CHAPTER SIX: CLASS 3 (THE PREPOSITIONAL VERB)

Previous work

Much of what has been written on the origins of class 3 has been directed to explaining its most striking characteristic, the prepositional passive. The most important contribution has been Gaaf's paper of 1930, 'The Passive of a Verb accompanied by a Preposition', which covers much of the relevant material. Gaaf points to the significance of preposition stranding (not by that name, of course), repetition of the preposition in relative clauses, semantic unity of verb-preposition pairs, equivalence to a single transitive verb, dissolution of OE compound verbs, loss of the indefinite pronoun man. On the significance of the order of verb and preposition he is mistaken and even contradictory: see the sections below on Verb-particle order. There are also other factors to consider and supplementary material to add to his, in some cases antedating it. His paper remains the basis of subsequent accounts.

Jespersen's scattered comments on the syntax and position of prepositions, and on the semantics of class 3 group-verbs, were published between the late 1920s and 1940s.¹ He does not provide a coherent account of class 3, but his observations are useful, as are his examples, mainly from the ModE period. He adds the important test of the sharing of an object NP by a class 3 group-verb and an ordinary transitive verb (MEG, iii, 272-75). Visser has that point too, and the same, solitary ME example, within a clearly organised account that provides far fuller exemplification (Hist.

¹The main references are MEG, iii, 139, 161, 184-95, 252-77, 312-15; v, 485-86; vii, 72-76.
Visser does not contribute any new ideas. The value of his contribution is the copiousness of his data, though several individual examples are mis-classified and early examples of some crucial patterns are sparse or lacking. Most serious is his misunderstanding of passives with a particle in pre-verbal position, for which see the section on Passivization below.

De la Cruz restates many of Gaaf's points and contributes useful material on class 3 as a means of forming transitive group-verbs from intransitive formatives ('13o Change'). He attempts to relate class 3 to classes 1, 2 and 6 in a structural analysis, as Gaaf had already done, less systematically, for classes 3 and 6. I shall take this point up below in the section on Verb-particle systems. De la Cruz is least convincing on the mechanism by which prepositional passives first appear: see the section on the Indirect passive below. The relation between the prepositional passive and the indirect passive—by which I mean a passive whose subject corresponds to an indirect object in the active—is also touched on in more general accounts of the history of the English passive which have appeared recently.

Most use already-known data, mainly Visser's, as evidence in theoretical controversies about the form of grammar and syntactic change, and about such issues as transformationally-versus lexically-derived passives, which are outside the scope of this study.

In this chapter the OE and ME periods are treated together in a

---

2 Visser gives useful bibliographical lists of earlier work at Hist. Syntax, i, 410 and iii-2, 2133.


4 Bennett in fact argues that this particular issue does not affect his analysis of the prepositional passive, which is similar to the one given here; see 'English Passives', p.109.
detailed account of the factors contributing to the development of class 3. The proposed diachronic account is then tested against the relevant material from ORM.
PREPOSITION STRANDING

Some kinds of preposition stranding have been normal in English from the earliest recorded material, others are of more recent origin. The relative clause with zero pronoun (e.g. the house I live in) is rare before the thirteenth century, and the interrogative patterns (e.g. Which (house) does he live in?) are rare before the early ModE period. In those patterns which do occur in OE the stranded preposition is usually placed before rather than after the verb. The kinds of preposition stranding found in OE are the relative, comparative and infinitive clause types. Many are given incidentally among the examples printed by Harrison, Sep. Prefixes, and Gaaf collects examples systematically both for OE and ME ('Passive', pp.3-11), as do the other scholars mentioned previously. Gaaf's examples include clauses with a dirO, that is class 5, as well as class 3 without.

Syntactic patterns which involve preposition stranding have the effect of placing the preposition close to the verb—nearly always adjacent to it—and away from the dependent NP, which is either placed earlier in the clause or is not overtly present in the clause at all. Preposition stranding therefore imposes a positional relationship on verb and particle and on particle and object (if any) which helps make possible the

---

5 Visser has one zero relative with preposition stranding dated c.1065, one more from the thirteenth century, and a number from the fourteenth century onwards (Hist. Syntax, i, 404, 541-42); other possible thirteenth century examples are Ley. Brut A 15517, Hey. 253. The earliest interrogatives found by Jespersen (ENG, v, 385) and Visser (Hist. Syntax, i, 406) are late sixteenth century. Cynthia Allen says that she knows of two thirteenth century examples ('Movement and Deletion in Old English', LIN, 11 (1980), 261-323 (p.284)).

6 See the PE examples given above, p.15, and the discussion in K. B. Charnley, 'The Syntax of Deferred Prepositions', AN, 24 (1949), 268-77.
restructuring to be discussed in a later section, by which the particle comes to be grouped with the verb syntactically.

**Verb–particle order**

Gaaf shows that the typical word-order for preposition stranding in OE is particle before verb, which persists especially in verse throughout the ME period; but that sporadically in OE⁷ and with increasing regularity from early ME onwards, the usual order is V–p. He suggests that the transposition of the particle to give V–p order is a 'potent factor in the origin and development' of the class 3 passive ('Passive', p.3), a belief echoed by other scholars.⁸ In fact the replacement of p–V order by V–p order is of negligible importance in the origin of the passive: several early class 3 passives, including Gaaf's own first citation ('Passive', p.19), actually have p–V order. The crucial factor is not the order of verb and particle but the separation of particle and NP and the juxtaposition of particle and verb. It is therefore necessary to demonstrate that these conditions obtain as much with p–V order as with V–p order (where, of course, there is no doubt).

First the separation of particle and NP. Comparative and infinitive clauses achieve it automatically by the absence of any overt prep0 within the clause, whilst for relative clauses Mitchell writes that 'the subject

---

⁷Gaaf gives three OE examples ('Passive', pp.7); Visser repeats one of them and quite erroneously adds MSol 460 (Hist. Syntax, i, 397); I can adduce with help from Dr Mitchell (private letter, 18 June 1977) or 21.15, FPs 86.3, 141.4, (?) Paad 43 in class 3; Bo 95.22, Net 28.80 in class 6.

⁸Cf. R. Körner: 'A basic condition for the syntactical displacement of the preposition is that the preposition can release itself from the rection and be placed after the verb or verbal unit' ('The Prepositional Passive: A Contribution to West-European Syntax', MSprěk, 43 (1949), 53–67 (p.56)). And Mustanoja: 'The type he is laughed at . . . seems to be due to a process beginning in late OE, the immediate result of which is that particularly in relative he– and hot–clauses the preposition is regularly placed after the verb; the verb and the preposition ("postponed preposition") eventually come to be regarded as a syntactical unit' (ME Syntax, p.113, sim. p.441).
at least will usually intervene between [relative he and particle]' ('Prepositions etc', p.249). His comment on OE applies equally well to those ME examples which retain p-V order.

Next the juxtaposition of particle and verb. Gaaf asserts that the particle is with very rare exceptions placed immediately before the lexical verb in OE when it is 'detached from the element of the sentence to which it belongs' ('Passive', p.2), i.e. the prep0. All but two of his many examples bear him out, and they, as it happens, are both class 6 passive. In similar vein, Mitchell writes of OE patterns with the order NP-(x)-p-(x)-V that the particle 'is almost invariably found directly before the simple verb . . . unless of course ne intervenes' ('Prepositions etc', p.250). The only other elements he finds intervening between p and V are direct objects of V and complements of the copula, both of which rule out class 3 anyway. The same generalisations apply to those ME examples which retain p-V order. Whether in p-V or V-p order, only a small minority of examples show any element intervening between verb and particle, and even then in p-V order it is usually proclitic ne or to. Hence there are no grounds for claiming that the relative order of verb and particle plays any part in the syntactic restructuring which groups them together.

**Topicalisation of prepositional object**

An important kind of preposition stranding which Gaaf neglects entirely is that caused by the topicalisation of a prep0, as in PE That house I could never live in. Visser has but three ME examples (Hist. Syntax, i, 399), all fourteenth century, so it is worth adding more to show that the pattern is well attested. As for OE, Cynthia Allen makes the following point in her important, TC-based article: 'Examples of preposition stranding with topicalized pronouns are extremely common in OE

---

9cp 180.12 and B1Hom 9.1, cited at 'Passive', p.4.
literature, while preposition stranding with topicalised full noun phrases is extremely rare' ('Movement', p.287). Wende, to whom she refers, gives the following possible examples of the latter in class 3 (Nachgestellte Präp., pp.137-38): *Wenu mu bet be anum belache hweartun & billecu unrotnes on becum & anum oðrum node swalc ne on becom* (Bo 20.17), *Bam folce code stoforan synaleCodes wolun* (ACHom lii. 12.109). Others are more dubious, the particle being almost certainly a prefix or an adverb. I can add *Fresond ic gemene wið* (NCharm 11.37).

Examples from ME include the following:

*pulliche dunes be gode pawel spek of* (AW 103a,22)¹⁰
*Nosen wið ute vampe's ligge in hwa se likeð* (AW 113b,13)
*ah be gode ich ga* [MS R: am] as *bisiliche abuten* (SW 30.35)
*Pan kinge he code to-foren* (Lay. Brut A 7022)
*ne sculde him nooder gon fore* gold ne na *garmeume* (ibid. 11404)
*momiane kinge he feht wið* (ibid. 14455)
*alle his chiptes he spec þus wið* (Lay. Brut B 7503)
*Here hors is fet bai laime vnder* (Bevis A 640)
*Sir B. shilde þe Lycon rame vnder* (ibid. 2454)
*Iosian he com agen to* (ibid. 3209)
*Pe castel ass he gode aboute, / For to diuise þe stoures stoute* (ibid. 3871)
*bau vigurse group be warleu in* (Curseror 2505)¹¹
*be tre scoo start al gloppend fra* (Curseror 8901; ODD)
*ay þe ma temptacions, & þe greuoer, þai stonde agayne* (Rolle [Horstman] i.12.4)

*Nulch sorw I walke with* (Lyric, MEWP VIIIC.4)
*Goddes payne and his passion pure salde penke I on* (PPL. B V.404)¹²
*A better barbican pat burne blusched vpon newer* (Gay 795)
*Now 'brid tymes prove best' penk on þe morne* (ibid.1680)
*Naynly his marschel þe mayster vpon calles* (Cleanness 1427)
*And þis I prayow yalle not offe* (Fast.L. 62.23)

The fronting of a personal pronoun in OE is usually not for the purpose of foregrounding it—on the contrary. Nevertheless the effect on verb-particle syntax is just the same, whether or not we choose to use the term 'topicalisation'. There are countless examples in OE of the type *him*

¹⁰ The construction in other MSS is quite different: *Pullich dun wes be code Pawel* (AR (Cleopatra) 177.18, sim. Nero 173.26, Titus 140.11, Pepys 165.27).

¹¹ Example from E. S. Olszewska, 'Types of Norse Borrowing in Middle English', *Saga-Book*, 11 (1935), 153-60 (p.159).

¹² This line is much altered by scribes. Schmidt in his edition prints *on it* (V.405), *Bennett bereon* (V.411), both with manuscript authority.
com on Codex wrecu (Or 88.27), and they remain very common in early ME, e.g. & him com towmes Willem earl of Albamar (Pat. Chron. 1138/2), & him balded after, hauskes swifte (Ley. Brut A 10063). The prep0 there is often fronted in similar fashion, with the preposition next to the verb rather than immediately after there; ME examples include Aw 32b.13, 37a.14, 57a.25, and Ley. Brut A 5001, 11434, 12597, 12822, 13090.

Topicalisation is also found with the verb 'to be': Angre & huses leaffi ah muchel to beon bitwenen (Aw 17b.2), & het is me wa ugor (SH 46.9).

Wh-clause

I have one example of a Wh-clause with stranded preposition in ME: Euanse heo biseched for is sikerliche ibozhen (SH, EMSP XXX.311).

Cause and effect

Preposition stranding, I have suggested here, is a contributory factor to the conditions for the syntactic restructuring that produces class 3 group-verbs. It can be argued, however, that it is not a cause but an effect of the restructuring. This is apparently Saaf's view for relative clauses: 'In relative clauses there was no need to place the preposition at the end, for that was not the only connective available. Speakers and writers somehow seem to have felt that the preposition belonged to the verb rather than to the relative' ('Passive', p.11). But that is to ignore the fact that the indeclinable relative, first be and later but, is the most common form of relative pronoun in direct object function from OE to at least the end of the ME period, and it is not surprising that the same form should be the normal one for a relative which is to be dependent on a particle. It is rare for any relative, declinable or indeclinable, to be preceded by a preposition in OE, and vanishingly rare for an indeclinable
relative to be preceded by a preposition in ME.\textsuperscript{13} The very high frequency of \textit{be}/\textit{but} as connective in relative clauses is the reason for the frequency of preposition stranding in relative clauses in OE and ME. The case is even stronger for the infinitive and comparative clause types, as there is no alternative to stranding short of a complete change of construction.

In the case of preposition stranding when a prep0 is topicalised, it is less easy to discriminate between cause and effect. I have little evidence of it before c.1200, when the first really positive evidence of restructuring becomes available, whereas the types of stranding previously discussed are all well attested in OE. The more common option of fronting the whole prepositional phrase would suggest that topicalisation with stranding is at least in part an effect of restructuring, but the chicken-and-egg analogy has to be invoked here, as so often.

ELLIPISIS

In all periods of the language, verbs which normally occur with an object are sometimes found with no object expressed. Different verbs have had this potential at different times; Visser prints some lists in \textit{Hist. Syntax}, i, 141-52. Mustanoja discusses the phenomenon as it occurs in ME (\textit{ME Syntax}, pp.144-45), and two of his examples involve an unexpressed direct object which is understood from an indirect or prepositional object in a conjoined clause; see also Ohlander's article.\textsuperscript{14} Context too is important in determining whether ellipsis of an NP is permissible.

A similar phenomenon is the non-expression of a NP after a particle


\textsuperscript{14} Urban Ohlander, 'Omission of the Object in English', \textit{SNPh.}, 16 (1943-44), 105-27.
that could have been used transitively in the same circumstances. There is a discussion of elliptical prepositions in OE on pp.61-63 above.

As a result of these potentials for ellipsis after verb or particle, it is quite common in OE and NE to find a pair of conjoined clauses, one of which contains a potentially transitive verb, the other a potentially transitive particle, and only one overt expression of an object NP which notionally belongs to both.\(^{15}\) Such patterns form one important matrix for a later development—to be discussed later in the chapter—in which a NP is simultaneously dir0 in one clause and prep0 in the other. It is sometimes difficult to make a rigid demarcation between the two kinds of structure. I give here a selection of examples which seem to me better described as having ellipsis in one clause than having a shared object, but the overall argument would be unaffected if a few examples were transferred to the other group.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ac ymē one niht eft gefremede / morūbeals mare ond no meanum fore, / } & \text{fahē ond fyrfne (Beo 135)} \\
\text{nam pu mid handa hīg plīhtigne / rinc on mesta, rehte ongean / feond mid folme (Beo 746)} \\
\text{Cræp pu togeanes, gudzinc gefeng / stolam olcnumm (Beo 1501)} \\
\text{bæte nīces mūnnes ingēhano wēnē bæte good sīc, } & \text{æfter hīgān, } \text{æ wilnaса to begitanne (Be 56, 3)} \\
\text{Wīhtred feng to Cantwara rīce, } & \text{æ heold .xxxiii. wintra (Chron. 40.14 (694))} \\
\text{pā foron his to & gefliamdon böne hēre (Chron. 86.21 (894))} \\
\text{ōsar he gesēah Cōdes englas } & \text{æ wiē spec (Wōom 15.15)} \\
\text{pēst man nolde him a timan gāfpl beoden oppe wiō gefeothtan (Chron. (1011), } & \text{Sweet's Reader XVII.11)16} \\
\text{ā him selle on peosan lande to abugan. } & \text{ā ādæs sworan. } \text{ā his men wurdon} \\
\text{(Chron. 236.12 (1100))} \\
\text{ā meast hine dryfdon his ægonum } & \text{ā him gelome frum bugon. } \text{ā swicon. } \text{ā to} \\
\text{his feondan cyrdon (Chron. 248.1 (1118))} \\
\text{ich ga lihtliche ouer. } & \text{ne do hute nemmī ham (AW 53b.5)} \\
\text{ah tealō lutel prof. } & \text{oder forget mid alle (AW 53b.12)} \\
\text{Stāmīn habbe hwa se wule; } & \text{hwa se wule beo buten (AW 113a.27)} \\
\text{ne lokin feste o na mon; } & \text{ne toggin wiō ne pleiēn (AW 115b.23)} \\
\text{Ah ich him luuiē & wulle don. } & \text{æ leue on as o lauerd (SJ 13.144)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{15}\text{Visser gives examples of 'absence of the prepositional object', mostly in clauses containing what would otherwise be class 6 collocations (Hist. Syntax, 1, 535).}\)

\(^{16}\text{Here, and also in the next example, a NP serves notionally as ind0 in one clause and prep0 in the other.}\)
ge nu neor & nim him (SJ 33.335)
pis eadi meiden . . . leop to & ilahte him (SJ 33.340)
Constantin valde eftor & warpen him beonne (SK 17)
& to him we kennid & onawe to laeuerd & to heh healent (SK 2065)
& lokien we to ben rihten. / & ich wulde halden to r & halden be for
herr (Lay. Brut A 5477)\textsuperscript{17}
Scipen heo per funden & sone in wenden (ibid. 6336)
& Rom-leoden readen to . . . / and smitten a pen Bruten (ibid. 13459)\textsuperscript{18}
and Carais to progr\textsuperscript{r} and mid on spere hine stong (Lay. Brut B 5313; cf.
A & Carrais him on brose)
Par laeuerd liggep & laeudi / Ich schal heem singe & sitte bi (Cwl & N. 959)
Pay slypped bi and syge hir not bat wern hir samun-fere (Clewness 985)

In the examples given above the particle belongs to a class 3 collocation.
Similar examples are also found with (potential) class 6 collocations, that
is, with a dir0 also present in the clause.

SEMANTIC UNIFICATION AND COLLOCATIONAL RESTRICTION

Having indicated the syntactic factors which promote the formation of
verb-preposition combinations, I now discuss the factors which lead to
semantic unity and mutual predictability of verb and preposition—also im-
portant contributions to the formation of group-verbs. A number of collo-
locations in OE already have the appearance of forming semantic units equi-
\textsuperscript{17}I am not sure whether halden to has as notional prep0 ben rihten or be.
\textsuperscript{18}Here a NP serves notionally as prep0 in both clauses.
pear-tree (Aeth.; IV, 2394). The fact that the combinatorial meaning of a
verb has diverged from its independent meaning helps to weld verb and par-
ticle together as a notional unit. If the preposition loses its spatial
force so that it becomes, in synchronic terms, an arbitrary and unmotivated
particle which just happens to be the one that goes with a given verb,
then that too will tend to associate it with the verb as part of a compo-
nite entity, e.g. on in OE peliefan on, ME (bi)lefen on. Thus existing col-
locations become lexicalised and begin to form semantic units. What is
striking about the late OE and ME periods is the number of new collocations
formed as well, unified from their first appearance or liable to form units
in the manner detailed above. They arise in several ways.

Dissolution of compound verbs

It is a commonplace that a large number of OE compound verbs emerge
in ME as verb-particle collocations, though the 'compounds' which several
scholars discuss include the so-called separable type, which I have argued
are not compound verbs at all but ordinary collocations subject to the
word-order norms of OE; see pp. 53-57 above. The number of genuine, i.e.
inseparable compounds which later break up into class 3 collocations is
smaller, especially if one discounts those which have doublets in OE.

Cass discusses in detail the development of OE wipstanan from a compound
to a collocation ('Passive', pp. 16-18), though of course it is actually
the compound which survives into ModE. Another combination found in two
forms is that of see * through. De la Crus notes as an interesting case
hit bleke cloëd, . . . is bescure agen be wînd. & wurse to huruh seon (AR
(Hero) 22.6), with the comment that 'the prepositional use of huruh, which
is fully attested, would require the order huruh to seon' ('Context', p. 20).19

19 On separation of prefix and verb-stem in ME manuscripts see p. 66 above,
though note that in this case the prefix is represented by the abbreviation
h and intention to separate it is not certain.
Actually the other major manuscripts of AR do show prepositional use in this passage, albeit with V-p order: ..., ụrụe to sọnị burh (AU 13a.11, sim. Cleopatra 20/17). It is not clear that one is always justified in seeing the collocation as lineal etymological descendant of the compound in such cases. Caaf discusses the replacement of OE forlicgan, ME forlicgan, biliçyen, etc by ligien bi/wib (‘Passive’, pp.12-19). Although the meaning and function of the combination of lie + by is essentially unchanged by the replacement, bi- belongs to a system of transitivizing prefixes, whilst the free particle bi belongs to a system of prepositions in which spatial meaning is still present. Note too Caaf’s evidence that the spatial meaning of prefixal wib- is becoming obscured in late OE and ME (‘Passive’, p.16).

Decay of prefixal system

Rather than decide whether a ME collocation is essentially the same combination as an OE compound, it is safer—and far more widely applicable—to regard a number of ME class 3 collocations as the semantic and functional equivalents of OE compound verbs, and therefore as their replacements rather than lineal descendants. The decay of the OE prefixal system has already been discussed in Chapter 5. Amongst the prefixes which disappear entirely or have their productivity greatly curtailed are several which have the effect of making an intransitive verb transitive or of allowing a different semantic role to be taken by the object NP. Both effects are also found in class 3 group-verbs, of course; Jespersen gives examples of the distinction of meaning made possible by using a verb intransitively + preposition rather than transitively (MEC, iii, 252-72). Therefore it is plausible to account for some of the increase in class 3 collocations as being a functional substitute for compound verbs; see also de la Cruz, ‘13c Change’, pp.161-65, 167. The collapse of the prefixal system and hence of the systematic relationship between a simple verb and a compound
also means that compounding loses its force as a living process of word-
formation, so that new uses and meanings tend to be expressed by other
means, principally by class 3 collocation, by borrowing of new verbs from
French and Latin, and by the transitivization of intransitive verbs. OE
bebencean has been replaced by think about/of/on, seridan by ride over/to,
ofsendan by send after/for.

Decay of case system

It is a commonplace of linguistic history that the decay of the OE
case system is associated with an increased use of prepositions. Thus
Mustanoja: 'Owing largely to the general decay of the OE inflectional sys-
tem the use of the prepositions is greatly expanded and enriched in late
OE and in ME. The syntactical relationships formerly expressed by means
of the case-endings now come to be expressed mainly by means of word-order
and prepositions' (ME Syntax, p.348). The general point is valid even if
cause and effect are reversed. I give some examples of verbs which in OE
typically govern a case and which in ME come to be collocated with a prepo-
sition, either instead of or as an alternative to simple transitive use:
metan + acc, later + with; seccean + acc, later + after/for; fægnian + gen,
later + in/of/on; reccean + gen, later + of; mündrian + gen, later + at/of/
on; leopen + dat, later + on/to; wibstanban + dat, later + again. (Some-
times collocation with a preposition is also known in OE.)

Foreign borrowing

Another source of class 3 collocations is to be found in the generally
high levels of foreign influence, especially during the ME period, from
Scandinavian (from late OE onwards), Latin (both in OE and in ME), and
French. Scandinavian influence is treated in Chapter 8. The principal
French contribution consists of the use of a verb with a preposition anal-
ogous to the preposition associated with that verb in French. Mustanoja
writes: 'As for verbs which might be regarded as governing an indO bor-
rowed from French there is a tendency to use to after the analogy of the
original French construction (à), as in Why commaund God to voy ye sholde
nat eten (Chaucer, PastT, X, 328)' (ME Syntax, p.97). Collocations which
have been suggested as calques of French usage include do with, enter into
(cf. F. danse), holden in/of (cf. OF tenir a).20 For play at Mustanoja
suggests the influence of OF jouer a, MedL ludere ad, or ON leike at (ME
Syntax, pp.362-63). Mustanoja's long chapter on prepositions in ME in-
cludes a number of suspected cases of foreign influence on prepositional
use, some of which go into class 3 collocations (ME Syntax, pp.345-427).
A much more recent example is give into 'yield (to a fashion)', modelled
on F. donner dans (OED s.v. give v. 59b).

Ellipsis

What is probably a minor source of class 3 collocations is ellipsis
of a noun phrase or prep. phrase from some longer idiom. I have noted a
probable example of each. Ellipsis of sword(s) or some other weapon word
is necessary to explain Then these three..., drew upon me, and I also
drew upon them (Bunyan, Pilgr.Migr. 1930.12); cf. OED s.v. draw v. 33b.
And ellipsis of a prep. phrase accounts for certeyn jegys wyth hem schold
come down and svt on syche penyll as he norwyd ryvotous in thy centre
(Past.L. 168.11, sim. 162.3, 312.35), cited by OED s.v. sit v. 26, sit on/
upon 'sit in judgement or council, deliberate on'.

SYNTACTIC RESTRUCTURING

In Chapter 1 I suggested that the preposition in a PE class 3

20The suggestions come, respectively, from John Orr, Old French and Modern
English Idiom (Oxford, 1962), p.56; H. T. Price, Foreign Influences on
Middle English (Ann Arbor, 1947), p.126; NED s.v. holden v. 7b.
collocation like sleep in (the bed) shows divided constituency, some of its properties corresponding to the structure

\[ \text{[\textit{v} \text{sleep}] \text{[\textit{pp} in [\textit{np} the bed]]} \]

where PP stands for prepositional phrase, whilst other properties suggest the alternative structure

\[ \text{[\textit{vp}[\textit{v} \text{sleep in}] [\textit{np} the bed]]} \]

\textit{v} being here a group-verb. In OE, however, there is no need to invoke the second analysis: all of the syntactic properties of class 3 in simple declarative clauses are accounted for adequately on the assumption that the preposition forms a constituent with its NP object. In other clause types, e.g. those with preposition stranding, the precise analysis would depend on the grammatical framework being used, but a likely TG analysis, for example, would still derive the particle from an underlying prepositional phrase.\(^{21}\)

It is around the turn of the thirteenth century that evidence for the second type of analysis begins to accumulate.\(^{22}\) A number of different syntactic phenomena are all better accounted for by the group-verb analysis, the important ones being the sharing of an object between a class 3 collocation and a transitive verb, and the passivization of a class 3 collocation; examples of each will follow in succeeding sections. As to the factors which permitted—perhaps caused—the restructuring to take place, the preceding sections of this chapter have been an attempt to incorporate

\(^{21}\)The argument would be as to whether the prepO had been moved or deleted; see, e.g., Allen, 'Movement', p.272.

\(^{22}\)The concept of a particular syntactic string being assigned different structural analyses by successive generations of language-learners has been canvassed by many scholars. Saussure uses the phrase 'reallocation of functions within the same linear sequence' (\textit{Ling. Evolution}, p.59), and Paul A. Bennett gives a handy list of other terms recently employed ('Observations on the Transparency Principle', \textit{Linguistics}, 17 (1979), 843-61 (p.552)).

In this case I do not propose the replacement of one structure by another. In my view the old structure is not discarded, rather a single clear-cut constituent structure is superseded by a dual structure, and furthermore this dual structure, once established as a possibility in the language, is first adopted for particular collocations at widely differing times.
them in a coherent account and to show their cumulative effect in the late OE and early ME periods.

Repetition of particle

In PS the relative clause *(the house) in which I live in would be ungrammatical: either the preposition precedes the relative pronoun or it is stranded, but not both. All the main contributors to the history of class 3 have observed that such relative and interrogative clauses with otiose preposition are in fact attested in earlier periods of the language. Whether or not such clauses would have been regarded as grammatical or as errors is immaterial, as the frequency of their occurrence strongly implies that they express a natural tendency of speakers or writers. One argument is that they are symptomatic of the dual structure mentioned just previously—and certainly the repetition of the preposition next to both NP and verb would fit that hypothesis very neatly, an explicit manifestation of a structure normally implicit. A weaker argument is that repetition is merely symptomatic of a positional tendency. Nearly all of the examples given by the scholars mentioned in note 23 come disappointingly late, well after the much more conclusive evidence of shared object and passivization. In fact the phenomenon is found in early ME and perhaps even in OE. First I give examples of relative and interrogative clauses involving class 3 collocations.

and hyne on hys nywan þruh alyde, on þere þe man ofer þer man ær on ne læg (Nic 10.33)24
& see me hwer þu wunest meast; of hwet cun þu art ikumen of (SN 38.1; MS R omits second of)
Unto which place every thyng, . . . moveth for to come to (Chaucer, MF 733)

23 Gaaf, 'Passive', pp.11-12; Jespersen, NEG, iii, 192-93; Visser, Hist. Syntax, i, 407; de la Cruz, 'Context', p.39 note 33. Some of Visser's examples are misplaced, the preposition before the relative belonging to the main, not the relative clause.

24 Example noticed in Hilliard, 'Reexamination', p.140.
Till all & synrye to quahem be knawlege of his present lettris sall to cum (quot. 1428, OED s.v. whom pron. 7a)
Also they found there namys of ech lady, and of what bloode they were com off (Malory, Works, 593.24)
all thes be ladyes for whom I have foughten for (ibid. 711.40)

Further examples from late fourteenth century on are to be found in MED s.v. of adv 7. Sometimes it is a different particle next to the verb from that which precedes the relatives:

buru hwt muhte sonre ful luue of aquiki-en (AR (Nero) 25.16; MS Cleopatra 24.13 has no of) for he shulde helpe us into whos servyse we were entred in (Malory, Works, 587.35)

The phenomenon also affects collocations of 'to be', class 6 collocations, agent-phrases in the passive, and so on:

‡etu lond on þem wood on þe twa byrig on getimbred, Sodome & Comorres (Or 1.6) þetu wæstbære lond on þem Sodome & Comorres 6a byrig on wordon (Or 22.30)
nim him of hwas white beod anumret of / þe sunne & te mone (MH 34.587; NS T omits second of)

For þetu icle lordes loun, / On whan þin herte is on ise (Bevis A 1838) the swardhe whereto ye durst nat sette to your honde (Malory, Works, 520.26) the ahyp wherein air Percivall had putte hys ayster in (ibid. 605.19) hyme ... by whom ye and all we were dayly worshipped by (ibid. 616.5) ony kynge, of what degre that ever he be off (ibid. 694.22)

An example with two different prepositions is:

Ne mis na þing hwer burg monnes meulche madsche wased him wið mare þen þet schaftes of mon (SR 234)

It will be recalled from Chapters 2 and 5 that there is some interchange between classes 1 and 3 and between 2 and 6 according as a prep is expressed or not. In OE and NE the dual affinity of the verb-particle collocation is sometimes expressed by repeating the particle: once in pre-NF position it is clearly a preposition, the other time near the verb it may either be taken adverbially or else regarded as a pretonastic preposition of the kind seen in relative, interrogative and wh-clauses like the above.

Se þe after rihte mid gerece wille / inweardlice efter spyrian (Met 22.1) þe hie honne on Reguluses fird on twa healifs byres on fore (Or 94.16) min lar haettwug in goð on þin ongdit (Bo 27.17) inne on þem frastenne seton feawa cilirsc men on (Chroni 884.11 (893)) and he toswyfe mycelne stan to hilde ðære byrgene (Matt(US) 27.60) þetu þet folc fram openlicum symbium ne ay fram abroden (ThCan 2 117.37; sim. 117.15)25

Example noticed in Hilliard, 'Reexamination', p.121. From abroden translates L. abstrahatur.
swa bet on ware rode ... sticodon on *manige arewan* (Chron. 215.11 (1083))
Swa muchel is bitwenen. bituhben godes neoleachunge. & monnes to wummon
(AN. 106b.26)
ase wis as in wilke flech bet he toc of pe nes neguer sunne in (AR
(Cleopatra) 157.17 as corrected by scribe B) 26
ju ledest burh myeses bet tu se muchel luedest. bute brugge & bat. burh
be reade sea (SJ 53.534) 27
be mid woh hefde to deon idrahen mon to (SK R 1193, inferred from apparatus)
in pe ne mai hit nanowses neomen in (SW. EMERVX. XIX.356) 28
For againes al pe woh & te scheme bet tu boledest. & againes al pe wa & te
pinful witunest: neauer ne cymedes ti mud to gruochen againes (Wold
25.199)
and in to water thou shalt not putten it in (a1382; MED
s.v. *in* adv. 2a(a))
And on this goode wyf he leith on socre (Chaucer, KV. 1, 4229)
Than sir Galahalt ... tud on a noble jesseraunce upon hym (Malory,
Works, 521.7)
AND SO WE LEVE OF HEREF OF LA SHEVALERE LE CHARTOTE (ibid. 656.27 [heading])
Further examples are given by Hall, Dubislav and Mustanoja. 29 Two different strands of foreign influence are to be distinguished. Some of the OE examples are probably imitations of a Latin exemplar containing a compound verb with spatial prefix; see Harrison, *Sep. Prefixes*, p.25 on repetition of *in* in *Bede*. And Sisam would explain certain ME examples—he cites four from Mandeville's *Travels*—as follows:
The pleonasm is explained by the divergence of French and ME word order. In French, as in modern literary English, the preposition is placed at the beginning of the clause, before the relative ... ME. writers naturally use the relative that, and postpone the preposition to the end of the clause ... The translator compromises between his French original and his native habit by placing the preposition both at the beginning and at the end. 30

26 Professor Dobson in his critical apparatus calls the insertion of *in* an
unnecessary addition to text, repeating *in* of line before, but acceptable ME idiom; not in other MSS.

27 Professor d'Ardenne in her critical apparatus describes the wording of both MSS as awkward and believes the first *burh* to be an anticipatory insertion.

28 EMERVX glossary gives *neomen* in *'enter*', but the second *in* might perhaps be the noun, which also collocates with this verb; see MED s.v. *in* n.2(a).

29 Fitzedward Hall, 'On Some Points of Usage in English', American Journal of Philology, 3 (1882), 422-33 (pp.429-30); Georg Dubislav, 'Studien zur mittel-
englischen Syntax I, II', *Anglia*, 40 (1916), 263-321 (p.315); Mustanoja,
*ME Syntax*, p.348.

One of his examples supports the hypothesis that the repetition is due to positional tendencies, whether as a result of translation or not, rather than to verb-particle grouping: the land of the whiche on of the bre Kynges . . . was kyng offe. So too do the examples involving 'to be' or class 6 collocations. The general transition from p-V to V-p order is certainly not what the examples demonstrate: the 'repeated' preposition may precede the verb in a text which has stranded prepositions in preverbal position.

Quasi-ellipsis

Quasi-ellipsis has already been discussed at length in Chapter 4 above. A particle stands in an equivocal relationship to a following clause, such that particle + clause is partly but not entirely like a prepositional phrase. One aspect of the syntax of the particle is that it forms a constituent with the element following; the complementary aspect is that it belongs instead with another item, usually the verb. Quasi-ellipsis involving class 3 collocations is therefore closely bound up with the syntactic restructuring we have been discussing.

SHARED OBJECT

In the PS sentence John looked at and admired the painting, the verbs look at and admire are what I have called 'linked' (pp.82-83 above), in that they share subject and object. Look at is not being used elliptically or absolutely, in fact it cannot be: *John pointed to the painting and Mary looked at. The possibility of linking with a transitive verb is good evidence that look at is a group-verb and has undergone the restructuring which permits, at the least, a dual analysis of the constituency of at. Some particles can be used absolutely in PS, and it is hard to determine the exact circumstances under which a particle could be so used in earlier periods. Therefore, as already mentioned, there are examples of conjoining
which may be taken either as showing ellipsis of the object in one clause, or as showing linking of the (group-)verbs in the two clauses, the object belonging to both. Examples of the former kind were listed above in the section on ellipsis. I now give examples of the latter. The very fact that some examples are indeterminate supports the contention that the latter, linked type developed out of the former, elliptical type. Such a development would foster the restructuring of class 3 clauses, and the restructuring would permit a class 3 collocation to share an object with a transitive verb. I give a collection of early examples below, and it is notable that the majority of them are relative clauses with stranding of the preposition, as in OE the picture that they looked at and admired.

Now the reason for this may be that the indeclinable relative in OE (and early ME?) is a clause connective which at times approaches being a subordinating conjunction (cf. Jeaspersen's analysis of ModE that, cited on p.16 above). Evidence that the indeclinable relative is not always given a clear nominal function within the relative clause (subject, dir0, prep0, etc) includes clauses of the type sio stow be ða nu on gehwæt eart (Bo 24.30, cited with many others by Visser, *Hist. Syntax*, i, 543), and an apparent anacoluthon like ba geasta he his ut of Homsbyrig to him gesseht feodon (Or 42.26 MS C). If this is indeed the case, early examples cited below need not imply full recognition of the p-V or V-p string as a group-verb, even though the most appropriate syntactic analysis may still be that the p-V/V-p string shares an object with a transitive verb.

 gif ge hit georne yeuble smeagan willað & æfter spyrgan (Bo 36.5) 31
 ðæt he wolde elcne cuman swiðe arlice underfoen & swiðe swæmlice wið
 geboæan (Bo 36.30)
 ða wulan þe his onlociað & habbað (CP 182.7; Gaaf, 'Passive', p.3)
 And forðu us esa swencæð & ongoan winnað maneg gesseafa (WHom 5.34)
 Hson bonne on dem Crist sylfa to clypas & lufulce geboæac þæs þe . . .
 (WHom 7.145)
 lytel is se fyrest byses lifes, & lyðre is, ðæt we lufiað & on wuniað
 (WHom 13.12)

31Here the object is shared by two class 3 collocations.
Swa hast swa seo meddre gesið, heo to blæwð and cunelép (Loh 1, 242.21; 
BT s.v. bleanen)
pe þing þe weolu handledon & feste ymbe weeron (Brut 56.12; BTS 
s.v. fæste 1b)
smul þet is þe usend hateæ & hunteð eftor hire (AR (Nero) 57.4)32
Pe Seone ðis gemoneschippe oðer to seggen oðer to don. oðer to bisen 
bioere, oðer to penchen eftor, oðer to minuten en þing þet ha 
haœd to gemen (AW 54b.10)
ei þing þet ne wið feareð. oðer æhte togeman (AW 93a.16)
 þeœu crist godes sunne, þet ich on leue. & luuie as leoflukeste. & luþsumest 
lauerd (SJ 11.114)
an þet ichulle treowliche to halden ant wið uten les luuien (SJ 12.96)
& þi sire sathanas þet tu leuest up on. & þi feeder hatest. & his heaste 
forœst (SJ 49.526)
be leoteð ne lutel of, & sparœð over speche (SK 806)33
forhove forte don hit. þet tu þuncheð uwel of & eil forte heren (HH 22.353)
& geuest þin bare bodi to tukin swa to wundre. & feare wið se scheome-
liche (HH 24.382)
hit is for þi he haœp. oðer wilneþ eftor comforth on econe (Cold 2.27, 
6.31)
wor hem þet ich luœede er & truste to & hopede (Rolle 14.151)
& þa tukest wrofe & vœele, / Wahr þu migst over smale fugele (Owl & N. 63)34
Pe knihtes þounht of hem god gemen, / Hem forto shewe and loken to
(Gaw 2139)
to visite & to speke wið þe King of Engeland (Brut 315.20; Mustandojæ, ME 
Syntesc, p.144)
ay þe na temptacions, & þe grauœser, þai stande agayne, & ouer-cornes
(Rolle Horstman) 1, 12.4)
any friesde þat þe maste luve, or maste treystes on (ibid. 28.23)
to luve & loken on þe (ibid. 61.19)
And what to leue and to lyue by (PP1. B XV.366)35
that the renoun of the comune of Rome ne hadde nat nat yit passid ne
clombet over the montaigne that highte Caucasus (Chaucer, Bo. II, 
pr.7, 60)
thilke thing that it ne mai net atayne to, ne fulfillen (ibid. V, pr.6, 80)
bet note place / þat ge han spied and spurred so specially after (Gaw 2092)
sir Launcelot, floure of all noble knyghtes that ever I harde of or saw be
my dayes (Malory, Works, 710.4)

32 This is the sole ME example cited by Jespersen and by Visser. In other 
 MSS the shared object is an indeclinable relative: be gode ance, be 
[bees with a subpuncted] Saul bet be feond heated & hunteð eftor (AW 
55b.5; sim. Cleopatra 55.10). The collocation is commutable with a simple 
transitive in ha hunted eftor priær & kechað launate (AW 16a.6)
33 See above, p.74 note 62 and p.75.
34 Punctuation from diplomatic edition of J. H. G. Grattan and G. F. H. 
and his note to lines 63f., also the discussion on pp.134-35 above.
35 Thus four MSS, but most, including the base MS W, repeat what before 
to lyue by.
PASSIVIZATION

The passive of class 3 does not arise by gradual development or shift of interpretation: this is one syntactic pattern which can only be the effect, not the cause, of restructuring. Its appearance gives definite confirmation that a particular collocation is being treated as a class 3 group-verb. There are lists of passive class 3 examples in Jespersen, 36 NS, iii, 312-15; Gaaf, 'Passive', pp.19-24; Visser, Hist. Syntax, iii-2, 2122-33; de la Cruz, '13c Change', p.174; accordingly I give only a few examples here. These are early examples not noticed elsewhere, and examples of the passive of _leten of_, on which see further below.

_pec wes sorhe to seen hire leoflich lich faren so rewliche wið_ (SJ 22.195)36

> be comenment ys brokun, / And be helyday, byfore of spokun (Mannyng, HS 1033; MED s.v. _ofspoken_ v. (1))

so wele it was of _leten_ (Mannyng, Chron 195.13; OED)

al be pynes pat may be on thoght (Rolle [Horstman] i, 121.3 (Arundel MS))

pat shal not be dispensid wiþ but reserved to a greterre strep (Wyclif, Eng. Wks. 7.29)

_Litel is he louid or letes by _pat_ such a lessoun techeþ_ (PP1.A XI.29)

_Litel is he loued or letes by _pat_ such a lesson techeþ_ (PP1.B X.37)37

And lytel y-letes by (PP1.C VI.3)

no prophete is so mychel _leten of_ in his owene cuntres as he is in straunge cuntres (Pep.Gosp. 44.9; MED)

He schall be loued and loued and lett of a whyle/Wele more _hen_ be man that makes hym-seluen (Winner & W. 27; MED)

mony mon for strenge . . . is ofte muchel _leten_of_ and loued and honoured (A Talkyng of _he_ Los of God 34.4; Visser)

and my name ys sir Launcelot du Leake, that hath bene ryght well seyde off (Malory, Works, 358.26, sim. 706.31)

and that the queene shulde nat be seyde unto of the kynges (ibid. 692.45)

And also he is more spoken of beyonde the see (ibid. xiv.24 [Caxton's Preface])

36 NS B does not have a passive construction here: _ber wes sorhe to seen on hire freoliche flesch hu ha ferden ber wið_ (SJ 23.228). The passive quoted above is, of course, a participial rather than a finite use, though the B reading suggests a dynamic rather than a statal passive participle.

37 The insertion of _or _letes by is a conjectural emendation apparently without B-tradition support; Schmidt omits it.
Verb-particle order

Visser cites a large number of class 3 passives, all with V-p order. He makes the following pronouncement: 'In the passive transforms the preposition stands at the end of the syntactical unit. A position before the past participle appears to have been possible, especially with prepositions separated (in print at least) from a verb of which they originally were prefixes. . . . This may have been the prototype of the pattern with end-position of the preposition.' *(Hist. Syntax*, iii–2, 2120–21). The middle of this statement is easily seen if the ten quite heterogeneous examples which accompany it are examined individually.

(1) ðylas bis . . . wæorðen upahæfene *(CP 197.2)*

In this collocation up is adverbial.

(2) Ispenia land is . . . eall mid fleote utan ymbhæfd *(Or 19.1)*

*Ymbhabban* is a compound verb which is not, to my knowledge, used with its parts separated, and the simplex *habban* is not used intransitively in the required sense.

(3) ne beob under dolfene *(Lamb.Ps. 36.31)*

The particle under and verb delfan have meanings which might permit them to be collocated, but ET(S) provides no evidence that they are so used. On the other hand the compound underdelfan is reasonably well attested in quotations of biblical material or translations from Latin (as here), and appears to be a translation loan.

(4) to þon þat þa fatu ealle weron hwaetwugu in gegotene mid blessunge þæs ylcan æle * *(CP 51.14)*

A case can be made here for analysing as a prepositional passive, whether class 3 or 6, and Visser's citation is for once pertinent and interesting. However, MS H has *ongoton* and 0 apparently in *geoton* for C's *in segotene*, both of which lack *ge-* and so look more like compound verbs. Furthermore, the translation seems to depend heavily on the Latin original, which has a compound past participle *infusæ*; *quatenus benedictione ejudem olei omnia*
Therefore I suggest that the cited OE reading of MS C is a freak of translation which should be left out of account.

(5) Relike sal bar-in be loken, /Pat euermar sal of be spoken (Cursor 8323)

This is clearly a class 3 passive, since of and spoken are not even contiguous. The preposition of is regularly used with verbs of speaking, esteeming, etc to govern the NP referring to the topic of speech, valuation, etc, without modifying the meaning of the verb; the prefix of- does not transitivize such verbs in that way.

(6) Bot nu þan am i after send (Cursor 14216)

The verb send is made transitive, with object the person or thing summoned, in one of two ways in ME: by prefixation with of- or by collocation with the prepositions after or for. This example is a class 3 passive.

(7) hwon we becó . . . so stronge bi stonden ðet . . . (AR (Hero) 118.21)

Bestand in the sense 'beset, afflict' is a compound verb, and in fact the collocation stand + by can have almost exactly the opposite sense, 'support', quite inappropriate here.

(8) I shal neuer be belayne (Bevis 2822)

In this manuscript be- is the usual prefixal form of the particle, by or bi the usual prepositional form—indeed cf. And lyrist wolde haue lyne hyr by (Bevis 2819). MS C has the undoubted compound forlayn in the equivalent passage to example (8), although the wording is generally rather altered.

So the probability is that our example is the passive of a compound transitive verb: thus Gaaf, 'Passive', p.16. This is the sole example of

38 Note too that Gesnass lists ingecstan against L. infundere from interlinear glosses (Lehnbildungen, p.144).

39 Both constructions are blended in zif be warewyn of bat neer be of sent after (BrLond 49.2; Gaaf, 'Passive', p.20). Note the false archaism of To after-send his foe (Spenser, FG, I.v.10)
Visser's of a compound which has a doublet in the form of a collocation.
(9) So were it was of leten (Mannyng, Chron 195.13)
(10) seest thou any token Or aught that in the world is of spoken?  
(?Chaucer, HE, textual note to 911-12)40
These two, like (5), are class 3 passives; (9) has already been cited.

Summing up Visser's ten examples, we find inseparable compound verbs in
(2), (3), (7) and probably (8); an entirely irrelevant class 2 collocation
in (1); and straightforward class 3 passives in (5), (6), (9) and (10). The
fact that p-V order is shown by the last-mentioned is no reason to exclude
them from the category of prepositional passives: p-V order in the passive
is possible in precisely those texts which permit preposition stranding with
p-V order in the active, whether as normal prose word-order or as an archaism
preserved for metrical reasons. (This is corroboration of the suggestion
that preposition stranding in the active is linked to the formation of the
prepositional passive.) The paucity of passives with p-V order is due to the
fact that the prepositional passive only begins to appear at a time when p-V
order is obsolescent. Finally, we have in (4) what may be an isolated OE
example of the class 3 passive, but confined to just one manuscript and a
slavish imitation of Latin syntax; it surely does not represent a genuine
syntactic potential of OE. There is little evidence for class 3 passives
developing out of prefixal compounds in the passive, and no reason to regard
the p-V examples as prototypes of the V-p type: they are syntactically equi-
valent to the V-p type, of roughly the same date of appearance, and merely
shorter-lived because of general word-order developments in the language.

Leten of

Visser's first citation of a prepositional passive with V-p order is
the leten of example from AW which I have shown to be in the active voice
(p.75 note 63 above). There are, however, a number of examples of leten
of amongst the early passives. A partial explanation can be attempted.

40 The lines are not admitted by Robinson. Visser notes that they may have
been added or reshaped by Caxton.
The particle in a prepositional passive has a hard-to-pin-down quality. It resembles, say, a stranded preposition in its collocational range, its evident transformational relationship with a preposition in pre-NP position, and (in PE at least) its characteristic lack of stress; and yet like an adverb it has no prep, explicit or implicit, and its constituency seems to be with the verb. Intuitively it is similar to the quasi-elliptical particles discussed in Chapter 4. Now the particle _of_—indeed the collocation _leten of_—occurs in quasi-elliptical active clauses, and furthermore the verb _leten_ is also used transitively in various ways, whether with particles like _dun, ut_, or in the sense 'regard' which is very close to the meaning of _leten of_. Furthermore the group-verb _leten bled_ has a personal passive which can be regarded as one of the earliest indirect passives, though as a fixed idiom it is a special case; see Visser, *Hist. Syntax*, iii-2, 2139-40. The first prepositional passives are a remarkable syntactic innovation, but in the case of _leten of_ the unfamiliarity of the passive is mitigated by the prior existence of sentences in which _leten_ without _of_ is passive and of others in which _of_ has quasi-elliptical function. _Leten of_ is therefore well suited to acting as a bridgehead, a model for the passivization of other class 3 collocations. It is significant that many of the class 3 passives recorded before the early fifteenth century are of collocations which are semantically and even phonetically similar: _let by, let of, set by, tell by, tell of_ (to give them ModE spellings), and also _speak of, write of_, etc. One must not press these explanations too hard, however, as they are dependent on hindsight; nor do they cover all the early examples, including the early thirteenth-century one I myself have found.

**Syntactic ambiguity**

The passive is one pattern in which, without clues as to intonation, the distinction between class 2 and class 3 can be neutralised. Some
potentially ambiguous examples of this kind have been discussed in Chapter 5 (pp.161-62).

A class 3 passive in p-V order may also be indistinguishable from the passive of a compound verb, if the combination of verb and particle in the given meaning exists in both forms. Examples of p-V strings with V a past participle that are potentially ambiguous include hurhstone (Beo 3047), ofergoten (Matt(ES) 8.24), hurhdroven (SK 119), bylevn (HarL.I. 12.44), overcrowen (Caw 2190), withatonde (Chaucer, Tr I.253). But it is very difficult to find examples which are in practice indeterminate, as in most cases the dictionaries show the co-existence of doublet forms to be fairly short-lived: through + eat is not recorded as a class 3 collocation until 1656 (OED s.v. eat v. 12), for example, whereas hurhsetan as a compound is cited several times in PE(S), but not at all in OED, so that that particular combination was probably never a doublet. Gaaf discusses the dissolution of the ME compounds vibetonen and belliscren (‘Passive’, pp.16-19) and gives examples of the passive of each in compound and in class 3 form, yet does not appear to find any of them syntactically ambiguous.41 Visser’s vague conjecture that the class 3 passive with V-p order may somehow be derived from the passive of a compound verb does not therefore receive support.

INFLECTIONAL SYNCRETISM

In OE there is potentially a distinction in the NP of four cases, nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative—and for some also a fifth, instrumental—though no nouns themselves retain such a full set of formal distinctions. It is generally held that a NP can be the subject of a

---

41 Gaaf cannot find examples of the passive of compound withatonde before 1449 (‘Passive’, p.18), though there are at least four examples in the works of Chaucer, one of them cited above. One of Gaaf’s citations is interesting in showing the past ptcp. form wibetonen, a morphological type not recorded by OED for the simple verb until the sixteenth century, and an indication perhaps that compound verb and class 3 collocation are kept separate.
passive verb only if it would be the accusative object of the active verb. Visser gives OE examples of subject NPs of passive verbs which appear to correspond to dative objects in the active (Hist. Syntax, iii-2, 2136-37, 2140, 2144, 2158-61), but the verbs concerned are sometimes construed with an accusative object instead, so that the evidence for an indirect passive in OE is not strong. However, during the ME period all formal distinctions between accusative and dative disappear, whilst the genitive ceases to be used as an object case, and it becomes possible to make a passive subject out of what would have been in OE a dative or genitive object in the active. The process has been charted many times; a historical account and references to earlier work may be found in Visser’s Hist. Syntax, iii-2, 2112-15, 2136-37, 2139-63.

Gaaf argues that ‘most prepositions do not, as a rule, govern an accusative, and particularly not in the specific senses that might be liable to the change under discussion [viz. formation of a syntactic unit with associated semantic change]’ (‘Passive’, p.14). He then goes on to argue that the loss of inflectional endings in the ME period accelerated the process by which a prepO became virtually a dirO of a group-verb. But Gaaf and Visser between them suggest nine OE class 3 collocations which look like group-verbs because of the semantic unity of verb and preposition, and six of them have accusative objects. So accusative-dative synonymy is not a prerequisite of syntactic restructuring, though of course it increases the pool of collocations which have the potential to be made

42 Confirmed by Bruce Mitchell, ‘F. Th. Visser, An Historical Syntax of the English Language: Some Caveats Concerning Old English’, BE, 60 (1979), 537-42 (pp.539-41). Visser’s data need to be checked carefully: the three apparent examples of indirect passives in Lay. Erupt on iii-2, 2144 are all mistaken, the first because of mis-division of clauses, there being no dirO (A 471), the second and third because the personal subject corresponds to the dirO and not the indO of the active (A 11372, B 11373).

43 Gaaf, ‘Passive’, p.14; Visser, Hist. Syntax, i, 391. I count Gaaf’s two instances of swincon after once only, and I assume that wunderian wad in El 959 governs an accusative, even though the object swytrto does not have a distinctive case ending.
passive. The same goes for the disuse of the genitive as a case determined by a preposition.

A new 'prepositional' case is seen in some OE texts, which might seem to prolong or renew a distinction between direct and prepositional objects. However, the prepositional case is generally in free variation with the undifferentiated oblique case, and some nouns and most pronouns fail to make the distinction anyway. Any retarding effect which this short-lived system may have had on the development of class 3 passives is impossible to measure, but it is unlikely to have been important, especially as prepositional case is not found when the preposition is stranded. With the emergence of the modern common case form, all objects become formally indistinguishable and are identified as objects largely by meaning and position. In ModE, of course, most objects follow the (group-)verb. No doubt the growth of this tendency has made a contribution to the rise of the class 3 group-verb as full equivalent of a transitive verb.

Past participles

In OE passives there is variation between participles that are uninflected and participles showing number/gender concord with the subject. Traugott claims that only adjectival (statal) passives show inflection of the participle, though Lightfoot is sceptical. Now the prepositional passive involves the past participle of what is usually otherwise an intransitive verb, a participle which cannot be an adjective of passive meaning. (Notice the adjectival ending in the curious OE example discussed above on pp.220-21, in segotene.) By early in the ME period all past

45 See, e.g., Quirk and Wrenn, OE Grammar, p.75.
47 Visser points out that this is by no means always the case (Hist. Syntax, iii-2, 2122).
participles have lost adjectival inflection (Mustanoja, *Hist Syntax*, p.440), removing any overt signal of agreement between subject and participle. It is possible that this fact helps to account for the first appearance of the prepositional passive in surviving written material c.1200 and its non-appearances in OE, despite the fulfilment of many of the conditions for its development.

**Indirect passive**

The apparent similarity between the prepositional and indirect passives, and the fact that they begin to appear at much the same time, has led scholars to associate the two. But there are important differences. The conventional explanation of the indirect passive is, in brief, that sentences of the type "*him was shown a palace* (grammatical in OE and ME) are remodelled into *he was shown a palace* through the mediation of such equivocal sentences as *the king was shown a palace*. The last-mentioned type is only equivocal once syncretism has levelled the old dative and nominative cases in nouns (and for many NPs in determiners and adjectives too), and the change of construction is linked to the growing feeling that pre-verb position is a subject position.\(^{48}\)

The origin of the prepositional passive is quite different. As Marchand puts it, 'Nobody has ever thought of explaining *he was sent for* from "*him was sent for* (from "*for him was sent*" . . . The absurdity of such an explanation would be too obvious.' (*Synt. Change*, pp.78-79).

Actually, de la Crusc proposes precisely that explanation, claiming that 'this change [viz. formation of the class 3 passive] involves the development of a subject from the object of a preposition in passive constructions, originally impersonal, and this presupposes the confusion of two distinct

\(^{48}\)See, for example, Visser, *Hist. Syntax*, iii-2, 2142-44; Bennett, 'English Passives', pp.104-105.
case-relations, at least in those circumstances in which the object of
the preposition is an inflected pronoun' ('Int Change', p.167). No evi-
dence is given. The type *him was sent* is possible, though rare—con-
sider *unto every one that hath shall be given* (A.V. Matt. 25.29), wording
which goes back to Tyndale but not as far as Wyclif. I have noticed only
the following examples, plus a couple inOrm: *Run ofpropap is to
secueden* (CP 189.23; Wende, Nachgestellte Präp., p.133; sim. CP 200.20);
*of be mi lefmon was soölche quiddet* (Wold 24.148), *of bee was seid* (Rolle
[Horstman] i 101.9); *to his side was run / By . . .* (Milton, *Paradise Lost,
VI.335*). TheOE citations may be following the Latin original, and both
OE and ME citations are only dubiously subjectless, having a following pas-
sage of direct speech as at least notional subject. But the type *him was
sent for* is vanishingly rare: I have never seen an example in English.

De la Cruz’s argument seems to be based on the illusory parallelism of the
indirect passive, and on the evidence of Icelandic, which has developed
the *him was sent for* type but not the full indirect passive (cf. *Synt.
Complex*, p.177). The lack of evidence for this mechanism, as against the
wealth of evidence for an origin via syntactic restructuring in the active,
is telling. Nominative-oblique syncretism in nouns therefore plays no part
in the history of class 3.

Interestingly, Marchand even tries to explain the indirect passive
through a kind of restructuring of the active (and thus also seeks to
apply a single kind of explanation to prepositional and indirect passives).
His argument is that the indirect passive is an OE development, brought
about by a restructuring in which verb + dirO form a sort of group-verb
(I adapt his terminology), but that for several centuries it is ‘banished
from written documents’ and replaced by a hyper-correct *him was shown a
palace* type (‘Synt. Change’, pp.79-81). This view does not tie in well
with the frequent and very consistent use of the passive type with dative
(pro)noun, which gives way gradually to the full indirect passive with
unequivocal non-oblique subject NP, after the equivocal type has become reasonably common. But the indirect passive is not at issue here.

Where the two new passive types do resemble each other—and where they may have been mutually reinforcing—is in having a transformational relationship with the active, by which a NP object following the active verb corresponds to the subject of the passive. But they reach this situation by different routes. For the prepositional passive it is possible only after restructuring modifies the concept of 'verb' to include class 3 group-verbs; before that there is no passive. For the indirect passive it demands the widening of the concept 'object' to include indirect objects, 49 mediated both by inflectional syncretism and, according to the conventional view, by the fronting of the ind0 in many early 'impersonal' passives.

**VERB-PARTICLE SYSTEMS**

At a number of points in this dissertation I have tried to make clear the relationships between different classes of group-verb. It is an exaggeration to speak of a system of verb-particle collocations, which would imply a closed set of mutually exclusive and mutually defining choices, but in describing the history of one class one must allow for interactions with other classes. Two of the scholars already cited in this chapter attempt to show that the formation of the class 3 passive may have been promoted by the prior existence of other kinds of passive of verb-particle

49 Bennet suggests that the indirect passive begins to occur at much the same time that the ind0 of the active loses formal marking of dative case—and thus in his view ceases to be an ind0 ('English Passives', p.105). In fact the indirect passive as a general syntactic pattern is probably a fifteenth-century phenomenon, as far as simple NP arguments are concerned. Compare Lightfoot's claimed first occurrences for various verbs between 1422 and 1490 (Principles, pp.261-62) with Bennet's reliance on misunderstood thirteenth-century data ('English Passives', p.105), the examples mentioned in my note 42 above.
collocations.

Gaaf argues that 'the intimate connection that, under certain circumstances, was felt to exist between a passive transitive verb and a preposition, probably played a part in the origin of the passive of intransitive verbs accompanied by prepositions' ('Passive', p.10). The circumstances which produce that intimate connection are the ones Gaaf recognizes as producing preposition stranding, namely relative clauses with the relative or relative adverb as prep0, comparative clauses, and infinitive clauses. Forty-four instances of such class 6 passives are then given, all with V-p order and most of them late ME. 50 Now it is difficult to assess the validity of Gaaf's suggestion, especially as he is not at all specific about the part which these class 6 passives are supposed to play in the formation of the class 3 passive. Certainly the two types have a similar shape; they probably have a similar rhythmic and intonational pattern—they do in OE. So the class 6 passives with stranding may have helped the development of the class 3 passive by making familiar strings of the form passive verb-preposition. 51 But the syntax of that preposition is quite different. In the class 6 passives the particle is a preposition with a prep0, implicit or explicit (e.g. PE (the documents) which the servants were sent for), whereas the particle in the class 3 passive has no prep0, its notional prep0 having subject function (e.g. (the documents) which were sent for). Admittedly the difference is blurred in the passive infinitive types.

Another connection between the class 6 passives with stranding and class 3 passives is the fact that some collocations belong to both

50 There are forty-five citations ('Passive', pp.10-11), but one at least is misplaced, God is conli to tristen in (Wyclif), which is not passive.

51 The same would go for class 6 and class 3 examples in p-V order, which Gaaf neglects, except that the strings in question would have the reverse order.
classes, a PE example being send for, as illustrated above. Class 6 pass-
ives of those collocations might facilitate the development of class 3
passives. (Compare the tentative suggestion that the passive of leten of
in ME is strengthened by the passive use of transitive leten.) Of Caaf's
forty-four citations of passive class 6, probably only seven or eight are
also capable of being used in class 3.52

De la Cruz makes a stronger claim in the paper 'A Late 13th Century
Change in English Structure'. Although he argues that 'the most immediate
factor [in the formation of the class 3 passive] remains the confusion of
two different case-relations',53 the climax of his paper is the exposition
of a structural factor ('13c Change', pp.170-172). In effect he constructs
a $3 \times 3$ matrix—though he does not present it like that—in which the
columns represent classes 6, 5 and 2, respectively, and the rows represent
active relative clauses, passive relative clauses, and active infinitive
clauses.54 He then argues that the only empty space in his matrix is the
passive relative clause in class 3, and that there is significant struc-
tural pressure for the gap to be filled so that the symmetry of the system
may be enhanced. He fails to observe that this alleged structural pressure
would not lead directly to all kinds of class 3 passive, merely to those
in relative clauses with relative as subject. Not many of the early class
3 passives are of that type: I have noticed out of some three dozen
fourteenth-century examples only Cursor 8324; Rolle [Horstman] i 121.3;
Wyclif, Eng. Wks. 390.29; and (with relative clause reduction) Mannyng,
NE 1034.

52 The collocations are don by, nomin/taken fra, wrettyn for, (?) for-given
till, none to, sent to (x 2), called to.
53 That factor is dismissed as mistaken, pp.227-28 above.
54 De la Cruz's diagram actually allows for both p-v and v-p order at each
intersection, but he rightly argues that the transposition of the particle
affects each class and does not disrupt the system.
However, that is not a decisive objection. The real question is whether the relationships of the three classes and the three syntactic patterns are close enough and exclusive enough to constitute a system. The three syntactic patterns may be taken to stand for all the patterns which produce preposition stranding in classes 3 and 6 and which leave the adverbial particle in similar positions in class 2. All are related too by the general development of word-order which alters the fundamental position of the verb: the particles, being essentially spatial modifiers of the verb, all share the general transition from p-V to V-p order in the stranding patterns, though the adverbial particles of class 2 begin the transition before the stranded prepositions of classes 3 and 6.

Classes 2 and 3 have it in common that they are two-place verbs (one object in the active) consisting of a verbal formative and particle; classes 3 and 6 have it in common that they each govern a prep0. On the debit side we can observe that some of the commonest adverbial particles of class 2 (swee, dun, forb, up, ut, etc) do not belong to class 3 and 6 collocations in the ME period.55 As for the parallel between classes 2 and 3, we can note cautiously that the rhythmic and intonational patterns in FE at least are rather different for the two classes, whilst for classes 3 and 6 the particles involved and the rhythms are similar, but the syntax is very different in the crucial passive relative clauses:

there is a far closer structural parallel between the class 3 passive and the prepositional passive of (originally) class 6 collocations, as in be taken advantage of, than between the class 3 passive and the normal class 6 passive. And the structural parallels used by de la Cruz are

55 De la Cruz writes: 'There is still another factor that has contributed to the growth of the prepositional verb. We refer to the prepositional development of particles which are never attested as prepositions during the OE period: up, ut and down.' ('15c Change', p.169). But there is little evidence of their participation in close-knit class 3 group-verbs in ME and certainly not in the prepositional passive.
constant throughout the whole period from OE to ME; they do not explain why early ME should be the crucial time.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

Indefinite agency

It is a commonplace that passives are most often used with agent unexpressed, an observation which applies to the class 3 passive. It has frequently been conjectured that the rise of the class 3 passive (and indeed of the indirect passive) is related to the disuse of the indefinite pronoun *men*/*men*/*men*/*me*, e.g. by Saaf, 'Passive', p.19. The obsolescence of that pronoun in the late ME period and the alternatives available are discussed by Mustanoja, NE Syntax, pp.219-26, with additional references to previous work. He reports that 'in early ME . . . the active *men*-construction prevails (the active-passive ratio being approximately 3:1). For some reason or other the parts are reversed in late ME, where the passive of indefinite agency is a great deal commoner than the active indefinite construction with *men* (*men*).' (NE Syntax, p.226).

Verb-particle order

I have argued that the transition from *p-V* to *V-p* order in patterns with preposition stranding plays little part in the origin of the earliest class 3 group-verbs. However, the increasing regularity of *V-p* order—that is, fixed relative order and no other elements intervening—found in most syntactic patterns involving class 3, is strongly conducive to the lexicalisation of the collocations. They become equivalent to simple transitive verbs in every way except that inflectional morphology is centred on the verbal formative and leaves the particle unaffected. We may contrast two examples. Henry V writes in a letter . . . the Castell of Touque, e-boute the whiche our wel-beloued cosyn thelre of Hunnymdon lay (BCLondonk 67.6). Here the idiomatic class 3 group-verb *lie about*
'besiege' does not appear as an uninterrupted string. His fictional self, in a play written nearly two hundred years later, says *He two saw you four set on four, and bound them and were masters of their wealth... then did was two set on you fours...* (Shakespeare, H4 II.iv.235). Set on 'attack' is an idiom of opaque meaning, making it desirable to avoid splitting it up; hence if initial *then* is to provoke subject-verb inversion, the *do*-periphrasis must be used for verbal formative and particle to stay together. The idiomaticity of collocations and the fixity of word-order in most syntactic settings grow up side by side—each promotes the other. Of course, idiomaticity in many collocations predates the modern rules of word-order, but the establishment of the *do*-periphrasis in negatives, questions, etc., which has the effect of keeping lexical verb and complement adjacent, occurs during the period 1400-1700, which Visser records as showing rapid growth of the prepositional passive (Hist. Syntax, iii-2, 2123-27).
PREPOSITION STRANDING

Verb-particle order

The following lists of examples of preposition stranding involving
class 3 collocations are in intention complete. Only two class 3 examples
show p-V order in a relative clause:

(1) Jesum Patt mannkinn afferterr 3ernepb (12776)
(2) sallt ise swiðe god Per þer itt to bilimmepb (1656)56

A dubious contender is

(3) þing Patt he nohht off ne wisste (2928, 2934, 3112)

Witenn is probably transitive with nohht its nominal dir0, but it is
possible that witenn is being used intransitively with nohht adverbial.57

V-p order occurs over forty times:

(4) patt gillt Patt he wass fallenn inne (6022)
(5) patt kinedom, patt Godd Hehfragerr rixlepp inne (17106)
(6) Patt hallghe kineriche, / Patt Heffness King min Faderr shal
    Hehlike rixlenn inne (17173)
(7) Patt hallghe kineriche, / Patt Cristess Faderr, Heffness King,
    Hehlike rixlenn inne (17189)
(8) patt Kalledwissehe land, Patt teg3 pa comenn offe (3470)
(9) bure / Patt he comm offe intill þiss lif (14169)
(10) all patt Patt mann ma33 stenn offe (7805)
(11) þiss gode prest, Patt we nu walmenn offe (461)
(12) [antecedent] patt [subject] spacc offe (5602, 9890, 9943)
(13) pa fowre deor, Patt we nu spakkenn offe (5974, 5994)
(14) [antecedent] . . . Patt [subject] Spacc offe to [sb.] (5369, 10464)
(15) Pa staness patt he spacc þer off (9867)58

56WH tobillimmepb, but this is no compound verb, cf. tack an Off bisse
twinekenn lifess / Billimmepb to batt halleche swinne (6096).

57According to OED s.v. wit v', trans. use would be more likely at this date.
In OE the verb witenn is used absolutely, or + clause, or + nominal dir0.
Witenn off 'be aware of, have knowledge of' does not occur in demonstrable
class 3 use: either there is both an off-phrase and a batt-clause (e.g. 8447, 10532) or there is negation, always involving nohht as well as ne
(further examples 9941, 11733, 11905); cf. also Jack, 'Negative Adverbs'.

58WH beroff, which makes no sense and cannot be construed.
(16) Pa lifess patt icc habbe guw Summ del nu spelledd offe (6386)59
(17) dagge Patt Crist ras onne off debe (4346, 4362, 4540)
(18) patt obrer dagge patt Crist Eignann to flittenn onne (13400)
(19) Patt cheestre patt te Laferd Crist Comm till (9479)
(20) patt/tatt ilke follic Patt Crist comm till onn eorbe (9357, 9401)
(21) Patt Judiasskenn cheestre, / Patt sannte Narse ferrde till / Par itt wass i be muntess (2766)
(22) [antecedent] Patt we nu melenn umbe (303, 429, 6300 [WH umbe],
6320, 7452, 9983, 10015, 13194, 13626, 13638, 16824, 16986,
18835)
(23) Patt hus . . . / Par ba preo kingess commenn inn To lefenn uppo
Criste (6930)50
(24) Beplewness cheestre, / Par ba twa gengess commenn till, To lefenn
uppo Criste (6831)

Relatives with the verb 'to be' are the following:

(25) [antecedent] patt [subject] iss/wass inne (3634, 3651, 6452, 7023,
19035)
(26) An sob Israeiisshe man, Patt niss na(n) fakenn inne (12796,
13606, 13642)
(27) Rihht tomar abuffenn Par be child Wass inne wipp his moderr (6438)
(28) Sallmsang, patt Nicodem Wess depe lereodd onne (16946)
(29) all patt alde lagheboc Patt he wass lereodd onne (17332)
(30) hire child tatt sho wass wipp (1803)
(31) Patt frummbbe patt [subject] iss/wass wipp (18558, 18727)

There is one WH-clause with a class 3 collocation:

(32) Her iss whamm guw birrb follghenn, / Whamm all mannkinn birrb lefenn
onn, & follghenn all hiss wille (12887)

Infinitive clauses with preposition stranding are found in both p-V and
V-p orders:

(33) Forr itt uss tacnepp strang wipp hann & luftsumm onn to lokenn, / & Crist iss bape-strang wipp hann, & luftsumm onn to lokenn
(3582)
(34) & ter bitwenenn wass pe sand All harrd to ganngenn onne (14802)

There are also questions, direct and indirect, introduced by where and with
the preposition placed afterwards, but it follows where immediately and is
not stranded:

59Ambiguous between classes 3 and 6 in the same way as example (3), but
taken as class 3.

60It is quite possible that her is not a relative adverb here but a con-
junction meaning 'when': note the use of inn rather than inuill, and cf.
be in analogous position in a closely related clause (6464). I have
counted the example thus in Chapter 5, but here I follow the analogy of
example (24) instead.
(35) wheroft Is biss batt tu me cnausst? (13694)
(36) Nathansmi to fra33nenn to Pe Laferred Crist wheroft / Patt wass
batt he cnow himm swa wel (13702)
(37) & he toe sone & drannc batt win Patt wass off waterr wurrpenn, / &
nisste he nohht wheroftte itt wass (14050)

There are no clauses of comparison with preposition stranding involving
class 3 collocations.

Examples (1) – (34) show that V-p order greatly outnumbers p-V order
for stranded prepositions in Orm. They also corroborate the claim that
p-V order is equally effective in grouping verb and particle together
positionally. In every case the preposition is separated from its prep0,
if there is one. Preposition and lexical verb are juxtaposed except in
the p-V examples (3) and (33), where the proclitics ne and to intervene,
and the V-p examples (15) and (18), where more substantial elements inter-
vene (unless in (18) bigenn to flittenm is regarded as a verbal group). I
discount examples (26), (26) and (29) involving the verb 'to be'.

Topicalisation of prepositional object

True topicalisation of a full NP governed by a preposition is not
found in Orm. A similar word-order appears in att tett burr3heses zate
himm comm An widewe townness (8631). Here, as with some of the OE and
early ME examples cited on pp.203-204 above, the operative principle seems
to be the fronting of light, unstressed pronouns; cf. p.183 above. The
same principle accounts for such examples as Forr batt mann sholde himm
munndennenn onn (15490), Forr batt he wollde himm cumenn to (6632), Pa
l-wcheess batt himm comenn to (8081), though not hwr he fictre wass unnderr
(13715, 13925).61

Cause and effect

Gaaf's claim, discussed earlier, is that proposition stranding in

61 The word-order here seems to me unidiomatic, perhaps metri causa; cf.
hwr bu wass unnderr en fichtre (13700).
relative clauses is due to a feeling 'that the preposition belonged to the
verb rather than to the relative' ('Passive', p.11), whereas I have sug-
gested that this is to confuse cause and effect: preposition stranding
in relatives is a mere consequence of the choice of the indeclinable
relative pronoun as clause connective, in early ME at least. The rival
assertions can be tested by eliminating one possible factor, that of verb-
particle attraction: we consider relative clauses where the relative is
direct object of the verb in the relative clause, and then also clauses in
which the relative has different functions again. In most cases there is
a choice available in principle between balt and a wh-relative. First I
show that there is 100% correlation between b-relative and preposition
stranding on the one hand and between wh-relative and 'Fied Piping' (prep-
osition before relative) on the other. Then we compare the numbers of
relative clauses which use balt or a wh-pronoun in the various functions.

Unfortunately, relative clauses shade into wh-clauses, indirect
questions, factive clauses, comparative clauses—a syntactic quagmire
which need not concern us here. (Gaaf does not define what he means by
relative clause; nearly all his examples are adjectival in function,
mostly restrictive, apart from some of those introduced by there/where.)
Most problem cases are avoided by confining discussion to adjectival rela-
tive clauses where the relative has a nominal or clausal antecedent; a
further advantage is that such clauses usually permit a choice for the
relative. Just one borderline problem needs to be mentioned, illustrated
in the following examples:

(38) teg3 haffdenn don All balt te boc hemm tahhte (7687)
(39) Helyas be prophete... sihhte winnenn wel All whattse he wolle
geornenn (8690)
(40) To lisstenn whatt te preost gwi g333b Off giure sawle nede (9017)
(40) is clearly a nominal (wh-)clause, but the others resemble it somewhat
in function, even though both can be taken as adjectival relative clauses
with all as nominal antecedent. I count those like (38) but not those
like (39) in my lists of relative clauses.

The lists of relative clauses where the relative is prepO cover the whole WH text. To make a comparison with clauses where the relative is dirO I read a portion of the text chosen at random, lines 7571-12719, over a quarter of the whole. Finally, to permit further comparison with clauses where the relative has other functions I read a shorter, randomly-chosen portion, lines 12720-13999. I have tried to distinguish restrictive (R) from non-restrictive (N) clauses, but it is a difficult distinction in some cases.

Clauses where the relative is prepO are presented in separate lists according to the lexical verb. First, clauses with an intransitive lexical verb, making a class 3 collocation (cf. PE the house that I live in).


bar: 1657 R, 6932 N, 6932 R.


Second, clauses where the verb is 'to be' cf. PE the house that I am in).


bar: 6438 R.


Third, clauses with a transitive verb (cf. PE the house that I saw you in). 62


62 I have treated as transitive verbs aviddenn + batt-clause, seggenn + batt-clause/direct speech, underratanndenn + bu-/batt-/whatt-clause, vvittenn + batt-/whatt-clause, and the string toc to weneenn + batt-clause. I have made the assumption that whatt in 123 and 417 has an antecedent (nohit and nan hing, respectively), though each clause could equally well be taken as nominal.
Fourth, clauses with a transitive verb in the passive (cf. the house that you were seen in).


**whamp/whatt**: 2831 N, 7649 N, 13492 R, 13546 R, 18568 N.

In every case **batt** and **ber** are accompanied by preposition stranding, whereas the **wh**-pronoun is preceded by its governing preposition. (It should be clear that we are not concerned with prepositions that belong to the main clause rather than to the relative clause; in any case such relative clauses are nominal ones.)

The choice of relative pronouns and adverbs is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>batt</th>
<th>ber</th>
<th>wh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>39 (R 33)</td>
<td>3 (R 2)</td>
<td>11 (R 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to be'</td>
<td>13 (R 7)</td>
<td>1 (R 1)</td>
<td>55 (R 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans. active</td>
<td>8 (R 8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 (R 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans. passive</td>
<td>39 (R 37)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (R 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Relatives dependent on a preposition

In the following clauses in the specified sample the relative pronoun has the function of dirO (cf. **FE** the house that I saw).


**whamp/whatt**: 8030 R, 9411 R, 10370 N.

A shorter sample is used for clauses in which the relative has subject function (cf. **FE** the house that faces east).

There are no examples with wh-pronouns.

In the same sample the following clauses have the relative in an adverbial function (cf. PE the last time that I saw him):


bmr: 12899 R, 13740 R, 13744 R, 13925 R.

There is also one possible example of a relative clause with the relative in ind0 function (cf. PE the chap that I gave a lift): & niccle bettre ise hiss till use . . . Penn batt wass till Natanesel. Patt ure laferred seconds. / Patt he sahh him. . . . (13902). The second batt-clause is either a relative clause with antecedent Natanesel\(^63\) or else a complement clause ('better for us to . . . than it was for Nathanael that . . .').

All the lists given above are collected together in the following table, with queried entries counted as if they were certain.

---

\(^{63}\) Relative batt as ind0 is occasionally attested in Orm, e.g. & tatt head wass hambre heed Patt Crist gaff ha aville takenn (3438, simil. 16216). Relative whamm as ind0 is apparently found in batt mann . . . Whamm bu har(r) witness to be follic (17940, 18266; compare 12615 and 18342).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>function of relative in clause</th>
<th>corpus</th>
<th>batt</th>
<th>hwh</th>
<th>wh</th>
<th>total of relative clauses</th>
<th>percentage with batt or hwh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>12720-13999</td>
<td>84 (R 61)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84 (R 61)</td>
<td>100% (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>8   (R 8)</td>
<td>4 (R 4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (R 12)</td>
<td>100% (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind0</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>1   (R 0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (R 0)</td>
<td>100% (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dir0</td>
<td>7571-12719</td>
<td>63 (R 54)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (R 2)</td>
<td>66 (R 56)</td>
<td>95% (96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep0</td>
<td>all WH text</td>
<td>99 (R 85)</td>
<td>4 (R 3)</td>
<td>93 (R 11)</td>
<td>196 (R 99)</td>
<td>53% (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep0 (class 3)</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>39 (R 33)</td>
<td>3 (R 2)</td>
<td>11 (R 3)</td>
<td>53 (R 38)</td>
<td>79% (92%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Relative pronouns

The figures cannot be made to carry too much weight: the full prep0 figures are compared with a partial sample of dir0 relatives, and there is a supplementary comparison with a smaller sample of other relative functions; the single, dubious ind0 example is clearly statistically useless. It is possible too that the percentages are distorted by the repetition of set phrases. Nevertheless some conclusions can be drawn. Preposition stranding effectively rules out selection of a wh-relative in O, whereas there is the lone nominal relative of example (32), not covered by this analysis of adjectival clauses—whilst pre-NP position ('Pied Piping') demands it.64 Second, it is clear that overall the vast majority of adjectival relative clauses use the batt-relative, given that the totals for subject, adverbial and dir0 function would have to be scaled up to represent the numbers in the whole text. In particular, the batt-relative is the favoured choice in clauses where the relative is dir0. Therefore if the selection

---

64 It appears that wh with preposition stranding is generally uncommon in early ME, to judge from the paucity of examples in Gaaf, 'Passive', p.12, and Visser, Hist. Syntax, i, 401.
of **batt** in clauses where the relative is prep0 is due to a feeling 'that the preposition belong[s] to the verb' (Gaaf, 'Passive', p.11), one would not expect such clauses actually to have a lower proportion of **b**-relatives —slightly lower in the case of restrictive relatives, markedly lower overall.

The figures are consonant with the following general points. The unmarked form of relative is **batt**, selected for all types of relative clause unless overridden by some particular conditioning factor. Tendencies which might play a part include the following: (i) an incipient specialisation of **batt** for restrictive relatives and **wh** for non-restrictive ones, 65 (ii) a feeling that preposition and prep0 belong together, (iii) avoidance of confusion between a **batt**-relative and some other construction, (iv) the possibility of specifying human/non-human distinction with **wh**, (v) a preference for **wh**-forms as generalising relatives, (vi) an incipient preference for **wh** as combined antecedent and relative. (The last-mentioned would not affect the relatives under discussion here.) The occurrence of preposition stranding in relative clauses in *Oyn* can be largely put down to the selection of **batt** as relative, without reference to the closeness or otherwise of the verb-particle bond.

ELLIPSIS

Ellipsis after a normally transitive verb is not very common, except when a series of transitive verbs shares the same object, notionally at least, and the NP is not explicitly repeated for each verb, e.g. *To fedenn & to fosstrenn henn. To staorenn & to berrchein* (1558), *He zeff henn bisne cod inoh To lufrin God & dredein* (851). Possible examples where the verb is not in such a series include the following:

(1) **bitellen** and **werenn**: Puss mihte gho bitellen [sic WH] wel & werenn purzh bätt bisne (2045)
(2) **ferrsenn** and **flitenn**: hat herrtess lusst, To ferrsenn & to flitenn (14206, 15652)

Here we have suppression of a reflexive object: compare **bitellen** (7302), **werenn** (1406 etc), **ferrsenn** (19663), **flitenn** (15853), and see Visser, Hist. Syntax, i, 145-52.

(3) **berenn** & te33 . . . berenn ba to drunkenn / Patt hæfelled mann (14046; cf. 15316)
(4) "brekenn: he bracc ɔmɔgan Drihtin all hise hænnkess (15)

This usage of **break** is unparalleled in the dictionaries, but cf. **WHom** 20(BH), 49.

(5) **follghenn**: gıff lu . . . follghesest a3g clamnnessess slop, & lērest me to follghenn (1190)
(6) **geornenn**: Purrh wuht me neege geornenn, / Furr sume geornenn eorplig bing (11510)
(7) **haldenn**: ıtt [he, kirrtell] iss neh pe lich & haldēb warrn pe mare (10145)
(8) "adenn upp: Gap till wipp gure cuppeß, / & ladeb upp & berebß itt Till balldernmann on hæfelled (14043)
(9) **mekenn**: Pærôffe he mihte makenn mann, "Giff Patt he makenn wollde (9917)
(10) **streñkenn**: 3ade he þæbenn ut To streñeñkenn i pe kirke (1098; cf. 1771, 1799)
(11) **takenn** and **etenn**: & purzh Patt Adam toc & et Swa summ pe deôfell zerrnde (12350)

However, the expression 'a normally transitive verb' is a vague one, and there is no clear dividing line between such examples as (1) - (11) and others involving verbs more commonly found in absolute use, e.g.

(12) Patt tu pe loke wel patt tu Ne stele noht ne refe (4466)
(13) Tenn menn . . . Patt . . . etenn ìpe & drunkenn (4794)
(14) & affterr patt he seb, he dop (13618)
(15) Giff patt ıss patt mann drunkkëpp itt Att oferrdon, itt kwennkëpp (15212)

A similar problem arises with ellipsis after particles. I give some examples where adverbial use is unusual or where there is a strong sense of a prep 'understood':

(16) **affterrward**: & Farraon wipp all hiss ferd Comm affterrward wipp wrappe (14792)
(17) **bitwenenn**: Patt ìss min bodeward, tatt 3e 3uw lufenn swa bitwenenn (5272, cf. 5279)
(18) i: Butt iff mann 3afe i mare (10182; cf. p.177 above)
(19) **oferr**: òg33perr . . . gede upp o pe flumm . . . & all comm oferr drissfot (10335)
(20) till: see pp.96-97 above.
(21) to: Henne alle wile icc nammenn her Bi beggre firrste wordess. / & talle wile icc setten to (D337)
(22) wibb: us ne birrb nohht taker mell wibb, òiff anig mann uss eggebb, / To don . . . (11841; cf. pp.101-102 above)
(23) wibb: Forr pine iss sur & bitebb wibb & swennkebb erblig kinde (15203)

Bitebb wibb is glossed by WH 'biteth tenaciously'. The verb bite is not normally collocated with with in English, and one possible explanation of wibb here is that it stands for wibball 'moreover'; but see further below.

(24) wibball: & o batt an [sc. bucc] he leggde per All beggre sake & sine, / & let itt eornenn forp wibball [WH forwp wibb all] Ut imtill wilde wesste (1334, cf. pp.176-77 above; sim. 12282)

There is one example of the type which might lead to restructuring and a genuinely shared object, where a potentially transitive verb (drachenn forp) and a potentially transitive particle (off) occur in conjoined clauses with a single overt expression of an object NP (here clausal) that notionally belongs to both:

(25) & mólde nohtte lape gast Per drachenn forp, ne malenn / Off batt terrafftert sone iss seg̣d & writenn off himm sellenn (11939).

Drachenn forp elsewhere in Orm is always transitive or passive.

**SEMANTIC UNIFICATION AND COLLOCATIONAL RESTRICTION**

A number of class 3 collocations in Orm demonstrate semantic developments which reinforce the unity of verb and particle. The following collocations use the verbal formative in an idiomatic meaning: fallenn (inn) till 'appertain to', gan till 'conduce to', haldenn wibb 'side with', lettenn off 'look upon', lokenn till 'look after', stanndenn ongenn 'resist', swinnkenn till 'journey to'.

In many collocations the preposition has lost its literal, spatial sense: biddenn uponn, *bidenn affterr, cleppenn (upp)on, fiaskenn affterr, xeornenn affterr, haldenn onn, herenn till, *holenn onn, hunntenn affterr, langenn affterr, leppenn (upp)onn, lechenn onn, *liastenn affterr,
lisstenn till, *littenn to, lokenn (upp)onn, mushenn oferr, rixenn oferr, sekenn afterr, seon onn, stanndenn ommeg, swinnkenn afterr, takenn wibb, trowenn (upp)onn, wirkenn onn, wunndreenn onn. Omitted to save space are the collocations of abuten, off, umbbe in the sense ‘concerning’.

Other apparently habitual collocations include biddenn forr, blimmenn off, cunnenn onn, dalenn wibb, fleon fra, kellenn off, lokenn till, rekkenn off, *rinenn upponn, rosenn off, sennen onngenn(ess), sekenn till, shedenn fra, shinenn onn, spekenn wibb, witen off, wunndreenn off, wurrbenn till.

Dissolution of compound verbs

Of the large number of compound verbs in Oerm (see Chapter 4 above), most have either survived intact into ModE (e.g. unnderrtakenn) or have become defunct without ever appearing in two-word form (e.g. *forrwurrbenn). There is little evidence in Oerm of a process of dissolution of compound verbs to produce class 3 collocations. The particles which need to be considered are oferr, hurrh, umbbe and wibb.

Oferr- is a living prefix in Oerm. OED’s first citations for overfall, overdil, overswive (unique to Oerm) and overthink all come from this text, and the prefix seems to have usurped some of the functions of off- (which also occurs): *oferrhinukenn (x 2) is equivalent to OED’s ofthink, *oferrtredenn (x 3) is used beside offtredenn (as well as tredenn dun, etc), *oferrfallenn (x 1) seems in context to have the meaning given by OED for offfall, and a compound from the same semantic group is *oferrwerrnenn, used twice in text subsequently erased. Now *hinukenn is impersonal, tredenn and werrnenn are transitive in Oerm, but fallenn is intransitive: *oferrfallenn could therefore in principle break up into a class 3 collocation, though subsequent English has preferred fall (down) on, fall on top of rather than fall over in senses like *oferrfallenn (but without the connotation of destruction). A transitivizing function is seen also in
oferrewifenn (x 2; cf. OE oferewidan), akin in form and sense to the long-established oferrumanenn (x 20) and oferrgannangenn (x 1), but cf. also muchenn ofer (8043). *Oferreldenn (x 1) and *oferrflowenn (x 1) as used in OTH would correspond to class 2 and 1 collocations respectively if they broke up, whilst *oferrbedenn (x 1) and the idiom att oferrdon (x 5) show oferr- in the sense 'to excess', which has remained a prefixed function.

The prefix burrh- in OTH confers the senses 'throughout' or 'thoroughly' on the simplex, sometimes with a transitivizing function; compounds containing it are burrhgean (x 1), burrbloken (x 1), burrhsekenn (x 16), *burrhonean (x 2), *burrhwundenn (x 6). Only the first two correspond to later collocations of similar meaning, though burrh prep. in OTH is not much used in the senses 'throughout' or 'from beginning to end of'.

The prefix umabe- forms many new compounds in NE; see OED. OTH has the unique compound umbeclippenn 'circumcise' (x 1) beside clippenn (x 1) and clippenn awæx; (x 2)—the verb clippenn is a Scandinavian borrowing—as well as the more common umbeshwenn (x 14) and umbeshwenn awæx; (x 2). Both compounds are probably calques ultimately on L. circumcidere and do not occur in separated form. OTH's third compound with this prefix is umbeshapenken (x 9), the first citation in OED. The collocation hemmekenn umbe (x 1) dates back to OE, however. See p.85 above for discussion of the doublet.

Wibb- occurs in wibbegenn (x 3), for which there is no evidence of dissolution in OED, and in wibbestanndenn (x 10). Gaaf discusses the dissolution of the latter in early NE ('Passive', p.16), but the collocation may have been an independent formation. In OTH the use of trans. wibbestanndenn beside wibbestanndenn ongenn and stanndenn ongenn shows that the prefix has lost its original sense and that the compound is probably as opaque in meaning as it is in PE, but the preposition wibb has also almost lost the
sense 'against'.

I have not noticed any class 3 collocations in Orm which correspond
to earlier, synonymous compounds of the same elements. There seems,
therefore, to be not much interchange between prefix and preposition
illustrated here—and some of what there is is in the retrograde direction,
that of formation of new compounds.

_decay of prefixal and case systems_

I give here an indication of the range of functions of class 3 collo-
cations in Orm by listing against a number of them (i) any (near-) synonyms
amongst the single-word verbs in Orm, (ii) equivalent OE compounds if there
are no equivalent compounds in Orm, and/or (iii) equivalent use of the
cognate verb + case in OE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orm</th>
<th>OE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bidenn affterr</td>
<td>abidenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clepenn (upp)onn</td>
<td>clepenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumenn onn</td>
<td>bilispenn, cumenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fihhtenn (onn)onn</td>
<td>fleon, attfleón, forraekenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fleon fra</td>
<td>legstenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragynenn off</td>
<td>befrigyn + gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gellpeann off</td>
<td>geornenn affterr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geornenn affterr</td>
<td>*currsenn, butenn, putenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrecnenn till</td>
<td>harrcenn, herenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kepenn off (neg.)</td>
<td>forrhoghenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lukenn oferr</td>
<td>*hilukenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lefenn (upp)onn</td>
<td>lefenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libenn wipbutenn</td>
<td>spelenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokenn (upp)onn</td>
<td>bihaldenn, *gowenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokenn till</td>
<td>findenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mælenn off/ummb</td>
<td>oferrawifenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mughenn oferr</td>
<td>barrnenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nedenn to</td>
<td>neghenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neghenn towardd</td>
<td>*rinenn upponn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*zekenn off (neg.)</td>
<td>forrhoghenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rixleonn oferr</td>
<td>weldenn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Abb (3907, 8608, 11471, 12654) contrasts with (onn)onn. Vestigial traces of the OE senses are found at 2468, 6251, 10227, 11887.]
The list is not intended to be complete or definitive, nor is it intended to imply that class 3 use is in all cases absent in OE.

The use of a verb either transitively, or intransitively with a preposition, allows for different nuances of meaning and even perhaps for quite different meanings to be expressed. *Drinckenn off* exists beside *drinckenn*—here the difference of meaning is clear enough—but with *takenn wibb* and *takenn* any difference is now imperceptible. Similarly we have *fleson* with and without *frea, wurzbenn* with and without *till*. Sometimes there is a choice between different particles for a given verb, again not always with a clear difference of meaning. Where there is difference, the class 3 collocation becomes a tool for greater precision and expressiveness. Some of the alternative prepositions in class 3 are as follows: *blisseenn forf/ off, fallenn inn/underrpell, lechenn off/onn, malenn off/umbe, rixlenn inn/aferr, sekenn afterf/forf/till, benkenn abutenn/off/umbe, wibbrenn ongennes/wibb, wunndrenn off/onn*. Takedenn *Wibbit lines 8464-85* is a marginal alteration of *takenn till* (WN notes; Turville-Petre, 'Studies', p.20.

 sixty *Bigenn* 'dwell' is not used transitively ('inhabit') in *Ory*, but cf. participial *unnbigedd*. 
SYNTACTIC RESTRUCTURING

Repetition of particle

There is only one possible example of the repetition of a preposition in stranded position as well as before a wh-pronoun. The clause is an indirect question, the collocation is class 6: beza Himn wolldenn bare fraconenn. / Wibb whatt tæg mimhtenn cwenenn himm Swa bwerrt ut wel wibb alle. / Pæt he hurzh Halix Gæst inn hemm Himn wolldie takenn resste (12986). Wibb alle at the end of the clause looks very much like an otiose duplication of wibb at the beginning, though it would antedate OED s.v. wibbal prep. B, whose first quotation is from Cursor. But then wibball (1336) similarly antedates wibbal adv. A.2; see p.176 above.

The real problem is that wibb alle is very common in Orm as a vaguely intensifying sentence adverb, often used as padding, and corresponding to OED's wibbal adv. A.1 'besides, moreover, ... '; at times it appears to have the contextual meaning 'entirely'. 68 Wibb alle in the example under discussion could belong to this type, especially as the whole phrase swa/ all bwerrt ut wel wibb alle recurs at 4203, 5137, 15035, and 16899. On the other hand, the hu-clause in the following extract is very similar to our indirect question, except that it lacks both wibb and wibb alle: & ta ditt shulenn sibben sen. Hu sitt na mughenn cwenenn / Swa bwerrt ut wel. batt ioc me shall. In zumnkerr herrte resstenn (13042). That might suggest that wibb alle is an echo of wibb.

In the following example there is a particle next to the verb in addition to the preposition in pre-NP position: Pexx alle semenn zedenn inn Wibb himm inntill batt errke (14554).

68 Note especially Pa batt tokenn hemm till Crist Hallflinnness, nohht wibb alle (15766), and cf. a similar use of mid(æ)alle, e.g. Da 103.30, Gw1 & M. 666.
There are two examples to consider:

(1) Te ðirp heilppen ðwhilc mann ðatt neð ise to þin heilppe / Wibb all ðatt tu mitht speleyn wel & libbem þer wibbutenn, / Off all ðatt welreldyng ðatt te þin ðrihtin hafépp lenedd (10131)

(2) Forr þine ise sur & bitepp wibb & owennkepp orblig kinde (15206)

The syntax of both is uncertain. In (1) libbem þer wibbutenn goes with the auxiliary mitht and is parallel to speleyn ['spare'] wel. Either þer is prep0 of wibbutenn or it is the adverb meaning 'there, then'. As prep0 of wibbutenn it would be syntactically redundant, there being a potential prep0 in the relative ðatt, but that kind of anacoluthon does occur elsewhere, e.g. Henness herxtess, ðatt skoldeyn ben his ðepp bus. To reostenn himm parinne (15639). As the sentence adverb 'there, then' it would be semantically redundant, but metrical padding is common enough in Oryg, and none of the usual monosyllabic expedients—mitht, wel, all—is wholly suitable here. In fact þer is quite often inserted 'he rime swa to fillenn'. Only if the latter is the case could it be argued that example (1) has an object shared between a transitive verb and a class 3 collocation. Example (2) looks as if it might have a shared object, orblig kinde, though the apparent collocation of *bitenn + wibb is almost unparalleled and obscure; cf. p.245 above.

69 Similar occurrences of pleonastic þer are found at 12654 and 14546; other pleonastic pronouns include himm (6914), himm (12561, 12606, 15013).

70 Examples include 14308, 14668, 17916, 18107, and two especially telling parallels; ðatt oberry bucc. ðoc þer wibb wibb dæppes gine (1376) and Tokenn þer wibb | WH bærwibb| twinne mett (15084, cf. 15092). In spite of initial impressions to the contrary, both of them have tokenn wibb + nominal prep0, with þer meaning 'there, then'.

71 I am told by Helen Maclean that hide wed in Danish is an archaic collocation meaning 'hang on, hold fast, cling on tenaciously', which would fit the context of the phrase in Oryg; WH Glossary compares Den. holde wed. Compare also bitest vid e-n 'bides med en', s.v. bita v. in Johan Fritzner, Græbog over set gamle norske & prog. 3 vols (Christiania, 1886-96).
PASSIVIZATION

There are no examples of passive class 3 collocations in Ory.

Leten of

I have suggested that the early passivization of *leten of* is partly explained by the familiarity of the passive of trans. *leten*. The argument cannot be valid if trans. and intrans. *leten* are morphologically distinct, yet that is the implication of the separate WH glossary entries, *letenn* 'think, judge' and *letenn, letenn* 'let, allow, leave; commit, entrust'. D'Ardenne, too, in discussing 'two more or less distinct conjugations' of the verb in language AE, mentions that 'a somewhat similar differentiation is seen in the Ormulum' (SJ, pp.247-48). In her analysis the present stems differ, the past tenses are identical, and the past participles are orthographically identical but differ in the length of stem vowel, the evidence for this being less strong than for the other points.

The evidence of *Orm* is as follows. There is a present stem *let*, with long vowel.72 There is a present stem *let*, probably with short vowel.73 And there is a present stem *lat*, with long vowel.74 (OWD and MHD, incidentally, lump all three together s.vv. *let v* and *leten v*, respectively.) All past tense forms have the stem *let*, probably with long

---

72 *E* is always a long vowel in *Orm*, unless in *modmod, demwenn*; see Clark, *Est. Chron.* p.1 and references given there; furthermore the intermittently-used acute accent is usually a sign of length, whilst *læte* is line final at 4859 and 4897 and so cannot have a short first syllable.

73 Non-past *letenn* is frequently written with a breve accent above the stem vowel, is never line final, and cf. ModE *let* with short vowel (on which see W. van der Gaaf, 'Contributions to the History of English', MPh. 12 (1927), 194-99 (pp.195-96)).

74 The stem only appears in 3 pres. sg. *latebb*, line final at 1229, and corresponding to the noun *læte* 'appearance, manner', also line final at 1213, 1235, and 9998. The verb must derive from ON *læta* rather than OE *lætan*, just as *læte* comes from ON *lát*, *leti.*
The past participle is *leten* once and *-letenn* three times, the latter only in the compound *forrletenn*.

The relation between form and function is only partly observable, as the meanings 'let go', 'loose', 'lose', 'abandon' do not appear in the present system or in the past participle, unless in the compound *forrletenn*, where the spelling is consistently *-lent-. All present forms of 'think, judge, esteem' have the *lent-** spelling—d'Ardenne's 'usually' is over-cautious—as do two occurrences with the evident meaning 'behave' and one with the meaning 'pretend, act as if'.

Three occurrences of *latebb*, also carrying the meaning 'behave', must be referred to a different verb, *latenn*: there is no parallel in *Orm* for a 3 pres. sg. in *-e*—corresponding to an infinitive in *-e* or *-e*, apart from the variants *slēp/slab* and *slēw/slēn*. The only other past participle or present occurrences of the verb all involve the semi-auxiliary meanings 'cause' or 'allow', mostly with a following infinitive. Of these, five infinitives are spelt *letenn*, one infinitive is spelt *latenn*, four 2 sg. imperatives are spelt *let*, and one past participle is spelt *letenn*. It seems to me that the evidence for a systematic *letenn/latenn* distinction is inconclusive, and that in any case, if the compound *forrletenn* is taken into consideration, both the trans. 'let go' senses and the intrans. 'think' senses belong to the *lent-* stem. In *Orm*, then, they are indeed the same verb.

**INFECTIONAL SYNCRETISM**

Case syncretism has removed all dative/accusative distinctions from the grammar of *Orm*. A subject/oblique distinction is maintained only in

---

75 The past sg. regularly and the past pl. often have acute accent(s) over the stem vowel, and cf. OE *let*, *leten*. Full details of the forms can be found in Bernhard Thüns, *Das Verb* bei *Orm*: Ein Beitrag zur *Os. Grammatik* (dissertation Leipzig, 1909; Weiβes i. Th., 1909), pp. 34, 69.

76 Lines 13658, 16532 and 7322, respectively, all wrongly glossed in WH.
personal pronouns, except *itt*, and in a few proper names of foreign origin.77 All other nouns have a common case form, most have a different possessive or genitive case form (which is never used as a verb or particle object), and some have a prepositional case. There is random use of *e* in such nouns as *lem(e)*, *bigiminning(e)*. Inflectional endings in adjectives and determiners, apart from sporadic survivals, have nothing to do with case marking.78

**Indirect passive**

There is no question of a formal category 'dative' in Ory, but one can argue for a functional category 'indirect object'. It is doubtful whether meaning can be used to identify indirect objects: for example, is someone who is taught any less a recipient than someone who is spoken to, or who is given something? And position in the verb phrase is much less secure a guide than it would be in OE:

1. *Hire frend Hann tokenn rab hitwenenn, / To gifenn hire summ god mann (2367) 'give her to some good man'
2. *a mann pa seggde patt te king (8143) 'told that to the king'
3. *To gifenn heoffness lihht & leom patt follic patt sholld him folighenn (3974)
4. *a wel itt birlp uss trowenn (2680)
5. *a wel uss birlp itt lefenn (1617)

The modern tendency to put ind0 before dir0 is clearly present in Ory, but my examples (1) - (3) are chosen to show that it can be overridden by a tendency to front pronouns or by a desire to put last an element which is to be further qualified; see also Palmatier, *Descr. Synter*, pp.55-56.

Three further tests can be made use of. We can call a personal NP an ind0 if it is interchangeable with a *to- or till*-phrase:

77Viz. the oblique forms *Helvamm, Herodian, Jesum(n), Lucam, Harrcumm, Mansvamm, Masvamm*, which differ from the subject forms. Not all of them are used consistently.

(6) Mann segde himm þa þatt ... (8369)
(7) tegr segdenn to Johan [direct speech] (10291)
(8) he þa segðe þuss till hemm [direct speech] (10289)

A passive participial adjective like undemded might be assumed to prove that the verb, here demenn, takes a dir0 and not ind0 in the active. And an object shared by two 'linked' verbs might suggest that both verbs govern the same kind of object. Thus from
(9) þe birrp ... Wel lufenenn menn & hellpenn (5182)

it could be argued that hellpenn takes a dir0 in Orm. 79

There are a number of so-called 'impersonal' verbs which occur without grammatical subject or with non-anaphoric itt as subject, and which appear only in 3 sg. A personal NP is clearly object of such a verb if it is an inflected pronoun or plural; if it is a common case noun or pronoun in the singular its status is equivocal. The following verbs belong here:
(10) *bihofenn, *birenn, langenn, *lisstenn, *reowenn, shetenn, purrfe, beon noht off

To these can be added some verbs which are similar except that a subject other than itt is possible:
(11) bilippenn, likenn, misalikenn, pinnkenn

These verbs have no passive. The personal NP can be introduced by to or till only for bilippenn.

79 These assumptions are not necessarily justified. For example, the verb buchenn has an oblique-case object (e.g. 6627) which is interchangeable with a to-phrase (e.g. 11386) or till-phrase (e.g. 7100), and yet buchenn is linked with fellhhenn (1303) which in turn is linked elsewhere with verbs that certainly take a dir0. And speleenenn has personal objects introduced by to (e.g. 6275) and till (e.g. 8715), though it is linked elsewhere to verbs that govern a dir0 (e.g. fullhtenn (9150)). One way out is to argue that the verbs are not linked after all—one is being used elliptically. But it is quite likely that the tests give conflicting results: cf. the PE verb lecture. These personal object can resemble either a dir0 ('reprimand') or an ind0 ('give lecture to'). Buchenn and speleenenn are the only problem cases, however: there are none in the crucial group of verbs with two non-prepositional objects.

80 There is also one clear example (unless an error) of *birenn used personally, alle þe ... birrdenn cleunenn hemm (4026), and a very probable one at 6632. All the rest are equivocal or impersonal.
The remaining verbs that take a single object and are descended from OE verbs which govern a dative include the following: 81


Another group comes from OE verbs which govern a genitive: 82

(13) abidenn, brukennenn, gemennenn, nitennenn, ommonnenn, strehennenn, trowennenn

The object of such verbs is a dirO in Orm (leaving aside the conflicting evidence for buchenn discussed in note 79 above): several occur in passives where the non-oblique case of the subject NP is certain, two have passive participial adjectives, and most are linked to verbs that undoubtedly take direct objects. 83

Having discussed the one- and two-place verbs we can now deal with verbs that take two non-prepositional objects—the ones which might provide examples of the indirect passive. Those in Orm fall into four sub-groups. The first kind of verb has a personal indO which is interchangeable with a to- or till-phrase:

(14) swmennenn, bitacennenn, bitcennenn, brinngennenn, *cweennennenn, gifenenn, kibennenn, ofrennenn, recennennenn, seggennenn, senndennenn, setennennenn, shwennennenn, spellemennenn, tscennennenn, timbrennenn.

Passives of the type

(15) Himm gifenennenn wass patt riche (7011)
(16) Peg3 wisstennenn bitt himmennenn wass patt da33 summ unncup sihhpe shweddenn (227)

are common, equivocal passives of the The king was shown a palace type

are rare, and indirect passives of the He was shown a palace type are

81 Other cases are also found in OE after the etyma of some of these verbs.

82 As note 81.

83 Berrghennenn, demennenn, frofrennennenn and werrpennenn occur in the passive; the case of the NP in passives of cweennennenn (13804) and helppennenn (6201) is unclear. The participial adjectives lmrreddennenn, umdenedden, and umplappedden confirm the status of demennennenn and lerenennenn. And the linking test confirms the transitivity of buchennenn, cweennennenn, folighennennenn, fon, forsekanennenn, frofrennenn, godennenn, gemennennenn, helppennennenn, lerenennennenn, ommonnennennenn, stcrennennennenn, trowennennennennenn, wissennennennenn, wibbstanndennenn.
not found. A number of the verbs do have passives with a personal subject, but only when it corresponds to a dirO in the active in a semantic role not reserved for personal NPs, e.g.

(17) hidarr ann icc semni to be (209)
(18) Swa summ he were gifenn himm To wurprenn himm to fode (3694)

A second sub-group contains verbs that do not collocate with a to- or till-phrase in Omg, some possibly by chance only:


Again the indirect passive is completely lacking. Its consistent absence in such a large corpus—and one in which the originally dative object of the verbs listed in (12) has become a dirO—is in keeping with the conventional derivation of the indirect passive and unfavourable to Marchand's explanation (pp.228-29 above).

The personal object of the third sub-group is of uncertain status, as there are no passives or to- or till-phrases to give clues:

(20) fecchenn, forrgifenn, fraignenn, gatenn, lenenn, *tipenn

Semantically this sub-group resembles (14), apart from fraignenn.85

The personal object of the fourth sub-group is a direct object:

(21) *bidenn, bidenn,86 clepenn, *hatenn, larenenn, tsochenn.

Levenn is linked to simple transitive verbs when it has only the one, personal object; the participial adjectives umbedenn and umneredd authenticate biddenenn and larenenn (though again perhaps only for monotransitive use);

---

84 Setenn is also used in the active + personal object NP + tinf. The passive of this idiom shows interesting variation between two types, all batt flocc batt hemn is set (Holm; WH set) To gennenn & to matenn (3796, sim. 11690) and hurm be prestess ware beaz. Sette to larenenn sillferr (15800, sim. 13291).

85 Fraignenn also differs in normally having its non-personal object either governed by a preposition, or clausal, or both.

86 There is no distinction in the WH glossary between *bedenn and bidenn. It seems to me that the OE distinction between bedenn and bidenn is fully maintained in Omg, both in morphology and in case syntax, though the meanings are, as in OE, somewhat blurred.
and the rest have passives with personal NP in non-oblique case. As the
stema of all these verbs take, or can take, an accusative of the person in
OH, this sub-group falls outside the scope of our discussion of the in-
direct passive.

I have summarised above the evidence which Orm provides on the origins
of the indirect passive. On the prepositional passive there is slight sup-
port for de la Cruz's hypothesis of derivation along the path for him was
sent > him was sent for > he was sent for (see pp.227-28 above):

(22) Off hemm ise writen o Latin, Patt te33 . . . . (8213)
(25) O balde lagheboc was sett . . . Patt . . . (10404)
(24) Jesum Mannkinne sawle sallfe, / Josepess sune, off Nazarep,
Himm hafe we nu fundenn; / Off whamm wasu ar purrh Noyseu &
purrh profetes essvidded, / Off-patt he shollde . . . (13486)
(25) Patt ilike mann on erpe, / Off whamm wasu ar purrh Noyseu & purrh
profetes essvidded (13545)

Whether (22) and (23) are subjectless is doubtful, since the patt-clauses
which follow are at least notionally the subject of the passive verb.97

However, there is no trace in Orm (or elsewhere?) of a transition to the
second stage, where an oblique NP is presumed to be left in topicalised
position and the particle stranded near the verb.

VERB-PARTICLE SYSTEMS

There is little to be added to the discussion earlier in the chapter.
The only relevant evidence from Orm is on the relation between passives
of class 6 with preposition stranding, and class 3 prepositional passives.
There are thirty-nine of the former in relative clauses in WH, plus two
more at V415 and V516, plus a passive infinitive clause at 3527. Of the
class 6 collocations in those forty-two examples, I estimate that only one,
streamken onne, could conceivably have appeared in a class 3 passive if
that had been possible in Orm's dialect.

97 These are really class 6 collocations.
ADDITIONAL FACTORS

Indefinite agency

One reason for the absence of the prepositional passive in Ory may be that the pronoun *nanp*—in full, unreduced form—is still available; there are about 35-40 instances in the whole work. Alternatives include *ba*, *za*, *be fello*. 