no relationship between *till* and the tinf; (B) *till* is elliptical for the whole infinitive clause—only possible if the *to* of the tinf retains some prepositional character; (C) *till* is a preposition governing the infinitive—only possible if *to* is a non-prepositional marker of the infinitive. I shall refer to these configurations as types A, B, and C, respectively.

There are two examples of *beon + medig + till + tinf*: *Acc giff bu waro medig till To nitennitt att aude* (12244), *Forrhbi wasse he riht medig till To wisenn him & lerenn* (16998). (*Beon +) *medig + tinf* is also current (2527, 4428, 6420, 12936), also *forr + tinf* (11757). No differences of meaning or emphasis are apparent. Type A is surely out of the question, but there is little to choose between B and C. Rhythm perhaps favours B, as does the semantic similarity to the elliptical/anticipative *till* of *gen* *till*.

*Cumenn + till + tinf* occurs twice: the first occurrence is *...I Bebblemess cheastr, / Pur ba twa gensess comenn till. To lefenn uppo Criste* (6831). The simplest analysis has *till* as a directional particle, possibly governing *ber*; cf. *Patt cheastr hatt te Leferrd Crist Comm till, forr ber to bigenn* (8479). The second is *& tobb bätt Sannte Peterr wass Ar borenn her to manne, / Pohwhewbree comm he lahtre till To lefenn uppo Criste* (13204). An earlier part of the same passage, *comenn till be Leferrd Crist ... sohhtenn Crist onn erbe, / To lefenn uppnenn himm* (13196), suggests that *till* is a directional adverb in the extract under discussion. Thus both examples are type A and can be eliminated from consideration in this section.

*Habben + lefe + till + tinf* appears once: *& giff begg haffdenn lefe till All afterr hezare ville / To takenn off he Maheleod Patt tat* *tegg sholldenn nitennn ...* (10229). *Habben + lefe + tinf* is found at
13210, and xifenn + lefe + tinf at 12196 and 16216. It is clear that
till is inserted in the cited example 'he rime awa to fillenn', just as in
the redix examples. The separation of till and tinf argues for type B here.

Takenn + till + tinf is found four times: & burrh batt he forrrwerr-
pebb all Hisse fishease fulle wille, / & takebb till wibbb all hiss mahht
Gaeltike lif to follechenn (17230); & takebb till wibbb blibe mod Gaeltike
lif to ledenn (17246), 17310); & takeenn till full innwerrdli; Burrr
shrifftte & burrh ddbote / To wreshenn all here schenn woh (17841).
Semantically the till may be entirely superfluous, given that takenn +
tinf means 'begin to do sth.', although a conceivable contextual meaning
of takenn till + tinf is 'break with the past, begin to do sth. different
and persist in it', to judge from the evidence here. Syntactically the
examples are type B, considering the wide separation of till and tinf,
especially in the last example.

There is a single instance of turrmenn + reflexive object + till +
tinf: Forr Crist, son summ he fullhtnedd wase & stichenn upp o strande, /
Forrrbricht anan he turrende hissen till To biddenn hisse bernes / Upp till
hiss Federr (11154). There is a superficial resemblance to the type A till
seen in the cueenn till examples, but I am inclined to assign this to type
C because of the comparison with a till-phrase in Patt sume . . . turrmenn
fra be labe gast & turrmenn heann till Criste (6606), and with a tinf in
Butt iff hezz muqennn turrmenn heann To betenn bezzre gilltase (15672,
15894, sim. 19637). Of course, types B and C differ only in degree if we
grant that there is a cline between adverb and preposition, and our example
can be seen as an intermediate type.

Apparent examples of to introducing a tinf all turn out to have some
other explanation; see lines 9339, 6134, 6632.

Finally in this section comes an example involving takenn + wibbb +
tinf: Patt dide he forr to showenn / Patt uss ne birrb nohht takenn wibbb,
3iff ani; mann uss exsebb, / To doh ohht orr to speckenn ohht. Off ifell &
off sinne (11840). We have to consider the possibility that *takenn wibb* governs the tins, because of the example discussed above, pp.94-95. But three reasons can be given for rejecting the possibility and taking *wibb* as an elliptical preposition: (i) the elements intervening between *wibb* and the tins do not belong to the infinitive clauses; (ii) *wibb* governing a tinf presupposes a nominal analysis of the tinf, with *to* as a mere marker, whereas government by *eggenn* (which certainly does go with the tins in question) implies that the *to* retains some prepositional value;¹⁰⁵ (iii) the extract in question is actually the second member of a rhetorical antithesis, the first member of which is *Patt did he forr to shawenn /

Patt usa birrb takenn vel burwibb. Siff anig mann usa lerebb, / To stizhenn upp till haliz lif & upp till hezhe mahhtese (11824). It now becomes obvious that *wibb* is elliptical and is used because the negation has left no room for *burwibb* or *wibball*.¹⁰⁶

There is additional, indirect evidence of particles introducing infinitives, in the shape of particles which govern a pro-form that stands for an infinitive (and which may have an infinitive in apposition to it). Two caveats are necessary. It is not certain that the pro-form specifically represents the infinitive: it may stand for an abstract proposition, as for example in *Zhe ne wass nobht twr onnyw* (2371). And the fact that a tinf is in loose apposition to a prep0 does not prove that the tinf itself could have been dependent on the particle. I quote some possible examples below, with brief comment where necessary.

* & forr to tuurnenn ure luaset All toward heftiness blisse, / To

¹⁰⁵ I assume that *eggenn* is not used absolutely but is construed with the tins, from the fact that it is not elsewhere used in *Orm* without an accompanying *to*-phrase or tinf.

¹⁰⁶ Room could have been created by the omission of *nobht*, but that would have led to a clash of word and metric accent on *takenn*. And omission of *nobht* is syntactically (as well as metrically) unlikely anyway: see C. B. Jack, 'Negative Adverbs in Early Middle English', ES, 59 (1978), 295-309.
hernenn aga beraffterr her. To winnenn itt to brukenn (14148). The problem here is to decide whether beraffterr anticipates the tinf to winnenn, given that ge(o)rnenn may be construed + affterr + prep0 (e.g. 3245) or simply + tinf (e.g. 12140). The answer is probably not, since the simplest explanation is that aga beraffterr forms a temporal adverbial.

Off nan bing elless niss he nohht. Butt off bott an bing ane. / To stanndenn inn to ewennenn himm (7983). The use of ne been nohht off + tinf has already been vouched for above, p. 90.

Uss birrh birnenn rod to don. & haldenn a baronnne (3252); cf. Icc hold o childess bweess (8054). These examples bear on the discussion of holden on p. 73 above.

& himm birrh mfre stanndenn inn. To lefenn Gadd & wurrhenn. / & aga himm birrh been fressh berro. Bi dayess & bi ribhettess (6346). All birrh be don bin mahht berro. To xenenn hire & roten (6186, sim. 12090); cf. Purrh bott tu dicesst all bin mahht To betenn bine sinness (7979). Purrh bott I do min luest berro. To don summ heffic sinne (11817). All of these are straightforward.

& tacenbh niss to sobe / Pa mahhtess bott te laferrd Crist. Uss sette forr to folgenn. / & gaff uss bissene himm selff berro. To fillenn henn & folgenn (4545). Berro may be in apposition to to fillenn henn & folgenn—cf. xifenn + biss + tinf at 851, 9068—but possibly it refers to be mahhtess, although "heroff would have been expected (cf. Uss gaff heroffe bissene (4967)). Last in this group of examples involving to we have Patt all isu turnnedd to bott au. To winnenn affterr ahhte (16018).

For umbenn we have the example tu leressst henn . . . To beowutenn an Allmehhtid Odd . . . & aga to hen umbenn batt au. To winnenn eche blisse (1534); cf. the discussion of hen umben on pp. 71-72 above. The

107 For completeness one should mention that ge(o)rnenn can also be construed + dir0 (e.g. 1363) or + batt-clause (e.g. 7601).
particle always has the form uuembe and metrical accent on the first syllable elsewhere in Orm.

Finally, for wibb there is an example already quoted (p.102 above): Patt uas birrb takann wal berwibb, Siff amig manu uas lerrebb, / To stichenn upp . . . (11825). The bow in berwibb may equally well represent the proposition which follows or specifically anticipate the infinitive to stichenn.

Reviewing the examples discussed in this section, we find indications of quasi-ellipsis in the following: blinnenn off, latenn off, bringenn onn, drachenn (upp)onn, beon rexxi till, habben lafe till, takann till, turnenn till. All but the first two named are closer to the adverbial/elliptical side of the border than to the prepositional.

PARTICLES OCCURRING IN ORMULUM

The discussion of Orm in this and the next three chapters is based on a collection of particle occurrences which is in intention complete. Only the following cases have been ignored or recorded selectively: particles which introduce finite clauses; to as infinitive marker; forr introducing a to-infinitive; clause- and sentence-modifying adverbials like forrbi, to benn, herafftert, herfore, herburrh; prepositions in pre-NP position; prefixes.

I close the chapter with a list of particles found in Orm, subdivided into prefixes, prepositions, adverbs (including some which can also serve as prefixes and/or prepositions), and marginal items. Many decisions are implicit in the layout I have chosen. For example, i, inn and inne are treated as one. Now it is easy to show that i and inn are conditioned variants of one word (see note 99 above); whether or not inne is also 'the same' word is more a matter of discretion. Likewise it seems reasonable to me to distinguish the prefixes att-, forr- and to- from the
prepositions att and forr and preposition/adverb to, using semantic considerations above all; cf. pp.79-80 above. It is less clear whether oferr- prefix and oferr preposition/adverb are to be distinguished as different lexical items: I have chosen not to. I have tried to apply commonsense, synchronic considerations, taking into account similarity or dissimilarity of form and of distribution—which with low frequency items boils down to apparent identity or difference of meaning. In deciding to list ut off but not, say, upp till as a compound preposition, I have considered frequency of collocation and of contiguity of the elements, but without any formal statistical argument. There is a gradience here.\textsuperscript{108}

**Items which serve only as verbal and nominal prefixes**

A-, ann-/onnd-, att-, forr-, se-/i-, miss-, orr-, sunderr-, to-, unnd, wiberr-

**Items which serve only as prepositions**

Afferr, amang/mang, att, baffenn, bi, bigomndenn, bihinndenn, binebenn, binnenn, butenn, (fore)\textsuperscript{109}/forr, forrbbi, fre, fraawrd, inn till, innto, inn wibb, midd, can ufenn, tekenn, tozewees, towarrd, burrh, ummebo/ummbenn, umnderr, ut off.

**Items which can be spatial adverbs**

In this context 'spatial' adverb is interpreted widely, to include derived uses; what is excluded is temporal and manner adverbs and other

\textsuperscript{108} Similar problems beset the student of BE: see, for example, the article by Vestergaard cited on p.34 note 21 above.

\textsuperscript{109} I place fore in brackets because it occurs only in bermfore: I do not know whether it might have had a separate existence inOrm's English.

\textsuperscript{110} See Burchfield, 'Ornualum: Words Copied', p.104, s.v. ufenn.
kinds of adverb remote from the particle system. Items are included here even if they can also serve as prepositions or prefixes, and in some cases where there are no certain instances of adverbial use—but where the item cannot certainly be assigned to the 'preposition only' category either: abufenn/bibufenn/bufenn, abutenn, afterrrward, awesg, biforenn/biforr, bitwenenn, dun, dunnward, forberr, forh, pow/pymeas/ynnomo/omnymeas, hindenn, 111 i/inne, (o) 112/off/affe, o/oom/onne, o bonch, oferr/off, omnfaes, till, to, uno/unpe, umno/unpeun, upward, ut/ute, utten wibb/ utwibb, wibb/wibball/(wibb alle), 113 wibbinenn, wibbiuteq.

Particle-like items

Here I give a set of peripheral items which bear some resemblance in behaviour to items in the previous lists. First there are the generalised spatial adverbs: her(e), hebenn, hebenirward, hiderr, ker(e), bebenn, biderr, biderrward, 114 wher(e), whebenirward, whiderrward. Then comes a miscellaneous collection: all, att herme/hem, efft, full, heh, neh/nheh, e lofitt, rinh, samenn, tosaddr, to (be) grund(e), tosemenn, ummehtrin, umnderrfot. 115

111 See Burchfield, 'Ormulum: Words Copied', p.100, s.v.

112 I refer to o (12189), which may be a form either of off or of omm: see p.93.

113 The phrase wibb alle is very common in some such sense as 'besides, moreover', e.g. at 9290, 4705; in some instances it appears to mean 'entirely': see especially 16788. Neither of these meanings would justify inclusion in the list as a variant of wibb/wibball. However, there is an occurrence of wibb alle at 12969 which can be interpreted as a metrical variant of wibball; the example is discussed in Chapter 6 below.

114 See Burchfield, 'Ormulum: Words Copied', p.103, s.v.

115 It would be possible to extend the list to include, say, att sb's hamndesæ, att inne, lic, unnlic. The cut-off point is bound to be arbitrary.