CHAPTER EIGHT: OLD NORSE AND ENGLISH

In several features of verb-particle usage English and the Scandinavian languages behave in similar ways. All make great use of idiomatic particle group-verbs. The Scandinavian languages allow in broad outline the same possibilities of preposition stranding as English, differing in certain crucial respects from continental Gmc languages like Dutch and German, especially in relative and infinitive constructions. Danish, Swedish and both standard forms of Norwegian all have a prepositional passive, whether periphrastic or medio-passive (m-form). These similarities have been explored by Körentz, 'Prep. Passive', followed by de la Cruz, 'Synt. Complex'. Körentz traces the prepositional passive in Swedish back to the seventeenth century ('Prep. Passive', p. 66).

On the adverbial side it is notable that particles like *up* (up), *by* are frequently used with Aktionsart values and that there are lexical and syntactic parallels between such English group-verbs as burn up, give up and Scandinavian cognates; see Smithers, "NEVF", p. xxxiv, and Samuels, *EVA* (Evolution), p. 164. Von Schon also notes a similarity, and she suggests a period of common development, though she believes that 'since many of our Old English examples of the phrasal verb antedate the extant Old Norse texts', it is not possible to demonstrate which language the new structure originates in ('Origin', p. 219); her definition of the phrasal verb is simply a verb-adverb combination in V-p order, without reference to idiomatic properties. Ershova claims that Scandinavian influence is a catalyst in the English development of the verb-adverb combination, bringing out latent tendencies and possibilities; as with other kinds of Scandinavian influence, it corresponds to and does not oppose
internal laws of development (Ershova, summary, p.15). John Nist goes so far as to attribute the phrasal verb and derived nouns in part to Scandinavian structural influence,¹ but this appears to be merely an impression based on the evident similarities. (Claims that individual group-verbs are borrowed from or calqued on Scandinavian forms are discussed later in the chapter.)

In this chapter I shall consider the matter in the following way. A sketch of the relevant facts of OE usage is followed by an attempt to trace them to earlier stages of Scandinavian. Then the dates of first appearance in English are set beside the facts of Scandinavian in an attempt to measure the likelihood of Scandinavian origin for English constructions² and group-verbs. Finally the material in Qm is looked at.


²Scandinavian influence in other areas of English syntax has been considered by Jespersen, GGE, pp.76-77; Eugen Einenkel, 'Die dänischen Elemente in der Syntax der englischen Sprache', Anglia, 29 (1906), 120-26; H. Logeman, 'On some Cases of Scandinavian Influence in English', Archiv, 117 (n.s. 17) (1906), 29-46; Olszew ska, 'Types of Norse Borrowing'; M. S. Kirch, 'Scandinavian Influence on English Syntax', PMLA, 74 (1959), 503-10.
Scandinavian dialects

I use the term 'Old Norse' to encompass both the West Norse (principally OF and ONorw) and East Norse (principally ODan and OSw) divisions conventionally recognised for the Scandinavian language in the Middle Ages, giving citation forms usually in normalised OK. The Scandinavian dialects which contributed to English lexis were brought to England between the late ninth and the eleventh centuries, mainly by Danes and by Norwegians, some of whom had come from colonies in Ireland and in other offshore islands. Björkman and others regard the major lexical influence—apart from early borrowings of legal, nautical and similar words—as dating from near the end of the period of Scandinavian settlement and beyond, when the languages blended intimately and Scandinavian as a separate language eventually died out. Any syntactic or general structural influence would also come late in the period of linguistic intercourse. The Scandinavian dialects spoken in England might by then have undergone their own internal changes. There is little direct evidence of these dialects, and there is only limited surviving evidence of the earlier Danish and Norwegian from which they derived, consisting of runic


4 See Erik Björkman, Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English, 2 vols (Nalle a. S., 1900-02), pp.3-24; Max Förster, 'Abt Razo! d'Escoire und der spätes', Archiv, 162 (1932), 43-48 (p.48 note 17); Joseph Wright and Elizabeth Mary Wright, An Elementary Middle English Grammar, second edition (London, 1928), pp.30-31; Serjeantson, History, pp.61-64; and the standard histories of English.

inscriptions, many of which are of a formulaic kind with little syntactic variety, and later copies of poetry—the WN Edda poems of uncertain date and the intricate, quite un-prose-like skaldic verse.

The dialect of ON most readily available and providing the most copious and varied evidence is Ol, and it is often used as the basis of description of ON generally and to fill out the scantier evidence of other dialects. Icelandic is also relatively conservative in its morphology. Icelandic prose of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (mostly preserved in later copies) is a convenient starting-point. Features once identified in Ol can in many cases be shown to belong also to earlier Danish and Norwegian.

VERB-PARTICLE USAGE IN OLD ICHELANDIC

The following sketch is presented from the point of view of English usage discussed in previous chapters, with examples taken from Ásilda saga (c.1220) and Njáls saga (c.1275-85). It draws on the work of Nygaard, Heusler, Wessén, Gordon, and Blaisdell.

Prepositions and adverbs

Interchange between the two categories is somewhat freer than in English at any stage of its history. Those adverbial particles which are


7 The dates are those given by Gordon, Intro. OE, pp.106, 87, respectively. I have read the sagas in the Íslensk fornrit editions.

8 R. Nygaard, Norrón syntax (Kristiania, 1905) and Bemerkungen, retteleer an supplementar (Kristiania, 1917); Andreas Heusler, Altisländisches elementarbuch, sixth edition (Heidelberg, 1964); Sina Wessén, Schwedische Sprachgeschichte, iii, Grundtage einer historischen Syntax (Berlin, 1970); Gordon, Intro. OE; Foster W. Blaisdell, Jr., Proposion-Adverbs in Old Icelandic, University of California Publications in Linguistics, 17 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959).
not used prepositionally by themselves (e.g. upp, ut) tend to enter into compound propositions (e.g. upp á), whilst all prepositions can be used with ellipsis of the prep0 (Heusler, Aisli, Elementarbuch, pp.145-46); Bleiredell shows which prepositions actually do so in each of his eleven early OE sources (Prep-Adverbs, pp.44-45). Some examples of elliptical prepositions are:

at: hrútr hiló at (Nj 21.6)
á: Skalla-Grímir tók við óxinni, helt upp ok só á um hrútr (Ek 95.18)
ertir: ok þú munir þó mest eptir gangs (Nj 252.7)
frá: ok seg þu frá, Njáll (Nj 90.8)
á móti: at þú mun ekki mega á móti smala (Nj 145.1)
þil: en aðna Skalla-Gríms tóku þátinn ... ok reru til ok dápu þá alla (Ek 69.11)
við: Egill sagöi, hvat þeir Skalla-Grímir hóftu við melnk (Ek 81.22)

It is particularly this freedom to use a preposition elliptically which would make strict application of my PE classification to OE an artificial exercise.

Prepositions may govern at-infinitives and finite clauses in OE;⁹ of. the discussion of ME on pp.68-70 above. Examples are:
pá lagóti hann allan hug á at bjóða settir fyrir Björn (Ek 39.7)
run ek nú heima sitja ok látu af at þjóða konum (Ek 13.5)
hvát þér sé náðkut kunnigst af, hversu fór með þeim Brúti (Nj 61.16)
þeir ... þóluðum um, hversu með skýldi farsa (Nj 140.1)
ef Bárðr visst náðkut til, hverjum lónum þeir mundu náðst vera (Nj 201.22)
með þér þó sjá yfir, at hann gerið eigi of stórr (Ek 32.12)

Word-order

OE word-order differs from OE word-order most obviously in the

behaviour of the finite verb. Heusler has noted that the finite verb is normally the first or second clause element (not counting clause-initiators like conjunctions and relative pronouns): see his Aisl. Elementarbuch, pp.169-76. Some examples of the positioning of adverbial particles are given by the following instances of lóka upp 'open; deliver (judgement)':

þa léi Arinbjorna lóka upp kístu (Eg 216.17)
þaðir, lóka upp húsdóttir (Eg 244.20)
ok þeir sá firðinum upp lóka (Eg 71.25)
þeir áttu hof þeir sann, ok var því aldiri upp lokit (M 210.13)
þeir lokkað upp augur hans (M 273.15)
er hann kom í þau spor í spau, sem upp hoptu lokizk augur hans (M 275.21)
því at þeir lóka eiga fyrir upp gerð á hendri honum en . . . (M 196.9)
Hon gekk til kístu sinna ok lækk upp (M 36.15)

These examples indicate some of the main tendencies: pre-verbal position often associated with non-finite parts of the verb, post-verbal position otherwise common except for emphatic initial placement and in certain subordinate clauses (neither illustrated here), V-p-0 commoner than V-O-p (none here) for idiomatic collocations, though with somewhat similar conditions governing the choice to those in English. They also show the same collocation being used as class 1 (a bay opens up), class 2 (sb. opens up a chest), class 2 passive, medio-passive (eyes open themselves up), and class 1 by ellipsis of dir0. The related noun usually has the particle first: upplók 'an opening' (CVC).

The normal position of a preposition is immediately in front of its prep0, with exceptions caused by stranding, by intervention of other elements between prep and prep0, and by ellipsis (with consequent shift to adverbial status). Some examples of the collocation fara með 'wield; deal in; deal with; manage' are:

því at þau munt best ok hófligast með hann fara (M 359.21)
þá . . . þat er ok fer með (M 27.16)
skip þat, sem þorgils gjallandi fór með (Eg 44.21)
lóasæf álfr, þat er hann mætti með fara (Eg 40.25)
etegirinn, þar er ek bennaða állum með at fara (M 194.20)
hann hefði með at fara skjalda, er . . . (Eg 275.10)
hversu hon hefði með farit ráðsegur hans (M 26.9)
hversu þá vill láta með fara (M 160.17)
en ef leyniliga er með farit (M 272.10)
Stranding may also be caused by topicalisation of a prep: *míns hefir bá til setið* (Mj 102.13). Again we see a tendency for the particle to precede non-finite parts of the verb, though ordinary usage is otherwise for the prepositional phrase to follow the verb. In comparing 'class 3' patterns of ON with those of English it must be borne in mind that ellipsis of all objects in ON, including prepositional objects, is quite normal if the object is clear from the context, and secondly that the existence of three different object cases makes the situation more complex than that of OE, with its single oblique case. Nouns related to V + prep collocations have the particle first: *modfor* (Mj 144.7).

**Idiomatic group-verbs**

ON abounds in idiomatic group-verbs corresponding to all the classes of the system set up to describe OE. For classes 1 and 2 there are such examples as *líd af* 'pass' (Mj 93.11), *koma at* 'arrive' (Mj 204.10), *koma frá* 'be fulfilled' (Mj 108.1), *barna upp* 'produce, mention' (Ar 37.17), *gafa upp* 'surrender' (Mj 203.11), *brenna upp* 'burn up' (Ar 32.1), *tala upp* 'annoy' (Ar 180.12), *leyva út* 'redress' (Mj 247.10).

Class 3 group-verbs include *rægna optir* 'pursue, fetch' (Mj 313.1), *síða fyrir* 'provide for, manage' (Mj 25.21), *taka við* 'receive' (Mj 67.16), *síða um* 'take care of' (Mj 74.22). There is a subjectless passive with stranded preposition and uninflected prep, e.g. *var bar nefn sumar at safinu, or . . .* (Ar 225.14), *forðar heinar, or fyr var fyr saf* (Ar 62.7), or with prep unexpressed, e.g. *ok var bó báðan okki optir leit* (Mj 432.5).

An example of class 4 is *síða um við* 'deal with, be concerned with' (Mj 166.3); of class 5 *leggja á við* (Mj 21.2). An interesting parallel to a later English development is the addition of a prep (usually of, um or við) to a shorter group-verb, e.g. *fór er bó spurdur optir um lógmenn* (Mj 384.14), *bá leidadur optir um ráki bat allt, or . . .* (Ar 220.11); cf.
Nygaard, *Norrøn Syntax*, p. 22. Other group-verbs include the \( V + NP + \) prep type, as *bera eld at* 'set fire to' (Mj 198.19), *siga hlut at* 'be concerned with' (Mj 94.19), *sefa raum at* (Mj 99.16) 'pay attention to', *leggja hug ã* 'take an interest in' (Mj 133.19).

**Prefixes**

The prefixal system of ON is minimal. Later Scandinavian has re-introduced prefixes under German influence, but in ON there are only traces of the unstressed Gmc spatial prefixes (Heusler, *Aisl. Elementarbuch*, pp. 40-41; Samuels, *Ling. Evolution*, pp. 84-85; Wessén, *Schw.Spr.*, iii, 117-21).

**VERB-PARTICLE USAGE IN OTHER SCANDINAVIAN DIALECTS**

Usage in dialects contemporary with classical OE does not vary significantly from what has been described in outline above. For OSw there are merely some differences in the case governed by certain prepositions and in the range of compound prepositions employed.¹⁰ Agreement between the dialects at the extremes of the Scandinavian area suggests that OE may fairly be taken to stand for both EW and WN in this respect. Blaisdell's *Prep-Adverbs* demonstrates that early Icelandic manuscripts do not differ materially from the classical writings of the Saga Age as far as prepositions and elliptical prepositions are concerned. The nearest approach which can be made to the Viking Age dialects which were imported into England is by consideration of early poetry and runic inscriptions. Verb-adverb combinations are found in both, and prepositional use is broadly like that of classical OE but with a greater use of postpositions.¹¹

¹⁰See Wessén, *Schw.Spr.*, iii, 89-96, 98-100 and further references there, 123-24, 319-20.

Idiomatic group-verbs like göra til 'deserve' are more readily found amongst collocations of verbs with prepositions (often used elliptically) than with pure adverbs.

I have looked for evidence in the Viking Age material of the complete use of upp, the appearance of give up and certain other phrasal verbs in English being the one general feature of group-verb history for which Scandinavian influence seems essential; see the next section.

Sefa upp itself I have been able to trace neither in early poetry— it is cited by Egilsson from the late thirteenth century work of Sturla Porparson—nor in the runic remains. Other idiomatic uses of upp in poetry include lúka upp 'open' in Fjólsvinnaðal, Helgakviða Hundingsbana II, Guðrúnarkviða II, with the antiquity of the verbal idiom vouch for by the appearance of the noun upplok in Hávamál 136. The use of upp in the sense 'open' is probably very old and partly spatial—of the etymology of the related English word open, e.g. in ODEE s.v.—but lúka upp may be considered an idiomatic group-verb when used of heogra 'burial mound' or hús 'house'. Segja upp (loka) 'pronounce (the law)' is used by Hallfreðr vandraskáld, and briða upp (stokka) 'break open/up/down

12 For poetry I consulted Sveinbjörn Egilsson, Lexicon posticum antique lingue septentrionalis: Græbog over det dansk-islæske skjaldesprog, re-edited by Finnur Jónsson (Copenhagen, 1913-16), and Gustav Nechel, editor, Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern, ii, Kommentierendes Glossar (Heidelberg, 1927), also the third edition by Hans Kuhn (Heidelberg, 1958). For inscriptions I consulted the main collections of Danish, Norwegian (not the very oldest), Swedish and Icelandic runes: Danmarks runeindskrifter, Lis Jacobsen and Erik Nolteke, 3 vols (Copenhagen, 1941-42); Norges innskrifter med de yngre runer, edited by Magnus Olsen, 5 vols (Oslo, 1941-60); Sveriges runeindskrifter, edited variously by Sven Sjöberg, Erik Brate, and others, 14 vols (1900- ); Islands rænindskrifter, Andra Böcksted, Bibliotheca Arnamagnana, 2 (Copenhagen, 1942).


14 Born c.965: Einarsson, History, p.61.
(boarding, benches) occurs in Atlamál in gveplensku 17. In brjóta upp the particle confers a completive sense on the verb.

In the runic remains the particle upp is surprisingly rare altogether. It is not even used with verbs like reisa, settja in the common formula of the type 'X set up this stone ...'. It does occur once on the Tyllinge kyrka stone in Uppland: Vífastr ... reisa stam henna upp at Gúðmund, broður sinn (Sv viii.785),16 a fairly late, Christian inscription.

The verb brjóta occurs with a pre-contiguous particle several times in the runic material. Two Danish stones contain the following curses on anyone who desecrates the stone: sibi sa manr is hali kubl ub biruti (Dan 61 Skern-stenen 2) and uísbi at rata huaas ub briuti (Dan 338 Glemminge-stenen). Both stones are dated c1000–c1050. Jacobsen and Moltke interpret the word transcribed ub as ON of, whereas an earlier editor, Wimmer, took ub in both instances to be ON upp.17 The matter has been argued over at length: see the references given by Jacobsen and Moltke in their word-list s.v. of, and compare ub in nor 1.4, which Olsen says can be interpreted as upp, of or or, since the inscription is fragmentary. Jacobsen and Moltke adduce uf briuti on the Saleby stone in support of ub as of, following Dal.18 They believe it to be an example of the 'expletive particle' of/ump—both forms occur interchangeably—


16 I give the inscription as normalised by the editors, Elias Wessen and Sven B. F. Jansson. They comment on the uniqueness of upp here (Sv, viii, part i, p.369).

17 Ludy. F. A. Wimmer, De danske runeminderarkrer, 4 vols (Copenhagen, 1893–1908), ii, 175. The collocation brjóta upp is of course well attested at a later date.

18 Inerid Dal, Ursprung und Verwendung der altnorischen 'Expletivpartikel' 'of', 'um', Avhandlinger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1929. No. 5 (Oslo, 1930), p.85. She explains the form as the regular phonological development of an unstressed schwa syllable before a labial consonant (best illustrated by the prepositions of and um).
which is moderately frequent in runic inscriptions and common in poetry. It is an unstressed pre-contiguous particle or prefix which often has a perfective function, explained by Dal as a relic of the lost Gmc unstressed prefixes. Further examples include uhuln 'buried' (Sw iii.164 Spånga), cf. ON hylle, and skialti ub faltan 'with shield fastened' (Sw ii.136 Rök); see also Dal, Ursprung, pp.43 note 1 and 83.

The perfective function of the early expletive of/on is comparable to that of the later upp, which can be seen as a functional replacement. Egill Skalla-Grimsson has the string upp of hof (Sonatorrar 21, Eg, p.254), where the adverb upp, partly redundant with hefja and probably having intensive or completive function, coexists with expletive of. Another interesting parallel has been pointed out by Samuels, who notes that ge- in the Lindisfarne Gloss behaves much like expletive of/on in ON. 20

I have not been able to establish the date of origin of ON completive upp by the present limited investigation, given that the poetic instance of briota upp is of uncertain date and the possible runic instances are contested. The absence of (other) examples in the material can be explained away by the limited variety and extent of the early poetry and the runic inscriptions, by the economy of expression typical of both forms, and by the rivalry of the expletive particle, which may have been preserved in poetry as an archaism—less plausible for the runic remains. Some idiomatic uses of upp have been established in early poetry, and the upp of briota upp, if that collocation is an early one, is not unlike that

19 See Neckel and Neckel-Kuhn, Glossary, s.vv., and Dal, Ursprung, passim.
20 K. L. Samuels, 'The Elder Edda and the Lindisfarne Gloss: A Syntactic Parallel', EGG, 3 (1949-50), 37-41. One of the parallels adduced is that both kinds of particle are avoided with negated verbs, which Dal explains for the expletive particle of ON as being due to the semantic incompatibility of completion and negation (Ursprung, pp.19-20). I have not collected material which would show whether the same applies to completive adverbial particles in English, though I note sume he iaf up, & sume ne iaf he noht (Fæ. Chron, 1140/41).
seen in geifa upp; both are completive and suggest irreversibility. Completive upp appears to be well established in the period of extant prose.
SCANDINAVIAN INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH

The limited evidence of tenth and eleventh century Scandinavian and the similarities between what is known of it and OE make it difficult to measure the Scandinavian contribution to the growth of the English group-verb; cf. Kirch's criteria for proving Scandinavian influence and also the similar problem of G. and AmE (pp.157-58 above). No doubt some factors go unnoticed as a result. It is probably right to argue that the main contribution of Scandinavian is one of reinforcement (p.272 above), and the previous sketch indicates which areas of particle syntax this might be true of. I shall concentrate on one feature in particular where a discontinuity of development suggests an innovation due solely or mainly to Scandinavian influence.

ADVERBS

The collocation of verb and spatial adverb has a continuous syntactic history from early OE to the present day. The semantic and functional history is one of cumulative innovation and growth in a complex, many-branched pattern, but nearly all the innovations are explicable as internal developments deriving ultimately from spatial meanings of the adverbs. Despite the syntactic overlap between early English and ON and the many lexical parallels in classes 1 and 2, it is hazardous to try to ascribe an English phrasal verb to Norse example. Cecily Clark, for

21 Namely, that a feature should appear in runic ON but not in pre-Viking Period OE (Scand. Influence', pp.509-10).

22 One of the functional factors implicated in the growth of the phrasal verb is the loss of verbal prefixes (pp.165-69 above), and Samuels suggests that this loss 'was due partly to their lack of stress but, in the North and Midlands, the immediate model for the loss was provided by Old Norse' (Ling. Evolution, pp.165-64). This, then, would be an indirect contribution of Scandinavian to the phrasal verb.
example, suggests that *leiten ut* (Pet.Chron. 1140/54, etc) is influenced by Norse usage, but the existence in OE of *leiten + ina* for *leiten + ut* and similar collocations is enough to explain the pairing of *leiten + ut* in a transparent sense. A more convincing example because so similar to a specific ON idiom is *her har Godwine upp his mal* (ChronE 183.6 (1055)).

**Aktionsart up**

Apart from individual examples of borrowings and calques there is a feature of more general importance which may be due to Norse influence, and that is the use of *up* as an Aktionsart marker without spatial meaning. Some of the idiomatic uses of *up* in OE may incorporate Aktionsart values of completion, intensification, and so on—for instance 'into the state of being open' (*OED* s.v. *up* adv. 16: c1205—, but cf. *ALS* example cited on p.155); 'so as to cause sound to ascend, increase, or swell' (*OED* sense 7b); 'into existence, prominence, vogue, or currency' (sense 11); 'disclosed, made known' (*OED* s.v. *up* adv. 11c; *BT* s.v. *uppe* adv. II).

Metonymic development of the direction + goal meaning in collocation with verbs like *hebben, weaxan* may also lead to some measure of completive or intensive value; see pp.152, 154—55 above. But the evidence for *up* as a pure Aktionsart marker in OE is very weak. *BT(S)* offers three apparent examples.

Two are given in *BT* s.v. *up* adv. IV 'marking separation, as in to cut *up*, break *up*' (though one could improve on that definition of *up* in PE cut *up*). The first is *suulsam, i.e. escisam, ut alocene, up alibode* (*AldV* 13, 78, 2903)—that is, Latin lemma, Latin gloss, and two OE glosses.

---


24 E. S. Olszewski, 'Illustrations of Norse Formulas in English', *LSE*, 2 (1933), 76–84 (p.83).
Both OE verbs mean 'separate, take away'. Most occurrences of alcan and all six of aleobian/alibian in BT(S) occur in collocation with spatial adverbials: for the latter a fram-phrase, an of-phrase (twice), onweg, up and ut. They appear to be verbs which collocate characteristically with spatial adverbs, some of which no doubt may be taken as echo particles with effective value. But there is no reason to assume development of the modern 'colourless' complective/intensive up, which would in any case be inappropriate in the original text, which refers to the ripping off of an arm rather than the ripping up of a body. The glosses as cited here are dated in the eleventh century, probably copied from the Brussels manuscript written at the beginning of the century. For comparison we may look at the first dates given in OED for the complective or totalitive use of up with verbs of cutting, opening, breaking, etc, such as break up (1493), carve up (-), chop up (1840), cut up (14..), divide up (-), hack up (? no citations given), open up (1532-88), rip up (1565), slice up (-), smash up (1513), split up (1648)—dates where available s.v. up adv. 1 16-18 or the verbs. All are very late ME or ModE.

Where up retains its connection with a literal, directional sense there are of course earlier examples, e.g. hew up (a tree) (Orm 9235), break up (a door) (May 1660), open up (gates) (1513; OED).

Next we have the use of forlaisten + un twice within a few lines to describe the diverting of a great river into a number of easily-crossed streams: He 

[sc. a vow] mid dedum palmae & hie [sc. the River


26See N. R. Ker, Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon (Oxford, 1957), art. 320, 8, respectively.
Gyndes] upp forlet an feower hund sa & on lx & sicban mid his firde her oferfor (Ca 43.13, sim. 43.17). The collocation is glossed by Professor Bately 'divide up', implying that OE upp is here an Aktionsart marker equivalent to up in the PE phrasal verb; OEB similarly compares the collocation to PE break up, etc (s.v. up adv.1 17b)—indeed the collocation appears to be a translation of the L. verbs comminuit and perhaps also conciusum deductumque at the first occurrence and of derivavit at the second. 27 The problem is that forlaten on its own never seems to mean anything like 'divide': senses recorded elsewhere in Professor Bately's glossary and in ET(S) are of the general type 'leave, release'. The common means in OE of expressing 'divide (sth.) into (sth.)' is todelan on, e.g. at Ca 45.1, Chron 230.5 (1094). Forlaten does collocate with upp elsewhere but with each word in its usual meaning, e.g. at Se 700, and with the infinitive stigan at GenB 1405 (where the dir0 is the waters of the Flood). One is tempted to conjecture that the translator of Ca has not rendered the L. exactly and that upp is somehow to be understood in a spatial meaning, perhaps 'let overflow (after damming) into ... '—the passage is after all cited also in ET S. v. forlaten VIII.(1) 'cease to hold or to restrain'; alternatively upp might have reference to opening a barrier (cf. a lute wilt lowsia up ower flodseten (AW 18b.3), though the comparison is a distant one). Otherwise, acceptance of the gloss 'divide up' means that we have to suppose not merely the use of upp with Aktionsart value but the creation of a highly idiomatic, wholly opaque, and quite unparalleled phrasal verb. The date of Ca given by Professor Bately is in the period 889-99 (edition, pp.xcii-xciii).

The third example, and the case for up as colourless completive that is hardest to dismiss, is the half-line girwan up swemaendo (Jud 9; BT s.v.

27 I take the Latin from Sweet's edition, although the translator apparently worked from a poor L. text: see Bately's edition, pp.lv-lvi.
already discussed above, p.154 note 77. This time the use of the verb is regular enough: cf. symbol & sousea min ic gearude (Matt.[L.] 22.4; BT), also the cognate ON *dura + velislu, etc (CVC s.v. A.II). But completive up does not appear to collocate with the verb elsewhere. I have noted only gearwan/gairwan + up in a literal sense at Sat 236 and the much later use of a related verb in garwed up (of a gate) (Caw 820). The poem Judith is usually dated in the tenth century, whereas OED's citations s.v. up adv. 1.8c 'to or towards a state of completion . . . with verbs denoting clearing, putting in order, or fixing in place' start at 1419-20, although that is probably unnecessarily late (cf. Samuels, Ling. Evolution, p.164). Nevertheless, pure Aktionsart value in the tenth century seems so isolated that I suspect some spatial sense, though the Vulgate reading on which the passage is presumably based, fecit cenam (Judith 12.10), offers no clue.

The first unequivocal appearance of Aktionsart use that I know of is in the collocation iuwen up in the Final Continuation of Pet. Chron. This is a certain example, because there is no plausible spatial sense, there are five occurrences in that text plus one of *aiuien up (all listed on p.136 above), and because the group-verb has continued in use since then, e.g. at SK 1811; Chaucer WBProl, III, 427, Mercht, IV, 2312; Past.L. 58.21. Furthermore the same class meaning of up appears in sveden up (SK 133, 867), yield up (AW 72b.18; Chaucer, Tr I.801, KnT I, 3052; Malory, Works 710.37; Past.L. 646.23), deliver up (c1340; OED), resign up (c1400; OED), surrender up (c1590; OED).

The usage in Pet. Chron. appears to be quite new—and not just because no earlier examples are known. The usual verbs for 'surrender (a stronghold, etc)' in OE are compounds like acifan, forcyfan, forlanan, ofcyfan; see PT(S) s.vv. and compare from a slightly earlier portion of

---

28 See e.g. ASPR, iv, pp.lxii-lxiv; Sweet's Reader, p.136.
the same manuscript his scega men . . . heom . . . heora castelas ageafon (Chron. 248.1 (1118)). It is interesting that in one of the examples in the Final Continuation the new completive un and the older prefix a- reinforce each other, implying a transitional stage. It is also notable that the collocation shows no trace of OE verb-particle ordering (see pp.136-37 above). The text is dated c1155 in Clark's edition, p.xxv.

Clark assumes that the usage is a Scandinavianism ('Studies', p.87; Pet. Chron., p.lxix). The spelling of the initial consonant of the verbal formative shows clearly that it descends from OE gifan rather than ON gefa, so that at most it would be a calque. The compound aiæven (past pl.) is even further away from ON. However, the occurrence of Some he iaf up, & some ne iaf he noht (Pet. Chron. 1140/41) proves that simple verb and group-verb are felt to be related, so that un can be seen as an addition to the verb, rather than V + p forming an opaque idiom. And as an addition to this particular verb, it seems to me that un is likely to be a result of Scandinavian influence, as (i) there is no real precedent in English and no obvious development out of existing uses, (ii) the text comes from the old Danelaw area and contains other Norse 'grammatical' words—particles and conjunctions (Clark, Pet. Chron., p.lxix), and (iii) there is more reason to believe that the usage is established in Scandinavian than in English dialects at that date.

The justification for giving such detailed consideration to this one collocation is that it seems to me to represent one of the few sharp breaks in the continuity of the history of un, and that its adoption and spread in English may have promoted the phrasal verb with un as a marker of Aktionsart—a development which has become of great importance in the

29If proof is needed—but in PE the group-verb and the simple verb are more remote from each other: the former, for instance, is now rarely used with an inco (cf. Pet. Chron. 1140/26 and ON, e.g. Hi 45.19), whereas the latter is rarely used without.
language.

PREPOSITIONS

The one break in the generally smooth history of the class 3 combination is the restructuring posited for c.1200. There seems little reason to believe that ON has any part in this. The frequency of the subjectless passive in ON might conceivably have fostered the development of the prepositional passive in English, but the histories of class 3 passives in English and Icelandic have been very different: I have argued in Chapter 6 that English has not developed a stage further than Icelandic but has taken a different route altogether.

Scandinavian forms and meanings contribute to the period of experiment and change in prepositional use in ME (Strang, History, pp.274-75), and a possible structural influence is the extension of elliptical and quasi-elliptical prepositional use. It is interesting that ME lesten (vel, etc) of, whose first elliptical use is in Chron—he possibly a York manuscript (p.76 note 65)—has a close counterpart in ON lát (vel, etc) yfir, except that the latter appears to mean 'express approval, etc of' rather than 'look favourably, etc upon'. (The difference may not be so definite.) In early ON poetry stressed adverbial or postpositional yfir corresponds to unstressed prepositional of (Heusler, Aisli, Dictionaries, p.144 Anm. 2). Very like the late OE/early ME examples on pp.74-75 above are ON examples like Brynjólf lét illa yfir hossi ræðamót (Eg 17.9), ... sagði honum bat, sem til tíðenda hafði orðk í for hans; Pórir lét vel yfir, er bau ráð skuldu takask (Eg 105.19), Hon lét vel yfir (Nj 123.21). A comparison of texts from Scandinavian areas of England with texts which show little sign of Scandinavian lexical influence might help to show whether or not the correspondences are significant, for on the present evidence they could equally be fortuitous.
Cecily Clark suggests that to stem bi (Pet. Chron. 1140/5) might be attributed to Scandinavian influence, but in view of the equivalent OE infinitive construction with p-to-v order and the general shift of stranded prepositions to post-verbal position, this suggestion seems unnecessary.

Individual class 3 collocations

A number of individual items have been ascribed to Scandinavian influence. Olczewska suggested that late OE tagan on 'touch' and tagan with 'receive' are to be referred to WN take ą, take wið, respectively ('Illustrations', p.79), highly plausible given the fact that the verbal formative itself is a new borrowing and may be expected to come complete with prepositional construction. On the same page she compares ME ware in 'lay out on' (OED ware v.2) with VN verda. Clark adds from Pet. Chron. feran mid (ON feran med 'deal in') ('Studies', p.87, Pet. Chron., p.lxix), though Alfric uses feran mid in that sense (MFS s.v. feran II. (1a)). Here the English and Norse traditions reinforce each other, and ME feran wið is established as a transitive collocation by the shared object test (AW, see p.213 above) and so far the earliest example found---the passivisation test (SJ, see p.213). Einenkel cites the use of at in laugh at by comparison with OE hlieðhan + gen, as an indication of the influence of ON blája at ('Dän. Elemente', p.123 note 1).

ORPHULUM

There is surprisingly little verifiable Norse influence on group-verb usage in Ory, partly because many collocations—e.g. haldenn upp, risenn

upp, farenn ut—belong to both English and Scandinavian traditions, more still if such regular correspondences as OE on; ON á are taken account of. Brate counts some fifty verbs in Órm as being of Scandinavian origin—arguing usually from the form but occasionally from the meaning—of which about a dozen are uncertain or occur in participial form only ('Nord. Lehnmärter', pp.30-66, 585). Not many of the remainder occur in collocation with particles. Particles borrowed from Norse are fre (though Brate implausibly regards this as an internal development, a variant of frevom like á or ó from inn or omn); probably till; therefore indirectly frewarrd and inn till; ummbe/ummbenn; and also a lofft and ummbebrin. See ÓHRE s.v. aloft, fre, till.

As far as class 1 and 2 collocations are concerned, there are few innovations apparently dependent on Norse example. It is noticeable that the verbs rekkenn, takenn (both Norse loans) do not co-occur with upp in Órm. 31 The use of cumenn upp in the clause Att same time whanne hísse lotteMass cumenn upp to beowtenn (155) may be modelled on ON, cf. ok kom jarann upp hlutr Silfre (CVC s.v. hlutr á): the collocation does not appear to be used in connection with the casting of lots in early English Howenn upp (a tree) 'cut down' (9285, etc) corresponds to Icelandic högrva upp, as in Órm used in the context of Matthew 3:10 (CVC s.v. högrva II), but there is no reason to assume dependence of the ME on the Scandinavian. The collocation sifenn á (10182)—if genuine: cf. p.177 above—looks Scandinavian in type, especially in the use of á as an elliptical preposition. The verb clipenn is of Norse origin, but CVC does not record its use in ON with an effective adverb as in Órm's clipenn awægg (4142, 4248), nor does Norse skilja appear to collocate with átt as in Órm's *skilenn ut (16860). 32 Berenn forb (witness) (16690) might conceivably be

31 Leckmann (16253), for instance, is the converse of wurrpenn dun.
32 But cf. skilia undan: Fritzner, Ordbog, iii, 325, col. 1, mid.
a calque of ON *bera frám*, as seen in [þérólfr] *berr fram* sidan orð konunga ok jarðnir (Eg. 24.27), but it is as likely to be an independent formation; both English and ON normally have the idiom *bear witness, bere viti* without adverbial particle. The collocation *takenn onni* 'begin', used in tinf at 2553 and prep. phrase at 11260, seems to be a blend of English and Norse idiom. *Takenn* itself is a Scandinavian loanword, and *takenn + tinf* 'begin (to do sth.)' is modelled on ON *taka (til) + at + inf* (OED s.v. *taka* v. B62, Clark, 'Studies', p. 87), and is common in Orm; see p. 99 above. The use of *onni* is unlikely to be modelled on ON *a* (though cf. CVC s.v. *taka* V.2) and seems to correspond to ME *fon onn*, etc. *Gan/ganneen till* 'set to, get going' (15170, etc) is probably modelled on ON *ganga till* (*galk* till ok sé (Eg. 34.22)), but it is worth noting that a similar idiom may have arisen in English too, cf. *mutun gongan to, helpen hildfruman* (Beo. 2648); Orm uses *gan* nine times in this idiom and only uses *ganneen* once, for metrical reasons. A group-verb analogous to class 2 is seen in *tredenn underrfot* (D73, etc), one of the earliest instances in OED of *underfoot*; cf. en [þá] *treðr mik nu undir fétun* (Mj. 134.19). However, OED cites similar adverbial usage from AR, Lay. Brut, and Middle Dutch. Overall there is little evidence of the borrowing of some 1 and 2 idioms from ON, although it must be pointed out that there are very few idiomatic class 1 and 2 collocations in Orm and that many of the more literal collocations can be seen as a blend of English and Norse antecedents.

Dubiously class 1 or class 3 is the difficult *bitenn wibb* (15209), which may be a Scandinavian calque; see p. 251 note 71 above. Another collocation of *wibb* is *deleinn wibb*, which at 10140 means 'share with' (class 6) but at 6175 means 'have dealings with (sb.)' (class 3). The latter is reminiscent of Norse usages like *deila vid e-n* 'contend with (sb.)', *eiga vid e-n* at *deila* 'have to deal with (sth.)', on which see OED s.v. *deal* v. 10, CVC s.v. *deila* I.4; but the form of Orm's *deleinn* is derived from
OE *deλæn*. A class 3 group-verb which can safely be ascribed to Norse influence is *takenn wibb* 'accept, receive'; compare Husvel he *takobb ægg wibb ba Patte sekkenn Codess are (Orm 1516) with *toku heir vel við honum (Nj 12.14). For another collocation of *takenn*, *takenn till + tinf* (four examples quoted p.101 above), compare *toku marcir ba til at meða hann (CVC s.v. *takæ* 1.4, p.623, col. 2, mid.). It is possible that Orm's relatively frequent use of a *tinf* as object of a preposition (pp.89-104 above) is encouraged by Scandinavian example. The Norse loanword *fisakenn* is used in collocation with *affterr* at Orm 13292, but both OE *after* and ON *eptir* are used in that sort of way, so there is no special significance in the usage. In class 6 we have two Scandinavian loans used in collocations corresponding to OE usage: *æskileμ* + *fra* at 16860 (here the preposition is also a loanword), and *æggenn* + *to* at 11819, cf. *æggja* + *til (Nj 115.9).