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Abstract

This thesis reassesses a corpus of Old Norse words which previous scholars claimed to have been loaned from English. It has been over sixty years since the last concerted study of these purported borrowings, and research has not moved much beyond the foundations laid by Absalon Taranger in 1890. This thesis seeks to establish a more plausible corpus of English loanwords in Old Norse, focusing particularly on lexical material relating to the spheres of Christianity and literacy.

Chapter 1 offers a detailed survey of the literary material relating to language contact between English- and Norse-speakers, with a special focus on the English missionary effort. I suggest that we should see the Anglo-Saxon church as a distinctly international, multilingual institution during the Viking Age. A case study focusing on the twelfth-century First Grammatical Treatise contributes to the debate over Anglo-Norse mutual intelligibility and explores Norse-speakers’ integration within a wider European cultural sphere.

In Chapter 2, I assess 113 supposed English loanwords in Old Norse in order to ascertain which ones we can confidently ascribe as English borrowings. I suggest that the number of loanwords that are unambiguously English in origin are fewer than previous scholars have suggested and that some conceptual fields demonstrate more English influence than others. I also indicate that a large number of purported English loans are more likely to be polygenetic in origin.

Chapter 3 categorises and interprets the reanalysed lexical items. I devise a number of new categories into which our corpus of loanwords can be grouped. I use these new groupings to reflect on Anglo-Norse language contact more generally, and place my work within the context of recent research on institutional religion as an engine for language change and the emergence of Anglo-Scandinavian identity in England.
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Introduction

The study of Old Norse loanwords in English has long been one of the cornerstones of scholarly research into Anglo-Scandinavian contact in the Middle Ages. In the past twenty-five years philologists have subjected the long-established corpus of Norse borrowings to the rigours of modern lexico-semantic and sociolinguistic study, underpinned by thorough literary-historical scholarship. Despite the great advances made in this field, there has been no parallel growth of interest in loanword material being transferred in the ‘other’ direction — that is from Old and Middle English to Old Norse. This is not without good reason. The period in which Anglo-Norse contact would have been most intense also falls before the beginnings of recorded literacy in Scandinavia, making concentrated synchronic studies — say of dialect or textual groups — much less feasible. There is also the simple fact that materially fewer English words were borrowed into Norse than the other way around. Yet despite this smaller corpus, it remains striking that the last major studies of English borrowings remain Absalon Taranger’s influential 1890 work, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, and Frank Fischer’s 1909 *Die Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen*, plus J.E. Buse’s unpublished 1955 PhD thesis which reuses much of those two scholars’ material.

Together, Taranger and Fischer provided a ‘core’ group of borrowings which has subsequently informed all lists of English loanwords in ON. Although philologists have added or discarded lexical items from Taranger and Fischer’s groundwork as they see fit, it is rare that

---

any of the loans are accompanied by detailed explicatory information, and we are mostly reliant on entries in etymological dictionaries. This is problematic, as lists of loans may well be treated uncritically by scholars; as Philip Durkin cautions:

Lists of loanwords given in handbooks and histories of English can give the appearance of being simple statements of fact. It is important to realise that they are not: they are hypotheses, sometimes supported by evidence so secure that they are not in any real doubt, but very often based on much less secure foundations.²

This thesis inspects these foundations, bringing modern knowledge to bear on a subject area which has largely been ignored for the past sixty years. Through a re-examination of 113 purported borrowings from English to Old Norse, I argue for a reduced but richer corpus of English loans. My thesis consciously takes the same ecclesiastical focus as Taranger, but places language contact front and centre in the story of the Christianisation of Norse-speaking peoples by English churchmen. The loanword analysis which forms the centrepiece of this thesis is therefore bookended by two chapters: the first is a historicist review of literary-historical and scholarly material which provides ‘contextual’ evidence for Anglo-Scandinavian interaction, focusing on a conversion process which had, in the words of Lesley Abrams, ‘a significantly English cast and an English script.’³ The third chapter considers the theoretical implications for language contact in the Viking Age in light of my newly reformed corpus of English (and non-English) loanwords.

The central question of this thesis is: which purported English loanwords in Old Norse can be categorically be identified as such? This is a useful question to ask in and of itself, though the inevitable corollary to such an enquiry in the context of contact linguistics is: what can these loanwords tell us about the relationship between speakers of English and Norse? This is arguably the more interesting, if rather diffuse, question. Given my focus is on those word fields associated with the ecclesiastical sphere, the follow-up questions with which I am concerned are: what can such words tell us about the Anglo-Saxon(Anglo-Norman) church’s role in the Christianisation of the Norse-speaking peoples, both at home and abroad? How do these loanwords complement our picture of Anglo-Norse contact in general, particularly with regards to important debates over mutual intelligibility, prestige, and the beginnings of literacy? Finally, how do our textual sources depict the language contact situation in conversion-era Scandinavia and the Danelaw, and how do these narratives inform (or contradict) the evidence of the loanword material?

**Previous scholarship on English loanwords in Old Norse**

As I noted above, most of the extant research into English borrowings in ON comprises lists of borrowings, sometimes as part of larger lexicographical endeavours, and usually with little of the sustained analytical commentary to which we have become accustomed from scholars working on Scandinavian influence on English. This is not to criticise previous researchers for laxity however, especially since our expectations of what constitutes a loanword study have transformed radically from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries when most of this

---

work was being carried out. The identification and synthesis of raw loanword material was a formidable undertaking. In this section I will briefly survey the main studies which have treated the subject of English loanwords in Old Norse.

The starting point for any such overview inevitably has to be Absalon Taranger’s monograph. It remains a remarkably useful synthesis of historical material, and some of its arguments, such as the similarities between early Scandinavian and English parochial systems, appear to have been vindicated to an extent. For philologists, Taranger’s lists of ecclesiastical borrowings have been among the most enduring aspect of his work, informing all subsequent loanword studies in one way or another. These borrowings included terms relating to the offices of the Catholic church (ábóti < abbot; munkr < munuc; prestr < prēost), the material accoutrements of divine service (guðspjallbók < godspellbōc; saltari < saltere), and the canonical hours (ðúttusöngstið < ùhttíð; nón < nōn; aptantíð < æfentíð). Taranger does not give details of his methodology for the identification of these as specifically English loanwords, and it does not take too much effort to identify problems with some of his suggestions. While these issues will be addressed in detail in Chapters 2 and 3, it is worth noting for now that words such as ábóti or prestr could plausibly have come from languages other than English, and Taranger received criticism from Konrad Maurer and others for perceived Anglocentrism. For Taranger, language was, however, subsidiary to the

---


6 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 273.

7 Ibid, 345-46.

8 Ibid, 347.

9 For a good overview of this dispute, see: Marit Myking, Var Noreg krisna frå England?: Ein gjennomgang av norsk forsking med utgangspunkt i Absalon Tarangers avhandling Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske (1890) (Oslo: Senter for studier i vikingtid og nordisk middelalder, 2001), 97-105. Maurer’s attacks seem to be based in no small part on his own Germanocentrism. This Anglo-German competition over various aspects of early Scandinavian
broader aim of establishing institutional connections between the two regions, meaning that he frequently glossed over instances where other languages might be more convincing sources for borrowings.¹⁰

Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norsk was one of the main sources for Frank Fischer’s Die Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen (henceforth LAW), the first half of which was completed as part of a doctoral dissertation at what is now Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and subsequently published in 1909.¹¹ As the title intimates, the work focused not just on English loans into OWN, but also took into account Latin, Romance, Slavic, Celtic and other WGmc influences. Synoptic in nature, Fischer grouped his lists of loans under individual donor languages, and in the case of English makes a distinction between ‘Englisch’ and ‘Englisch-Lateinisch’ loans. While he makes clear that his kirklichen Lehnwörter have been compiled using Taranger’s work, the methodology for collecting many of his words is unclear and most of his entries are only lightly annotated, often simply listing cognates in other languages, with the implied assumption that the categorisation of many of these words remained uncertain.¹² The second part of the book provides a list of sources for the identified loanwords and is divided by genre; though a prodigious undertaking, the lack of contextual information limits its use somewhat.

history is fascinating, but sadly not something that can be pursued further here. In general, Myking’s monograph deals with the accuracy and salience of Taranger’s work, coming to the conclusion that, while he got some aspects of the Christianisation correct, he ultimately underplayed the fact that ‘Kristna impulsar kan ha komme til Noreg frå mange område [other than England] før kyrkja vart formelt grunnlagt’ (‘Christian impulses could have come from many regions before the church was formally established’, p.192). It is certainly the case that few would today argue against the idea that the conversion was, at its heart, an international effort.

¹¹ Frank Fischer, Die Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1909).
¹² He does state from the outset that any hope of accurate dating of these words’ entry into Norse cannot be countenanced: Fischer, LAW, iv.
In the middle of the twentieth century a number of works appeared which developed the foundations laid down by Taranger. Otto Höfler’s series, “Altnordische Lehnwortstudien”, beginning in 1931, followed Fischer in dealing with all borrowings in ON.\(^\text{13}\) Consciously or not, Höfler tends to push continental WGmc donors (usually MLG) for a number of words, and actively challenged Fischer on his decision to ascribe English origin to certain loans.\(^\text{14}\) In 1939, C.T. Carr’s *Nominal Compounds in Germanic* (henceforth NCG) listed a number of purported English loans that relied heavily on Fischer, expanding them to include some interesting new terms such as *bersynðugr* (<OE *bersynnig*) and *goðkunnigr* (<OE *godcund*), though he left these entries free from much by way of explanation.\(^\text{15}\) Carr’s work seems to have been overlooked by subsequent scholars, perhaps because his focus was not specifically on loanwords *per se*. Eighteen years later Carl-Eric Thors’ thorough-going but cumbersomely organised *Den Kristna Terminologien i Fornsvenskan* (henceforth KTFS) analysed the lexis of the early Swedish church, in the course of which he inevitably treated a number of English-influenced borrowings.\(^\text{16}\) This work has gone further than most in actually pursuing the individual etymologies of important loans, such as *byskup* and *kirkja*, even if the focus is on the East Scandinavian dialect (though OWN is also referenced throughout). The most welcome aspect of Thors’ research was the forthright injection of uncertainty into his analysis in light of the many possible origins for certain words with numerous cognates in other languages; for the aforementioned *kirkja*, for example, he states: ‘det råder alltså ovisshet om de nordiska formernas härkomst.’\(^\text{17}\)


\(^{14}\) See comments on *akkert*, *båla* and *bytta*, for example: Höfler, “Altnordische Lehnwortstudien I”, 286; also *mynt* and *strätt*, 266 (among others).

\(^{15}\) Though given that the focus of his work lies outside the realm of borrowings, this is forgivable. For the full list of loans see: C.T. Carr, *Nominal Compounds in Germanic* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), 31-37.

\(^{16}\) Carl-Eric Thors, *Den Kristna Terminologien i Fornsvenskan* (Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursallskapet i Finland, 1957).

\(^{17}\) ‘…there is uncertainty about the origin of the Norse forms,’ KTFS, 23.
A year later Wolfgang Lange’s study of early Christian vocabulary in the Scandinavian languages also touched upon the subject of English loans, though his study is less concerned with linguistic borrowings than it is with the flourishing of a specifically Christian-inflected literature in general. Dietrich Hofmann’s *Nordisch-Englisch Lehnbeziehungen der Wikingerzeit* focused on the literary and stylistic function of parallel ON and OE terms (largely in poetry), as well as the possible influences both languages had on one another. Again, while potential loans are discussed, he is also concerned with broader influence, such as the idea that the works of Óttarr svarti and Þórarinn loftunga ‘were imbued with English influence, in their lexicon, syntax, and conceptual background.’ This influence also extends to comparison of similar poetic phrases that might well be as much a result of a shared poetic tradition as mutual influence; see, for example, his comparison of the kenning *dis Skjöldunga* with Old English *ides Scyldinga* (‘für eine irdische Frau’). As Richard Dance has argued, Hofmann’s work is in need of reassessment, though his focus on poetry would probably demand a devoted study in itself. Rounding off the significant twentieth-century studies is Ernst Walter’s *Lexikalisches Lehngut im Altwestnordischen*, which lacks a specific focus on Anglo-Scandinavian contact, but includes treatment of a number of possible English loans. Walter also provides an excellent introductory chapter to the development of literacy in Iceland and Norway.

---

Lost among this research was J.E. Buse’s PhD thesis entitled “Old and Middle English Loan Words in Old West Norse,” completed at Cambridge in 1955; no part of this was ever published, and it has had no subsequent influence on the field. Buse provided an overview of ecclesiastical and mercantile contact between England and Scandinavia, but devoted the majority of his thesis to a study of individual lexical items suggested by previous scholars. The result is compendious, with each word treated individually, though usually with little interpretative prose. He makes a welcome attempt to categorise the loans according to their likelihood to have English as their source, coming up with three groups: A (‘certainly or very probably… English’), B (‘likely to have come from England, though the evidence is not sufficient to justify their inclusion’) and C (‘English is no more than a possible source’). However, he puts the cart before the horse by declaring the words he considers to be English from the outset, while many loans (e.g. djákn, kirkja, klerkr) are declared to be English on the basis of the strong Anglo-Scandinavian connections he sets out in the historical synopsis at the beginning. In his decision to rely on ‘an a priori likelihood that an early religious loan word in OWN is from the English’, his work does little to challenge or expand upon Taranger’s foundations. As a catalogue of every word mentioned by scholars as a possible English borrowing, Buse’s work is useful, however, and he also helpfully spelled out a few phonological tests for identifying English loans.

---

23 According to the sign-in sheet at the front of the thesis, I appear to be only the second person to have consulted it since it was written, and the first since 1974.
25 Ibid, ii.
26 Ibid, 19-24 for ecclesiastical loans.
27 Pages 85, 124, and 142 respectively.
28 Ibid, 55. And furthermore, that there is an ‘a priori probability that [a loan] came in through the English or ecclesiastical Latin rather than (say) Frisian or German.’
29 Though these are of limited application. Ibid, 52-53.
In addition to works dealing with loanwords specifically, a number of etymological dictionaries inevitably incorporate some work on borrowings. Hjalmar Falk and Alf Torp’s 1910 *Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (henceforth NDEWB), Ferdinand Holthausen’s 1948 *Vergleichendes und Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altviktorischen* (VEWA), Alexander Jóhannesson’s 1956 *Istándisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (IEWB), Jan de Vries’ 1957 *Altnorðisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (ANEW) and Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon’s 1989 *Íslensk orðsifjabók* (ÍOB) are the outstanding monuments of etymological lexicography on OWN produced in the twentieth century.\(^{30}\) Both Jóhannesson and de Vries made a point of foregrounding borrowings by giving them their own sections. Each of the abovementioned dictionaries is clearly indebted to the efforts of Taranger and Fischer, though de Vries incorporates more material into his own catalogue of borrowings. One counter-intuitive benefit of these dictionaries is their compilers’ willingness to indirectly admit their own ignorance: while focused loanword studies are prepared to settle on a particular etymology to benefit their argument, lexicographers can list multiple possible source languages without offering absolute commitment to one in particular.\(^{31}\) The problem of multiple source languages was confronted head-on by Steffan Hellberg in a 1986 article in which he observed that a number of Thors’ purported English loans in Swedish may have a multiplicity of different linguistic origins.\(^{32}\) This difficulty is one to which I will return repeatedly throughout the present thesis.


\(^{31}\) Jóhannesson’s entry for *prestr*, for example, simply lists the cognate forms in OE, OS, OFris and OHG. De Vries has a devoted section of ‘unsicher’ loanwords.

In the new millennium, there have been a few scattered developments with regards to the problem of English loans, first with Reider Astå, Hans Schottmann and Erik Simensen’s chapters in the two volumes of *The Nordic Languages* handbook.\(^{33}\) Given the summative nature of this work, each of the chapters provide solid distillations of the research in the area but do little to deepen our knowledge further and Simensen’s chapter simply (albeit usefully) compiles a list of all previously suggested loanwords in one place. The most important recent contribution to the field, however, is an article by Peder Gammeltoft and Jakob Povl Holck focusing on English borrowings in Old Danish; they are among the first scholars to describe in any detail some of the methodological issues surrounding the identification of English loans. They criticise the predilection of twentieth-century scholarship to focus on ‘form and meaning alone’ and instead stress the need to look at linguistic criteria as well, though I would question whether this characterisation is quite accurate.\(^{34}\) Among other things, they also point to the need to be sensitive towards the presence of competing cognate terms (using the example of *roæ*, ‘rose’, in ODan), the problem of the transferral of OE diphthongs into Norse, and, perhaps most importantly of all, the difficulty in attaining ‘a decisive conclusion about [a] word’s path.’\(^{35}\) Although they admit their work is preliminary, their own lists of loanwords and loan translations still lack detailed individual analysis.\(^{36}\) Regardless of any shortcomings, Gammeltoft and Holck’s work is a welcome contribution and crucially begins to bring modern analytic sensibilities to bear on the subject.

---


\(^{35}\) Ibid, 140.

\(^{36}\) Ibid, 156.
This is the sum total of works that deal with English loanwords with any degree of detail, and it is notable that only three — Taranger’s, Buse’s, and Gammeltoft and Holck’s — deal with Anglo-Scandinavian connections specifically. Almost all the studies mentioned here were furthermore carried out before the advent of modern contact linguistics and sociolinguistics. The etymologies of individual loanwords are often contested, but on the whole the same words tend to come up time and again, and no wide-ranging challenge to the foundations established by Taranger has been forthcoming. The gap for a fresh reassessment of this material should therefore be evident.

**Anglo-Scandinavian Language Contact in the Viking Age and Beyond**

The reanalysis of the loanwords identified by previous scholars is a crucial task in and of itself, but these words — including those that are not necessarily ‘English’ — can of course provide important insights beyond the simple fact of their transmission. In recent years, study of language contact between English- and Norse-speakers in the Viking Age has been thoroughly modernised, even if the focus has largely been on the eventual effects on English. In his *Language and History in Viking Age England*, Matthew Townend states one of the most important principles of contact linguistics in the past half-century:

> …any investigation into a situation of language contact must be broadly sociolinguistic in conception, and one must not fall into the habit, however

---

unconsciously, of thinking of languages as disembodied entities that can exist apart from those who speak and write them.\textsuperscript{38}

The problem of languages ‘disembodied’ from their speakers is nowhere more evident than in the lists and etymological dictionary entries which older scholars tended to favour, and recent scholarship has sought to redress this, at least in the context of Viking Age England. The work of Richard Dance and Sara M. Pons-Sanz has led to something of a renaissance in the study of Old Norse loanwords in English, with both carefully applying modern etymological, lexicosemantic and sociolinguistic methodologies to their studies,\textsuperscript{39} while others have been addressing mutual intelligibility, prestige and the vexed issue of the possibility of an Anglo-Scandinavian creole.\textsuperscript{40} Away from the field of Anglo-Norse language contact specifically, distinguished linguists such as William Labov and James Milroy have transformed our conception of language change and contact linguistics, and a number of researchers have refined how we categorise loanwords in general.\textsuperscript{41} Although much of this work is in itself quite old, much of it has yet to be applied to the study of English loans in Old Norse.

\textsuperscript{38} Matthew Townend, Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations Between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 11-12.

\textsuperscript{39} See in particular: Richard Dance, Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midlands Texts (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003); Sara M. Pons-Sanz, The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).


All this is not to say that earlier scholars have not taken into account what we might consider to be ‘social’ aspects of language contact: Taranger used linguistic material to support his position that the Anglo-Saxon church was integral to the burgeoning of Christianity and, to a lesser extent, literate culture in Norway. Lange and Walter, though not expressly concerned with English borrowings, used loanwords to uncover some of the ways in which Christianity shaped ON language in general. Moreover, there is a limit to how far modern developments in Anglo-Scandinavian language contact can be applied to the case of English loan material in ON. Philologists are hampered by the fact that it is near impossible — and probably pointless — to focus on one particular group of texts: there are no real ON equivalents to Dance’s West Midlands corpus or Pons-Sanz’s focus on Northumbrian glosses, which allow concentrated evaluation of how loans are integrated into the language. The borrowings do, therefore, have to be analysed largely in isolation, though that does not mean written context cannot be taken into account on a word-by-word basis. Lexico-semantic analysis is also more limited, particularly since many loans deal with entirely new concepts, making it tough to analyse their integration against native nomenclature.

In addition to etymological analysis, I will devote particular consideration to how and why loanwords might have been transmitted, focusing on speakers as users of language in both oral and written contexts. This sociolinguistic aspect is important for understanding not only the particular points of language contact, but also for uncovering the role of the church in language

---

42 Dance, Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English; Sara M. Pons-Sanz, Analysis of the Scandinavian Loanwords in the Aldredian Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (València: Lengua Inglesa, Universitat de València, 2000).

change. My focus is by its very nature on texts in Old West Norse, and there is an unavoidable geographical element to this. I follow Taranger in concentrating on Norway (and Iceland), though one cannot consider language contact in the Viking Age without considering the Danelaw. Although contact of both a spoken and written nature took place in mainland Scandinavia, it is Northern England where the majority of Anglo-Norse interaction is bound to have taken place. As others have argued, the Danelaw is where many Anglo-Saxon missionaries must have cut their teeth proselytising to Norse-speaking pagans, even if our records for such an endeavour are next to non-existent. English (and other Germanic) borrowings in Old Norse are a crucial part of the Anglo-Scandinavian contact situation and should be considered in light of research that has hitherto concentrated only on the effects on English.

Definitions

Thus far I have talked about Anglo-Norse or Anglo-Scandinavian language contact, but it is important to define to what we are referring with these labels. Old Norse (abbreviated to ON) refers to the Northern Germanic language spoken in Scandinavia from the beginnings of the Viking Age up to around 1200, after which it applies only to the language of Norway and Iceland. The language is divided into two very broad dialect areas: Old East Norse (OEN) in what is now Denmark and Sweden and Old West Norse (OWN, often synonymous with Old

46 On some of the problems with defining the North Germanic language(s) in the proto-historic period, see: Michael P. Barnes, “How ‘common’ was common Scandinavian?” NOWELE: North-Western European Language Evolution 31 (1998): 29-42.
Norse) in Norway and Iceland. Since my focus is exclusively on loans in an OWN written context, I consistently use Old Norse, ON, or simply Norse, in reference to the language unless I need to distinguish it from OEN.\textsuperscript{47} The speakers of this language are referred to as Norse- or ON-speakers.

The fairly substantial length of time in which Anglo-Norse contact could have occurred also raises a problem for how we designate English. When contact was likely to have been at its most intense from around 850 to 1100, English (or at least written English) is designated by the label Old English (OE). By the end of the twelfth century, however, the language had transitioned to something which was recognisably Middle English (ME); while contact would have been greatly reduced by this time, it would not have stopped entirely. For simplicity’s sake I use English as the label to designate the language up to 1300, using OE and ME when necessary. I refer to the users of English as English-speakers.

There is one further non-linguistic problem in how we define the institution of the church in the period. Thus far I have made reference to the Anglo-Saxon church, but post-Conquest this term becomes less useful; Anglo-Norman would instead be a better designation. The ‘Anglo-Saxon’ church is in itself problematic as it tends to be used synonymously with the West Saxon church, especially after the Viking invasions and settlements begin in earnest from the mid-ninth century. Quite what we should be calling the church in the Danelaw, and to what extent there even was a functioning institution in that region during the Viking Age, has no easy answer. Despite its shortcomings, I will use the term Anglo-Saxon when referring to the pre-

\textsuperscript{47} Where refinement is needed I will distinguish between OWN and OEN, as well as Old Icelandic (Oíc.), Old Danish (ODan.), and Old Swedish (OSw.).
Conquest institution of the church in England generally, and distinguish between West Saxon, Northumbrian, or the Danelaw as appropriate; post-Conquest I will use Anglo-Norman. If I need to refer to the church as an establishment across the milestone of 1066 — and there was, after all, plenty of continuity as well as change — I will simply make reference to the ‘English’ church.

**Thesis outline**

Because the study of English borrowings in ON has frequently been incorporated into more general research on loanwords, a fair amount of groundwork which we might otherwise expect to take for granted needs to be established. Our ability to analyse the linguistic influence of ON on Old and Middle English has greatly benefited from the amount of contemporary historical and literary evidence giving context to this contact situation, not to mention the wealth of scholarly research from the past century that has served to elucidate it. Indicative of this is the fact that, in her monumental investigation of Old Norse lexical items in Old English, Pons-Sanz was able to condense her background to Viking Age England into a few easily definable stages. This is not intended as criticism, but instead to point out that scholarly understanding of that period and region is extensive enough that only cursory contextual evidence is required to set up a large-scale lexical study. When assessing linguistic and literary influence in the ‘other’ direction — that is, English influence on Old Norse — we perhaps have a less established grand narrative of Anglo-Scandinavian contact upon which to rely. While the issue of the English in medieval Scandinavia has been treated at length by individual scholars in the past, it has rarely been the

---

48 Pons-Sanz, *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*, 6-7.
focus of prolonged studies primarily due to the dearth of evidence in comparison to Viking incursions in England.\textsuperscript{49}

As a corrective to this, my first chapter synthesises the evidence we have for England’s role in the conversion of the Norse-speaking peoples, with special attention directed towards the issue of language contact. Offering a coherent narrative of Anglo-Norse contact during the conversion period is an important task in itself, but it also allows me to demonstrate three other important things which have significant implications for how we approach the loanword material: first, that English- and Norse-speakers showed some awareness of the similarities between their languages; second, that Anglo-Saxon churchmen were integral for bringing learning and literacy to Norway; and third, that we should view the English church (and particularly the Anglo-Saxon church) as an institution with a strong international outlook.

The second part of the thesis is the central component of my research, constituting the reanalysis of 113 purported loanwords relating to Christianity and literacy, which are further subdivided into broad lexical fields. A brief preamble discusses how the corpus was compiled and reviews some of the theoretical underpinnings of loanword studies in general. The rest of the chapter consists of reassessments of each individual loan, aiming to establish which of our lexical items can realistically be considered to have an English origin. I seek to build upon the

etymological approach taken by previous scholars, integrating contextual evidence when formal morpho-phonological grounds can only take us so far. I find that the number of borrowings which we can categorically label ‘English’ is rather smaller than earlier research has implied, though much of the other ‘non-English’ loanword material is still highly revealing about the language contact situation during the conversion. As well as helping to build a new corpus of English loanwords, this section is also intended as a useful reference catalogue for future researchers.

The final chapter categorises all 113 loanwords according to a set of new categories of my own developing. I seek to add some much-needed nuance to the way we conceive English loans, paying due attention to formal linguistic criteria and contextual semantic evidence. Those borrowings which previous scholars have often suggested to be English, but which are likely not to be, are also subjected to full scrutiny; I suggest that lexical ‘polygenesis’ might be a useful way of conceiving of many of these (often Latinate) words. Having established these categories, I consider the wider implications of these loans in the field of Anglo-Norse language contact.
Chapter 1: Contact and Mission in early medieval England and Scandinavia

As noted in the introduction, the role of the English church in the conversion of Scandinavia has been treated on numerous occasions, but rarely with a focus on language contact. This chapter explores the possible channels through which the English language may have influenced Old Norse, with the aim of providing detailed historical context for the loanword analysis to follow in Chapter 2. It is not my intention to provide a comprehensive retelling of the Christianisation of Norse-speaking peoples; instead, I want to shift the emphasis onto language contact during that period, and in particular what our textual sources can or cannot tell us about language contact. I have, however, organised this chapter in an unapologetically ‘chronological’ manner, starting with the Viking Age and ending with the turn of the thirteenth century. I accept there are disadvantages to this, not least the fact that most of our sources concerning the period 800-1100 are not contemporary, but an exhaustive synthesis of this material is necessary given the rarity with which it has been done in the past. My approach is therefore historicist, underpinned by attentive close-reading. I adopt a critical approach to the texts, but not, in the words of Paul Bibire, the sort of ‘historical scepticism which disbelieves the sources because they


51 The most recent wide-ranging account to do this is Winroth’s The Conversion of Scandinavia: Vikings, Merchants, and Missionaries in the Remaking of Northern Europe.
exist.\textsuperscript{52} I concentrate on sources concerning churchmen and missionaries in particular, since they represent the kind of marginal, mobile and well-networked social groups which tend to lead linguistic change, a theoretical point to which we will return in Chapter 3.\textsuperscript{53}

In medieval written sources, ‘language contact’ is something which is by and large unrecorded. The purpose of the present chapter is therefore to identify the contexts in which English- and Norse-speakers may have interacted in a missionary context. As Sarah Thomason has stressed, however, language contact can also take place ‘solely through education’; since literacy would have been one of the most important aspects of Christianisation, I will similarly seek to highlight where textual exchange may have happened.\textsuperscript{54} I will address the following important questions: how far is it possible to identify missionaries as ‘English’ or ‘English’-speakers as opposed to Norse-speakers or continental Germanic-speakers, and how do later sources tend to describe them? Related to this question, are such anachronistic national categorisations meaningful or helpful when reconstructing the contact situation during the Viking Age? Do the written sources give any indication of what language was used by Anglo-Saxon churchmen? For example, was it preferable for a cleric to be a native speaker of the target culture, or could he simply muddle through with mutually intelligible Old English and some learnt Old Norse?\textsuperscript{55} Finally, what, if anything, does our evidence have to say about the

\textsuperscript{53} For a brief discussion of these ‘innovators’ (and early adopters), see: Milroy and Milroy, “Linguistic Change, Social Network and Speaker Innovation,” 366-67.
relationship between these two closely related languages and how might this affect our study of linguistic influences and loanwords in general?

1.1 - Prelude: Pre-Viking Age missionary contact

Although outside of the chosen time-frame for the present study, it is worth prologuing my treatment of the Viking Age with an account of some of our sources concerning the Anglo-Saxon mission to continental Europe which began in the second half of the seventh century. While the main effort of this missionary drive centred on Frisia and the Germanic-speaking populations of northern Francia, our sources mention some interest in bringing the inhabitants of Denmark into the Christian fold. Indeed, it is likely that Christianity reached Scandinavia quite early on via various different routes, and Per Hernæs has gone as far as to suggest Christian ‘impulser’ in mainland Scandinavia as early as the sixth and seventh centuries, though he perhaps overreaches when postulating that the raid on Lindisfarne was a result of elite anxiety over the religion’s influence at home. Even so, the Anglo-Saxon church clearly took some interest in the conversion of the southern reaches of Scandinavia. When bishop Ecgberht, for example, was considering his mission to heathen territory, Bede recounts that:

Quarum in Germania plurimas nouerat esse nationes, a quibus Angli uel Saxones, qui nunc Brittaniam incolunt, genus et originem duxisse noscuntur; unde hactenus a uicina gente

56 For a brief overview of Denmark in this period, see: Gelting, “The kingdom of Denmark,” 73-77.
Brettonum corrupte Garmani nuncupantur. Sunt autem Fresones, Rugini, Danai, Hunni, Antiqii Saxones, Boructuari.\textsuperscript{59}

This passage indicates that Bede had a far more sophisticated view of the origins of the English-speaking peoples than is suggested by his own earlier narrative of the Angles, Saxons and Jutes; here, the \textit{Danai}, ‘Danes’, as well as several other peoples are also incorporated into the English \textit{origo}.\textsuperscript{60} Bede’s apparent linking of the English to \textit{Germania} seems to indicate ‘familial’ relatedness because of the term \textit{genus}, but this must more realistically imply linguistic connections, especially as he suggests that this is where the \textit{Angli} and \textit{Saxones} find their origins.\textsuperscript{61} While Ecgberht was never able to evangelise Frisia himself, he did send the priest Willibrord and others in his stead. Treating saints’ lives as reliable repositories of historical fact is evidently problematic, though Alcuin’s \textit{Vita Willibrordi} does at least give some indication of what he thought was an appropriate course of action for a missionary. After unsuccessfully trying to persuade the Frisian ruler Radbod to convert, Alcuin recounted that Willibrord instead resolved to try his luck with the Danes:

\begin{quote}
Et dum apud eum vir Dei fructificare non posse agnovit, ad ferocissimos Danorum populos iter evangulizandi convertit. Ibi tamen, ut fertur, regnabat Ongendus, homo omni fera crudelior
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[59] ‘He knew there to be in \textit{Germania} many peoples, whom the \textit{Angli} and \textit{Saxones}, who now inhabit \textit{Brittania}, have learned to consider [as their] origin and people; from whence they are incorrectly called \textit{Garmani} by the neighbouring \textit{Brettonum}. They [the peoples of \textit{Germania}] are \textit{Fresones}, \textit{Danai}, \textit{Hanni}, \textit{Old Saxones}, \textit{Boructuari}.’ Bede, \textit{Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People}, edited by Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 476.
\item[61] Abrams does suggest that the Anglo-Saxon church’s drive to convert the continental Saxons, and later Scandinavia, was possibly based on the perception that ‘they shared a common ancestry’, “The Anglo-Saxons and the Christianization of Scandinavia,” 215.
\end{footnotes}
et omni lapide durior, qui tamen iubente Deo veritatis praecomem honorifice tractatab. Qui dum obduratum moribus et idolatriae deditam et nullam melioris vitae sper habentem offendit, acceptis tunc triginta eiusdem patriae pueris ad delectos a Deo populos regni Francorum revertiere festinavit. Sed in eo ipso itenere catecizatos eosdem pueros vitae fonte abluit.

The account has a sense of verisimilitude, though we should be wary of the fact that the *Vita Willibrordi* is first and foremost a hagiography, and therefore self-consciously literary. In his *Vita Anskarii*, for example, Rimbert reports that Ansgar’s ninth-century mission to Haraldr klak in Denmark ended with him bringing two boys back for the purpose of education, so it is entirely possible that this is simply echoing Alcuin’s account of Willibrord. That both *vitae* depict very similar episodes should act as a caution against interpreting them literally.

There are, however, a couple of reasons to give these accounts the benefit of the doubt. The fact that both Willibrord and Ansgar seek out the Danes’ chieftain lends them a degree of credibility since the targeting of leaders was a key missionary tactic. Willibrord’s purported administration of the sacraments also emphasises the importance of ‘outward practice of Christianity’ in saving souls, especially in a situation where the opportunity for thoroughgoing education would have been minimal. Other than what educational goals might be inferred

62 “And while the man of God acknowledged that he is not able to bear fruit, his path of evangelisation turned to the most fearsome Danish people. And there [Denmark], it is heard, Ongendus reigned [over the Danes], a wild beast crueler than all men and harder than stone, who nevertheless received the herald honourably through the command of the God of truth. He [Willibrord] finds [the people] enduring customs and committing idolatry and none having hope of a good life, [and] having accepted thirty youths of that country he hurries to return to the chosen people of God of the kingdom of the Franks. And in the course of his journey he purifies those catechumens with the waters of life,” Alcuin, *Vita sancta Willibrordi - Das Leben des heilegen Willibrord*, edited and translated by Paul Dräger (Trier: Kliomedia, 2008), 28-30.


from Willibrord’s adoption of so many young men, the issue of language does not arise at all in the Vita Willibrordi passage, and we have no indication of how he may have initially communicated with the Danes. It is possible that he had a translator accompanying him or that he had learned a Scandinavian dialect beforehand, though quite how this latter approach might be undertaken is unclear. It may be that the southern dialect of Old Norse at this time was mutually intelligible with Willibrord’s English. We have no indication of the languages which would have been used, and other contemporary sources addressing conversion instead talk largely about which basics of Christian doctrine should be taught to the unconverted instead.

1.2 - Contact and mission in the Viking Age

After Willibrord’s ill-fated attempt at bringing a Scandinavian leader into the Christian fold, no other Anglo-Saxon mission to the region is recorded throughout the eighth and ninth centuries. The textual evidence instead shifts to the efforts of the Archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, most notably in Rimbert’s aforementioned Vita Anskarii. This must partly be due to the fact that the Viking invasion and settlement of Britain and Ireland from the late eighth century onwards brought the problem of conversion closer to home for the Anglo-Saxon church. The conversion

---

66 Ian Wood suggests that a missionary ‘could address this [i.e. preparation] in advance,’ The Missionary Life, 257.
67 Einar Haugen suggested that the purported North-West Germanic grouping may have lasted until relatively late before splitting in two, though the seventh century would have been particularly late for this to still be the case: The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to their History (London: Faber & Faber, 1976), 110-12. It has been convincingly argued that English and Old Norse would have been mutually intelligible to some extent during the Viking Age: Matthew Townsend, ‘Viking Age England as a Bilingual Society,’ in Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, edited by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 89-105. For the theory that Northumbrian English was closer to Norse than other varieties see: Bibire, ‘North Sea Language Contacts in the Early Middle Ages: English and Norse,’ 93-95. For a rebuttal of the idea that English and Jutlandic dialects were particularly close, see: Hans Frede Nielsen, ‘English and the Jutland Dialect: or, the Demise of a Romantic Notion,’ in Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth edited by Andrew Wawn (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 97-108.
of Norse-speaking incomers in the Danelaw territories is largely obscure to us, with Abrams noting that, much like in Scandinavia itself, ‘there is no surviving evidence of a missionary enterprise in Scandinavian England.’ What we can say, however, is that Christianity did survive in the Danelaw, though probably with less robust (or at least different) institutional underpinnings. Dawn Hadley argues that conversion must have been ‘achieved within the Danelaw itself, and through the efforts of ecclesiastics in that region,’ noting that no ‘written tradition’ exists for Anglo-Saxon mission there in the same way it does for Scandinavia. We can at the very least be sure that Christianity had been firmly reasserted by the middle of the tenth century, even if some non-Christian beliefs and customs persisted for longer among the general populace.

There is the occasional piece of written evidence. Abrams, for example, has pointed to the letter from Pope Formosus to the English bishops in the 890s, reprimanding them for their desultory track record in converting the Vikings, though he goes on to praise recent efforts without offering any specific details as to what this might have entailed. Instead, addressing the bishops directly, he stated that ‘semina uerbi Dei… cepistis renouare.’ The reasons for this

70 For a good account of the church in this period, see: Julia Barrow, “Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” in Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, edited by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 155-76. Even after the reassertion of Christianity in the tenth century, Barrow notes that church foundations in the Danelaw were ‘small, and most were set up on estates by landowners, or in towns by, presumably, leading figures in urban populations’, 165. Dawn Hadley suggests that such ‘proliferation of local churches’ indicates that the church was not in a ‘moribund’ state in the tenth century, “Conquest, colonisation and the Church: ecclesiastical organisation in the Danelaw,” 126.
72 Ibid, 311.
73 Abrams, ‘The conversion of the Danelaw,’ 36. Barrow posits that this letter may have been prompted by disgruntled clergy in the Danelaw with no episcopal authority, “Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” 157.
sudden change in fortune are uncertain, though it can be no coincidence that this letter was sent towards the end of Alfred the Great’s reign, which of course entailed the beginnings of the reassertion of West Saxon power and a great flourishing of Latinate and, crucially, vernacular learning.\textsuperscript{75} Earlier in the ninth century, the fourth Council of Tours had instructed the preaching of sermons in the Germanic and Romance dialects, so it might have been that a growing sensitivity across Western Europe to the use of the vernacular in preaching was one contributing factor to Alfred’s reforms.\textsuperscript{76} Given the fact that OE and Viking Age ON seem to have been mutually intelligible, a renewed interest in the vernacular would have been very useful to those involved in the evangelisation of non-Christians in the Danelaw, particularly if they lacked ‘well-educated’, Latinate clergy.\textsuperscript{77} The conversion of Scandinavian settlers in England would undoubtedly provide another route by which English could influence Norse, not to mention the ‘quotidian reality’ of conversations that would have taken place between the resident English-speaking population and the incomers.\textsuperscript{78}

It is probably no coincidence that we have a clearer picture of the Anglo-Saxon church’s involvement in the conversion of Scandinavia for the century following Alfred’s reign, though the written evidence is on the whole post-tenth century. Hamburg-Bremen seems to have maintained a somewhat shaky monopoly of influence over Denmark during the 900s, with any...

\textsuperscript{75} As Elaine Treharne puts it in a provocatively titled chapter: ‘The well-known educational reforms instigated by King Alfred in the 890s established the cultural and intellectual value of English at a time when no other vernacular language had attained such centrally authorised validity’, in “The authority of English, 900-1150,” in The Cambridge History of Early Medieval English Literature edited by Clare A. Lees (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 554.


\textsuperscript{77} Barrow, “Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” 161.

\textsuperscript{78} Townend, Language and History in Viking Age England, 8.
English influence seemingly at a minimum until the reigns of Sveinn tjúguskegg and his son Knútr inn ríki in the early eleventh century.\textsuperscript{79} We do, however, have evidence for the Anglo-Saxon church’s influence in Norway during the reigns of Haraldr hárfagri, the semi-legendary uniter of the Norwegian realm, and his son Hákon inn góði, though this is almost entirely through later sources.\textsuperscript{80} Saga narratives from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries tie the reigns of Haraldr and Hákon to two significant developments in Norway’s history: the coming of Christianity to the region and the entry of an elite Norwegian dynasty into wider European politics. Both of these events are connected first and foremost with England.

There is also a fair amount of archaeological evidence which points to Anglo-Saxon (or at least insular) influence which would coincide with the reigns of both these kings. Fridtjov Birkeli’s research suggested that many primitive stone crosses found along the western seaboard of Norway, dating from the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, seem to be modelled typologically on Anglo-Saxon and Irish models.\textsuperscript{81} Brit Solli’s investigations on the island of Veøy have demonstrated that Christian burial grounds were beginning to emerge in Norway by the end of the tenth century (whether due to English influence or otherwise).\textsuperscript{82} Stefan Brink and Dagfinn Skre have advocated an early start to the Christianisation of Scandinavia generally, and

\textsuperscript{79} As discussed below, there is an attempt to install German bishops in several sees. Gelting, ‘The kingdom of Denmark,’ 81.

\textsuperscript{80} It is worth noting that the sources probably overstate Haraldr’s capacity for uniting the entirety of Norway: Sverre Bagge and Sæbjørg Walaker Nordeide, “The kingdom of Norway,” in Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus’ c.900-1200, edited by Nora Berend (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 129.


the former has given cautious support to the idea that, prior to proper parochial organisation in
the twelfth century, the embryonic Nordic churches modelled pastoral care on the so-called
‘Minster model’ of Anglo-Saxon England. The

Several late twelfth- and thirteenth-century sources agree that Haraldr had Hákon
fostered at the court of Æthelstan in the 920s, with the latter converting to Christianity, though
we lack any contemporary mention of this. The first reference instead comes in Sigvatr
Þórdarson’s poem Bersogluvísur, which was addressed to King Magnús inn góði of Norway in
1038 in defence of the farmers who had taken part in a rebellion against the ruler’s father, St
Óláfr. In the course of the verse, Sigvatr recounts how Hákon was responsible for law-making:

Hét, sás fell á Fitjum,
fjölgegn, ok réð hegna
heiptar rán, en hónum,
Hókun, firar unnu.
Þjóð helt fast á föstra
fjölbliðs logum síðan
(enn eru af, því minnir)
Aðalsteins (búendr seinir).

83 Dagfinn Skre, “Missionary Activity in Early Medieval Norway. Strategy, Organisation and the Course of
Events,” 1-19; Stefan Brink, “New Perspectives on the Christianisation of Scandinavia and the Organisation of
the Early Church,” in Scandinavia and Europe 800-1350: contact, conflict, and coexistence, edited by Jonathan Adams and
Katherine Holman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 166-68; Stefan Brink, ‘Early Ecclesiastical Organisation of
Scandinavia, especially Sweden’, 23-39, especially 33-34. It is worth noting, however, that there is some indication
that the church in the Danelaw did not conform to the Minster model: Dawn Hadley, ‘Conquest, colonisation and
the Church: ecclesiastical organisation in the Danelaw,’ Historical Research. The Bulletin of the Institute of Historical
Research LXIX (1996), 121.

84 This is recorded in Snorri Sturluson’s thirteenth-century Heimskringla. Despite the three-hundred-year gap,
Gareth Williams contends that Snorri’s account is probably credible, ‘Hákon Aðalsteins fóstri: Aspects of Anglo-Saxon
Kingship in Tenth-Century Norway,’ in The North Sea World in the Middle Ages: Studies in the Cultural History of North-

85 ‘Hákon, who fell at Fitjar, was called valiant and resolved to punish feud’s ransacking; and men loved him. Later
the people held fast to the laws of the mild fosterson of Aðalsteinn; still the farmers are reluctant to let go of that
Gade (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 16.
Quite apart from the recording Æthelstan’s ‘Scandinavianised’ personal name, this stanza is also significant because it memorialises Hákon through reference to his laws (‘lógum’) and his people’s (‘þjóð’) adherence to them. At the time Sigvatr composed Bersogvisur, it would not have been two decades since St Óláfr codified a new set of Christianised laws with the aid of the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ bishop Grímkell, so this reference to another king associated with both England and the law cannot be an accident on his part.86 Law-making need not be a literate activity, particularly in the context of tenth-century Scandinavia, but it is not out of the question that legislation may have been reformed or systematised under English influence.

Later Norwegian prose sources flesh out the details of Hákon’s fostering, and all are largely in agreement about the details, slight though they are. The Historia Norwegie, which was probably composed between 1150 and 1175, and is our earliest historical text from medieval Norway, notes that Hákon was Haraldr’s second son, ‘quem Adalstanus rex Anglorum sibi in filium adoptavit.’87 After Haraldr’s death, his first son Eiríkr took over his realm for a very brief time before being ejected because of his wife Gunnhild’s ‘nimiam insolenciam’; Hákon subsequently returns to Norway from England, where he is accepted as king by the ‘maritimis Norwegie gentibus’ having been raised ‘officiosissime’, though he quickly returned to paganism.88 This episode is recounted with different details in the Old Norse synoptic history Ágrip af Nóregskonungasögum which was composed in around 1190 and most likely used the same

---

86 It was probably around 1024 when Grímkell helped St Óláfr in declaring a new Christianised law-code, Stefan Brink, “Christianisation and the emergence of the early church in Scandinavia,” in The Viking World, edited by Stefan Brink in collaboration with Neil Price (London: Routledge, 2008), 625-26. See also, of course: Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 208-9.


88 ‘most excessive haughtiness’; ‘coastal peoples of Norway’; ‘most dutifully’; ‘devoted [himself] to gods and not to God’. Ibid, 82.
source as the author of *Historia Norwegie*. Rather than completely renouncing Christianity, Hákon is said to have ‘hélt þó sunnudags helgi ok frjáðaga fóstu’; indeed, according to the author, Hákon’s Christianity must have been visible enough that ‘snørusk margir menn til kristni af vinseldum hans’ and that:

Hann reisti nekkverar kirkjur í Nóregi ok setti lærða menn at, en þeir [the pagans] brenndu kirkjurnar ok vogu prestana fyrir honum, svát hann mátti eigi því halda fyr illvirkum þeira.

Given the gap between these events and the composition of the texts describing them, we are right to be sceptical about their accuracy, though several scholars have shown that we should perhaps afford the *Historia* and *Ágrip the benefit of the doubt. In her biography of his reign, Sarah Foot notes that Æthelstan had a reputation for adopting young aristocrats, including Louis IV, son of Charles the Simple, and Alain, son of Count Matuedoi of Brittany. Foot goes on to suggest that, despite the ‘implausible… details’ of the Scandinavian sources, ‘some historical truth probably underpins these accounts’, and that Æthelstan may have seen the baptism of a rival or a rival’s son as a good way of taking the edge off any threat they might have posed. It

---


91 ‘Many men converted to Christianity due to his popularity’; ‘he raised certain churches in Norway and put learned men in them, but they burned the churches and slew the priests before him, so that he could not continue it on account of their evil’, IF XXIX, 8. This brief passage preserves a few of the purported OE loans (*festa, kristni, kirkja* and *prestr*, plus also *sunnudagr* and *frjádagr*) which are discussed in Chapter 2. These will have, in all likelihood, lost any exotic quality by the late twelfth century, but they do nicely illustrate how missionaries brought not only a new religion, but also the lexical tools required to explain that religion and its culture.


93 Ibid, 55. Others also support the veracity of the fostering tradition: Knut Helle, “The Organisation of the Twelfth-Century Norwegian Church,” in *St Magnus Cathedral and Orkney’s Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, edited by Barbara E. Crawford (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988), 47; Williams, ‘Hákon Abalsteins fóstri: Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Kingship in Tenth-Century Norway,’ 113. This stands in contrast to Magnús Fjalldal, who claims that all we have to go on for Hákon’s adoption is later Old Norse sources and his *Abalsteinsfóstri* appellation. He also casts doubt on whether a ‘fifteen- or twenty-year-old boy’ would ‘have found it easy to go back to fiercely pagan
is possible that the king may have used a similar tactic when dealing with Sigtryggr at Tamworth in 926 and his step-brother Edmund certainly did after treating with Óláfr kváran in the 940s.94

This is ample context for thinking about the language contact situation during the reigns of Haraldr and his son. Hákon undoubtedly matured in a multilingual environment since Æthelstan’s court was a destination for scholars from across western Europe.95 Over a century of Scandinavian invasion and settlement would have inevitably brought the West Saxon royal house into contact with Norse-speakers, a fact that seems to be reflected in the developments of Old English poetry during the period, including The Battle of Brunanburh which recorded and celebrated the victory of Æthelstan over Óláfr kváran and Constantine II of Scotland.96 Indeed, Samantha Zacher has convincingly posited that Æthelstan’s court surpassed those of other Anglo-Saxon kings in terms of international outlook and that ‘the climate of multiculturalism undoubtedly engendered wider exposure to different customs and languages.’97 Birkeli was no doubt right to suggest that Hákon ‘var først og fremst en engelsk oppdradd vestlending,’ even if the details of his early life are somewhat vague.98 Hákon’s reception of Christianity surely

---

indicates that religious tutors would have had plenty of experience in effectively evangelising speakers of Old Norse dialects, and the Scandinavian-settled regions of Northumbria and eastern England would have presumably provided good testing grounds for those priests that accompanied him back to Norway. It is possible that the name of one of the churchmen associated with this missionary activity, a certain ‘Sigefridus norwegen시스’ (OE Sigfrih), is recorded in a necrology in the text De antiquitate Glastionie ecclesie, which is usually attributed to William of Malmesbury.99

William himself records a version of Haraldr hárfagri’s embassy to Æthelstan in Gesta Regum Anglorum; although it does not mention the adoption of Hákon, it does state that ‘missorum nomina fuere Helgrim et Osfrid, qui, regaliter in urbe Eboraca suspeti, sudorem peregrinationis premiis decentibus extersere.’100 The latter half of this statement clearly gives the impression that good relations were established between the two rulers, and Sarah Foot, following a detailed close reading of William’s prose, concludes he may have had access to a now lost tenth-century account of Æthelstan’s reign.101 The two names recorded in this episode are interesting: while Helgrim seems to be an unproblematic rendering of ON Hallgrímr, Osfrid may present something of a problem. The Norse rendering of this name would have been *Ásfriðr (‘god peace’), but this name is rare in Scandinavia outside of a few later instances in Denmark, and Gillian Fellows Jensen suggests the Danish forms such as Asferth and Asferd might be ‘Anglo-

100 ‘...the names of the emissaries were Helgrim and Osfrid, who were received generously in the city of York, [and] wiped away the sweat of their travel with appropriate rewards.’ William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum. The History of the English Kings. Volume I, edited and translated R.A.B. Mynors, completed by R.M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 216.
Scand[sic], showing contamination by OE Ōsfrēd, Ōsfrīd.\textsuperscript{102} The *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* shows that Osfrid, in its various forms, was a very common OE name, apparently from the time of the Anglo-Saxon settlement onwards,\textsuperscript{103} and it is tempting to speculate (with a healthy dose of scepticism) that Osfrid might represent someone of Anglo-Scandinavian heritage travelling between England and Scandinavia.\textsuperscript{104} Certainly any Scandinavian ruler wanting to treat with kings in Britain and Ireland would have welcomed the help of native speakers, and the possibility arises that missionaries could have used the prospect of access to wider European politics as leverage for bringing their faith to non-Christian chieftains. Clerics with a working knowledge of English, Norse and Latin, therefore, would probably have found themselves in quite an advantageous position when heading off into the pagan hinterlands; as noted above, the adoption of Hákon was probably looked upon as a way to ‘neutralise one potential external enemy’ and it seems possible that mission could be a similarly good weapon in this respect.\textsuperscript{105} If the son of a young Norwegian noble could cross the North Sea and back, adopting a new faith along the way, it is certain that, among the great mass of Scandinavians who made their way to England, some did return back to their homelands.\textsuperscript{106} This would furthermore offer another conduit whereby English loanwords might gain some currency.

\textsuperscript{102} Gillian Fellows Jensen, *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1968), 19. The issue of personal names as indicators of language of nationality will be returned to below.


\textsuperscript{104} Though this carries the assumption that names are good indicators of speech-community or ethnic identity, which is disputable.

\textsuperscript{105} Foot, *Æthelstan: The First King of England*, 55.

\textsuperscript{106} Simon Trafford discusses how modern migration studies has explained ‘that migration tends to take place along well-established routes or ‘streams’ to a specific entry point; that for every stream a counter-stream back to the place of origin tends to develop’: “Ethnicity, Migration Theory, and the Historiography of the Scandinavian Settlement of England,” in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 26. Some of the best evidence for travel between England and mainland Scandinavia can be found in runic inscriptions, see: Martin Syrett, *The Vikings in England. The Evidence of Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, 2002), especially the corpus of inscriptions 29-82.
After Hákon’s death the written sources are largely silent about any English involvement in converting Norway during the latter half of the tenth century, at least until the reign of Óláfr Tryggvason. It is unlikely that that Christianising pressure would have ceased altogether; Bagge and Walaker Nordeide have suggested, for example, that Adam of Bremen’s relative silence on Norway was due to there having already been greater influence from the Anglo-Saxon church. Throughout the tenth century the German church — centred on the see of Hamburg-Bremen — appears to have been the biggest influence on the Christianisation of Denmark and the establishment of church structures there. Widukind of Corvey recorded that in 965 a clergyman named Poppo converted Haraldr blátönn, who famously erected the Jelling Stone claiming to have made the Danes Christian, and that he helped the king to appoint priests in the country. Adam of Bremen’s Gesta Hamaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum notes that the conversion was later bolstered by Pope Agapetus giving Hamburg-Bremen the authority to appoint bishops to Denmark and ‘ceteros septentrionis populos.’ This account is corroborated by a charter from the reign of Otto I which granted privileges to episcopal sees at Schleswig, Ribe and Århus, though whether any bishops actually occupied these seats is uncertain. However, when Sveinn

107 Bagge and Walaker Nordeide, “The kingdom of Norway,” 138
109 Michael H. Gelting has recently suggested that Haraldr may have been baptised before this event, which he also places two years earlier in 963, ‘Poppo’s Ordeal: Courtier Bishops and the Success of Christianization at the Turn of the First Millennium,’ Viking and Medieval Scandinavia 6 (2010), 101-33. There is even some suggestion that Jelling bears Anglo-Saxon artistic influence, M.K. Lawson, Cnut. The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century (London: Longman 1993), 7.
110 ‘…other peoples of the north.’ Adam of Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte, edited by Bernhard Schneider (Hannover und Leipzig: Hansche Buchhandlung, 1917), 64.
tjúguskegg overthrew Haraldr, there seems to have been a shift in focus from Germany to England, and it has been suggested that the bishops appointed to these seats probably fled if they were resident, or at least lost any meagre influence that they did possess if not.\textsuperscript{112} We should therefore probably look upon Adam’s account of Sveinn reverting enthusiastically back to heathenism with some caution, as he later seems to have become a patron of Christianity, appointing at least one Anglo-Saxon bishop — a certain Gotebald — to Scania.\textsuperscript{113} Indeed, German ecclesiastical influence over the area may never have been quite so thorough as Adam would have liked, and Michael Gelting has recently pointed to archaeological evidence that suggests continuing Christianisation throughout Sveinn’s reign with, for example, the establishment of a church at Lund in the early 990s, which was then under Danish control, and the founding of Roskilde in around 1000, possibly with a royal residence and accompanying church.\textsuperscript{114} None of the sources recording the development of Christianity in Denmark during the late tenth century have anything to say about language, though they do indicate that there must have been a complex contact situation, with speakers of at least three different Germanic languages being present in the region. This contrasts with the situation in Norway and Iceland, for both of which we have slightly firmer evidence regarding the linguistic situation.

\textsuperscript{112} Gelting, ‘The kingdom of Denmark’, 83.
\textsuperscript{113} Adam of Bremen, \textit{Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte}, 101; Abrams has suggested that this smearing by Hamburg-Bremen may have been a result of ‘a perceived threat by missionaries outside its authority - possibly Englishmen’, ‘The Anglo-Saxons and the Christianization of Scandinavia,’ 225-26; this proposition is given more overt support by Gelting, ‘The kingdom of Denmark’, 83.
1.3 - Bishops and missionaries at the turn of the eleventh century

Textual accounts of the Anglo-Saxon church’s role in the Christianisation of Norway focus largely on the reigns of Óláfr Tryggvason (r.995-1000) and Óláfr Haraldsson (r.1015-28). Indeed, Ian J. Kirby states that the ‘conversion of Norway was thus essentially the work of its two missionary kings, aided by the clergy they brought with them from England.’\(^{115}\) The Norwegian histories and Icelandic sagas provide some information about the ‘English cast’ which characterised the conversion, most of whom were peripatetic missionary bishops.\(^{116}\) Hadley notes that ‘evangelisation was regarded as the work of bishops’, so their prominence in the sources is to be expected; this probably means that the named individuals mentioned account for only a small proportion of the clergymen who helped turn Norse-speakers to Christianity.\(^{117}\)

Later historical tradition has it that Óláfr Tryggvason converted during his period of raiding in England, probably during the 980s, after meeting a religious recluse somewhere on the Scilly Isles.\(^{118}\) This is almost certainly a romanticised account of Óláfr’s conversion,\(^{119}\) though it is possible it happened when Æthelred II sent Bishop Ælfheah of Winchester and ealdorman Æthelweard to treat with the Norwegian at Andover in 994, where manuscript D of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us that:

\(^{115}\) Ian J. Kirby, *Bible Translation in Old Norse* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986), 20.
\(^{118}\) Ekrem and Mortensen, *Historia Norwegie*, 92-93; ÍF XXIX, 21.
\(^{119}\) It is apparently based upon an episode in Gregory the Great’s *Dialogues*: Peter Sawyer, ‘Ethelred II, Olaf Tryggvason, and the Conversion of Norway,’ *Scandinavian Studies* 59:3 (1987), 301-2.
Peter Sawyer has suggested that English royal policy was to convince Óláfr to return to Norway to challenge jarl Hákon Sigurdarson of Hlaðir, who at that point supported Sveinn tjúguskegg and Danish overlordship. As mentioned above, this in turn would have simply been an extension of how the West Saxon monarchy had been dealing with Scandinavian rulers for a century or more; Andersson has pointed out that English ‘cultivation’ of Óláfr and his subsequent conversion effort were probably linked, and it is worth re-emphasising that Christianisation had been ongoing in parts of Norway for some time by this point. Either way, later sources record that several clergymen accompanied the king back to Norway: Historia Norwegie mentions ‘Iohannem episcopum et Tangbrandum presbyterum’ as well as ‘alios plures Dei ministros’; Ágrip includes Tangbrandus as ‘Þangbrandr prest’ as well as Sigurðr ‘byskup’ and Þormóðr; finally, Theodoricus names bishop Sigeweard, Theobrand of Flanders and Thermo. No extant source gives much detail about these men’s careers in Norway, though they are all described in various sources as also having had some hand in the conversion of Iceland, with the apparent exception of Sigeweard/Sigurðr/John.

---

120 ‘The king Æthelred sponsored him at his bishop’s hands and bestowed him [with] kingly gifts, and Óláfr promised him then - [and] moreover [he] thus kept his word - that he would never after come to the English with hostility’, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle Volume 6 MS D, 49. See also: Kolsrud, Noregs Kyrkjesoga. I. Millomalderen., 126.
123 Ekrem and Mortensen, Historie Norwegie, 94; IF XXIX, 22; Theodoricus monachus, The Ancient History of the Norwegian Kings, translated and annotated by David and Ian McDougall, with an introduction by Peter Foote (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1998),11.
124 It is likely that the name of this priest was actually Sigeweard, with Susan Edington suggesting that John was an alternative — possibly baptismal — name. Janet Fairweather has suggested that the confusion with someone named Sigurðr can be ascribed to the presence of a bishop named Sigefried who is said to have gone with Óláfr inn helgi to Norway. Edington supports this view with the detail from Goscelin’s Miracula Sancta Yvonnis in which a certain ‘Siward’ spends time abroad with a companion called ‘Wlfed’ at roughly the same time Sigeweard would have been in Norway. Susan Edington, ‘Siward-Sigurd-Siffrid? The Career of an English Missionary in Scandinavia,’ Northern
The first source that provides us with detailed information about missionaries to Iceland in this period also happens to be the earliest text written in Old Norse: Ari Þorgilsson’s Íslendingabók, which was composed at some point between 1122 and 1133. Ari, known authoritatively as inn fróði, ‘the wise’, was trained at Teitr Ísleifsson’s school at Haukadalr and it has been argued by Íslendingabók’s most recent translator into English that this text was largely — if not primarily — a history of this preeminently powerful clan. It is perhaps this closeness to Teitr and his brother Gizurr, the sons of the first bishop of Iceland, that has made his account seem so reliable, drawing heavily as it does on oral sources to flesh out its narrative; his dating of the settlement, for example, is based on Teitr’s estimation, a man admired by Ari as ‘bæði… marðspök ok óljúgróð’. The first missionary who Ari discusses is a man named Þangbrandr who was sent by Óláfr Tryggvason to Iceland and ‘kenndi mǫnum kristni ok skíða þá alla, es við trú tíoku.’ This same man is also said to have been one of the priests whom Óláfr took to Norway with him from England in Theodoricus monachus’ Historia de Antiquitate Regum Norwagiensium and Ágrip. It is assumed that Þangbrandr was ultimately from continental Europe since his name in all likelihood comes from OHG *thanc, danc (‘thank’) and *brant

---

125 Íslendingabók - Kristín Saga, ed. Siân Grønlie. (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2006), xiii. It is likely that Sæmundr Sigfússon had composed a Latin history of the kings of Norway earlier than Ari, though no copy of this is now extant, Gabriel Turville-Petre, Origins of Icelandic Literature (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 51.
126 Íslendingabók - Kristín Saga, xiv-xv.
127 Ibid, xvi-xvii.
129 ‘taught Christianity to men and baptised them all, who received the faith’, ibid, 14.
(‘firebrand, sword’), though Theodoricus offers a different form, *Theobrandus*, which has been suggested as a rendering of *Þeodbrand*; as we will see below, this is not the only man with a continental Germanic name who may have been linked to England. While Þangbrandr is the subject of embellished narratives in later sources, most notably in *Njáls saga*, Ari tells us he only spent a short amount of time in Iceland. Having converted several receptive chieftains, including Hallr Þorsteinsson, Hjalti Skeggjason and Gizurr inn hvíti Teitsson, he meets opposition from a greater proportion of the population and eventually kills ‘tvá menn eða þríjá, þá es hann hóðu nít’ and is forced to flee back to Norway. An enraged Óláfr condemns the Icelanders and intends to harm or kill any present in Norway, only for Gizurr and Hjalti to turn up serendipitously in the same summer and ‘hétu hónum ums lýslu sínni til á nýjaleik, at hér yrði enn við kristinni tekit.’

After Þangbrandr’s ill-fated journey, Gizurr and Hjalti return to Iceland accompanied by Þormóðr, another priest mentioned in Theodoricus’ text as *Thermo*, who is again said to have

---

131 Halldór Halldórsson, “Some Old Saxon Loanwords in Old Icelandic Poetry and Their Cultural Background,” in *Festschrift für Konstantin Reichardt*, edited by Christian Gellinek (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1969), 111; *Íslendingabók - Kristni Saga*, 23 n.60; Theodoricus monachus, *The Ancient History of the Norwegian Kings*, 66 n.65; for a discussion of German names in Anglo-Saxon England, see: John Insley, ‘Continental Germanic Personal Names in Tenth-Century England,’ in *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century. Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876-1947)*, ed. David Rollason, Conrad Leyser, and Hannah Williams (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010) 35-49. As an aside, PASE, while showing no results for either Þangbrand, Theobrand or *Þeodbrand*, does have an entry for a certain Theodbriht, a brother of the Abbey of Abingdon from 954-1030, which might support the possibility of the existence the name *Þeodbrand*. A plain Old Norse reinterpretation of this already hypothetical name would be *Þjóðhjart*, though it is possible that the second part swapped *þríði* (a variation of Old English *þreow*), ‘light, bright, holy’ for *brandr*, ‘a torch, flame.’ This suggestion is of course highly speculative, and would only be able to account for Theodoricus’ Theobrand. It does not explain how *þreow* might have ended up being construed as *fangr*-, which means ‘kelp’ in Old Norse, though given the later tradition that Þangbrandr’s ship sank while sailing around the coast of Iceland, not to mention the subsequent failure of his mission, ‘kelp-flame’ might be an appropriately ironic nickname. It is also worth noting that Abingdon had definite links with Scandinavia during the eleventh century, as described below. Theodbriht, PASE [accessed November 26, 2014, http://www.pase.ac.uk/pdb?dosp=VIEW_RECORDS&st=PERSON_NAME&value=14382&level=1&lbl=The odbriht].

132 ‘two or three men, those who had denied him’, ÍF I, 14-15.

133 ‘promised to him their help anew, that here Christianity will be accepted,’ ÍF I, 15.
originally accompanied Óláfr to Norway from England.\textsuperscript{134} The name Þormóðr is unproblematically Old Norse in origin,\textsuperscript{135} which makes it odd that he is almost immediately sidelined in Ari’s narrative; when the three men attend the Alþingi with the intention of preaching, it is left to the Icelanders to recount the message:

\begin{quote}
Enn annan dag eptir gingu þeir Gizurr ok Hjalti til þǫgbergs ok báru þar upp erlendi sin. En svá es sagt, at þat bæri frá, hvé vel þeir mæltu.\textsuperscript{136}
\end{quote}

That Þormóðr might take a back seat in the proceedings makes sense narratively since Þangbrandr’s own attempts had been met with hostility, though it is hard not to take a cynical view of this. In her introduction to \textit{Kristni saga}, which contains an extended version of the events at the Alþingi, Grønlie suggests that foreign missionaries are deliberately marginalised by the saga author in order to present conversion as an Icelandic endeavour.\textsuperscript{137} On the other hand, Theodoricus puts more of an emphasis on Þormóðr’s role in the conversion, which seems plausible since (assuming he might have been Anglo-Scandinavian in origin) he could have been well placed to lead the conversion effort among ON-speakers.\textsuperscript{138} One explanation, then, why later authors presented Þormóðr’s mission as succeeding where Þangbrandr failed may be linguistic: a pre-Christian population may have been easier to convert if they received the message from someone using their own tongue.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{134} Theodoricus monachus, \textit{The Ancient History of the Norwegian Kings}, 11.  \\
\textsuperscript{135} Fellows Jensen, \textit{Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire}, 311.  \\
\textsuperscript{136} ‘And the following day Gizurr and Hjalti went to the law-rock and delivered their message. And so it is said, that it was reported, how well they spoke.’ IF I, 16.  \\
\textsuperscript{137} Íslendingabók - \textit{Kristni Saga}, xlv. For the extended episode in \textit{Kristni saga} see: Biskupa sögur I: \textit{Kristni saga, Kristni þættir, Jöns saga ins helga}. Íslensk Forrit XV, edited by Sigurgeir Steingrimsson, Ólafur Halldórsson and Peter Foote (Reykjavik: Hið Íslenska Forritafélag, 2003), 31-33.  \\
\textsuperscript{138} Theodoricus monachus, \textit{The Ancient History of the Norwegian Kings}, 15-16.
\end{flushleft}
Over fifty years after the conversion of Iceland, Adam of Bremen records that Archbishop Adalbert of Hamburg-Bremen was preparing to tour the Scandinavian region when the Danish king, Sveinn Æstriðarson, persuaded him against it:

>A cuius profectione itineris, quod iam publice moliebatur, dehortatu prudentissimi regis Danorum commode reflexus est, qui dixit ei barbaras gentes facilius posse converti per homines suae linguae morumque similium quam per ignotas ritumque nationis abhorrentes personas.\textsuperscript{139}

The fact that Sveinn emphasises the need for missionaries to know the languages and \textit{mores} of their target population might suggest that he saw the German church as having a significant problem in this area; indeed, it may go some way to explaining the difficulties that Hamburg-Bremen had in asserting its control over the region during the preceding century or so.\textsuperscript{140} Regardless of whether Sveinn actually stated these reasons or not, Adam’s decision to include them may point to institutional beliefs about what was good practice for missionaries.

Another Icelandic tradition has it that a certain bishop named Friðrekr came to Iceland prior to Þangbrandr’s ill-fated attempt; as we will see below, he is mentioned briefly in \textit{Íslendingabók}, but his story is developed in the thirteenth-century \textit{Kristni saga}.\textsuperscript{141} Grønlie sees \textit{Kristni saga} as a concerted attempt to deny Óláfr Tryggvason the credit of having started the conversion

\textsuperscript{139} ‘After his departure, which he had already publicly undertaken, he was persuaded to turn back by the most prudent king of the Danes, who said the barbarians would easily be converted by men with the same language and customs than by strange practices shunning a nation’s character’, Adam of Bremen, \textit{Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte}, 220.

\textsuperscript{140} For a detailed look at the problems faced by the see, and the subsequent distortion of how it presented its authority, see: Gelting, ‘Elusive Bishops: Remembering, Forgetting, and Remaking the History of the Early Danish Church.’

\textsuperscript{141} Grønlie suggests that more credence should be given to this saga as it ‘may be more representative [than \textit{Íslendingabók}] of how heterogeneous historical traditions about the conversion really were’, \textit{Íslendingabók - Kristni Saga}, xlv.
of the island, which is instead ascribed to an Icelander named Þórvallr Koðránsson.\textsuperscript{142} Having spent time raiding, Þórvallr meets a bishop from ‘Saxland’ named Friðrekr and ‘tók af honum skírn ok trú rétta.’\textsuperscript{143} The Icelander eventually convinces Friðrekr to come with him back to his homeland:

\begin{quote}
Svá er sagt er þeir byskup ok Þórvallr fóru um Norðlendingafjórðung, ok talaði Þórvallr trú fyrir mánnum því at byskup undirstóð þá eigi norrœnu.\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

The author of \textit{Kristni saga} clearly assumed the bishop would not have been skilled in ON, and thus that Þórvallr was the bilingual one; the communication problem facing Friðrekr would have been just as acute for Þangbrandr.\textsuperscript{145} This analysis of course rests on the assumption that just because a priest or bishop has a continental Germanic name, it means they were monolingual OS or OHG speakers, which is of course not necessarily true. While it may have been thus for Friðrekr, who was by all accounts taken directly from the continent, Theodoricus claims that Þangbrandr came from England via Flanders. If this is the case, he is likely to have been a product of the Anglo-Saxon church and was deemed capable of bringing the Christian message to the unconverted.

The next flurry of named missionaries coincides with the reigns of Óláfr Haraldsson in Norway and Knútr inn ríki in Denmark, in 1015 and 1016 respectively. The conquest of England by Knútr and his father Sveinn tjúguskegg brought that country ‘firmly and inextricably

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{142} Íslendingabók - \textit{Kristni Saga}, xlv.
\item\textsuperscript{143} ‘received from him baptism and true faith’, ÍF XV, 4.
\item\textsuperscript{144} ‘So it is said that the bishop and Þórvallr travelled around the Northern Quarter, and Þórvallr preached the faith [lit. ‘spoke faith’] before men because the bishop did not then understand Norse’, ibid, 6.
\item\textsuperscript{145} The presence of the verb \textit{understanda} in this passage is also striking, since (as is examined in detail the next chapter) it is likely a loan of the Old English word \textit{understandan}.
\end{footnotes}
into the Scandinavian world,’ and consequently also brought Denmark partly under the influence of the Anglo-Saxon church. Adam of Bremen records that Knútr, in addition to marrying Emma, the widow of Æthelred II, appointed bishops from England to new Danish episcopal sees, an event that Gelting believes happened in around 1021:


The names of these bishops have puzzled historians since they are apparently continental Germanic. A.V. Storm believed this meant they could not have had any sympathy for the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon church, while Timothy Bolton has recently suggested that Adam labelled them English as they were from a rival see of Hamburg-Bremen. This need not be quite so puzzling, and there is no real need to speculate on the presence of a German see specifically providing Knútr with rival bishops, primarily because clerics with continental German origins had been part of the landscape of the Anglo-Saxon church since at least Æthelstan’s reign, a practice that seemingly intensified under Knútr. I would also argue that Bernardus could be a Latinisation of OE Beornheard, which seems to have been a relatively

---

147 Gelting, ‘The Kingdom of Denmark,’ 83.  
148 ‘Returning from England in majesty, king Knútr held the kingdoms of England and Denmark for many years. Therefore, by necessity he brought many bishops from England to Denmark. Of those he placed Bernard in Skåne, Gerbrand in Zealand, and Reginburt in Funen’, Adam of Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte, 115.  
commonplace name in England, or that Reginbert and Gerbrand may be similar translations of unattested *Regnbeorht* and *Garbrand*, though these latter two would be something of a stretch.\(^{151}\) Finally, this passage specifically notes that the bishops came ‘ab Anglia’ rather than denoting them as Angliici, possibly acknowledging that ethnicity is complex where the personnel of the Anglo-Saxon church (or churches in general) is concerned.

Either way, it is important to emphasise that the clergy in western Europe at this time ‘were part of an international educated elite,’ and consequently their names do not have to be indicative of either their native language, loyalties or practices.\(^ {152}\) The Anglo-Saxon church had a number of clergymen with a continental background who could have been chosen for posts in Scandinavia, and the appointment of ‘continental’ clergymen as missionaries may have even been designed as a deliberate sop to Hamburg-Bremen, though ensuring that they were consecrated in England seems ultimately to have been in order to ‘bypass’ the see’s authority.\(^ {153}\) This tactic did not, however, work out, as Adam recounts that Archbishop Unwan seized Gerbrand and exacted loyalty from him at the first opportunity, and then warned Knútr not to assign any more bishops from England.\(^ {154}\) This is unlikely to have troubled Knútr, and the church in Denmark was at any rate ‘obliged to play an English game, with English men, and by English rules’\(^ {155}\) and for all intents and purposes the archbishopric at Canterbury seems to have been responsible for consecrating new episcopal appointments, even if it did not exercise ‘true

---


\(^{154}\) Adam of Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte, 93.

metropolitan powers in Scandinavia. It is reasonable to suppose that Gerbrand, Reginbert and Bernard had to have been trained for preaching in a region with no properly established parochial network and a complete lack of monastic institutions, and would consequently have to have been at least semi-competent at communicating the gospel to Norse-speakers in Denmark.

Only a year before Knútr’s accession to the throne, Óláfr Haraldsson had returned to Norway after time spent raiding in England, with the aim of taking control of the kingdom. Óláfr had probably been baptised prior to this, with William of Jumièges recording later that it had happened in Normandy after the encouragement of Archbishop Robert of Rouen, perhaps in 1013 or 1014. Ágrip records that, once returned, he fought off Eirikr and Sveinn, sons of Hákon of Hlaðir, ‘ok strykði ríki sitt med kristni ok ðillum góðum síðum,’ with Adam recording the names of the priests and bishops he brought with him to help him in that task:

Habuitque secum multos episcopos et presbyteros ab Anglia, quorum monitu et doctrina ipse cor suum Deo preparavit, subiecitque populum illis ad regendum commisit. Quorum clari doctrina et virtutibus erant Sigafrid, Grimkil, Rudolf et Bernard.

---

158 Óláfr had probably been part of jarl Þorkell hinn hávi’s force, Sawyer, ‘Cnut’s Scandinavian empire,’ 17.
160 ‘and strengthened his kingdom with Christianity and all good customs’, IF XXIX, 26.
161 ‘He had with him many bishops and priests from England, who by advice and teaching prepared his soul for God, and through them he brought the local populous to the right path. Of these, Sigafrid, Grimkil, Rudolf and Bernard were famed for their learning and virtues’, Adam of Bremen, *Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte*, 117-18.
In contrast to those clergymen appointed to Denmark by Knútr, the names of these men suggest, at least superficially, a more varied origin: Grimkil and Rudolf certainly represent the Norse names Grímkell and Hröðólfr, Sigafrid could be OE Sigefrð or ON Sigurðr (<Sig[fr]rðr) while Bernard, as mentioned above, could reasonably be either OE Beornheard or Old Saxon Bernhard. Again, while caution should be taken in ascribing national or linguistic identity to these men, the names are more suggestive of an Anglo-Scandinavian contingent in comparison to Knútr’s bishops. Sigurðr is perhaps the most mysterious of these four; he appears to have become bishop of Niðarós, though there has also been a recent hypothesis that he is also synonymous with both a certain bishop Sigeferð of Lindsey and St. Sigefríd of Sweden. Grímkell is remembered as having been one of the most important members of Óláfr’s entourage, and Snorri Sturluson records the so-called hirðþyskapt, ‘court bishop’, as occupying the place nearest to the king’s own high seat; he also seems to have been instrumental in drafting early Norwegian church law and ensuring that his royal patron became a saint after his death at the battle of Stiklarstaðir in 1030.

Of the four men taken to Norway, two also appear in Íslendingabók in Ærí’s famous list of foreign bishops who appeared in Iceland before Ísleifr Gizurarson’s consecration on the continent in 1056:

Þessi eru nöfn byskupa þeira, es verit hafa á Íslandi útlandir at sögu Teits: Friðrekr kom í heitoi hér, en þessir váru síðan: Bjarnhunr enn bókvið fimmi ár, Kolr fá ár, Hröðólfr nítján ár, Jóhan enn írski fá ár, Bjarnhunr

---

162 Fairweather, Bishop Osmund: A Missionary to Sweden in the Late Viking Age, 176-217.
Bjarnharðr enn bókvís, ‘the book-wise’, is normally associated with the Bernard mentioned in *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, while Hróðólfr is likely Adam’s Rudolf, who is said to have left monks at Bœr in Borgarþjörðr in *Landnámabók* and later returned to become abbot of Abingdon in England. In the late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century Icelandic work *Hungrvaka*, Bjarnharðr is also said to be ‘af Englandi… ok haft fylgt Óláfi inum helga ok haft síðan af hans ráði farit til Islands’, and is interestingly given the patronymic *Vibráðsson*. As far as I am aware, this name does not appear in any other text mentioning Bjarnharðr, but may give some support to his English origins: *Vibráð* could be an ON interpretation of the (admittedly rare) OE name recorded as either *Wilrēd* or *Wilrēd* in *PASE* (presumably as either a contracted form of *Wilfred* or alternatively maybe *willa* (‘purpose; joy’) + Northumbrian *rēd* (‘counsel’, WS *rēd*).168

164 *These are the names of those foreign bishops, who have come to Iceland according to Teitr’s history: Friðrekr came here in heathen times, and these were after: Bjarnharðr the book-wise for five years, Kolr for a few years, Hróðólfr for nineteen years, Jóhann the Irishman for some years, Bjarnharðr for nineteen years, Heinrekr for two years. And another five came here, who said that they were bishops: Örnólfr and Goðskolkr and three ‘ermskir’: Petrus and Abrahám and Stephánus.* IF I, 18. Traditionally ‘ermskir’ has been translated as ‘Armenian’ but the above translation follows Grønlie in leaving it as it is likely they were from the Baltic region, not Asia Minor. For a brief summary of this position see: Ian McDougall, ‘Foreigners and Foreign Languages in Medieval Iceland,’ *Saga-Book* 22 (1986-89), 189.

165 ‘En er Hróðólfr byskup fór brott ór Bœ, þar er hann haft þú þá váru þar eptir munkar þrjú.’ IF I, 65.

166 Hróðólfr has also been tentatively identified as a native of Rouen where St Óláfr was said to have been baptised, Jón Þórunn Magnússon, *Íslendinga Saga. I.*, Bjöörveldisöld (Reykjavík: Almenna Bókasafélagið, 1956), 169-70; *Íslendingabók - Kristni Saga*, 26-27 n.77; Jón Stefánsson, ‘Rudolf of Bœ and Rudolf of Rouen,’ *Saga-Book* 13 (1946-53), 176; Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature*, 72-73; Timothy Graham has suggested that Hróðólfr’s abbacy of Abingdon provides ‘the most likely context’ for runic marginalia in CCC MS 57, a tenth-century copy of the Rule of St Benedict possibly made at the abbey, ‘A Runic Entry in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript from Abingdon and the Scandinavian Career of Abbot Rudulf’ (1051-52), ‘Nottingham Medieval Studies’ 40 (1996), 16-24.


168 John Insley, ‘Personal names in place-names’, in *Perceptions of Place. Twenty-First-Century Interpretations of English Place-Name Studies*, ed. Jayne Carroll and David N. Parsons (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society, 2013), 222-23. There is also the possibility that this name could be derived from OHG or OS Wilfred, though Germanicspeakers in general seemed to be quite adept at substituting cognate elements of names, and I would suggest *Wilfred* might be rendered *Wiffrēd* in ON; given the fact that Bjarnharðr was connected with England anyway, *Wilrēd* seems more likely. Townend has provided convincing evidence that cognate substitution was commonplace in the
As ever, caution should be applied to such an interpretation, but there is some evidence that the author of *Hungvaraka* may have been preserving a separate tradition, or at least giving space to varying traditions. He is, for example, very careful to qualify the information he gives about the bishops by giving variations of the phrase *sumir segja*, ‘some say.’ From the point of view of language influence, it is notable that the common thread that ties these three men together is literacy, with Grímkell being involved in law-making, Hróðólfr allegedly running a pseudo-monastic foundation, and Bjarnharðr being described as *bókvisi*.

Of all the men listed, with the exception of Jóhan enn írski and the *frír ermskir*, Ari does not choose to specify the origin of those clerics with Germanic names, including the two men who accompany the *ermskir* bishops, Órnolfr and Goðiskolkr. This singling out of an Irishman and several indeterminate eastern clerics suggests that Icelanders were largely used to encountering speakers of other Germanic languages rather than anything more ‘exotic’, perhaps in turn suggesting that less of a distinction was made between Germanic speakers generally. Ian McDougall suggested that these men must have become ‘fluent’ in ON, while Gabriel Turville-Petre thought that those like Hróðólfr who stayed in Iceland for prolonged periods of time ‘must’ have developed their Icelandic to a proficient level. McDougall also suggests that Hróðólfr and Bjarnharðr would have had time in Norway to develop their language skills before moving on to Iceland, but it seems highly unlikely that any of these men would have accompanied Óláfr

---

*Scandinavisation* of Old English place-names, and it seems likely this would extend to other words: *Language and History in Viking Age England*, 43-68.

169 ‘Jón byskup inn írski, ok hafa þat sumir menn fyrir satt at hann færði síðan til Vinþlands’ (‘Bishop John the Irish, and some menn hold it as truth that he goes away to Wendland’); ‘Bjarnharðr… ok sumir menn segja at af Englandi væri’ (‘Bjarnharðr… and some men say that he was from England’); ‘Ín fjórði var Rúðólfr byskup, er sumir kalla at Úlfr héti,’ (‘The fourth was bishop Rúðólfr, who some say is named Úlfr’), ÍF XVI, 11-12.

170 McDougall, ‘Foreigners and Foreign Languages in Medieval Iceland,’ 189; Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature*, 74.
with only a rudimentary knowledge of ON.\textsuperscript{171} Indeed, the argument built up over this section strongly supports Torstein Jørgensen’s statement that:

\begin{quote}
Det er vanskelig å la være å dra den slutning at denne langvarige misjonsinnsatsen kan ha vært uttrykk for noe annet enn en planlagt strategi, og at utgangspunktet for denne strategien var Håkon den godes fosterårs i dette syd-engelske kongedømmet tidlig på 900-tallet.\textsuperscript{172}
\end{quote}

Clearly the Anglo-Saxon churchmen who arrived in Scandinavia would have been well prepared for communicating with and evangelising ON-speakers; they had, after all, been contending with a significant Scandinavian population in the Danelaw for over two centuries and had been in communication with Norwegian chieftains since at least Haraldr hárfagri’s day.

This is not to mention the fact that by the late 900s men of Scandinavian descent had begun to penetrate the upper hierarchy of the English church, notably Oswald, bishop of Worcester, and Oscytel, bishop of Dorchester, both of whom later went on to become archbishops of York.\textsuperscript{173} Lesley Abrams has suggested that Anglo-Scandinavian entrants into the church may have even been ‘specially trained’ for the purpose of mission in Wessex.\textsuperscript{174} Certainly the idea that OE- (or other Germanic) speakers would be sent to Scandinavia without a proper proselytising strategy seems unlikely, even if we accept a high degree of mutual intelligibility, as does the proposition that loanwords relating to Christian doctrine or practice were only

\begin{footnotes}
\item[171] McDougall, ‘Foreigners and Foreign Languages in Medieval Iceland,’ 189
\item[172] ‘It is hard to conclude that this long-term missionary drive could have been an indication of anything other than a planned strategy, and that the origin for this strategy was Håkon the Good’s years of fosterage in the southern English kingdom in the early 900s.’ “Fra Wessex til Vestlandet,” in Nordsjøen. Handel, religion og politikk, edited by Jens Flemming Kroger and Helge-Rolf Naley, 99-108 (Stavanger: Dreyer, 1996), 107.
\item[174] Lesley Abrams, ‘The conversion of the Danelaw’, 37.
\end{footnotes}
introduced *ad hoc* to Norse dialects during the stress of preaching in Norway and Iceland. While mutual intelligibility would have no doubt helped in such a process, the transmission of more complex messages would require careful consideration. As Milton McC. Gatch once speculated, it is entirely probable that ‘the first preaching in Scandinavian dialects may have taken place in the Danelaw,’ including the contemplation of all the issues of communication and translation that must have been considered alongside such an endeavour.\textsuperscript{175}

Thus far I have synthesised our relatively thin historical evidence which supports and expands on the narrative offered by the likes of Lesley Abrams. That Anglo-Saxon churchmen were active in Scandinavia was of course never in doubt, though the written sources do indicate that this was not an endeavour consisting solely of what we might consider ‘Englishmen’ or ‘English-speakers; rather, the Anglo-Saxon missionaries seem to have been an international, and very probably multilingual, collection of individuals. Rather than problematising the presence of ‘German’ bishops, we should instead see these men — English, German, or (Anglo-Scandinavian) — as part of the fabric of the Anglo-Saxon church, and therefore carriers of its traditions, missionary methods, and, in all likelihood, textual culture and language. While we do get glimpses into some of the methods that might have been used by missionaries — such as Willibrord’s adoption of a number of young boys or Friðrekr’s teaming up with Þórvaldr as his translator — for the most part we are left in the dark. As I have argued, however, it might reasonably be assumed that many of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries who ended up preaching in the Danelaw and Scandinavia already possessed some sort of ability to work with the two vernaculars, particularly considering that the conversion of Norse-speaking populations in the

\textsuperscript{175} Gatch, “The Achievement of Aelfric and His Colleagues in European Perspective,” 55.
Danelaw would have been a long-standing concern for the English church. Quite what this ability consisted of is difficult to assess, though we can perhaps posit mixed abilities, with fluently bilingual Anglo-Scandinavians rubbing shoulders with OE- and OS-speakers who relied to some extent on mutual intelligibility. And even if thorough education in Latin was relatively hard to come by, its centrality to Christianity means that it must have formed part of this confluence of tongues.

1.4 - The dawn of literacy: the eleventh to thirteenth centuries

The issue of literary culture — written or oral, Latinate or vernacular — is one that the sources narrating the conversion rarely discuss, and when they do it is usually only indirectly: for example Bjarnharðr’s nickname bókvísi, or any texts that Hróðólfr must have possessed at his purported school. As we will see below, English literary culture did influence early Norse writing to an extent, and in some cases manuscripts made their way across the North Sea to Scandinavia. Assuming manuscripts existed in any modest amount across the region in this early period, the practicalities of education (and particularly Latinate education) must have been exceptionally difficult: even after the foundation of sees, it is likely that many missionaries were transient, and therefore procuring and transporting writing materials would have been a thankless task.\textsuperscript{176} Throughout the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, Latin literacy and adequate doctrinal teaching were pressing issues even in such a heavily Christianised region as England, so the problem in a Scandinavian context would inevitably have been more acute.\textsuperscript{177} This section

\textsuperscript{176} Skre, “Missionary Activity in Early Medieval Norway,” 13. Writing of course required much more than literates - a skilled work-force was needed to supply, among other things, materials such as vellum, ink, and leather.

\textsuperscript{177} Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies may have been composed specifically for priests with poor Latin, Jonathan Wilcox, “Ælfric in Dorset and the landscape of pastoral care,” in Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England, edited by Francesca Tinti (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005), 55.
briefly sketches out possible points of contact between England and Scandinavia post-1050 to the thirteenth century, before moving on to outline the thin but compelling evidence for the English role in helping to bring literacy to Norse-speakers.

After the reigns of Óláfr Tryggvason and Óláfr Haraldsson, the saga authors seem to treat the conversion as complete, though Christianisation itself was of course a far more prolonged process, and may still have been in its infancy even by the mid-eleventh century. Although the missionary bishops mentioned in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century histories largely disappear from the historical record, traffic of both a clerical and mercantile character undoubtedly continued between England and Scandinavia. In Denmark we know that English monks helped in the founding of the cathedral chapter of Odense at some point between 1095 and 1100, and that one of their number, Ælnoth, composed a life of Knútr II inn helgi; in Norway, Cistercian monks from Fountains and Kirkstall Abbeys were respectively invited to settle the Lyse Valley in 1146 and an island in the Oslo fjord in 1147. At the end of the twelfth century, there is also some indication of earlier Anglo-Saxon influence on the Abbey at Selja in western Norway, though Lesley Abrams has stated that this is unproven. Shortly after the

---

178 For a definition of Christianisation as opposed to conversion, see: Abrams, “Conversion and Assimilation,” 136.
179 Outside of the ecclesiastical sphere, there were notable trading links between Norway and Lincolnshire and East Anglia, Leach, *Anglo-Saxon Britain and Scandinavia*, 60-61. While the ‘character and scale’ of this trade is largely obscure during the twelfth century, Peter Sawyer notes that early thirteenth-century records indicate Danes and Norwegians ‘might be encountered anywhere along the British coast from the Tyne to Cornwall’, “Anglo-Scandinavian trade in the Viking Age and after”, in *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History. Essays in memory of Michael Dolley*, ed. M.A.S. Blackburn (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1986), 189. Sawyer also mentions a writ from Henry II’s reign demanding a toll from Norwegians visiting Grimsby and the rest of Lincolnshire, 187. Katherine Holman provides a good survey of post-Conquest Anglo-Scandinavian contacts in general: *The Northern Conquest. Vikings in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Signal Book, 2007), 181-215. See also: Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 24-34.
Cistercian mission the future English pope Nicholas Breakspear visited Norway, Denmark and Sweden as a cardinal between 1152 and 1154. Later in the same century an Englishman named Martin became bishop of Bergen (1194-1216), while Archbishop Eysteinn of Nidaros (1161-88) spent some time in exile at Bury St Edmunds.

The Icelandic sagas also mention the occasional trip from Iceland to England, most notably in the case of Þorlákr inn helgi Þórhallsson (1133-93), bishop of Skálholt in the latter part of the twelfth century, who is said, after a time studying in Paris, ‘þaðan för… til Englands ok var í Lincoln ok nam þar enn mikit nám ok þarfsælligt.’ Orri Vésteinsson has suggested, in the case of St Þorlákr at least, that this trip would have been ‘unlikely’ due to the costs involved, and we should perhaps be wary of the fact that the saint’s successor, Páll Jónsson (1155-1211), is described in his own saga as having gone to learn in England in strikingly similar terms, though without referring to a specific location. Given the continuing traffic between Scandinavia and England’s eastern seaboard, however, such travels cannot be dismissed completely out of hand, and Anne Holtsmark offered evidence for a Norse-speaking presence in Lincoln well into the late twelfth century. Indeed, if Norse-speaking communities survived in England into the 1100s, there is every likelihood that the Anglo-Norman church also included some Norse-speakers.

---

183 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 16.
184 ‘from there… went to England and was in Lincoln and took there yet extensive and useful studies,’ ÍF XVI, 52. See also: Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 17-18.
186 ‘En síðan fór hann suðr til Englands ok var þar í skóla ok nam þar svá mikit nám’ (‘And then he went south to England and was there at school and took thereafter extensive studies’), ÍF XVI, 297-98.
187 In the form of a ‘dødeliste fra ca. 1185’, En Islandsk Scholasticus fra det 12. Århundre. (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1936), 111-12.
188 On the seemingly intractable question of how long ON was spoken in England, see: David N. Parsons, “How long did the Scandinavian language survive in England,” in Vikings and the Danelaw. Select Papers from the Proceedings of
It is during the twelfth century that our first manuscripts begin to emerge in Scandinavia, though it is highly likely that textual culture first emerged in the eleventh century.\(^{189}\) As Hreinn Benediktsson notes:

\[
\text{…the great majority of extant manuscripts, even the earliest ones, can be shown to be, not originals, but transcripts of earlier copies now lost, which, in turn, may have been transcripts, and so on… it is, to put it mildly, quite unlikely that nothing was written earlier [than 1150] in the vernacular in Iceland.}^{190}
\]

Quite apart from manuscripts which may have been produced in Old Norse, there is likely to have been a not insignificant number of imported texts, especially until the point at which the skills required to make manuscripts (not just write them) were cultivated. We have evidence of Latin manuscript fragments that were seemingly produced in Anglo-Saxon scriptoria, or at least under the guidance of English-trained scribes, and some of these show up in the bindings of post-Reformation books.\(^{191}\) Fragments of missals, antiphoners and other ‘musical’ texts with

---

\(^{189}\) For a brief summary of our early manuscript evidence for Iceland, see: Hreinn Benediktsson, Early Icelandic Script. As Illustrated in Vernacular Texts from the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (Reykjavík: The Manuscript Institute of Iceland, 1965), 13-14.

\(^{190}\) Ibid, 16.

English influence have been identified from across Scandinavia in the form of Insular scribal features. Indeed, early Norwegian script seems to have been largely based on Insular practices, with Icelandic representing ‘a confluence of two currents, one from the continent, the other from England.’

While there is substantial proof for the importation of Latin texts from England, we have little evidence of English vernacular manuscripts in Scandinavia, with the exception of a small part of the Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection, GKS 1595. Such a deficit in our knowledge has not stopped some fairly grand pronouncements on the possible influence that English vernacular tradition had on the development of OWN literary tradition:

There is reason to believe that in both Norway and Iceland there was direct English influence on the development of the vernacular literary tradition. It may have something to do with English influence that a preaching literature began to be produced, perhaps as early as the late-eleventh century, in those countries. That first preaching in Scandinavian dialects may have taken place in the Danelaw area of the archdiocese of York in the tenth and eleventh centuries is not beyond the bounds of reasonable speculation: and it may also be the case that Sweden and Denmark, unlike Norway and Iceland, did not produce early vernacular sermon texts because their conversion was undertaken by Germans rather than Anglo-Saxons.

193 Hreinn Benediktsson. Early Icelandic Script, 18, 20-21, 28-29, with quote from 35.
195 Gatch, ‘The Achievement of Aelfric and His Colleagues in European Perspective’, 55; see also Turville-Petre, Origins of Icelandic Literature, 114.
Gatch’s supposition seems reasonable, though at the time of writing he largely lacked any firm evidence for utilisation of OE texts in Scandinavia. The main exception was Arnold R. Taylor’s work demonstrating that Ælfric’s *De falsis diis* had formed the basis of a substantial part of a homily in the fourteenth-century *Hauksbók*. Since then, however, researchers have accrued more proof of OE vernacular texts having provided the basis for some ON texts. Other homiletic material in both Norway and Iceland has been linked to England in some way or another, with at least two homilies in the twelfth-century Norwegian Homily Book (NHB) being posited as reworkings or translations of OE material, while it has been argued that the Icelandic Homily Book (IHB) ‘was compiled with the aid of an English homiliary designed as a resource for vernacular preaching.’

Christopher Abram has firmly linked the so-called *Sermo ad populum* in the NHB to Ælfric’s *Prayer of Moses*, arguing that it ‘can be placed within an Anglo-Saxon tradition of vernacular homilies’, though he does not go so far as to suggest direct translation from OE to ON, instead positing that memorial transmission may have played a part in the text’s composition. He argues that the NHB imitates preaching compilations that could be found at Worcester and Rochester, even postulating ‘an Anglo-Norwegian textual community in the twelfth century’ at the former site. More recent research has suggested that Martin, bishop of Bergen from 1194-1216, and who was born in England, ‘må ha brakt med seg bøker til bispestolen, bøker som kan ha vert skrevet i England’.

---

196 The most comprehensive early confirmation of this was provided by Arnold R. Taylor, ‘*Hauksbók* and Ælfric’s *De Falsis Diis.*’ *Leeds Studies in English* 3 (1969), 101-9. Christopher Abram provided a robust expansion of this argument in: ‘Anglo-Saxon Homilies in their Scandinavian Context,’ in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J Kleist (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 425-44.


200 ‘may have brought books with him to the bishopric, books that could have been written in England’, Kirsten M. Berg, “Homilieboka - for hvem og til hva?” in *Vår eldste bok. Skrif, miløg og biletbruk i den norske homilieboka*, edited
Grammatical Treatise has convincingly argued that its author, Snorri Sturluson’s nephew Óláfr Þórdarson, had access to a version of Ælfric’s vernacular Latin grammar in thirteenth-century Iceland. This is based largely on the startling similarities between the technical language used by both authors, where the Icelandic vocabulary appears to be calqued on OE terminology, even selecting cognate words where possible. Evidence for this is bolstered by the fragmentary AM 921 III 4° that teaches the conjugation of Latin amo in a way that ‘is an exact copy of the section in Ælfric’s Excerptiones’.

While Anglo-Saxon literary culture clearly exerted some influence on early ON texts, this has not led to any sustained forays into the issue of linguistic contact. Although observations on loans and translations between English and ON have been made, these have not gone much beyond pointing out where cognates are utilised and where phraseological parallels are evident. Despite the fact that OE manuscripts were patently intelligible to some Norwegian and Icelandic clerics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, or that the composer(s) of the NHB were possibly relying on memories of oral Anglo(-Norse?) texts, the striking nature of this fact seems to have been overlooked even when it is addressed directly. Clearly there was intellectual exchange between speakers of English and Norse which we cannot easily uncover.

by Odd Einar Haugen and Åslaug Ommundsen (Oslo: Novus Forlag, 2010), 75. She also speculates that he may have even penned some manuscripts himself, though she admits this is ‘spekulasjoner’.
201 This may need further study, however, as some of the terms could conceivably be calques from Latin. Kari Ellen Gade, “Ælfric in Iceland,” in Learning and Understanding in the Old Norse World: Essays in Honour of Margaret Clunies Ross, edited by Judy Quinn, Kate Heslop and Tarrin Wills, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 337-9.
202 Ibid, 335-7.
203 ‘English vernacular manuscripts were available in Iceland and intelligible to at least some Icelandic clerics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.’ McDougall, “Foreigners and Foreign Languages in Medieval Iceland,” 189.
The narrative that I have sketched out in this chapter thus far shows that the opportunities for English to influence Norse speakers in the Viking Age and beyond were manifold. Anglo-Saxon churchmen, steeped in vernacular tradition, would have encountered non-Christian Norse speakers from a position of high prestige, both linguistically and socially. The message they bore was the promise of eternal salvation, a message that was absolutely conditional on access to literate culture, Latinate or otherwise. Clearly the association between English-speakers and literacy which was evident in Íslendingabók was not one that happened by chance. Although our sources inevitably lead us to a relatively narrow view of language contact based upon a small educated elite, we should not forget the ‘quotidian reality’ of contact in the Danelaw, as well as via the smaller groups of people who may have made their way between England and Norway. The lexical analysis presented in the next chapter helps to elucidate these various contact situations further, but first it is necessary to turn to another matter to which I have only alluded: namely contemporary medieval perceptions of the relationship between their languages and, more specifically, the relationship between the various Germanic languages. The issue of contemporary perceptions of language have significant implications for the way we approach research into language contact, as well as our ability to theorise on how, precisely, we should characterise mutual intelligibility between the Germanic languages in the early medieval period.

1.5 - ‘Now after their examples’ - English and the Icelandic First Grammatical Treatise

The so-called First Grammatical Treatise (henceforth FGT) is preserved in the fourteenth-century Codex Wormianus (AM 242 fo) alongside three other linguistic treatises, a copy of Snorra Edda and our only known copy of the eddic poem Rígsþula. The treatise is assumed to have been produced in Iceland in the twelfth century, most likely at some point between 1125 and 1175,205 with ‘at least one intermediate copy’ before being transmitted into the Wormianus.206 The text’s author, traditionally referred to as the First Grammarian, aimed to create an orthographical system suitable for writing Icelandic, deeming the Latin alphabet to be not quite satisfactory enough for this purpose. Having proposed a number of letters and diacritics sufficient for such an undertaking, the bulk of his thesis is preoccupied with demonstrating differences in quality between individual phonemes using a system with a striking resemblance to the modern system of minimal pairs.207 The First Grammarian’s scholarly attempt to codify his own vernacular led the FGT’s most recent editor to call the text nothing less than ‘an outstanding, if somewhat marginal product of… Europe’s Twelfth-Century Renaissance’.208 While the First Grammarian’s orthographical ingenuity has been rightly admired, there is one passage in the

206 Odd Einar Haugen, ‘So that the writing may be less and quicker, and the parchment last longer: The orthographic reform of the Old Icelandic First Grammatical Treatise. E.C. Quiggin Memorial Lectures 14 (Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, 2012), 1-3.
207 He tells us, for example, that ‘har vex á kykvendum, en hár er fiskr’ (‘hair grows on living things, but hár is a fish’), where the diacritic over hár indicates that that vowel is pronounced ‘i nef’, meaning it is nasalised. Einar Haugen (ed.) First Grammatical Treatise: The Earliest Germanic Phonology (Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1950), 16; for a good synopsis of the Grammarian’s proposed reforms see: Haugen, ‘So that the writing may be less and quicker, and the parchment last longer’, 9-15.
208 Benediktsson, The First Grammatical Treatise, 33.
text’s prologue that has gained significant attention due the potential of what it has to tell us about medieval intellectual thought about the historical development of language.\textsuperscript{209}

The section in question concerns a reference to the English language, and immediately follows a discussion of how English scribes had adopted Latin script for vernacular purposes. Like the rest of the treatise, this passage is rich in detail, and I want to use it as a platform for thinking about two related issues: first, the questions it raises about how English and Norse speakers may have perceived one another, and second, how this might feed into thinking about English as having ‘weight and authority’ as a vernacular.\textsuperscript{210} It is worth quoting at some length:

Í flestum lýndum setja menn á bökr annat tveggja þann fróðleik, er þar innanlands hefir gørzk, eða þann annan, er minnisamligastr þykkir, þó at annars staðar hafi h[e]ldr gørzk, eða log sin setja menn á bökr, hver þjóð á sina tungu. En af þevi at tungurnar eru [ó]líkar hver annarr, þær þegar er ör eðinn ok inni þomu tungu hafa gengizk eða greinzk, þá þarfl ólika stafi í at hafa, en eigi ina þomu alla í þllum, sem eigi rita grikkir látinustofum girzkuna ok eigi látínunum laðíkum stofum látínu, né enn heldr ebreskir menn ebreskuna hvárki girzkum stofum né látínu, heldr rítr sínnum stofum hver þjóð sina tungu.

Hveriga tungu er maðr skal ríta annarar tungu stofum, þá verðr sumra stafa vant, af þevi at eigi finsk þat hljóð í tungunni, sem stafirnir hafa, þeir er af ganga. En þó ríta enskrí menn enskuna látinustofum, òllum þeim er réttraðir verða í enskunni, en þar er þeir vinnask eigi til, þá hafa þeir við aðra stafi, svá marga ok þesskonar sem þarf, en hina taka þeir ór, er eigi eru réttraðir í máli þeira.

Nú eptir þeira dœnum, alls vèr erum einnar tungu, þó at gørzk hafi mjök þonnur tveggja eða nøkkut báðar, til þess at hægr verði at ríta ok lesa, sem nú tíðisk ok á þessu landi, bæði log ok áttavísi eða þyðingar


\textsuperscript{210} Treharne, ‘The authority of English, 900-1150’, 554-55.
The ambiguity of the second two subclauses of the final paragraph — ‘alls vér erum einnar tungu, þó at gorzki hafi mjökkur tveggja eða nokkut báðar’ — has provoked much debate due to the fact that they seem to imply that the First Grammarian had first-hand knowledge of English and, perhaps even more contentiously, that he demonstrated an awareness that the languages were in some way related to one another. This latter point is based largely on the suggestion that the languages have gorzki, ‘changed’, an idea that is reinforced when put alongside the First Grammarian’s earlier statement that all ‘tungurnar eru [ó]líkar hver annarri, þær þegar er ór einni ok inni sômu tungu hafa gengizk eða greinzk.’

The potential significance of these statements cannot be overstated: not only do they suggest a vague understanding of language development, they also have serious implications for the study of the relationship between English and Old Norse (not to mention other Germanic vernaculars), and particularly with regard to the problem of mutual intelligibility.

---

211 ‘In many lands men put in books knowledge of two types, that which has happened there in their lands, or the other, that which thought is most memorable, though the latter has happened in another place, or men set their own law in books, each nation in its own tongue. And because languages are different to one another, since they changed and split out of one and the same tongue, then [there is] a need to have different letters, and not all the same for all [languages], as Greeks do not write Greek with Latin letters, and Latin men do not write Latin with Greek letters, nor yet do Hebrew men keep Hebrew with either Greek nor Latin letters, each nation writes its tongue in its own letters. Whenever a man must write a language with the letters of another tongue, then will some letters be lacking, because that sound that the letters have is not to be found in that tongue, they are surplus to requirement. And though English men write English with Latin letters, all of those that can be properly pronounced in English, but when they are not suitable, then they have other letters, so many and of different kinds as needed, and they remove those that cannot be pronounced in their tongue. Now after their example, as we are all of one tongue, though one of the two has changed much or both somewhat, I have accordingly written an alphabet for us Icelanders, in order that it is possible to write and read, which is now desired in this land, both law and genealogy or holy interpretations [homilies], or thus that wise learning, which Ari Þórgilsson has set in books with penetrating understanding,’ Haugen, First Grammatical Treatise, 12-13.

212 ‘languages are different to one another, since they changed and split out of one and the same tongue,’ Haugen, First Grammatical Treatise, 12.
In the past century the FGT has been edited for publication twice, first by Einar Haugen, who was in little doubt that the First Grammarian did indeed have some familiarity with English (‘one foreign language beyond Latin he unquestionably did know’), and again by Hreinn Benediktsson, who thought it unlikely that the author would have had any first-hand experience with English or any other vernacular tongue. On the question of the relatedness of the languages and their historical development, Haugen suggested the First Grammarian wrote ‘with some warmth of the kinship’ between English and Icelandic; Hreinn Benediktsson, on the other hand, having dismissed the possibility of the First Grammarian’s understanding of other vernaculars, remained silent on the issue. In 1999, Gunnar Harðarson published a thoughtful article for Íslenkst mál which surveyed some of the Latinate grammatical literature of the period, ranging from Isidore of Seville to Roger Bacon, and attempted to relate it to intellectual thought in the FGT. From Bacon comes the idea that ‘er mállýska sérstök mynd tungunnar ákvörðuð af tiltekinni þjóð,’ which Gunnar believes is comparable to Isidore’s idea that languages can be a unified whole but vary in dialect. Furthermore, he connects these theories to a passage in the prologue to Snorra Edda where it is said that ‘þjóðirnar skiptusk ok tungurnar greindusk’ in the aftermath of the Æsir’s settlement of northern Europe, surmising that this shows not only an awareness of the divergence of the Germanic languages but also that these languages are ultimately united, despite their differences, by the language of the Æsir.

This article received two replies in quick succession: the first was from Jan Ragnar Hagland,
who agreed with Harðarson on points of interest regarding medieval intellectual thought about language and the modern debate over mutual intelligibility, but thought that more care should be taken with the way scholars use literary sources. The second reply came from Magnús Fjalldal, who echoed Anne Holtsmark’s argument that the First Grammarian was probably referring only to the Babel myth and that, ultimately, the preface is ‘so ambiguous that it raises more questions than it answers.’

Gunnar Harðarson’s article warrants far more credit than it has received thus far, and it demonstrated that the ambiguities of the FGT could indeed be made navigable by appealing to a greater range of sources. While Harðarson’s conclusion that the First Grammarian’s comments about English and the splitting of tongues could only have arisen from direct knowledge of English and English texts is speculative, the idea that he might have been aware of the linguistic relationship between English and Norse is entirely plausible and should be re-emphasised. It is worth looking at one of Harðarson’s non-Icelandic sources in a little more detail; namely Dante’s comments in the De vulgari eloquentia where he speculates that three peoples arrived in Europe occupying northern-, southern-, and south-eastern reaches of the continent respectively. He goes on to elaborate:

Ab uno postea eodemque ydiomate in vindice confusione recepto diversa vulgaria traxerunt originem, sicut inferius ostendemus. Nam totum quod

219 Fjalldal, Anglo-Saxon England in Icelandic Medieval Texts, 8-9. It should be noted that Harðarson actually dealt with the issue of Babel in his article, stating that an awareness of the genetic relations between languages need not contradict a belief in the myth, “Alls vér erum einnar tungu,” 14. Holtsmark, En Islandsk Scholasticus fra det 12. Árhundre, 87-88.
220 See particularly Harðarson’s comments on the idea that the the language postulated to have been spoken by the Æsir may have been seen as a precursor to the Germanic dialects, “Alls vér erum einnar tungu,” 25-26.
Harðarson concluded from this that the splitting and development of languages was not ‘óþekkt á miðöldum’, and that some of this information was collected via ‘athugun og reynlu’ that must have come through travelling.\textsuperscript{223} These are not unreasonable assumptions, and he goes on to suggest that the First Grammarian may have come to the first idea independently.\textsuperscript{224}

Harðarson notes that Dante was happy to group the Romance languages together as well, but he leaves out perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Italian’s description. While Dante shows no knowledge of the relationship between the Germanic and Slavic languages (which he of course states share only one word, \textit{ió}), he couches the relationship between ‘Yspani, Franci et Latini’ — in no uncertain terms — as having developed from the same language:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{222} ‘Afterwards diverse languages derived from one and the same language in a vengeance of confusion, just as we reveal below. For one language alone prevailed in the whole [region] which [stretches] from the mouth of the Danube or the marshes of Meotidis right up to the western borders of England, and limited by the borders of France and Italy and the ocean, and afterwards was divided into different languages by Sclavones, Ungaros, Teutonicos, Saxones, Anglicos and a number of other peoples, [and] this alone remained in all a general sign of their beginnings, that they respond \textit{ió} in the affirmative.’ Ibid, 16.

\textsuperscript{223} ‘unknown in the Middle Ages’; ‘observation and experience’. Harðarson, “‘Alls vér erum einzar tungu,’” 17.

\textsuperscript{224} Ibid, 17.

\textsuperscript{225} ‘An indication that these three peoples derived from one and the same language, is obvious, because they are known to name much with the same vocabulary, that is ‘God’, ‘heaven’, ‘love’, ‘sea’, ‘earth’, ‘is’, ‘lives’, ‘dies’, ‘loves’, and nearly all else.” Dante, \textit{De vulgari eloquentia}, 16.
The fact that he picks out cognate words is especially significant and, as suggested below, has implications for how we might consider the relationship between English and Norse. While Harðarson’s claim that the First Grammarian had direct access to English manuscripts or a knowledge of that language is unprovable solely on the basis of the text of the FGT, the idea that its author was aware of genetic linguistic relations should be endorsed. Fjalldal’s and Holtmark’s argument that the First Grammarian probably had Babel in mind when composing his text is, on the surface, a powerful counter to this notion. As Harðarson himself notes, however, this does not mean that he could not also perceive contemporary language variation to some extent, even if this perception was filtered interpretatively through the biblical episode.226

Indeed, Tim William Machan has rightly noted that ‘for nearly as early as the development of writing there is evidence of both [change and variation] and also of speakers’ awareness of them,’ and the Babel myth is itself just one way people have sought to understand such variation.227 There are certainly hints in other texts that medieval conception of language development and language classification was relatively nuanced.228

I want to draw attention to two examples in particular. As noted earlier, the Council of Tours convened at the end of Charlemagne’s reign in 813 included the first official confirmation that sermons could be delivered in a language other than Latin:229 ‘Et ut easdem omelias quisque

227 Language Anxiety. Conflict and Change in the History of English (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 5. He points out that the Bible in fact preserves two accounts of language change and variation in very short succession: Genesis 10 where ‘change and variation exist as ordinary features of human experience’ and Genesis 11 (the Babel episode) where change is conceived of ‘as divine punishment’, pp. 83-85.
228 Mark Faulkner points to Gerald of Wales’ comments that the Celtic languages seem to all ultimately stem from the same source language, as well has his observations on changes within English, “Gerald of Wales and standard Old English,” Notes and Queries 58 (1), 2011: 19-24, particularly 20-21.
aperte transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Thiotiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intellegere quae dicuntur.\textsuperscript{230} The terms \textit{Romana} and \textit{Thiotisca} cannot and should not be interpreted as referring to monolithic entities — that is, say, Old French and Old High German — and instead should be seen as incorporating a variety of different vernaculars, including those languages that we now call Old English and Old Norse. Indirect support for this assertion can be found in the eleventh-century \textit{Encomium Emmae Reginae}, which was written for Knútr inn ríki’s wife Emma by a monk based in the Low Countries, probably at the abbey of St-Bertin in Flanders.\textsuperscript{231} A panegyric text such as this seems a relatively unlikely place to find a comment on language, but the author provides us with just that in a brief digression on the meaning of Knútr’s son’s name:

\begin{quote}
Uocator siquidem Hardocnuto, nomen patris referens cum additamento, cuius si ethimologia Theutonice perquiratur, profecto quis quantusue fuerit dinocsitur: ‘Harde’ quidem ‘velox’ vel ‘fortis’, quod utrumque, multoque maius his, in eo uno cognosci potuit.\textsuperscript{232}
\end{quote}

What is striking here, I think, is the use of \textit{Theutonicus} by a continental Germanic speaker to describe a word that could be found in very similar forms across all the contemporary Germanic languages.\textsuperscript{233} This is compelling evidence to suggest that medievals were not only able to make a distinction between closely related languages such as, for example, OE and ON, as the First

\textsuperscript{230} Also that one may desire to translate the same homilies openly into rustic Roman language or Germanic so that all may easily be able to understand what is said’, \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Concilia aevi Karolini (742–842). Volume II}, 288.


\textsuperscript{232} ‘Indeed he would be named Harðaknútr, recalling the name of his father with an addition, which if the etymology is explored in Germanic, his greatness will be truly discerned. ‘Harde’, indeed, \{means\} ‘swift’ or ‘strong’, either of which, and many more characteristics as well, one could perceive in him alone’, \textit{Encomium Emmae Reginae}, 34.

\textsuperscript{233} Including: OE \textit{heard}, ON \textit{hárðr}, OS \textit{hard}, OHG \textit{hart}. For a brief discussion of the history of the term \textit{Theutonicus}, see the OED entry for ‘Teutonic’ [unrevised].
Grammarian clearly does, but also, like Dante, to make broader generalisations with regards to language family on the basis of similarities between the lexical inventories of two tongues.\(^{234}\) The fact that the Encomiast was writing for a court with a strongly multilingual character is perhaps no coincidence, and his origin in north-east Francia meant that he ‘may… have been familiar with contexts in which two vernacular languages were in contact.’\(^{235}\) Elizabeth Tyler suggests, furthermore, that ‘[t]he Anglo-Danish court must have been characterised by much explaining across linguistic boundaries.’\(^{236}\) Within the multilingual missionary context we discussed above, where Germanic-speakers were in regular contact with one another, language similarities (and differences) would have been similarly noticeable, and it is hard to imagine that this was not discussed. The Encomiast perhaps offers us a glimpse at some of the linguistic contemplation which underpinned the work of missionaries. Both these sources bolster Harðarson’s assertions, and even Hreinn Benediktsson’s seemingly dismissive statement that the First Grammarian's knowledge does not ‘go beyond’ what any ‘learned’ Icelandic might know about English in the twelfth century still allows for the idea that close linguistic relatedness was a knowable and noteworthy fact, even if early Icelandic writers were not conversing directly with English speakers or poring over some now lost library of Anglo-Saxon texts.\(^{237}\)

In addition to the First Grammarian’s sensitivity to the notion that English and Icelandic were related languages, I also want to briefly discuss the significance of why English is mentioned

---


\(^{236}\) Ibid, 368.

\(^{237}\) Benediktsson, The First Grammatical Treatise, 197.
at all in his preface. As discussed above, recent research indicates that English textual culture appears to have had some impact on the development of vernacular literature in Norway and Iceland. The First Grammarians, of course, uses English’s modification of the Latin alphabet as justification for his development of a specifically Icelandic writing system, but what makes this part of the prologue especially interesting is the fact that he seems comfortable to set English alongside Latin, Greek, and Hebrew as an authority for his own endeavour. If English-speakers can develop the Latin alphabet to cope with the peculiarities of their own phonological system, then Icelanders are at liberty to do the same for themselves. As Stephen Pax-Leonard has argued, the FGT ‘incorporates speakers of English as part of [Old Norse] linguistic identity.’

The most obvious vernacular parallel to the passage in the FGT comes from Alfred the Great’s preface to the OE translation of Gregory the Great’s *Regula Pastoralis*, where the author discusses the precedents for translation of religious texts:

> Da gemunde ic hu sio æ was ærest on Ebreisc geðiode funden, & eft, þa þa hie Crecas geleornodon, þa wendon hi hie on hiora ægen geðiode ealle, & eac ealle œdre bec. And eft Lædenware swa same, sidan hie hie geleornodon, hi hie wendon calla ðurh wise wealhstodas on hiora ægen geðode. & eac calla oðra Cristena δioda sumne ðæl hiora on hiora ægen geðiode wendon.

The difference between the texts is, of course, that the preface to the *Regula Pastoralis* is discussing the issue of translation rather than orthographical reform, though both are grappling with the issue of vernacular literacy and its legitimacy. As Malcolm Godden has shown, the Alfredian

---

239 ‘Then I remembered how the law was first devised in Hebrew language, and again, when the Greeks [had] learned [it], then they translated them all into their own language, and also all other books. And again the Romans thus the same, after they [had] learned them, they translated them all through wise interpreters into their own language. And also all of the other Christian nations [translated] a part of them into [their] own language.’ *King Alfred’s West-Saxon Version of Gregory’s Pastoral Care, Part I*, edited by Henry Sweet (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958 [EETS reprint]), 5-6.
preface was in all likelihood influenced by a ninth-century Carolingian fashion for justifying the use of the vernacular, which of course ultimately had its roots in St. Jerome’s own contemplations regarding translation from the biblical languages into the Latin of the Vulgate.\textsuperscript{240} Could it be that the First Grammarian was in turn ultimately influenced by the sentiments of missionaries from the Anglo-Saxon church, themselves steeped in a relatively vibrant vernacular culture?\textsuperscript{241} This is not to advocate that the First Grammarian had a copy of the Preface to hand, nor that he had met any English clerics, but to suggest that such ideological justifications are something that could be also be passed on orally, much as Christopher Abram has suggested that transmission of some homilies in the NHB may have been reliant on memory of orally delivered texts with their roots in an Anglo-Saxon milieu.\textsuperscript{242}

Ultimately, however, this particular suggestion has to remain within the realms of speculation, and Richard Dance’s warning that one should avoid seeing an ‘actual connection’ where there is only ‘coincidence’ is pertinent.\textsuperscript{243} What I do not think can be doubted, though, is that the First Grammarian was certainly using English, alongside the biblical languages, as a worthy example of how to model a vernacular script; as Treharne puts it, ‘the English

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{241} It should be noted that there is a distinct lack of Germanic language texts in the post-Carolingian period on the continent. Cyril Edwards suggests this might be partially due to the vernacular having little ‘active official backing’, which clearly stands in contrast to the situation in Late Anglo-Saxon England, “German vernacular literature: a survey,” in \textit{Carolingian culture: emulation and innovation}, edited by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 169.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{243} Dance, “North Sea Currents,” 2.
\end{flushright}
language... was a formidable political, religious, social and cultural agent in Anglo-Saxon England and beyond. Assessing whether he had any direct knowledge of the language is more difficult, and Odd Einar Haugen’s suggestion that the text was originally written in ‘Carolingian style’ rather than Insular-influenced script (as in Norway) perhaps suggests that he did not.

This section has served to demonstrate two things: first, that it seems highly likely that English- and Norse-speakers would have been aware of the close relatedness of their respective languages, and second, that early medieval English literary culture exerted influence on the development of literature in Norway and Iceland in some capacity. The latter point reinforces the picture that was developed in my treatment of historical sources above, namely that the reputation of Anglo-Saxon churchmen for learning and literacy in OWN texts was a trope with some basis in reality; while Abram and Gade have provided solid philological evidence for this, the reassessment of the First Grammarian’s treatise suggests equally compelling twelfth-century evidence. There is thus a sound contextual basis for thinking about the lexical impact of English on ON which will complement the reassessment of individual loanwords in the following chapters. It is more difficult to assess the consequences of the likelihood that English- and Norse-speakers were aware, no doubt to varying degrees, about the relatedness of their own languages other than to say that it lends support to the idea that there was some degree of mutual intelligibility. Such mutual intelligibility would, of course, be contingent on a number of factors, and, as will become clear below, makes the secure identification of many borrowings very difficult indeed.

245 “So that the writing may be less and quicker, and the parchment last longer,” 5.
Chapter 2: The reanalysis of purported English loanwords in Old Norse

Having surveyed our historical sources, I now turn to the centrepiece of this thesis: the reassessment of a corpus of English loanwords in Old Norse which have been posited by previous scholars. This chapter begins with some preliminary comments on loanword study in general before giving way to case studies of individual lexical items under various conceptual subcategories. My primary aim is to establish which words can be comfortably assigned status as loans from English, though given the international nature of the conversion as seen in Chapter 1, I am also as interested in words which seem to be of ‘non-English’ origin.

2.1 - The scope of the present study

As we saw in the introduction, most previous studies have tended to list suggested English loanwords with little in the way of accompanying discursive material.246 I do not eschew lists, but it is my intention to underpin the data with some of the analysis that has often been missing, and thus to compile a new selection of likely English loans. I have consciously looked to the likes of Richard Dance and Sara Pons-Sanz’s research on borrowings in the ‘other’ direction as models, not to mention the recommendations made by Gammeltoft and Holck in their interim assessment of the state of research into OE borrowings in ODan. This is not to say that the methodologies used by Dance and Pons-Sanz can be simply lifted and applied wholesale without any adjustment, but their combination of etymological rigour and contextual sensitivity is a

246 The main exceptions being Thors, Walter and Buse.
methodology worthy of emulation. Over the next few pages I will sketch out what data was selected and why, highlight some methodological problems, and define pertinent linguistic terms.

2.1.1 - Problems with the corpus

In his work on Norse-derived terms in twelfth- and thirteenth-century West Midlands Middle English texts, Dance rightly criticises previous attempts to draw upon ‘widely different dialects and textual traditions’ and emphasises the need to study items which occur together in the same text.247 He also goes on to fault the abovementioned ‘list’ approach favoured by many twentieth-century philologists, a critique which I have already levelled at some of our previous scholarship in the introduction. Dance’s observation actually serves to highlight one of the major discrepancies between loan studies in Old and Middle English and ON. For scholars researching Norse loans in English, there is an unbroken (albeit varyingly patchy) textual corpus stretching from the late ninth century up to the ME period. This has a couple of important repercussions: first, it means that the penetration of loans into the wider English lexicon can be roughly tracked at a diachronic level, while variation in the uptake of these loans over different geographical areas can be understood synchronically, particularly from 1200 onwards. Secondly, the effect that Scandinavian speakers had on the vocabulary of English, though not as pronounced as Anglo-Norman and French, was profound enough that there is reckoned to have been approximately 1500 words of Norse origin in the language, with some 600 still in common use in standard Modern English today.248 The sheer volume of borrowed lexis and the relative

---

247 Dance, Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English, 9.
profusion of texts in which to study them means that there is ample opportunity to embark on focused case-studies of groups of geographically and temporally restricted texts.

The contrast with the situation in Scandinavia is considerable. If we discount runic inscriptions, we have no evidence of written Old Norse prior to the early twelfth century in Iceland and the mid- to late-twelfth century in Norway, meaning that the beginning of our corpus postdates the period in which English and Norse speakers were in regular contact with one another in large numbers. This is something of a simplification however; in particular there is the problem of the body of skaldic poetry which, although recorded much later in writing, had its origins in the multilingual environment of Viking Age England and Scandinavia. Even more so than for ON loans in English, the first appearance of a loanword is not a very useful guide for dating its borrowing.

In the previous chapter we also explored the links which existed between Western Scandinavia and England into the twelfth century, though the scale of contact was small in comparison to the daily interactions that undoubtedly occurred in the Danelaw and at the courts of the Anglo-Saxon kings. The number of lexical borrowings from English is subsequently very small: I have collated 338 possible loans mentioned by scholars, with far fewer surviving in the

---

249 Magnus Rindal posits that the first manuscripts were made in Norway in the eleventh century, though he does not go so far as to suggest these were necessarily in Old Norse, “The history of Old Nordic manuscripts II: Old Norwegian,” in The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages edited by Oskar Bande, Kurt Braunmüller, Ernst Håkon Jahr, Allan Karker, Hans-Peter Naumann and Ulf Teleman (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 802.


vocabularies of the modern Scandinavian languages. As a consequence of all this, while it might be possible to select a small corpus of texts with narrow geographical and temporal range,\textsuperscript{252} the very low number of loans means that a thorough synchronic analysis of how English borrowings might have become integrated into the lexicon of individual authors or textual communities is not really feasible.\textsuperscript{253} We are instead left with little choice but to treat lexical items as individual case studies, and this is the method taken up in the main part of this chapter.\textsuperscript{254} The remainder of the present section is given over to a discussion of the linguistic background and a synoptic discussion of the loans in general.

\textbf{2.1.2 - Definitions: English and Old Norse}

In the introduction I briefly outlined the practical labels I would be using in reference to the two main languages of the thesis, but it is worth briefly outlining the development of English and ON, since their delineation as distinct languages is key to any discussion of what might or might not constitute borrowed material. From a prescriptive diachronic perspective, this is straightforward: both represent different manifestations of (respectively) the West and North Germanic branches of the Germanic sub-grouping of the Indo-European language family.\textsuperscript{255}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{252} The texts produced in Hólar in northern Iceland during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for example.
\item \textsuperscript{253} One possible exception to this would be the works of Viking Age skalds, which would require a new study in the vein of Hofmann's work. Steffan Hellberg did this on a smaller scale for Þórarinn loftunga's \textit{Glaðningsþiða}: “Kring tillkomsten av \textit{Glaðningsþiða}.” \textit{Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi} 99 (1984), 14-48.
\item \textsuperscript{254} As Gammeltoft and Holck do with their study of gemstên in ODan., “Gemstên and other Old English Pearls - a survey of Early Old English loanwords in Scandinavian,” 132-34.
At some point in their history, prior to around the fifth century, the West and North Germanic strands probably constituted a larger ‘North-West’ subdivision, with WGmc. probably breaking off as a distinctive grouping somewhat earlier.\textsuperscript{256} This of course means a great deal of overlap in both lexical cognates and phonology.\textsuperscript{257} For those wishing to study the exchange of lexical material between the two languages, this has the obvious and much commented-upon problem of making it exceptionally difficult to identify what constitutes a loan or not, particularly where there is a dearth of written evidence.\textsuperscript{258}

As described in Chapter 1, after the first Viking raids at the end of the eighth century, there is a period of some 400 years where there would have been contact between English- and ON-speakers to varying degrees. This contact would have taken place between speakers of various dialects of these languages: Anglian and WS English dialect speakers would have encountered Eastern and Western varieties of Old Norse (plus the undoubted variation these subdivisions disguise). From the latter half of the main contact period, from around 1050, speakers of all varieties of Norse would also have begun to encounter a variety of English that was beginning to undergo reductions in morphology. Old Norse, on the other hand, was

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{257} On the latter, see: Townend, Language and History in Viking Age England, 41; see also 33-37 for comparison of the sound inventories of both languages.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
probably fairly uniform for much of this period, with the OWN varieties in which we are most interested being particularly conservative. Given the diversity that was inherent to each language in this period, however, and for the reasons outlined in the introduction, I have deemed the use of the labels ‘English’ and ‘ON/Norse’ as most appropriate for our two main languages.

### 2.1.3 - Definitions: Loanwords

Loanwords are among the richest signifiers of language contact and change, though they are also one of the most difficult to establish with any degree of certainty, particularly where the quantity of written evidence is thin and at ‘a greater time depth.’ This problem is even more acute when we are dealing with two or more languages that are very close to one another genetically, as is of course the case with English and Norse, and this problem has been highlighted since the earliest days of serious academic enquiry into borrowing between the two languages. Although plenty of formal linguistic criteria exist to help us identify ON loans in English, there are few widely applicable tests for the ‘other’ direction. In order to mitigate this we must take into account a wide range of evidence in order to get anywhere near a concrete answer as to whether a particular lexeme is borrowed or not, and if so, which language was the

---

259 This is especially true of OIc.: Dance, “English in Contact”, 1725; Barnes, on the other hand, has suggested that ‘the form or forms of Scandinavian we see emerging during the Viking Age need not reflect the totality of the population, but could be solely that of the linguistically most dominant,’ though he does go on to question whether a small group of speakers could have been quite so influential on the development of written Old Norse as we know it, “How ‘common’ was common Scandinavian?” 39.


261 Pons-Sanz gives the most comprehensive account of morphological and phonological tests for ON>OE, and these are at least partly useful for OE>ON: *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*, 28-76. Buse devised three formal criteria for English loans in ON; these are useful, but not widely applicable: PGmc. ai > OE ā / OWN āe/ai; PGmc. a > OE ā / ON ā; PGmc. nk, nt, mp > OE nk, nt, mp / OWN kk, tt, pp. "English Loan Words in Old Norse," 52-53.
likely source. Even when we have marshalled all phonological, morphological, semantic, and contextual evidence, however, it may still be impossible to say with any degree of certainty whether we are dealing with a loan or not. As the individual word studies will demonstrate, this is, with some exceptions, particularly true of purported English loans in Norse.

It is worth discussing what we mean by the (essentially synonymous) terms ‘borrowing’ and ‘loanword’. The semantic preposterousness of such terms has been much commented upon, and it is generally agreed that both terms are now ‘entrenched’ in the historical linguistic lexicon to the extent that they have become divorced from their original meanings. The terms are, according to Einar Haugen, the ‘vaguest’ examples of borrowing terminology, and in fact disguise several different types of loaning behaviour. Quite apart from the fact that borrowing can refer to lexis, morphology, phonology or syntax, there is also much diversity in what we mean by the ostensibly more specific term ‘loanword’.

At the most basic level a loanword is simply ‘a word that at some point came into a language by transfer from another language.’ (Lending languages are referred to as ‘source’ languages in the present thesis, while the language which ‘borrows’ the word is the ‘recipient’). A word is adopted, often with partial phonological adaptation, and it is integrated into the inflexional morphology of the recipient language; take for example, OE/ME loft, ‘air, sky’, an

263 Durkin, Borrowed Words, 3.
266 Durkin, Borrowed Words, 8.
uncomplicated borrowing of ON lop.

Many loans are not ‘straightforward’ adoptions, however, and we might find that a lexeme has been altered in some respect during the course of borrowing. In addition to loanwords, which are what Martin Haspelmath calls ‘material’ borrowings, we also find ‘loan translations’, which he terms ‘structural’ borrowings. Also known as calques, loan translations absorb a lexical item (often a compound) into the structure of the recipient language. For example, OE hāmsōcn (‘offence of attacking a man in his own house’) is a good example of this, whereby the ON heimsōkn was analysed correctly and translated into the corresponding English cognates (heimr-hām and sökn-sōcn). It is here that the close genetic relationship of the two languages begins to become problematic however, as it is difficult to know for certain that it was not coined independently. In addition to loan translations we can also include loanblends, which import an unanalysed element from the source language, and semantic loans where a meaning from a lexeme in the source language is extended to a cognate in the recipient language. Semantic loans are particularly difficult to assess properly since it can be hard to get a good grasp of what certain words mean prior to the point of contact, particularly when the corpus of extant texts is so small and where the source and recipient languages share a large number of cognates. The identification and analysis of semantic loans would require a new wide-ranging study, and for this reason they largely lie outside the remit of

---

269 Pons-Sanz, The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English, 116.
270 Pons-Sanz urges some caution with regards to hāmsōcn, ibid, 116.
272 Dance notes that ‘parallel sense-development’ is entirely possible where cognates are concerned, Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English, 93. Andreas Fischer is critical of semantic typologies of loanword analysis, “Lexical borrowing and the history of English: A typology of typologies,” 105.
the present thesis. I will use the words ‘loanword’, ‘loan’, and ‘borrowing’ synonymously as generic terms for any loaned word, whether ‘material’ or ‘structural’ in nature.

2.2 - The data

The lexical items presented for analysis here are collated from all of the major studies that were discussed in the introduction. Buse presents by far the most exhaustive compilation of previous loanwords, but it is occasionally difficult to ascertain where he sourced his words from; most appear to be from Taranger and Fischer, though he seems to miss Carr, while the works of de Vries, Thors and others only appeared after the completion of his thesis in 1955. My own data is largely collated from Taranger, Fischer and the various etymological dictionaries (especially de Vries), though I have also incorporated the occasional English borrowing which is mentioned in passing in works that are not primarily lexicographical endeavours or concerned exclusively with issues of language contact. In raw terms, this means there are 338 individual words that scholars have suggested as being English loans at some point in the past 150 years or so; I have strived to make this list as comprehensive as possible. The full list (including information about which scholars mention them) can be found in the appendix. It is important to stress that this list is entirely uncritical, in that it makes no assumptions as to the likelihood of

273 For crucial works that examine how Old Norse lexis adapted to accommodate new Christian concepts, see: Lange, Studien zur christlichen Dichtung der Nordgermanen 1000-1200 and Astrid Salvesen, Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Norse Elucidarium (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1968).
274 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse.”
275 Including, for example: Turville-Petre, Origins of Icelandic Literature, 75 and Haugen, The First Grammatical Treatise, 50 & 74. For the ‘perennial problem’ of other linguists finding ‘counterexamples you missed’ see: Roger Lass, Historical Linguistics and Language Change (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 185. Taranger’s loans are found in Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 215-95, 329-66. De Vries’ list of English loans can be found in ANWB, xxvii.
whether a loan is ultimately of English origin or not, and is instead designed to provide a useful reference point for future research.

The potential borrowings cover a large range of conceptual fields, including, among others, animals (api, léo), architecture (kastali, tigl), clothing (glöfï, klaðï), and nobility (barún, lávarð). Given the focus of the present thesis, however, I will be directing attention to 113 words that can reasonably be classified as falling under the broad categories of Christianity and Literacy, the former of which is the largest category by quite some distance. The data has been further subdivided into fourteen different conceptual categories, plus one miscellaneous category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>Writing (material culture)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church architecture</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church material culture</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasts</td>
<td>Spiritual relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical hours</td>
<td>Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church service</td>
<td>Spiritual figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (practice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present study divides words according to quite broad conceptual fields of my own development. Most of the borrowings constitute what would have been new concepts in ON, meaning that the opportunity for analysis of loaned material within webs of native, semantically

---

related lexis is somewhat limited.277 A focus on lexical fields might be possible, though this would inevitably be far too crude to offer any real value; we could, for example, examine how a word like kirkja was integrated into the ON lexicon alongside an ‘equivalent’ native term such as hof under a conceptual field of ‘places of worship’, but it is doubtful this would yield any meaningful results.278

Throughout the analysis I make frequent references to the electronic corpora of both the Dictionary of Old English and the Ordbog over det norrøne Prosasprog (henceforth the DOE and ONP respectively). Both provide useful numbers for the appearance of individual words in OE and OWN, though it is important to note that the ONP corpus is continually being updated, so any numbers quoted from there are only accurate at the time of writing. Even so, the raw numbers do offer a good rough guide to the frequency of individual words in ON, and therefore a decent indication of their penetration into the wider lexicon.

The structure of the study is as follows: each loanword is evaluated on an individual basis, drawing on etymological, semantic and contextual evidence to come to an informed decision regarding its origin. Each entry begins with the headwords for both ON and OE respectively (with an accompanying definition in brackets), as well as the gender if I am dealing with a noun. I then survey which scholars have mentioned the word as being English (or otherwise) in the past, before moving on to my own assessment. In Chapter 3 I organise the loanwords into new classifications on the basis of my reanalysis and consider some of the wider

277 Two notable exceptions are rita/rita and undirstanda (with the former possibly showing showing a degree of semantic influence from English).
278 On the possible geographical connections between hof and later churches, see: Bagge and Noreide, “The Kingdom of Norway”, 124-25.
implications for Anglo-Norse language contact. The important questions for this section are: how likely is it that an individual lexical item has been borrowed from English? And, if the word seems unlikely to have a specifically English source, what are the probable alternative source languages?

2.3 - Loanword Studies

2.3.1 - Clergy

_abbadís_, f. - _abbodesse_, f. (‘abbess’)

Taranger and a number of others have suggested that _abbadís_ was a loan from English.\(^\text{279}\) In the twentieth century, Jóhannesson instead pointed to MLG _abbadesse_, and explained that the change in form, with the dropping of the final unstressed vowel and the lengthening of the penultimate vowel, might have been due to it having been a ‘volketyonomische Angleichung an _dis_ „mädchen, göttin.”’\(^\text{280}\) De Vries did not mention the possibility of folk etymology, suggesting instead it is a loan from MLG.\(^\text{281}\) Veturliði Óskarsson suggests it may have been taken directly from Latin, but MLG may also have been the intermediary source.\(^\text{282}\) A folk etymological explanation is attractive given medieval approaches to word study,\(^\text{283}\) but particularly in light of

\(^{279}\) Taranger, _Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske_, 273; KTFS, 107-8; VEWA, _abbadís_; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 61.

\(^{280}\) ‘a folk etymological approximation,’ IEWB, _abbadís_.

\(^{281}\) ANEW, _abbadís_.

\(^{282}\) Veturliði Óskarsson, _Middelnedertyske låneord i Islandsk Diplomsprog frem til år 1500_ (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag, 2003), 122.

\(^{283}\) i.e. ‘investigating the true meaning’ based on an assumption of ‘a direct relationship between the word and the object of activity that it represented’, Winfred P. Lehmann, _Historical Linguistics: an introduction_ (London: Routledge, 1992), 24.
the fact that the masculine equivalent, ábóti, may have been a reanalysis of its source word (see below).

The question of the source language is therefore a tricky one, though the earliest attestation in the ONP is from c.1270 in Strengleikar (translating OF abeese), so it might be that MLG may make more sense. It is unlikely that OF was the source language. Robert Cook and Mattias Tveitane, eds. Strengleikar: An Old Norse Translation of twenty-one Old French Lais (Oslo: Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, 1979), 48.

Óskarsson points out, however, that a convent was founded at Kirkjubœr by at least 1186, and we know that there were at least two monastic foundations in an OWN speaking context at Selja and Niðarhólmr by the turn of the twelfth century, both quite possibly founded by monks from England, as well as convents at Gimsøy and ‘Nunnusetr’ in the early part of that century. There is of course no reason to assume that the borrowing of a title like abbadís has to coincide with the actual establishment of religious communities, and so the possible timeframe in which loaning may have taken place could probably extend back to contact situations in Anglo-Saxon England or in north-west Germany. From a phonological perspective, the word need not be problematic as a loan from English, with a folk etymological reanalysis resulting in a pseudo-compounded form (abba-dís); we otherwise might expect something like *abbadís or possibly *abbatissa if native Norse phonology was simply projected onto the incoming lexical item. It may even be the case that the English or German word was loaned with WGmc. ‘pronunciation’ being maintained with a voiced stop, though this seems unlikely.

---

284 It is unlikely that OF was the source language. Robert Cook and Mattias Tveitane, eds. Strengleikar: An Old Norse Translation of twenty-one Old French Lais (Oslo: Norsk historisk kjeldeskrift-institutt, 1979), 48.


286 Buse suggests this points to ‘verbal borrowing’, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 61.

287 See Pons-Sanz on the development of PGmc. *[ð] in this position in OE and ON, The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English, 59.
We would be wrong to assume, however, that *abbadis* needed to have been loaned directly from one of either OE or OS/MLG and consequently diffused among Norse speakers. As we saw in the first chapter, while the Anglo-Saxon church did play a significant role in the conversion of Scandinavia, it was ultimately a multinational effort. With our very first word, the term ‘polygenesis’ becomes useful, or the idea that several competing forms of a cognate word were loaned multiple times over large geographical areas and long periods of time.\(^{288}\) The idea of polygenesis is not without some theoretical problems; I will examine some of the drawbacks of the category in Chapter 3, but the term will be employed where multiple source languages are possible. Ultimately, a secure identification of a specific source language is an impossibility. What we can state is that Norse speakers are likely to have encountered a variety of WGmc. and Romance forms.

\[\text{ábóti, m. - abbod, m. (‘abbot’)}\]

While *ábóti* is by far the most common form for this word (with 69 attestations in the ONP), there are two other forms (united by the presence of *-bb-*) which are attested earlier: *abbáti* in a homily from c.1150 in AM 237 a fol, and *abbóti* in a translation of the Rule of St Benedict from c.1200.\(^{289}\) Taranger mentioned it as an OE borrowing alongside *abbadis*, and a number of others have agreed.\(^{290}\) Falk and Torp suggested two waves of influence, first with OE *abbod* coming into Norse as *ábóti* and ODan./OSw. *abbot*, and later with MLG *abbet* giving rise to Dano-Norwegian


\(^{289}\) Where it translates Latin *prioris*. See the ONP entries under *ábóti, abbáti, and abbóti.*

\(^{290}\) Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse på den Norske, 273; LAW, 52; ANEW, ábóti; VEWA, abóti.*
Seip correctly included it in a small group of words that must have been absorbed into Norse before the turn of the thirteenth century. Buse is confident in its English origin. Writing about the history of the word form in general across a number of Germanic languages, the revised OED notes that: ‘The details of the form history of the word in many of these languages are complex and disputed, especially as the possible effects of repeated borrowing need to be taken into account.’ It does, however, suggest that the OIc. term was ‘probably’ loaned from English.

This lexeme, then, seems to offer a rare instance of relative unity of opinion on the source language, though Falk and Torp and the OED’s indication that the history of the word is a little more complex is welcome. There is a problem of how the Norse word ended up with a weak declension if it was a straightforward loan from OE abbod, though the OED notes that there is evidence of late OE forms with a weak inflection, particularly in the Peterborough Chronicle. I might also add possible influence from OFris. forms with a final unstressed vowel (abbate, abbete). The weak form may also have received reinforcement from another avenue that relates to Fischer’s suggestion that Norse bóti, ‘cure; improvement’ influenced the form ofábóti, much in the same way that abbadís may have been subject to ‘folk’ reanalysis. De Vries clarifies that the reinterpretation of the word may have been intended to convey a meaning of ‘sitten-verbesserer’. This is at least plausible, and if correct might indicate thatábóti and abbadís were

291 NDEWB, abbod.
293 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 62.
294 OED, abbot [2011].
295 OED, abbot.
296 See forms offered in the OED.
297 LAW, 52.
298 ‘moral-improver’, ANEW, ábóti.
loaned early on, when folk-etymological explanations may have been helpful for communicating the importance of unfamiliar social positions. If the ‘in remedy/as improvement’ explanation was used frequently in reference to the initial loanword, it is possible that phrases like OE. tō bóte and Norse til bóta (the latter with a genitive plural ending) bolstered weak masculine forms by analogical association with the Norse oblique singular cases ending -a. This may be a stretch however, and Gammeltoft and Holck do note that there was a mild ‘tendency’ for Scandinavian languages to ‘borrow loans in a weak form.’

Finally, Norse forms with -báti may also have been influenced by the weak masculine noun bati, ‘improvement’, which also survived in OFris. bata and MLG bate.

Given the attestation of late OE weak forms and the retention of the medial /o(:)/ vowel, OE may have been the most important influence on the development of ábóti, though this need not discount polygenesis or the ‘repeated borrowing’ mentioned by the OED. It is likely that several forms of this word were in circulation during the Christianisation of Scandinvia.

---

299 Gammeltoft and Holck, “Gemstén and other Old English Pearls,” 149
300 HGE, *ḥalōn.
byskup, m. - bisc[e]op, m. (‘bishop’)

byskupsdómr, m. - bisceopdóm, m. (‘bishopric’)

byskupsríki, m. - bisceopríce, m. (‘bishopric’)

byskupsstóll, m. - bisceopsstól, m. (‘bishopric’)

byskupsþýsla, f. - bisceopscír, f. (‘see, diocese’)

erkibyskup, m. - ārcebisc[e]op, m. (‘archbishop’)

ljóðbyskup, lýðbyskup m. - lódbisc[e]op, m. (‘[suffragan] bishop’)

As we saw in Chapter 1, according to later Icelandic sources missionary bishops were integral in helping Óláfr Tryggvason and Óláfr inn helgi establish Christianity in Norway. In his discussion of byskup, Thors is quite pessimistic about the prospect of coming to a firm decision on the origins of the word, suggesting that we are unlikely to be able to arrive at a secure origin for the word given the similarity of WGmc. forms. While many assert that byskup is loan from English, others have tended to be noncommittal, offering OS biscop and OHG biscof (among others) as equally probable sources. I suggest that polygenesis is again our best explanation for

---

301 Ibid, 48-49. The OE form biscop differs from other WGmc. in terms of the palatational of <sc> to [ʃ]. Hogg notes that the apparent diphthong <eo> in words like (sc[e]op, sc[e]can) probably represents ‘orthographical variation’ rather than phonological reality, and this is likely true of bisc[e]op given the existence for forms without <e>: “Phonology and Morphology,” 112. For a sketch of the word’s history in Latin and Romance (and subsequent loaning into High German), see: Marie-Louise Rotsaert, “Vieux-Haut-Allem. bischaf / Gallo-Roman *(e)hescobo, *(e)hescobe/ Lat. Episcopus,” Sprachwissenschaft 2 (1977): 181-216. Rotsaert posits a polygenetic origin for bischof, with two different Gallo-Roman forms as the source words (see especially p. 210). For a list of Romance forms, see also: Theodore Frings, Germania Romana, Hefte 2 (Halle: Max Niemeyer: 1932), 46.

302 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 219; LAW, 52; VEWA, biskup; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 72; IEBW, biskup; NDEWB, biskop; ANEW, biskip; Seip, Norsk Språkhistorie til omkring 1370, 209.
the development of the word, with multiple loans likely taking place across different areas between Norse and WGmc. speakers.

Although the firm assignment of a source language is not possible, we can assume that the word must have been loaned early. Quite apart from the presence of missionary bishops attached to royal courts, we should expect that at least some pre-conversion Norse-speakers had an awareness of who bishops were and what their significance to Christian communities was, particularly those in Britain and Ireland and on the border between Denmark and northern Germany. Forms of both byskup and erkibyskup could therefore have been in use in Scandinavia for a considerable amount of time before the conversion period began in earnest, as was more than likely the case in OE itself.  

While byskup and erkibyskup are likely the result of varied and widespread contact between North and West Germanic speakers, there are several compound words with byskup as an element that are better candidates for specifically English influence. The first group contains six words that are essentially synonyms for ‘diocese’ or ‘(a) bishop’s seat of power’, and all of which were noted by Fischer and Taranger. The parallels between these English and Norse terms are striking, though not all are entirely convincing. Taranger implies a connection between OE biceopscīr and ON byskupsýsla, which has an essentially synonymous meaning (ýsla meaning ‘stewardship’ or ‘district’). That it may have been a loan-translation with the second element substituted is possible, but cannot be proven to any degree of certainty. It is worth noting that

303 See summary in: Anna Helene Feulner, *Die Griechischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 104-5.
304 LAW, 52; Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, 219; Carr mentions byskupsröki, NCG, 33.
305 IED, ýsla; DOE, biceop-scīr.
the OE word scīr seems to have appeared in Norse writing in a very restricted sense, with Buse noting it was only attached to the place-name Dyflinn (with the sense ‘district of Dublin’). This latter example indicates that at least some Norse-speakers understood the meaning of scīr, and its thin attestation may be a result of simple substitution for a more suitable native term like sýsla. At best we can suggest it is possible that byskupssýsla was modelled on bisceopscīr, but it is likely that it could have been an independent coinage.

Byskupsdómr is a more likely candidate for a loan, though as Carr mentions, it could similarly be an independent coinage or a loan from OHG biskoftuom or MLG bischopdōm. The DOE defines bisceopdōm as ‘bishopric, the rank of bishop, episcopal see’ and therefore applies to the ecclesiastical office itself, though could potentially also be interpreted to mean diocese. A parallel version of the word is found in MLG bischopdōm. The compound was used alongside byskupsstóll, another possible loan, in chapter 10 of Íslendingabók, when Ari describes bishop Gizurr contemplating the establishment of a second see in Iceland:

En þá es hónum þótti sá staðr hafa vel at auðæfum þróask, þá gaf hann meir en fjórðung byskupsdóms síns til þess, at heldr væri tveir byskupsstólar á landi hér en einn, svá sem Norðlendingar æstu hann til.

306 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 357. All four examples in the ONP show that the use of skíri was confined to variations of a particular sentence that appears to have originated in Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar from AM 61 fol.
307 NCG, 33.
308 DOE, bisceop-dōm.
309 NCG, 33.
310 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 219; LAW, 52.
311 ‘And when it seemed to him that the see has increased greatly in wealth, he gave more than a quarter of his diocese to this: that there were to be two bishoprics here rather than one, as the Northerners requested of him,’ ÍF I, 23.
I would suggest a polygenetic origin for *byskupsdómr* is almost certain, with structurally identical insular and continental WGmc. forms being absorbed (or rather, loan translated) into the Norse lexicon and mutually reinforcing one another. *Byskopsstóll* may show English influence, or might alternatively be an independent coinage.\(^{312}\)

Like the two aforementioned compounds, *byskupsríki* was formed by using a common Germanic term as the head word, which in this context meant: ‘Myndighed, Herredømme som giver en Raadighed eller Magt over noget, som er ham underlagt,’\(^{313}\) and hence, by extension, ‘diocese.’ The word has the same meaning as OE *bisceoprīce*, and the lack of a similar compound in other WGmc. languages means that in this instance it is tempting to state a probable English origin with a little more confidence, though the late initial attestations (from the mid-thirteenth century onwards) do encourage caution.\(^{314}\) One fundamental problem with compounds like *byskupsdómr*, *byskopsstóll*, and *byskupsríki* is whether they necessarily count as loanwords or loan translations in the strictest sense. While there is no doubt that *byskup* was ultimately a borrowed element, the head words were common to all the Germanic languages around the North Sea area.\(^{315}\) This is not the same as saying that there was no influence from English (or MLG, or OFris., etc.) in the formation of these words, but it does call into question whether Norse speakers would have perceived them as being particularly ‘foreign.’

\(^{312}\) Thors also points to Middle Dutch *bischopsstoel*, KLMN, 50.

\(^{313}\) ‘Authority, domination which gives power over something subject to him,’ IED, *rīki*; OGNS, *rīki*.

\(^{314}\) NCG, 34. The first instance in the ONP is from *Gulaþingslög*.

\(^{315}\) -dómr is found in an eleventh-century *lausavísa* attributed to Óláfr inn helgi as part of the compound *jarlädómr*, ‘Lausavisur,’ edited by Russell Poole in *Poetry from the Kings’ Sagas 1, Part 2*, edited by Diana Whaley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 529. Similarly, *rīki* is found in the work of eleventh-century poets as part of the word *himinnrīki*: Þórarin loftunga, *Glaðingskið*, edited by Matthew Townend in *Poetry from the Kings’ Sagas 1, Part 2*, edited by Diana Whaley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 867-69. In both instances, however, there is likely also external influence at play: in the former from the OE term *órldóm*, and in the latter from OE *heofonrīce*, OS *himilrīki*, etc.
The link between *ljóðbyskup* and *lēodbiscop* words is a long established one. It was once assumed that it meant a kind of missionary bishop, though Taranger argued against this and instead put forward that we should take it literally as ‘folkebiskop’, simply ‘a bishop of the people.’\(^{316}\) Konrad Maurer agreed with this assessment, pointing out that it seems to have meant a suffragan bishop in later Norse texts.\(^{317}\) As such it is synonymous with *bisceop* or *byskup*, and this is the definition offered by both Bosworth-Toller (‘a bishop of a district, province, or diocese, a bishop subordinate to an archbishop’) and Fritzner (‘en af de under en Erke-biskop staande Biskopper’).\(^{318}\) After Taranger’s assertion that the OE term was loaned by Norse speakers, the link between between the two compounds was accepted by other scholars.\(^{319}\)

That there is a link between the two words is almost certain. There are 41 instances of *ljóðbyskup* and 36 of *lýðbyskup* (containing *lýðr*, ‘people’) in the ONP, though both are attested only from the late thirteenth century onwards. The gap in time between when the relatively commonplace OE word was in use and the first appearance of the Norse word is of course somewhat problematic, but not insurmountable. The definitions found in Bosworth-Toller and Fritzner appear to be semantically sound, in that the addition of *lēod-* or *ljóð-*/lýð-* is simply to clarify the precise rank of the bishop. It is worth illustrating briefly just how clear this semantic distinction is in both languages.


\(^{317}\) Konrad Maurer, *Vorlesungen über Altnordische Rechtsgeschichte II. Über Altnordische Kirchenverfassung und Ehrechts* (Leipzig: Georg Böhme, 1908), 44. He also draws comparison with the Latin *episcopi gentilium* however. For some reason, Gammeltoft and Holck favour the meaning ‘bishop of the people’ over ‘bishop subordinate to the archbishop’, “*Gemstēn* and other Old English Pearls,” 151.

\(^{318}\) ‘One of the bishops under an archbishop.’ ASD, *lēodbiscop*; OGNS, *ljóðbiskup*; see also DMLBS, sufraganeous, 2 ‘appointed to serve in a subordinate capacity’, b ‘(of bishop) suffragan (to a metropolitan).’ The idea of a suffragan appointed as a ‘subsidiary’ without episcopal jurisdiction is a later sense, OED, *bishop*, 2 [unrevised].

\(^{319}\) LAW, 24; NCG, 36; IEWB, *ljóðbiskup*; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 164; KTFS, 46-47; Gammeltoft and Holck, “*Gemstēn* and other Old English Pearls,” 151.
Taking into account spellings with both \textit{-bisceop} and \textit{-biscop}, the compound appears a total of 23 times in the DOE corpus. Of these occurrences, 14 occur in close collocation with the term \textit{archbishop}, often as part of larger lists of both secular and religious titles. All of the citations included in the DOE corpus are also late, starting from the beginning of the eleventh century onwards; a selection are offered below:

Cnut cyning gret his arcebiscopas & his leodbiscopas & Þurcyl eorl & ealle his eorlas & ealne his þeodscype.\textsuperscript{320}

Eac he lett gewritan hu mycel landes his arcebiscopas hæfdon & his leodbiscopas & his abbotas & his eorlas.\textsuperscript{321}

& se brema cyng & se arcebiscop & leodbiscopas & eorlas & swiðe manege hadode & eac læwede feredon on scype his þone halgan lichaman ofer Temese to Suðgeworce.\textsuperscript{322}

This is of course a small corpus of examples, but it provides contextual confirmation of what has already been asserted by other lexicographers, namely that our specifying element \textit{lœod-} defines a bishop against both a metropolitan and other religious and secular positions.\textsuperscript{323} This argument can only be pushed so far, however, as it is certainly the case that the simplex \textit{bisceop} occurs in similar listing contexts (see for example the examples in the DOE entry under I.A.1).\textsuperscript{324}

\textsuperscript{320} ‘King Cnut greets his archbishops and his \textit{lœodbiscopas} and earl Þurcyl and all his earls and all his people,’ E Liebermann, \textit{Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen} (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1903), 273.


\textsuperscript{322} ‘And the illustrious king and the archbishop and \textit{lœodbiscopas} and earls and very many clerics and also laymen conveyed his holy body over the Thames to Southwark in his ship,’ Cubbin (ed.), \textit{The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Volume 6, MS D}, 64.

\textsuperscript{323} Bosworth-Toller notes that \textit{lœodbiscopas} are equivalent in rank to \textit{ealdormen}; see also LAW, 24.

\textsuperscript{324} Though it does seem as though these examples are all earlier than those for \textit{lœodbiscop}.
In Norse there appears to be a similar pattern of usage, which the following two examples from *Konungs skuggsjá* and a Norwegian law-code illustrate:

…værðr þat iamnan hinna þæztu manna samfunndr þar sem konongar æigu stæfnur sinar. þa koma mæð þeim til stæfnu holðingar þeirra ærkibyskopar iarlar oc liðð byskopar lænder mænn oc hirðmænn eða riddarar.325

…með ræði oc samþycki ... einars erkibyscops. oc allra annarra liððbyscopia. lendra mænn. oc læðra stallara oc logmænn oc allra handgenginna mann þeirra sem vorv ihia. oc allra Frostoþings mænn.326

In each case the word *ljóðbyskap* features in a list of various other official roles, and, perhaps more pertinently, in conjunction with *erkibyskap*. Of the 41 examples of *ljóðbyskap* given in the ONP, 22 feature the word in a similar list context or (more frequently) in combination with some variant of *erkibyskap*. The pattern is even more pronounced with *ljóðbyskap*, with 28 of the 36 examples being in such contexts, and in fact one example neatly illustrates the semantic relationship:

…at uigslu hans [bishop’s] skulu uera iij. biskupar hit førsta. ok skulu íj uera lyðbiskupar. ok einn ekkið biskup.327

This demonstrates the hyponymic relationship of *erkibyskap* and *ljóðbyskap* to *biskup*, and to my mind offers compelling evidence for the word having been loaned from OE.

325 ‘…the best men will always convene wherever the kings have their meetings; they arrive at the meeting with their chief men, archbishops, earls, *ljóðbyskapar*, learned men, retainers and knights,’ Ludvig Holm-Olsen, ed., *Konungs skuggsjá* (Oslo: Norronne tekster, 1945), 44.

326 ‘…with the advice and agreement… of an archbishop and all other *ljóðbyskapar*, landed men, learned men, lawmen and all king’s officers who were present… and all the men of the Frostaþing,’ Gustav Storm (ed.), *Supplementer til forgaaende Bind* (Norges gamle love indtil 1387) (Christiania: Grøndahl, 1895), 17.

327 ‘…at his confirmation should be three bishops first of all and two should be *ljóðbiskupar* and one an archbishop,’ Oluf Kolsrud, *Messuskýringar: Liturgisk symbolik frå den norsk-islanske kyrkja i millomalderen* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwald, 1952), 111.
There is also etymological evidence that may lend weight to the above contextual evidence. The OED notes that the history of OE lēod is complicated by the existence of three very similar words in both form and meaning: lēod, f. ‘nation, people’, lēoda, m. ‘man, people’, and lēod, m. ‘man’ (found only in poetic diction or in compounds); all these variants developed, according to Kroonen, from the PGmc. a-stem *leuda-, as did ON ljóðr.\(^328\) Norse lýðr, ‘people’, on the other hand, appears to have developed from a related i-stem, *leudi-, along with other WGmc. forms.\(^329\) In ON, ljóðr is exceptionally rare compared to lýðr, and limited only to poetry; as Snorri notes in his list of heiti for ‘people’ in Skáldskaparmál: ‘Lýðr heitir landfólk eða ljóðr.’\(^330\) Dietrich Hofmann noted some parallels between OE and ON poetic compounds containing ljóðr, pointing to use of the word in Egill Skallagrímsson’s Arinbjarnarkviða, the eddic Völundarkviða and Eiríksmál — the latter of which he posited as showing several English-influenced features — as well as pointing to the possible relationship between ljóðyskup/lýðyskup and lēodbisceop.\(^331\) On the form ljóðr itself, he stated it:

> …steht auch in der Bildungsweise im Nordischen so isoliert da, daß ein Zusammenhang mit dem Angelsächsischen bestehen muß, obwohl sich über den Weg der Entlehnung nichts sagan läßt.\(^332\)

I agree there is no easy way to untangle the history of the form. We can, following Kroonen, posit the existence of two different forms in ON descended from two different PGmc. roots,

\(^328\) OED, † lede, n.1. [unrevised]. It is suggested that the singular sense evolved from the feminine original, which in turn likely switched genders by analogy with the synonymous þēod. See also HGE, *leudzi; EDPG, *leudi-.

\(^329\) EDPG, *leudi-. Both the a- and i-stems are probably derived from the verb *leudan-, ‘to grow’.


\(^331\) Hofmann, Nordisch-Englisse Lehnebeziehungen der Wikingerzeit, 37-38; for his argument regarding Eiríksmál, see 42-52. McKinnell disagreed with Hofmann’s assertions about Eiríksmál, though he did note the form ljóði in Völundarkviða paralleled OE leoda, which is ‘[n]ot found elsewhere,’ “Eddic Poetry in Anglo-Scandinavian northern England,” 327 and 331.

\(^332\) ‘…is so isolated in word-formation in ON that there must be a connection with the Anglo-Saxon, though nothing can be said about the process of borrowing,’ Hofmann, Nordisch-Englisse Lehnebeziehungen der Wikingerzeit, 38.
perhaps with one ossifying as a purely poetic form. Some degree of English influence might be possible, though ultimately unprovable given that -jó- would probably have been the natural interpretation of -ō-. Given that ljóðr was reserved for use in verse, it seems likely that English lēodbiscop provided the model for ON ljóðhyskup, and later ljóðhyskup, though the ‘Englishness’ of the first element is debatable.

It is also worth noting that ljóðr is not particularly common as a qualifying element in ON compounds in prose; in addition to ljóðhyskup, we also have lýðskylda, ‘homage, duty of a liegeman to his lord’ and the related adjective ‘subject, yielding’, all of which have obvious semantic overlaps. OE lēod, on the other hand, features more frequently as the qualifier of compounds, though with varying subtleties in meaning. This relative productivity perhaps strengthens the idea of English being the source language. There is, in addition, more scope for semantic analysis of the compound: we can posit that the element was also indicative of the pastoral role of bishops in the day-to-day lives of their people, since they were likely to encounter the laity more regularly, particularly in the administration of confirmation (as will see in section 2.3.11). A full lexico-semantic analysis of ljóðr/lēod in compounds, as well as literary analysis of the role of ljóðhyskupar/lēodbisceopas, could help elucidate any nuances of meaning that we are currently missing.

---


334 IED, lýðskylda.
Djákn, m., djákni, m. - diacon/déacon, m. (‘deacon’)

Subdjákn, m. - subdiacon/subdéacon, m. (‘subdeacon’)

These two words were originally posited as loans from English by Taranger, and later backed by others.\textsuperscript{335} The word is ultimately from Greek διάκονος but was almost certainly originally borrowed into OE (and OHG) from the Latin diaconus and absorbed into the a-stem class.\textsuperscript{336} An OE form with ‘native’ -ēa- is recorded, as well as several with an unstressed -e ending.\textsuperscript{337} In Norse there are two recorded forms: strong masculine djákni, which first appears in text at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and weak masculine djákni, which is not recorded until the mid-fourteenth century and which became the standard form in Modern Icelandic.\textsuperscript{338} Sigurðr Magnússon, a claimant to the Norwegian throne, was attributed the epithet slembidjákn.\textsuperscript{339}

Djákn is a word that of course occurs in many languages which Norse speakers would have come into contact with, with the most important in addition to OE being MLG diaken and OF diacne. This of course leaves open a number of possibilities for a potential source language, and it may be that the word was borrowed and reborrowed from various sources over time, much like I have suggested for byskúp. OE is certainly a possibility and, whether the stem diphthong was represented with <ia> or <ea>, it would have been straightforwardly adapted into Norse.

\textsuperscript{335} Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 273; LAW, 52; VEWA, djáken(i); AEWB, djákn; IEBW, djákn, subdjákn; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 85; ÍOB, djákn, subdjákn.
\textsuperscript{336} OED, deacon n.1 [unrevised]; Feulner, Die Griechischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen, 196.
\textsuperscript{337} See the forms listed in the DOE, diacon; Feulner, Die Griechischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen, 196.
\textsuperscript{338} ONP, djákn (106 occurrences); ONP, djákni (48 occurrences).
\textsuperscript{339} ÍF XVIII, 297. IED gives the first element of his nickname as being slembir, ‘akin’ to slemr, and probably having a sense of ‘a sham deacon’.
The loss of the unstressed vowel in the second syllable cannot aid us in identifying the source form.

The importance of the role of deacon in church services means that the word was probably loaned at an early stage of institutional Christianisation, and so a combination of Latin and Germanic forms is the most likely source, though we cannot be any more specific than that. Given the fact that the word had an international reach, a multiplicity of different languages almost certainly contributed to the development of the Norse form.

kanó(n)ki, kanú(n)kr, m. - canonic, canonica, m. (‘canon’)

The OE word, meaning ‘canon, one who lives under a canonical rule’, is taken directly from the Latin canonicus and was integrated as a masculine a-stem (though there are a few examples of a weak an-stem form). In Norse the word appears in several different forms, of which the most common is kanúnkr/kanó(k)i, 38 examples in the ONP, and kanóki, with 17 examples. A number of scholars have posited a link between the English and the Norse lexemes with varying degrees of confidence.

The word is associated with the twelfth-century poet Gamli kanóki, who was linked with the Augustinian foundation of Þykkvabœr in 1168, but the earliest attestation in the ONP is from Konungs skuggsjá in AM 243 b a fol from around 1275. In this text it is used in reference

---

340 Lewis and Short, canonicus, sense V.i.e; DMLBS, canonicus, senses 4 and 5.  
341 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kørkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 273; LAW, 52; VEWA, kannú(n)k;r; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 122; NDEWB, kannik; IEWB, kanóki; IOB, kanóki.  
342 Vésteinsson, The Christianization of Iceland, 133. For biographical information, see: Margaret Clunies Ross (ed.), Poetry on Christian Subjects, Part 1: The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (Brepols: Turnhout, 2007), 70.
to a lake named Logri in Ireland, in which ‘liggr ey ein litil oc ero þar í reinlifis mænþa er calla ma hvart er vil kanonca eða eremita.’\(^{343}\) The ONP notes that the fragment NRA 58 A has munca as an alternative, which perhaps reflects the overlap between regular canons and monks in the later medieval period.\(^{344}\) Prior to the twelfth century, Latin canonicus referred to those secular clergy who were attached to cathedrals or collegiate churches who may or may not have adhered to a religious rule; after around 1100, secular canons could be distinguished from regular (Augustinian) canons.\(^{345}\) Their precise definition in the lead up to the twelfth century can be rather ambiguous however.

The late attestation of the noun makes it difficult to connect the various Norse varieties of the word with the OE term, while ME canoun is an unlikely candidate both morphologically and phonologically.\(^{346}\) It is possible to imagine a situation whereby canonic was borrowed from OE into Norse as *(kanon(i)kr/*kanon(i)ki), followed by lengthening of the /o/ before the consonant cluster beginning with a resonant, with assimilation of \(n\) to \(k\).\(^{347}\) The appearance of a strong and a weak form in both English and Norse may also lend some credence to the idea that the former language was the source for these words. Given how OE adapted the Latin term, however, it is entirely possible that Norse-speakers also borrowed the noun directly from Latin and incorporated it into the masculine a-stems, with an associated shift in stress to the second syllable also contributing to /o/ lengthening. Thors notes that forms with -ú- *(kanú(n)kr)* may show

---

\(^{343}\) ‘Lies a small island and there are monks [there] which can be called either kanonkar or eremitar,’ Holm-Olsen (ed.) Konungs skuggjá, 23.

\(^{344}\) See the note in OED, canon, n.2.1 [unrevised].


\(^{346}\) ME canoun is from OF. See MED, canoun, n. 2. and the etymological information under OED, canon, 2.

\(^{347}\) Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 122; KTFS, 62; Haugen, The Scandinavian Languages, 205.
influence from Romance languages, since nasalised Romance /o/ tended to be interpreted as /u/ by Germanic speakers. It seems possible that both Latin and English ultimately contributed to the development of the Norse word, with an English weak form also having some small degree of influence.

As we have seen with the other ecclesiastical positions, there is difficulty in delineating a narrow time-frame for when the borrowing took place, but there is an underlying assumption that it must have been pre-1100, based on the picture sketched out in Chapter 1. Before the formal establishment of monasteries in Norway and Iceland, a situation could have existed in which lower order clergymen (or even laymen) lived as secular kanókar in the absence of formal monastic organisation. It could be that the Anglo-Scandinavian cleric Hróðolfr’s pseudo-monastic foundation at Bœr (see 1.3) simply consisted of a small group of men who committed to live by a specific rule as canons rather than monks per se, though this is speculative.

kapellán, m. - capellán, m. (“chaplain”)

Both these words have their ultimate origin in the Latin capellanus, referring to a ‘clerk ministering to religious needs of a household.’ The Norse word is recorded in the ONP from the early fourteenth century onwards, though there are only twenty citations overall. Fischer suggested OE as the source language, a view supported by others. This is far from certain: both Fischer and de Vries themselves point out the formally near-identical MLG kapellān, and

---

348 KTFS, 62.
349 DMLBS, capellanus.
350 ONP, kapellán (kapulán, kapalán, kapulán).
351 LAW, 52; VEWA, kapalein-n; ANEW, kapellán; Hodnebo, “Lânord”, KLN 11, 44; Buse posits either Latin or OE, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 303.
we also cannot absolutely rule out AN *capelein/chapelain*. It seems likely that AN was the source language for English, as the word does not appear until the early twelfth century in the vernacular; indeed, one example from the *Peterborough Chronicle* is spelt *capelain*. There is nothing about the phonology of the word to suggest English as being more or less likely than any other source, and therefore a connection with that language cannot be endorsed.

*kirkjuswordr, m. - cyricweard, m. (*church-warden*)

*Kirkjuswordr* is recorded only twice in the ONP, in the thirteenth-century *Bartholomeus saga postula* and fourteenth-century *Thomas saga erkibyskups*. It is certainly possible that OE *cyricweard* or ME *chircheward* provided the basis for the Norse as Carr suggests, though the combined scarcity and lateness of its attestations cast some doubt on this. The OED notes the existence of MHG *kirchwart*, referring to a sexton, and there does not appear to be a Low German equivalent. There is little contextually that can give us a clue to the origin of the Norse compound, so its loan status has to remain in a state of uncertainty.

*klerkr, m. - cler(i)e, m. (*cleric*)

In the early Middle Ages, the Latin term *clericus* could be applied to any clergyman in the church, though this later came to exclude some higher ranks. Taranger thought it was probably from

---

352 OED, *chaplain*; MED, *capelein*; MNDWB, *kappellén*.
354 NCG, 36.
355 OED, † churchward [2011].
OE, and this has gained subsequent support.\textsuperscript{357} In contrast, Thors offers a number of possible source languages for the word in OSw., including MLG.\textsuperscript{358} Cleric appears c.75 times in the DOE corpus and klerkr 170 in the ONP. The connection with English is possible, but not proven, and in Norse it is worth noting that it does not become commonplace until the late thirteenth century. One early exception can be found in the NHB on the miracles of St Óláfr, where a raging fire causes the people of the town of Hólmgardr [i.e. Novgorod] to flee ‘fælmfullir til clærc æins ok keni-mannz þef er Stephán va(r) nemdr.’\textsuperscript{359} There is nothing about the form of the word that might point to an English origin over MLG klerk, and a straightforward borrowing of the Latin with syncopation of the unstressed /i/ is not out of the question.\textsuperscript{360}

\textit{munkr, m. - munuc, m. (‘monk’)}

Given the centrality of monasticism to medieval Christianity, it is unsurprising that we find some variation of \textit{monk} in every major Germanic language. The word was originally loaned into the WGmc. languages from Latin \textit{monachus} (<Greek μοναχός) or its by-form \textit{monicus}, and the consensus is that these provided the basis for early Norse.\textsuperscript{361} Scholars largely agree that the word was loaned from OE, with Thors rightly noting the ‘nära förbindelser’ between some early Norwegian foundations and England.\textsuperscript{362} Jóhannesson is a little more cautious in his assessment, positing that

\textsuperscript{357} Taranger, \textit{Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske}, 273; LAW, 53; VEWA, klerk-r; IEWB, klerkr; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 142; ANEW, klerkr.

\textsuperscript{358} KTFS, 34-37.

\textsuperscript{359} ‘…frightened to a certain cleric and learned man who was named Stephan,’ Gustav Indrebø (ed.), \textit{Gammel norsk homiliebok: Cod. AM 619 4} (Oslo: Dybwad, 1931), 124.

\textsuperscript{360} MNDWB, klerk; DMLBS, clericus. Incidentally, this account of the miracle includes the English loan lávarð (OE hláford/eME lavard) in reference to St Óláfr.

\textsuperscript{361} See the revised etymological information under OED, monk, n.1. [2002]; Feulner, \textit{Die Griechischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen}, 264.

\textsuperscript{362} ‘close links,’ KTFS, 98; Taranger, \textit{Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske}, 273; LAW, 53; NDEWB, munk; VEWA, munkr; ANEW, munkr; IOB, 1 munkar; Arne Torp and Lars S. Vikør are lone voices suggesting a direct loan from Latin (via Greek), \textit{Hovuddrag i Norsk Språkhistorie} (Oslo: Gyldendal, 1993), 272.
OEN forms may ultimately be derived from continental Germanic languages. A polygenetic origin is not out of the question since many of the WGmc. forms are similar, particularly OFris. \textit{munek}, though the fronted, lower vowel of MLG variations perhaps makes that language less likely than others.

There are some good circumstantial reasons why we might favour English as the primary source language. Buse is perhaps right to point to the monastic connections of the twelfth century, but there is reason to think the loan would have been much earlier than this. The first attestation of the word in Norse can be found as part of the kenning \textit{munka valdi}, ‘ruler of monks [\textit{>God}]’, in Hallvarðr háreksblesi’s \textit{Knútsdrápa}, which is noted for its striking fusion of Christian and pagan imagery. By this point in the eleventh century, however, the word may well have been a long-established part of the Norse lexicon; given that Vikings encountered monks in their raiding as early as the eighth century, we can speculate that Scandinavians were not ignorant of the role of monasteries in the lives of their Christian victims. If the OE word was loaned early, it may well have developed relatively straightforwardly into \textit{munkr} via the syncopation of unstressed vowels: OE \textit{munuc} > early Norse \textit{munu\textsc{k}(u)}R > \textit{mun\textsc{k}}R > \textit{munkr}. We cannot be completely certain that English was the sole source, even if formal and literary-historical material might push us in that direction.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{363} IEBW, \textit{munkr}.
\item \textsuperscript{364} For the plethora of different forms - \textit{mönke}, \textit{mönik}, \textit{mönne}, \textit{mönnik}, \textit{mönk} - under: OED, \textit{monk}, n.1.
\item \textsuperscript{365} Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 189
\end{itemize}
nunna, f. - nunne, f. (‘nun’)

All Germanic forms of word nun derive from late Latin nonna, which originally referred to a wet-nurse.\(^{367}\) Most have preferred OE as the source language for Norse nunna;\(^ {368}\) a number of others, on the other hand, point out that OS or MLG are equally possible sources.\(^ {369}\) There is one instance of the word in a lausavísa by Einar Skúlason from the twelfth century (recited at a visit to the convent at Nonneseter) but it does not begin to appear in larger numbers until the turn of the thirteenth century (after the foundation of the convent at Kirkjubær in Síða in 1186).\(^ {370}\) It is highly unlikely that the word first appeared in that century however, and we can probably assign it to the group of words — including biskup, munkr, prestr — which were loaned at a relatively early date. There is unfortunately nothing about the form of the Norse word that allows us to narrow down the source to anything other than WGmc., with MLG nunne and OHG nunna being perfectly plausible alternatives to English. Like many of the other loans in this section, the significant overlap in vocabulary between the Germanic vernaculars points to polygenetic origin.

\(^{367}\) OED, nun, n.1. [2003]; DMLBS, nonna; ÍOB, nunna.

\(^{368}\) Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norsk*, 273; LAW, 54; NDEWB, nonne; VEWA, nunna.

\(^{369}\) ANEW, nunna; KTFS, 105-6; Óskarsson, *Middelnedertyske Låneord i Islandsk Diplomsprog*, 150.

Serveral scholars have assumed *prestr was loaned from English. Some variant of the lexeme can be found in all the Germanic languages however, and others have pointed to this heterogeneity as reason to be more cautious in ascribing an English origin. Taranger, Thors, and Buse point to the fact that in contrast to OE, the disyllabic continental forms all contain -er/-ar as part of the word stem, meaning they are less likely sources (though OSw. also maintained a form with an extended stem). One strong dissenting voice comes from Halldór Halldórsson, who prefers OS as the originator, arguing that the OE phonology makes its source status impossible; he points to the fact that the diphthong would probably have yielded the Norse form *prjóstr and that the r-stem of OS prēstr may have easily been reinterpreted as nominative -r.

He is surely right that the word was loaned prior to the beginning of the eleventh century, and given the centrality of priests in the church I would be inclined to argue that the word might well have entered the Scandinavian dialects at the earliest point of contact between Norse speakers and Christians. As with many other titles referring to offices of the church,

---

371 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paav den Norsk, 271; LAW, 54; Seip, Lånordstudier II, 79-80; AEWB, prest.
372 IEWB (*prestr) notes OS prēstar, OFris. prēstere, OHG priester alongside the OE; IOB (prestr) suggests either an OE or OS origin. Elis Wadstein prefers OFris., Friesische Lehnwörter im Nordischen (Uppsala: A.B. Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1922), 15; Torp and Vikør suggest it is 'frå gresk via latin', Hovuddrag i Norsk Språkhistorie, 272.
373 See the forms in the SEO under præst. Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 215.
374 Halldór Halldórsson, “Some Old Saxon Loanwords,” in Festschrift für Konstantin Reichardt, edited by Christian Gellinek (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1969), 124-25. He compares it to the loaning of OE prēon, ‘pin’, as Norse prjónn, though the etymology of this word is unclear - see comments in OED, prem. n. [2007].
prestr is likely a product of several competing influences, but I find Halldór Halldórson’s argument over the interpretation of radical -ar/-er less convincing, as those forms could equally have been absorbed along the lines of weak masculines to give something like *prestari (compare MLG ritter > Norse riddari).\(^{376}\) So while pre(o)st seems a likely morphological influence, the root vowel remains something of a problem; to quote Feulner’s understatement, ‘der Herkunft des Diphthongs ēo ist unklar.’\(^{377}\) On the other hand, the sheer variety of spellings we can observe in ME, paired with the fact that OE also had some instances of forms with <e> in the root syllable, might lead us to cast doubt on the phonological reality of <eo>, at least in later texts.\(^{378}\) The weight of evidence is perhaps mildly in favour of OE as the source language, though the usual caveats apply in that this is a decidedly pan-WGmc. lexical item.

Messeprōost is a better candidate for loan status than the simplex, and a number of scholars have thought it to be English in origin. In OE the word is extremely common, with 678 individual citations in the DOE corpus (plus 25 of messepreost), and it could be used in reference to both Christian and non-Christian priests (translating sacerdos in the Old Testament translations, for example).\(^{379}\) There are, however, only three instances of the word in the ONP:

\(^{376}\) It is worth noting, however, that the OE ‘agentive’ ending -ere is modelled on Latin -arius, Hans Heinrich Hock and Brian D. Joseph, Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship, An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996), 255. Other ON words with -ari are likely formed along similar lines (loddari, myntari, pentari), though whether due to English or Latin influence is unclear. I would also emphasise that OSw. speakers clearly did interpret the extended stem when they encountered OS/MLG forms; again, see the forms in the SED entry for praest.

\(^{377}\) ‘The origin of the diphthong ēo is unclear,’ Feulner, Die Griechischen Lehnsämter im Altenglischen, 312.

\(^{378}\) See the forms under MED, prōst, n.3. There is no space here to discuss possible origins for the diphthong, though concise summaries can be found in: KTFS, 66; Feulner Die Griechischen Lehnsämter im Altenglischen, 312-13. Buse notes that it is possible /eo/ was ‘monophthongised in the east [of England] as early as the tenth century,’ “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 215. Roger Lass also points out that long vowels in such instances as prōst or hlūttr are part of relatively rare superheavy syllables, and were likely shortened by late OE or early ME, Old English: A Historical Linguistic Companion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 38.

\(^{379}\) Feulner, Die Griechischen Lehnsämter im Altenglischen, 312; ASD, mæsse-prōost. The DOE also contains 25 instances of mesepreost, four of masepreost and two of mesepest.
two in *Gulathinglög* (DonVar 137 4to) and one in Sverrir’s Christian law (AM 78 4to), the latter of which replicates one of the examples in the former text:

Messo prestrar þeir er bispoc nemner til.\(^{380}\)

Messo prestr scal engi leiðangr gera ne kona hans ne klercr hans.\(^{381}\)

Messo prestrar aller er menn kaupa tíðir at.\(^{382}\)

The first and last examples are taken from the section demanding that two messuprestar from each fylki should attend the Gulaþing, while the middle example is from the part dealing with those exempt from taxes for the raising of coastal levies. There is little contextually that might link the Norse word to the OE, and the extra information provided — that the bishop ‘selects’ (*nemner til*) the messuprestar or the fact that the latter might be paid for mass (*kaupa tíðir at*) — does not suggest that the compound had any special semantic function to contrast it with the simplex *prestr*. It is possible that the compound represents an independent formation, but the commonplace nature of the word in English surely points to that language as the source. Bishop Grímkel’s alleged involvement in the development of early written Norwegian law lends some indirect support to this, with *messuprestr* perhaps representing a lexical remnant of his and other English clergymen’s influence.\(^{383}\)

---

\(^{380}\) ‘Those mass-priests which the bishop appoints,’ Rudolph Keyser and Peter Andreas Munch (eds), *Norges gamle love indtil 1387* (Christiania: Gröndahl, 1846), 4.

\(^{381}\) ‘A mass-priest shall not be raised in the levy, nor his wife or clerk,’ ibid, 97.

\(^{382}\) ‘All mass priests who men pay for mass,’ ibid, 412.

In Norse, prófastr referred either to ‘Øvrigheds-person’ or ‘Forstander i et Kloster’, meanings that are similarly reflected in the OE variants (‘an officer’ or ‘an officer of a monastery’). Continental Germanic forms, such as MLG/OFris. provest and OHG probost, also had secular and ecclesiastical referents. Most point to an OE origin, though Jóhannesson suggests that the OEN variants were loaned from MLG instead. According to the ONP, we have no record of prófastr until the late thirteenth century, which perhaps makes English a less likely source. Prófastr rounds off a lexical field that demonstrates how difficult it is to pin down English as the definite source; we can only speak in degrees of likelihood based on contextual and linguistic features. At the same time, lexical polygenesis provides an attractive alternative in many respects, and points towards the multilingual, international character of the clergymen who participated in the missionary effort in Norse-speaking areas.

**2.3.2 - Church architecture**

altari, m., n. - alter, altare, m. (‘altar’)

The Norse word altari is generally agreed to have been a loan from a Germanic language and English has not usually been identified as a likely source language. The Germanic languages

---

384 OGNS, prófastr; ASD, próost; see also the definitions under OED, provost, 1.a. and 4.a. [2007].
385 See the revised etymological note under OED, provost.
386 LAW, 54; VEWA, prófastr; ANEW, prófastr, prófastr; ÍOB, prófastr, prófastr; IEWB, prófastr.
387 The DOE entry notes that there are instances of alter/altare with feminine and neuter genders.
all borrowed the Latin *altare*, including OS *altari*, OHG *altāri*, OFris. *altare*, and each of these are potential fits for the source form. Höfler suggested that it was likely to have been MLG or OFris., Wadstein preferred OFris. alone, while Jóhannesson pointed to an OS origin; Thors and Holthausen, on the other hand, thought Norse forms were likely to have been loaned from English. As Falk and Torp note, OE tends to be discounted since:

> Da angelsächsisch gewöhnlich ein einheimisches wort für diesen christlichen begriff anwendet, haben die Norweger dies wort wohl aus derselben gegend bekommen wie die Dänen und Schweden, nämlich von den Deutschen.

The OE word in question was *wīgbēð*, a combination of *wīh*, ‘idol’, and *bēod*, ‘table’, which also appears as *wēofud*. The language did, however, borrow the Latin *altare* in both a disyllabic form, *alter*, and a later trisyllabic variant identical to the Latin. In terms of sheer numbers, there is little to distinguish it from the ‘native’ OE form: there are 35 occurrences of *alter* and *altare* combined in the DOE corpus, while *wīgbēð* occurs 37 times and *wēofud* 28. This means that OE did, in the late Anglo-Saxon period, have a word form that was phonologically close to the other Germanic lexemes. It is for this reason that Óskarsson treated it as a loan that could reasonably be either OS or OE in origin.

---

389 For a full list of common forms in these languages, see those listed under the etymological information in the OED, *altar*.


391 ‘Because the Anglo-Saxons normally uses a native word for this Christian term, the Norwegians have borrowed this word from the same place as the Danes and Swedes, that is from the Germans,’ NDEWB, *alter*.

392 OED, *altar*, n. [2012].

393 Óskarsson, *Middelnedertyske Låneord i Islands Diplomsprog frem til år 1500*, 150.
As Halldórsson noted, the gender of the Norse word is somewhat problematic, as there were both masculine and neuter variants which could be ambiguous. The ONP records 53 masculine and 113 neuter instances of *altari*, as well as four additional examples of a weak neuter *altara*. The original Latin *altar/altāre* was neuter in gender, as were the equivalent borrowed forms in OS, OFris. and OHG. Both OE *alter* and *altare* are largely masculine, a shift in gender which may be due to analogy with the native OE term ending with masculine *bē(o)d*. The masculine Norse term may therefore be a remnant of English influence, with a later neuter form eventually winning out over the course of the Middle Ages due to the predominance of this gender in MLG and Latin. An alternative explanation (both put forward and then dismissed by Halldórsson) is that since many Norse words ending *-ari* are weak masculines, the endings of the Latin and Germanic words were reinterpreted to fit into that paradigm.

The earliest example of *altari* in Norse is from Þórarinn loftunga’s *Glaðlogskaða*, dating from just after 1030, where it is decidedly neuter: ‘En þar upp/ af altari/ Kristi þæg/ kerti brenna.’ Whether used *ad hoc* or as an established lexical item, the word must have been loaned from a source language with neuter gender: Latin or another continental Germanic language. It is possible, then, that the later appearance of weak masculine forms is due to partial influence from OE, but it seems quite possible that this gender appears simply because of ambiguity over

---

395 MNDWB, *altar, alter, oltar, olter*; OED *altar, Lewis & Short, altar, altāre.*
396 Buse suggests such ‘analogy’ with the gender of a native word might be a useful diagnostic tool when identifying loanwords, though any such argument is ultimately unprovable, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 54-55.
397 The modern Icelandic word is strong neuter, though unusually with a weak nominative and accusative plural form, *ölturu*. Unstable gender assignment has been seen as evidence for a loan being relatively rare, see: Shana Poplack, David Sankoff and Christopher Miller, “The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation,” *Linguistics* 26, no. 1 (1988), 67. This might well have been the case in the early period of contact, though an unstable gender may also be a sign of competing influences in a Viking Age Scandinavian context.
398 His objection to this being that words ending with *-ari* tend to be associated with persons: Halldór Halldórsson, “Some Old Saxon Loanwords in Old Icelandic Poetry and Their Cultural Background,” 114.
399 ‘And there candles flicker up from the altar, received by Christ,’ Þórarinn loftunga, *Glaðlogskaða*, 872.
the nominative inflection. It is not possible to assign a source language for altari with any
degree of certainty. The weight of evidence points to a complex polygenetic prehistory.

fontr, funtr, m. - fant, font m. (‘font’)

The ONP gives 29 examples of fontr, the first of which occurs in Barlaams saga og Jósafats from
the mid to late thirteenth century. OE has a similarly low number of examples at 24, most of
which represent the root vowel with <a>. Fischer and Buse suggested that the Norse form
was taken from MLG, though this has not been uniformly supported by others. Holthausen
and Falk and Torp noted that it had plausibly been ascribed both English and MLG origins, but
offered no opinion as to which theory they favoured. Jóhannesson suggested that the Icelandic
form of the word might have been influenced by OE, while Magnússon rightly suggests OF font,
funt as other possibilities. Wadstein claimed OFris. font or funt as the original loans, at the same
time as discounting the feminine MLG vunte or vonté on the basis that they would have yielded
the weak forms *funta or *fonta. All of these forms are ultimately derived from the oblique
cases of Latin fons, ‘font, well, spring,’ with the stem font-.

Christopher Jones has carried out the most comprehensive study of the OE word,
concluding that the WGmc. forms could ‘indicate collateral descent from a borrowing into
earlier Germanic, independent polygenesis, or secondary and even tertiary loans among the

400 DOE, fant.
401 LAW, 56; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 96.
402 VEWA, fontr; NDEWB, font.
403 IEWB, fontr, funtr; ÍOB, fontur.
404 Wadstein, Friesische Lehnwörter im Nordischen, 11.
several [Gmc.] languages.” He notes that we have few examples of pre-Conquest fonts in England, many of which are likely to have been wooden, and perhaps even portable; we furthermore cannot often establish whether fant actually referred to a receptacle or simply the water of baptism. By the time the word appears in Norse texts from the late thirteenth century, we can be fairly certain that a physical vessel is the intended referent, as this example from Barlaams saga ok Jósafats demonstrates: ‘Konongrenn let gera einn viðan funt i kirkjunnir.’ It was certainly loaned earlier than this, though it is a matter of speculation as to when; the point at which Norse speakers began encountering churches and Christian ceremony seems likely, which could mean a ninth-century date.

Lexical polygenesis seems the most likely explanation for the development of the Norse word. The fact that the root vowel was represented with <o> or <u> points to a number of competing influences, of which English may well have been one, though this is entirely speculative. Funtr probably shows OF or OFris. influence as suggested by Magnússon and Wadstein. The later form with /o/ might represent Latinisation or, perhaps, simply an alternate variant of the word stemming from English that happened to be recorded later than funtr.

---

408 The realisation of the OE vowel was probably something like [ɔ] rather than [ɑ̃]; see: Hogg, ‘Phonology and morphology,’ 102; Jones, ‘Old English font,’ 149.
409 ÍOB, fontur; Wadstein, Friesische Lehnwörter im Nordschen, 11. MLG pronunciation may also have played a part, even if it did not result in the adoption of a weak form of the word.
hœfðkirkja, f. - hœafodcyrice, f. (‘cathedral, principal church’)

Taranger and Carr posited this compound as an English loan. In Norse, Kahle suggested that it ‘meint nicht wie sonst bischofskirche, sondern steinkirche im gegensatz zu den sonst üblichen holzkirchen’, but there does not appear to be any evidence for this and Fritzner is probably closer in his first definition of ‘katedralkirke’ (though his second definition muddies the water somewhat, as we will see below). Sure enough, the DOE provides the definition of ‘a principal church, cathedral’, though the corpus only yields one example of the word in a fragment of an early eleventh-century OE translation of the *Regularis Concordia* in CCCC 201, which may have been intended for nuns.

…cildon þisne antifen beginnendum, *Pueri Hebreorum*, syn þa palmtwiga todælede, and swa þa lengran antifenas singende gan to þære hœafodcyrican and ætforan þære dura geanbidigen.

Here the word *hœafodcyrice* translates the Latin simplex *ecclesia*, and there is no overt indication that this should necessarily be a cathedral, though of course this would certainly have been the case at many monastic foundations. Indeed, in the glossed version of the text from the second

---

410 Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske kirkes indflydelse paa den Norske*, 182; NCG, 35.
411 ‘…does not refer to the bishop’s church, but to the otherwise common wooden churches,’ Bernhard Kahle, "Das christentum in der altwestnordischen dichtung," *Arkiv for Nordisk Filologi* 17 (1901), 119; OGNS, *hœfðkirkja*, 1.
413 ‘…the children begin this hymn, *Pueri Hebreorum*, when the palm-leaves have been dealt out, and while the hymns are sung go to the *heafodcyrice* and wait before the doors,’ Julius Zupitza, “Ein weiteres Bruchstück der Regularis Concordia in altenglischer Sprache,” *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 84, no. 1 (1890): 3-4.
half of the eleventh century, the word *ecclesiam* is simply rendered as *þære cyrcean*.\(^{415}\) On the other hand, if such a text was produced for a specific community, then we can probably assume that the author had a particular church in mind. The MED records instances of *heued chirche*, meaning ‘cathedral; principal church’, in Robert of Gloucester’s *Chronicle* in reference to St Paul’s in London, which lends support to the meaning of the OE word.\(^{416}\)

In Norse, the earliest example in the ONP is found in a section of *Gulaþingslög* in AM 315 f fol. reckoned to be from the last quarter of the twelfth century.\(^{417}\) This part usefully seems to provide us with a definition of sorts:

\[
\ldots\text{kirkia er ein i fylki hveriu er ver kollom hofuðkirkju er vér eigum aller fylkismenn gerð upp at hallaða. Ên ef su kirkja brotnar oc falla hornstaver þa eigum vér timbru at koma firi .iii. manaðr.}\(^{418}\)
\]

The precise meaning here is a little difficult to ascertain. While a cathedral is certainly a possibility, I am not aware that the *fylki* were coterminous with Norwegian dioceses; what we can say for certain, at least, is that a *hofuðkirkja* was an important local church. Indeed, Fritzner indicates that *hofuðkirkja* overlapped in meaning with the word *fylkiskirkja*, which he defines as a ‘Kirke af det Slags, hvoraf der skulde findes en i hvert fylki, og hvis Vedligeholdelse skulde paaligge alle fylkismenn.’\(^{419}\) The fact that both the English and Norse compounds are made up

---

\(^{415}\) Kornexl, ed. *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*, 73.

\(^{416}\) MED, *hēd*, n. (1), 5b.

\(^{417}\) ONP, *họfðukirkja*.

\(^{418}\) ‘...a church is in each fylki which we call a hofuðkirkja, which all we fylkismenn must maintain. And if that church breaks and the corner pillars fall, then we have to bring timber within three months,’ Keyser and Munch, *Norges gamle love* (Vol. I), 7.

\(^{419}\) ‘a type of church which should be found in each county, and whose maintenance should be the responsibility of all fylkismenn,’ Fritzner, *fylkiskirkja*. This is not to say that it could not mean a cathedral, and in some examples it does seem to refer to this specifically, such as in *Thomas saga erkiðiskaup*: ‘riðr hann… til Cantuariam… i hofuðkirki æ Ænglanda,’ C. R. Unger, ed. *Thomas Saga Erkiðiskaup: Fortælling om Thomas Becket Eskebiskop of Canterbury: To Bearbeidelser samt Fragmenter af en tredie*. Christiania: 1869, 20.
of commonplace simplexes renders morphological or phonological analysis moot. If English was indeed the source language, then ON-speakers could easily have calqued the term.\textsuperscript{420} The loan status of \textit{hófuðkirkja} cannot, therefore, be asserted with any certainty, though a connection with English seems likely.

\textit{kirkja}, f. - \textit{cyrice, cirice} f. (‘church’)

\textit{kirkjuganga}, f. - \textit{cyriegang}, m. (‘church-going’)

\textit{kirkjusókn}, f. - \textit{cyricsócn}, f. (‘church-going’)

The precise development of the the Germanic reflexes of the Greek simplex \textit{κυριακόν} has, as the OED puts it, ‘been the subject of much controversy,’ though both they and Feulner provide comprehensive summaries of scholarship on this matter.\textsuperscript{421} Despite these disputes, the OED does point out that we are likely dealing with a very early loan indeed, since churches would have provided one of the most visible aspects of Christian material culture. Regarding \textit{kirkja} specifically, some have thought that the word is likely to have been loaned from OE, with Halldórsson suggesting that a process of ‘analogical phoneme substitution’ gave rise to the Norse form (rather than an attempt at reproduction, for which he offers the improbable \textit{[tjirtja]}).\textsuperscript{422} Others are more sceptical: Magnússon points to OE but also offers OS \textit{kirika/kerika} as

\textsuperscript{420} Both \textit{hófuð} and \textit{hófuð} could have the meaning of ‘chief, main.’

\textsuperscript{421} OED, \textit{church}; Feulner, \textit{Die Griechischen Lehnsörter im Altenglischen}, 186-87. There is agreement that the word must have been loaned into Germanic dialects directly from Greek; Feulner points to Roman centres on the Rhine which were subject to heavy Greek influence as possible centres of diffusion. IEWB, \textit{kirkja}, posits a PGmc. *\textit{kirika}.

alternatives, while Thors, with characteristic caution, says ‘det råder allstå ovisshet om de nordiska formernas härkomst.’\footnote{‘...there is uncertainty about the origin of the Norse forms,’ KTFS, 23.}

There is little reason to think that an English origin is any more likely a source than other WGmc. forms, other than in an indirect sense (Bibire, for example, suggests OE as the source for the continental Germanic languages).\footnote{Bibire, “North Sea Language Contacts in the Early Middle Ages: English and Norse,” 96-97. For a list of Germanic forms, see the etymology section of the OED, church [2011].} Like biskup or prestr, it is probable that the Norse form is a result of polygenesis; OE cyrice/cirice, OS kirika/kerika and OHG kirihha may all have contributed to the formation of the Norse lexeme. Buse noted that Germanic-speakers ‘must have had words for some of the more obvious outward manifestations of Christianity,’ and given the importance of churches in the Christian landscape (and the fact they would have been targets for the depredations of Viking bands), there would have been numerous different routes of borrowing.\footnote{Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 124.}

*Kirkjuganga*, ‘chuch-going’, is cited only six times in the ONP, and all of these examples are from the mid-fourteenth century or later. OE cyricgang is similarly lightly attested, appearing three times in the DOE corpus, twice with the meaning ‘church-going’ and once in reference to the feast of the purification (i.e. Candlemas); it does, however, survive into ME (seemingly without the latter meaning).\footnote{OED, †church gang; MED, chieche.} Despite settling on English as the likely source, Carr also noncommittally notes MLG kerkgang and OFris. tserkgang, which at least opens up the possibility of polygenesis, or perhaps even straightforward loan-translation from MLG given the later
attestations in Norse. On the other hand, the attestation in *Maríu saga* (Holm perg 11 4to) in the chapter heading ‘Af kirkugöngu Maríe’ concerns Mary’s trip to the temple to complete her purification, and there are examples in both ME and ON of the word referring to *churching*, a tradition based on this ritual. This strengthens the idea that there is a semantic connection between the English and Norse compounds, however opaque the exact process of borrowing may be.

*Kirkjusókn* can mean either ‘church-worship, attendance at service’ or ‘parish’, and is again proposed by Taranger and Carr as an English loan. The OE meaning extended from ‘church-going, attendance at church (as a token of religious observance or penance)’ to ‘right of sanctuary’, with a later twelfth-century meaning of ‘territory belonging to a church’. While *cyric-sócn* tends to occur in homilies instructing church-attendance as an important aspect of worship, the earlier examples of the Norse word, found especially in *Grágás*, focus more on the importance of church as a place to announce infringements of the law to the local community. This distinction is based on context rather than semantics, however, and there is one example from the NHB homily *De natiuitate domini sermo* which points to English as the source, rather than it being an independent formation:

---

427 NCG, 35. Taranger posited an OE origin: *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norsk*, 369
429 OED, *churching* [2011], ‘the public appearance of a woman at church to give thanks after childbirth; the ceremony performed at this time.’
430 IED, *kirka*.
432 DOE, *cyric-sócn*.
433 For example, ‘Boande skal segia at kirkio sócnom eða at samquom at þat hross er þar comit er hann veit eigi hverr á,’ Vilhjálmur Finsen (ed.), *Grágás: Elđa lögbök íslendinga* (København: Fornritafjelags Norðurlanda, 1852), 63. However, compare: ‘hann bauð lang-fæðrom at halda með rét-læte. ok kirkiu-sochn. ok hælgum bønum.’
The final list of ways in which one can honour God is strikingly similar to the phrasing of some of the abovementioned OE homiletic texts:

…redan hi georne, hu man þæs bote sece to Criste mid clænlicum fæstenum and mid cyrcsocnum and mid eadmedium benum and mid ælmesylenum.  

…ge healdaf þone halgan sunnandeg mid rihte, mid ælmesan and mid ciricsocnum, swa mon sunnandeg don scel.  

…us gedafenað þet we þisne dag simble wurþian mid ciricsocnum & mid ælmesdædum & mid halgum gebedum.

As Christopher Abram and others have demonstrated, the NHB certainly had strong Anglo-Saxon influences, meaning that the parallels in phrasing here are unlikely to be coincidence. It is impossible to ascertain exactly how such phraseological similarities occurred, and Abram suggests that either mnemonic transmission or direct copying are possible.  

‘Now he is here with us in this holy time, because he instructed our ancestors to uphold justice and church-going and holy prayers and alms-giving,’ Indrebø, *Gamal Norsk Homiliebok*, 33.

‘…to resolve eagerly, how one seeks this remedy from Christ with pure fasts and with church-going and with humble prayers and with alms,’ Karl Jost, (ed.), *Die <Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical>* [Swiss Studies in English, 47] (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1959), 168.

‘You hold the holy Sunday with righteousness, with alms and with church-going, just as one must do on a Sunday,’ Arthur Napier (ed.), *Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*, with a bibliographic appendix by Klaus Ostheeren [Dublin: Max Niehans Verlag, 1967] [originally published 1883], 223.

‘It is fitting that we always honour this day with church-going and alms and holy prayers,’ Richard Morris (ed.), *Legends of the Holy Rood; Symbols of the Passion and Cross-Poems. In Old English of the Eleventh, fourteenth, and fifteenth Centuries* (London: Early English Text Society, 1871), 17.

klastr, n., klaustri, m. - clauster, n. (‘monastic cell, monastery’)

Taranger suggested that klastr/klaustri was derived from OE, and this has since been supported unanimously by other researchers.\(^{439}\) In the ONP weak masculine klastr appears a good 75 years before neuter klastr, which is first recorded in Morkinskinna in c.1275. I would argue that it is difficult to connect either of the Norse lexemes with the English word, particularly since it could easily have been derived independently from Latin claustrum. On the other hand, as we saw in Chapter 1, monks from England were involved in the foundation of monastic sites at Odense at the end of the eleventh century and in Norway during the twelfth, so it is not out of the question that this terminology was transferred with them. The development of a weak masculine form remains puzzling, though I would suggest that such instability in gender might point to polygenesis.

munklíf(i), n. - munuclíf, n. (‘monastery’)

The status of munklíf(i) as a specifically English loan is rather more secure than many of the other words in this section.\(^{440}\) In OE, munuclíf could refer to both monastic living and the actual structure of the monastery itself, though the former meaning was common in Norse.\(^{441}\) The

---


\(^{440}\) It is mentioned by: LAW, 53; NCG, 36; NDEWB, munk; IEWB, munklíf; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 23; Gammeltoft and Holck, “Gemstên and other Old English Pearls,” 151-52.

\(^{441}\) ASD, munuc-líf; OGNS, munklíf; OED †monklife [2002].
compound appears first in the so-called ‘stave church’ homily (*In dedicatione tempeli sermo*) in one of our earliest Norse manuscripts:

\[ \text{Þver tre el ñcorba ñtaflægior. oc upp hallaða þeim treóm el áfa ñtýþia. merkia þa menn i criññenne ef ÿtta veralldar hæþningi i ræþom ñinom. en þeir efla munclif. oc helga ñtaþe. meþ auþéóvom ñinom.}^{442} \]

The sermon’s thematic concern with construction may indicate that *munclif* refers specifically to the building here, though I think the immediate context is ambiguous enough to at least make it possible that it refers to monastic lifestyle instead. Later examples in the ONP make it clear, however, that by the early twelfth century the word definitely refers to the monastery as a place:

\[ \text{Fiall er fcamt fra borg þeirri er Prenestina heitir. en i þvi fialli er munclif Petrþ p(o)la. i þvi munclifi fóði abbati munc…}^{443} \]

\[ \text{Hann atti for ör munclifi til anarf muncliff.}^{444} \]

As such, this meaning agrees with the predominant sense in late West Saxon texts, most notably in Ælfric. Gammeltoft and Holck are therefore right to suggest that *muncliff(i)* probably took its ‘appellative’ meaning from OE.\(^{445}\)

\(^{442}\) ‘The beams, which prop up the long plates along the walls and hold the timbers which support the ridge-beams, denote those men who reconcile worldly chieftains through their advice, and these strengthen *munclif* and holy places with their riches,’ Kolsrud (ed.), *Messuskýringar*, 95. Some of the technical architectural language was aided by Aidan Conti’s translation in: “The Performative Texts of the Stave Church Homily,” in *The Performance of Christian and Pagan Storyworlds: Non-Canonical Chapters of the History of Nordic Medieval Literature*, edited by Lars Boje Mortensen, Tuomas M.S. Lehtonen, and Alexandra Bergholm (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 238.

\(^{443}\) ‘The mountain is a short distance from that city called *Prenestina*, and in that mountain is the monastery of the apostle Peter. In that monastery the abbot trains monks…’ Porvaldur Bjarnarson (ed.), *Leifar fornra kristinsna fræða íslenska*: *Codex Arn-Magnaeus 677* ï4to auk annara enna elþu brota af íslenskum guþfræðisritum (København: 1878), 75.

\(^{444}\) ‘He had to go from one monastery to another,’ ibid, 102.

\(^{445}\) Gammeltoft and Holck, “Gemstên and other Old English Pearls,” 152.
While it is possible that \textit{munklif(i)} was coined independently, compounds with \textit{-lif} as the head-word are relatively rare in Norse, and one would suppose that a formation such as \textit{*munksta\text{\textael}f(i)r} or \textit{*munkh\text{\textael}ús} (or similar) would have been more natural. OE, on the other hand, did use \textit{lif} as part of a small number of compounds referring to a physical place: \textit{cottlif}, ‘habitation, small holding’, \textit{mynsterlif}, ‘a place in which monastic life is lived’, and \textit{stöclif}, ‘town, habitation’.\textsuperscript{446} For this reason it seems almost certain that English was the source language for the Norse term.


Fischer assigned all forms of this word, meaning ‘kirkelig Bygning af større Betydenhed’, an OE origin.\textsuperscript{447} Falk and Torp do not settle on one particular origin, but cite the OE word alongside MLG \textit{munster}, while Thors suggests Scandinavian forms with \textit{-u-} or \textit{-o-} root vowels were probably loaned from a continental Germanic source.\textsuperscript{448} The form which retains the nasal consonant in Norse has been suggested to be a specifically English-influenced form in contrast to \textit{musteri}, \textit{mysteri}, etc, which show conscious integration into the neuter \textit{ja-}stems.\textsuperscript{449} This is certainly plausible, though only Buse has noted just how rare this form is; the ONP contains only four examples, one from the IHB from ca.1200, and another two from the mid-fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{450} There is nothing about the provenance of these examples which should strongly point to English influence over a form like MLG \textit{münster}; Buse does, however, note that the place-name Westminster is rendered as \textit{Vestmynstr} in ON, which may be good circumstantial evidence.\textsuperscript{451}

\textsuperscript{446} DO\textit{E}, \textit{cott-lif}; ASD, \textit{mynster-lif}; \textit{stöc-lif}. Like \textit{munoctlif}, \textit{mynsterlif} could also refer to ‘monastic life.’
\textsuperscript{447} ‘An ecclesiastical building of greater importance,’ LAW, 53.
\textsuperscript{448} KTFS, 124. The etymological information for OED, \textit{minster}, also suggests that some of the myriad OF variants (like \textit{moste, muster}) may have had some impact on the Germanic forms.
\textsuperscript{449} IE\textit{WB}, \textit{mynstr}; KTFS, 124; AN\textit{EW}, \textit{mynstr}; \textit{IOB}, \textit{mynst(u)r}; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 188.
\textsuperscript{450} ON\textit{P}, \textit{mynstr}; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 188.
\textsuperscript{451} Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 188.
we saw in Chapter 1, archaeologists and historians have posited the idea that the early
Norwegian church was possibly based upon the Anglo-Saxon minster model, so we cannot
completely discount the idea that the word was first loaned by English missionaries. We
ultimately cannot be sure, however, and I would instead suggest that the best possible
explanation is a polygenetic origin with influences from various WGmc. and Romance forms.

2.3.3 - Church material culture

bjalla, f. ‘bell’ - belle, f. ('bell')

Bells are famously among the material accoutrements of Christianity that the papar are said to
have left behind on Iceland after the arrival of the first Scandinavians.\(^1\) Fischer indicated that
the word was taken from OE, though with no additional explicatory comments; De Vries later
expanded upon this, suggesting that MLG could also be the source language.\(^2\) Buse thought
English was also the most likely source.\(^3\) The presence of the word in stanza 6 of Glælognskviða,
composed for Sveinn Knútsson of Denmark in around 1032, means that it is one of the few
loans for which we have a relatively early record.\(^4\)

Hellberg has noted that Glælognskviða contains several words with probable OE origin,
especially given Æðrarinn loftunga’s associations with the Anglo-Scandinavian court of Knútr

---

\(^1\) ÍF I, 5.

\(^2\) For some reason Fischer gives bella, an unattested weak masculine OE form, LAW, 24; ANEW, bjalla. Holthausen prefers English, VEWA, bjalla.

\(^3\) Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 77.

inn ríki.\textsuperscript{456} As with many other loanwords we have examined, however, several forms may have contributed to the development of Norse \textit{bjalla}, particularly given the identical forms of \textit{belle} in OE, MLG, and OFris.\textsuperscript{457} The breaking of /e/ before back vowels might point to an early borrowing also, since this phonological development began to affect all Scandinavian dialects after the transition from ‘Ancient Nordic’ in the second half of the first millennium.\textsuperscript{458} De Vries, Hellberg, and Buse note that the altering of /e/ by analogy at a time after the change had taken effect is also a possibility however.\textsuperscript{459} Either way, \textit{bjalla}’s distinctive Norse phonology means that we cannot identify a specific source.

\textit{húsl, hunsl}, n. - \textit{húsh(e)}l, n. (‘the Eucharist’)

\textit{húsla, vb.} - \textit{húslan}, vb. (‘to administer the Eucharist, esp. as part of the last rites’)

The ON noun has historically been linked to the synonymous OE \textit{hús(e)}l, with both ultimately being derived from the same PGmc. root *\textit{hunsla-}, ‘sacrifice.’\textsuperscript{460} As Jóhannesson notes, however, ‘[d]as Etymologie des wortes ist unsicher’, and there have been suggestions that the form of the word retaining the nasal consonant is in fact a native Norse development from PGmc.\textsuperscript{461}

\textsuperscript{456} Hellberg, “Kring tillkomsten av \textit{Glœlognsvída},” 14-48; on Þórarin more generally, see Hofmann, \textit{Nordische-Englishe Lehnbeziehungen der Wikingerzeit}, 94-97.

\textsuperscript{457} That the Norse word might have developed independently from the PGmc. \textit{o}-stem cannot be entirely discounted either, though the close association of the word with Christian material culture perhaps favours a later West Germanic development (Orel, *\textit{belli}n). De Vries notes that the word might have arisen originally as a ‘Schallwort’ (ANEW, \textit{bjalla}).

\textsuperscript{458} Haugen \textit{The Scandinavian Languages}, 153; the literature on breaking in Norse is considerable, but Bo Ralph gives a concise overview in “Phonological and graphemic development from Ancient Nordic to Old Nordic,” 709-10.

\textsuperscript{459} ANEW, \textit{bjalla}; Hellberg, “Kring tillkomsten av \textit{Glœlognsvída},” 34 and 45; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 77.

\textsuperscript{460} EDPG, *\textit{hunsla}-; HGE, *\textit{xunslan}.

\textsuperscript{461} ‘the etymology of the word is uncertain,’ IEWB, \textit{húsl, hunsl}. Taranger saw a connection between the OE and ON terms, \textit{Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske}
Magnússon took the view that the word was influenced by OE hūsl in the sense of ‘sakramenti, vigt brauð og vin’, but he ultimately concedes, like Jóhannesson, that the ‘uppruni [er] óviss og umdeildur.’ Noreen and Buse both point out that a native Norse form would result in *hósl, with a lowered root vowel (/u:/→/o:/), thus making English the likely source. The OED’s etymological information for the archaic English word housel states conclusively that ‘[t]he idea that the Scandinavian word in Christian uses shows a borrowing or reborrowing from English is now normally rejected, largely on the grounds of the existence of forms with a nasal.’

In Norse contexts the word is recorded first in the Rök runestone inscription from the ninth century, where it clearly refers to a sacrifice in a general sense without there necessarily being any religious connotations, either Christian or otherwise. After the advent of literacy the word is recorded only with reference to the sacrament of the Eucharist, which means that we have next to no way of tracking its semantic development. I would be reluctant to completely discount the influence of OE usage, especially given Noreen’s observation on the phonology; at the very least it seems that the Christian sense of English hūs(e)l may have resulted in a semantic shift in the ON lexical item. The fact that Norse retained a form with the nasal consonant intact would not necessarily interfere with any semantic change.

---

462 ‘Sacrament, consecrated bread and wine’; ‘…the origin is uncertain and controversial,’ ÍOB, hásl.
463 Adolf Noreen, Altnordische Grammatik I. Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1923), 101-2; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 113.
464 OED, housel, s. [2011].
465 For the full inscription, see: Otto v. Friesen, Rökstenen. Runstenen vid Röks Kyrka Lysings Härad Östergötland (Stockholm: Jacob Bagges Söner, 1920), 28-29, and brief comments on hásl on 57.
466 Incidentally, the ONP only records one example of hūnsl, in an early fifteenth-century copy of Gregors saga þáfa. It is possible that this is an instance of the nasal being reinserted, though this is dependent on whether or not vowels were likely to have retained a nasal quality this late in the medieval period. The passage from Gregors saga þáfa also includes some code switching, with the use of corpus domini, as well as the synonymous loan øflata, C. R. Unger (ed.), Heilgra Manna Søgur: Fortællinger og Legender om hellige Mænd og Kvinder 1-2 (Christiania: Kongelige Norske Fredriks-Universitet, 1877), 394.
The history of the verb is similarly fraught, but there are a few noteworthy features that are worth discussing. OE **hūslian** appears only 12 times in the DOE corpus, all but one in works by Ælfric of Eynsham.\(^{467}\) The Norse word appears in the ONP 17 times in total, with 14 instances as **húsla** and 3 as **hunsla**. The ON word had the meaning of ‘to give the Corpus Domini to a sick person’, though it does not appear to have been quite so restricted in sense in OE, where it simply meant ‘to administer the Eucharist’.\(^{468}\) In ME, however, the word did also develop this more specific meaning of administration during the last rites.\(^{469}\) Since the verb describes a decidedly Christian ritual, it is certainly possible that the OE term influenced the Norse word; on the other hand, it could also have been derived independently from the noun **húsl**, **huns**.

One interesting parallel exists between Norse and ME usage that is worth mentioning, though it does not allow any precise conclusions to be drawn. The MED cites a number of variations of the phrase *schrift and hosel*, ‘confession and communion’ (or alternatively the verbs *schriften and houselen*):

Schrift and hosel ich ȝuyrne.\(^{470}\)

Graunt vs repentaunce and respiȝt and schrift and hosel or we day.\(^{471}\)

Onnȝæn þatt he shall shrifenn þe 7 huslenn ec…\(^{472}\)

Ech Monek scholde þat ilke day beon i-hoseled and i-schriue.\(^{473}\)

---

\(^{467}\) Primarily in his *Catholic Homilies* and *Letter to Wulfsige*; the non-Ælfrician reference is in the *Canons of Edgar*, see: DOE, **hūslian**.

\(^{468}\) IED, **húsla**; DOE, **hūslian**.

\(^{469}\) OED, **housel**, v., sense 1b. MED, **hūselen**, on the other hand, does not give this as a specific definition.


\(^{473}\) Horstmann, *The Early South-English Legendary*, 264.
These are comparable with some examples given in the ONP:

\[
\text{Kolbeinn segist þat gjarna vilja, ok sverr; er síðan leystr, skriptaðr ok huslaðr, en andaðist litlu síðarr.}^{474}
\]

\[
\text{Eptir sagða skipan, sem riddarinn er skriptaðr ok huslaðr, andaz hann.}^{475}
\]

\[
\ldots\text{gaf einn riddari er Romarik hét hest fyrir sál sinni skriptaðr ok húslaðr.}^{476}
\]

There are differences in these parallels, not least that Norse uses verbs exclusively, but the similarity is striking nonetheless. Given that the Norse examples of húsla/hunsla do not occur until the early fourteenth century, it is possible that there is some degree of ME influence in one way or another (see also discussion of skript in section 2.3.15). The administration of these sacraments together would not have been unique to the English- or ON-speaking worlds in the Middle Ages, and it is possible that such a set collocation developed independently in both languages.\(^{477}\) On the other hand, E.S. Olszewska demonstrated that ON alliterative collocations were a notable feature of the ME texts like the *Ormulum*, so some sort of transmission (in either direction) is certainly plausible.\(^{478}\) On balance, I believe the words are likely to have been semantically influenced by English.

---

\(^{474}\) ‘Kolbeinn said he wanted to earnestly, and swears; after he took confession and received communion, he died a little later,’ Guðbrandur Vigfússon, Jón Sigurðsson, Þorvaldur Bjarnarson and Eiríkur Jónsson (eds.), *Biskupa sögur 2* (København: Íslenzka Bókmenntafélag, 1878), 70.

\(^{475}\) ‘After the aforesaid arrangement, as the knight takes confession and communion, he died,’ C.R. Unger, *Postola sögar* (Christiania: B.M. Bentzen, 1874), 674.

\(^{476}\) ‘A certain knight, named Romarik, gave his horse for his soul and confesses and receives communion,’ C. R. Unger, ed., *Karlamagnus saga ok kappa hans* (Christiania: 1860), 267-68.

\(^{477}\) There are a number of alliterative collocations in ME that demonstrate Norse influence, though these are from a poetic context: Thorlac Turville-Petre, *The Alliterative Revival* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1977), 84-87; Dance, “Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English,” 245-46. Abram has noted a few parallel collocations in OE and ON homiletic traditions, “Anglo-Saxon Influence in the Old Norwegian Homily Book,” 10-11 and 14.

krisma, f., krismi, m. - crisma, m. (‘holy oil, chrism’)

Latin chrisma (f./n.) refers to holy oil used in various sacraments, though its exact route into both languages is a little uncertain. In English the word changed to weak masculine, perhaps as a result of analogy between the -a nominative endings rather than strict adherence to abstract gender. It might be that the existence of ON masculine and feminine forms reflects the influence of Germanic and Latin manifestations of the word. Given the centrality of chrism to baptism and other rites, there may be good circumstantial evidence to favour English, as we will see later when we look at verbs like biskupa and kristna. No firm source language can be identified however.

kross, kors, m. - cros, m? (‘cross’)

Kross is on the whole thought to have been loaned into Norse from OIr. A number of scholars also suggest OE as a possible alternative alongside the Celtic language. This should, however, be completely discounted; the word occurs only very late on in written OE (in the twelfth

---

479 OE ele, ‘oil’, also refers to a substance used for ‘ceremonial or religious purposes’, DOE ele.
480 LAW, 53; VEWA, krisma; IEWB, krismi, krisma; AEWB, krisma; ÍOB, krisma; Höfler, “Altnordische Lehnwortstudien I,” 259.
481 LAW, 19; Lange, Studien zur christlichen Dichtung der Nordgermanen 1000-1200, 96 and 170.
482 IEWB, kross (Jóhannesson also suggests the versions presenting metathesis may have come from OFris. könnt); ANEW, kross; ÍOB, kross.
century) and even then is used only as a geographical descriptor (and hence features in a number of place-names). Indeed, it is entirely likely that the English word was loaned either directly from OIr. or via Norse itself.

*messuvin*, n. - *messevin*, n. (‘mass-wine’)

The identification of *messuvin* as a loan from OE is highly unlikely. The compound does not appear as an independent lemma in the ONP (though it is in Cleasby-Vigfusson). The only evidence for the word in OE is a single gloss to Latin *infertum vinum*. Whether it can be considered an independent compound in either language is doubtful.

*oblát(a), oflát(a), oblét, f. - oflěte, oflěte, oflěte, f. (‘offering; sacramental wafer’)

These lexemes are all derived from Latin *oblata*, the past participle of *offerre*, referring to the consecrated host at mass; this was also the general meaning for both the English and Norse terms. There is little agreement on the word's origin, though Fischer and others point to OE. Both Höfler and Thors suggested that the OSw. manifestation of the word with a fronted stem vowel was due to OE, but they cited Fischer in calling the Norse word a Lat loan. Buse points to English on the basis that forms with <of-> appear only in OE and ON.

---

483 DOE, *croes*.
484 AEAW, *cross*; OED, *cross*; MED, *cros*.
485 Taranger, *Den Angælsiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, 343; LAW, 53; NCG, 36.
486 DOE corpus search, *messe win*.
488 ‘At least in part’, LAW, 54; IEWB, *obláta, ofláta*; ÍOB suggests Latin.
490 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 194.
The number of different forms in ON would suggest that there was no straightforward borrowing from just one language. The lexical item is very lightly attested in OE, with the DOE corpus offering only 10 instances of oflēte, 13 of oflētē and five of oflētē; the native synonym hūs(e)l was the more popular word for the host by quite some distance (numbering 337 in the DOE). In ON, neither oblāt or oblāta were particularly common, and the latter was only attested from the mid-fourteenth century, meaning that Latin oblata or MLG oblāt(e) were much more likely to be the influences for these forms (the word is not extant in ME). The existence of oblēt, which a raised stem vowel, is perhaps more promising evidence for English influence, though it occurs only seven times in the ONP and is strong rather than weak. Four of the examples in the ONP are from the IHB, and it occurs only three times over the following 300 years. Overall, the number of Norse variations seem to indicate that recovery of one single source language is impossible.

reýkelsí, n. - rēcels, n. (‘incense’)

Norse reýkelsí, ‘incense’ is certainly an English loan. As Magnússon notes, the word is a partial loan translation, with the initial syllable being analogically replaced by the Norse cognate reýkr, ‘smoke’ (OE rēc); it is commonly mentioned in lists of English loans in Norse.⁴⁹¹ There is little else to add to this consensus, except that recourse to the English word further supports the

---

⁴⁹¹ ÍOB, reykelsí; Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norsk, 346; LAW, 24; Seip, Norsk Språkhistorie, 210; IEWB, reykelsí; ANEW, reykelsí; Halldórsson, “Determining the Lending Language”, 372; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 231. See also: OED rechels. For ODan., see: Gammeltoft and Holck, “Gemstén and other Old English Pearls,” 148.
integral role of Anglo-Saxon clergymen in mission and their provision of some of the important ceremonial accoutrements of the church.

röða, f., röði, m. - röð, f. (‘cross, rood’)

Early English stands out from other Germanic languages in its preference for the use of röð (ME rode) for a crucifix.\(^{492}\) Only OS ruoda/róða and Norse röða/röði carry the same semantic connotations, whereas the reflexes of PGmc. *röðō- in other Germanic languages tend to refer more generally to a rod or stick.\(^{493}\) Fischer listed it as a loan, though De Vries is perhaps more accurate in his assumption that the Norse word existed independently and that ‘[d]ie bed[eutung] ‘kreuz’ ist aber aus dem [altenglischen] entlehnt worden.’\(^{494}\) Buse supposed the word to be native, but that it was influenced by OE, which seems to be a fair assertion.\(^{495}\)

Röða appears only 26 times in the ONP corpus, though it is found in our earliest Norse manuscript, AM 237 a fol., where it is collocated with kross: ‘Crossar oc rōþor. merkia meinlætes menn.’\(^{496}\) This may point to early competition between the two terms, though given the preference for kross in early texts, it is perhaps more indicative of the early closeness between the English and Scandinavian churches and the multilingual context of that period. The word also appears in the title of the poem Röðudrápa, which was composed by Þórdór Særeksson in memory

---

\(^{492}\) The OED, rood [2010] notes that a weak feminine byform also existed in OE.

\(^{493}\) HGE, *röðō(n).

\(^{494}\) ‘…the meaning ‘cross’ has been borrowed from OE,’ LAW, 25; ANEW, röða; IEWB, rōða, also suggests an OE origin but is unclear as to whether he means a straightforward loan or a semantic loan; ÍOB, I rōða, rōði, suggests comparison with the OE.

\(^{495}\) Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 233.

\(^{496}\) ‘Crosses and roods mark ill men,’ Kolsrud, Messuskýringar, 95. Masculine röði appears 27 times, though not until the second half of the thirteenth century.
of St. Óláfr. The failure of róða or róði to make much headway as alternatives to kross may suggest that the latter term was well established among Norse speakers prior to sustained missionary efforts by the Anglo-Saxon church.

skrín, n. - scrín, n. (‘shrine’)

Latin scrinium referred to a box or chest, often for books or manuscripts, but in OE acquired the more specific meaning of ‘a receptacle for the relics of a saint;’ this is also the main sense of the ON word. Taranger suggested it as an English borrowing, and others have consequently agreed with his assessment. Judith Jesch has noted its earliest appearance in stanza 24 of Sigvatr Þórdarson’s Efídrápa for Óláfr inn helgi, though the dating of the poem is problematic: ‘Göorts, þeims gött bar hjarta,/ gollit skrín at mínun…’ Given bishop Grímell’s promulgation of the cult of St Óláfr in the aftermath of his death, English may well have been the source language. The word could have been borrowed much earlier than this, though of course this can be little more than supposition. Polygenesis is likely to have played a part in its development.

497 Only one stanza (maybe two) survives: Þórðr Særeksson, Róðurdrápa, edited by Kari Ellen Gade in Poetry from the Kings’ Sagas 1, Part 1, edited by Diana Whaley (Brepols: Turnhout, 2012), 242-44.
498 ASD, scrín, though it seems to have retained a more general sense as well; IED, skrín.
499 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norsk, 346; LAW, 55; VEWA, skrín; ÍOB, skrín; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 262; IEWB is somewhat more guarded, offering MLG schrin and OHG scrini as alternatives.
500 ‘A golden shrine is made for my lord,’ Sigvatr Þórdarson, Efídrápa, edited by Judith Jesch, in Poetry from the Kings’ Sagas 1, Part 2, edited by Diana Whaley, 693 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012); on the dating see also, Judith Jesch, “The Once and Future King: History and Memory in Sigvatr’s Poetry on Óláfr Haraldsson” in Along the Oral-Written Continuum: Types of Texts, Relations and their Implications, edited by Slavica Rankovic, Leidulf Melve, and Else Mundal, 112-13 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010).
2.3.4 - Feasts

fasta, f. - festen, n. (‘fast’)

(fasta, v. - fæstan, v. (‘to fast’))

In Cleasby-Vigfússson, the entry for *fasta* states that this word must have arrived with Christianity, and the reason for this is couched in distinctively nineteenth-century terms:

…the old Scandinavians could have no such word, as voluntary fasting was unknown in the heathen rites, and at the first introduction of Christianity the practice was sorely complained of.\[501\]

This position was further supported by Fischer, who suggested that the ecclesiastical meaning must have come from OE, though he notes ‘eine ältere [Bedeutung] ist im [altnordischen] nicht belegt’, pointing to the idea that we might be dealing with a semantic loan rather than a direct borrowing.\[502\] Magnússon agrees, stating that the religious sense, ‘mun…vera komið frá Gotum inn í önnur germ. mál.’\[503\] Finally, in reference to the verb, Jan de Vries indicated that ‘das wort selbst wurde wohl ursprünglich im gotischen gebildet.’\[504\] The exact relationship between *fasta* and *fæsten* is difficult to unpick, not least because the ON term is occasionally mentioned as a possible loan in English. Jack believed the form *veaste* in the so-called AB language texts could plausibly have been a testament to ON influence; Dance gave this assessment the benefit of the

---

501 IED, *fasta*.
502 ‘an older meaning in Old Norse is not proven,’ LAW, 24; Falk and Torp (NDEWB), in their entry for the verb *faste*, write that: ‘Die grundbedeutung ist wahrscheinlich “festhalten an” wovon “an religiösen vorschriften festhalten.”’ (‘The basic meaning is likely “stick to” from which “to hold to religious prescriptions”’).
503 ‘will have come from Gothic into another Germanic language,’ IOB, *fasta*.
504 ‘the word itself was probably formed in Gothic,’ ANEW, *fasta*. 

doubt, though not without reservations. The various Germanic reflexes are ultimately derived from a PGmc. adjective with stem */fast/-, with a meaning of ‘firm, fast’, though the exact development is uncertain.

In ON, *fasta* first appears in the eleventh-century work of Árnórr Póðarson, namely stanza 15 of his *Magnússdrápa*. Here the skald integrates Christian nomenclature with the characteristically violent imagery of court poetry when he states that ‘vann Óleif’s sonr bannat…ara fóstu,’ while the twelfth-century *Ingadrápa* by Kolli inn trúi similarly combines the Christian and the pagan in the phrase ‘fasta Munins.’ These examples shed no light on precisely when *fasta* acquired a specifically religious meaning, but its playful use by Árnórr perhaps indicates it was established enough to be used subversively in verse. In OE sources there may be indications of influence from Norse: Ælfric’s *Letter to Sigewærd* and Wulfstan’s *Cena Domini* each contain a form of the word spelt *fæste*; in neither case is the word declined according to a weak paradigm, however, and the DOE suggests ‘the spellings may perhaps be taken as forms of *fæsten*.’ Ultimately we cannot be sure that *fasta* even existed as a noun or verb in ON prior to the advent of Christianity, though an adaptation of the adjective *fastr* on the basis of English usage is possible.

---

505 George Jack notes this is plausible in the context of the so-called AB language, “The Reflexes of Second Fronting in the AB Language.” *English Studies* 71:4 (1990): 295; Dance, *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English*, 440-41; see also AEEW, *fæsten* n.1. Björkman was altogether more sceptical, *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English*, 236-37.

506 This gave rise to the Norse *fastr* and OE *fast*. See the etymological information in the OED entries for: *fast*, n.1.; *fast*, v.1; *fast*, v.2; † *fasten*, n. [all unrevised]. See also HGE, *fæstaz*; *fæstum*; *fæsten*; *fæstenan*. Jack suggests the OE form developed along the lines of *fastrunn > *fæstynn > *fæsten* as a result of ‘double umlaut’, “The Reflexes of Second Fronting in the AB Language,” 236.


508 DOE, *faste*. 
gangdagar, m. - gangdagas, m. (‘Rogationtide’)

In both English and Norse this compound denoted the three days which preceded the Feast of the Ascension, or the dies rogationum in Latin. In the Germanic vernacular, the word literally means ‘walking days’, relating to the fact that processions were a key feature of worship on these days.\footnote{Lilli Gjerløw, “Gangdagene,” KLNM 2, 186-87. København: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1981; the celebration supposedly has its roots in the Roman celebration of ambarvalia, Johansson, “Bøndag,” KLNM 2, 408.} Taranger and Carr suggests English as a source language, though the latter also points to MLG gangdage as an alternative.\footnote{Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 370; the MLG word does not seem to appear in Schiller-Lübben. NCG, 34.} In the ONP gangdagr appears 68 times, and is attested early on in a twelfth-century computus found in GKS 1812 4\textsuperscript{o}.\footnote{ONP, gangdagr.} The word also features in the IHB, and Thomas Hall notes that the Rogationtide sermon ‘can be traced to tenth-century English practice’ in ‘both the substance and the liturgical setting.’\footnote{Hall, “Old Norse-Icelandic Sermons”, 673. The word appears in Perificatio Sancte Marie: Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen (ed.), The Icelandic Homily Book (Reykjavik: Stofnun Arna Magnússonar á Íslandi, 1993), 39v.} Given that the homily book was ‘compiled with the aid of an English homiliary designed as a resource for vernacular preaching’, the idea that gangdagr may be based on OE usage is entirely possible.\footnote{Ibid, 673.} I would suggest that the word is a very good candidate for having been loaned from English, though as with most other words addressed in this section, the period in which it may have entered Norse probably stretches anywhere from the tenth to the twelfth centuries.
This compound refers to the feast day of Pentecost, which is celebrated on the seventh Sunday after Easter, and is the source for PDE *Whitsunday*. The ONP records 38 instances of this word in its corpus, with the first citation from *In ascensione domini nostri* in the NHB:

Siðan foro þau oll saman til Ierusalem ok dvældu þar í bonum sinum. til þes er guð sendi þæim hinn hælga anda or himnum hvita-sunnun-dag.

The connection with OE is a long established one. Other sources are unlikely given that MLG *witte sondach*, which influenced OSw. *hwitasunnodagher* and ODan. *hvidesøndag*, denoted the first Sunday after Easter or the first Sunday of Lent. The exact relationship of the English and Norse terms to the Latin *Dominica in albis* is uncertain, as this similarly refers to the first Sunday after Easter and is only attested in insular and continental sources from the thirteenth century. Given this crucial semantic overlap, some sort of connection between the English and Norse compounds is likely. One puzzling issue, however, is the fact that the OEC only yields one instance of *hwítasunnandæg* in the D text of the ASC:

---

514 The celebration is now known as *Pinse* in the modern Scandinavian languages. For more information on the medieval celebration, see: Helge Fæhn, “Pinse,” KLNMI13, 321-22. See also: Árni Björnsson, *Saga daganna*. Hátturb og merkisdagar á Íslandi og uppruni þeirra (Reykjavík: Bókaforlagssins Saga, 1977), 59-60. The OE word, formed from *hwít*, ‘white’, and *sunnandæg*, ‘Sunday’, is thought to be a reference to the white robes of the newly baptised at Pentecost, see OED, *whitsunday*.

515 ‘Afterwards they all went to Jerusalem together and spent much time there in prayer so that god sent them the holy spirit from heaven [on] Whitsunday,’ Indrebrø, Gamal norsk homiliebok, 90.

516 NCG, 35; IEWB, *hwitasunnudagr*; IOB, *hwitur* 1. (*hvitadag(u)r* and *hwitasunnudag(u)r*); NDEWB, *hvidesøndag*, simply states it was probably loaned during the missionary era.

517 IOB, *hwitur*, 1. (*hvitadag(u)r* and *hwitasunnudag(u)r*); Hellberg, “Tysk eller engelsk mission? Om de tidiga kristna lånorden,” 44-45; see also the detailed etymological information in the revised OED entry for *whitsunday*.

518 OED, *whitsunday* [2015].
On þis an Eastron com se kyng to Wincestre, & þa væron Eastra on X kalendas Aprilis, & sona æfter þam com Mathild seo hlæfdie hider to lande, & Ealdred arcebishop hig gehalgode to cwene on Westmynstre on Hwitan Sunnandæg.  

Here the word is not compounded and the modifying adjective is declined (unlike the common citation of the word as hwītasunndæg); indeed, the DOE corpus entry is not for an individual lexical item, and instead can only be found by searching for one of its constituent simplexes. In OE the usual term for Whitsunday was pentecosten, and examples in both the OED and MED show that variations of hwītasunndæg do not appear again in the vernacular until the thirteenth century — in the Lambeth Homilies, for example. In the Lambeth Homilies’ version of Ælfric’s In die sancto Pentecosten, the translator makes sure to provide both OE and ME forms: ‘Ure witte sunnedei…is þe fifteoȝaðe dei fram þam ester deie…on þisse deie þet is pentecostes and wittesunnedie on ure speche.’ Quite apart from being a nice detail given the homily’s concern with language, this may also suggest that OE pentecosten was a literate, Latinising preference, with *hwīl sunnandæg existing as a popular vernacular term (Taranger suggested it may have been a specifically Northumbrian term introduced by missionaries).

This is far from certain, however, and one would assume that if we were to find the term anywhere in the OE corpus, it would be in one of Ælfric’s texts. The fact that the first appearances of the actual compound word — as opposed to a phrase — happen at the same

---

519 ‘At this Easter the king came to Winchester; and at that time Easter was on the tenth of April, and soon after that the lady Matilda came here to the land, and archbishop Ealdred consecrated her as queen in Westminster on Whitsunday,’ Cubbin (ed.), The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Volume 6, MS D, 83.
520 OED, Whitsunday; MED, Wit-Sǒn-dai.
522 The explanation occurs just prior to the episode in Acts 2:1-6 where the apostles speak in different languages under the influence of the Holy Spirit.
523 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 369-70.
time in both English and Norse vernacular (with the latter maybe even predating the first ME example) makes it difficult to ascribe a source. Given that the usual term was *Pentecosten* in OE even during the great flourishing of vernacular texts at the end of the tenth century, we might speculate that the English and Norse terms developed alongside one another.

*imbrudagar, m.*, *ymbrendagas, m.* (*‘Ember Days’*)

The Ember Days are a series of fasts occurring once in each of the four seasons of a year (hence Latin *quattuor tempora*) on a Wednesday and the immediately following Friday and Saturday.\(^{524}\) Most scholars are in agreement that the word is a loan from OE, and it is not paralleled in any other Germanic language in the Middle Ages.\(^{525}\) The etymology of the qualifying element of the OE word is contested, though two plausible possibilities have been put forward: it is either from the noun *ymbryne*, ‘a course of time, revolution, period’ or is a ‘corruption’ of the Latin *quattuor tempora*.\(^{526}\) Falk and Torp, although seeing an English origin as most likely, do not discount the idea that the Norse term itself was a reinterpretation of the *Quatember*, which was the continental Germanic word for the holiday.\(^{527}\) They note that the word does not seem to have been analysable by the fourteenth century in Iceland, where the homily *Vm uprisu kuicra oc dauða* offers

---


\(^{526}\) OED, *ember* n.2.; LAW, 52; Gjerlow, “Imbredagene”, KLN M 7, 362; ÍOB, *imbrudagar*; Árni Björnsson, *Saga daganna*, 34.

\(^{527}\) NDEWB, *imbredage*. 
a folk etymology: ‘imbress [i.e. imbres] heita skurír a latinu. En ver blondom saman latinu oc norrsnu þa er collum ímbru daga þat er skur daga.’

I would suggest that *imbrudagr* is probably one of our best candidates for having been loaned from English. While it is possible the word is based directly on the Latin, it seems unlikely both the Norse and OE words would have developed independently. We are therefore dealing with a partial loan translation, with Norse speakers having reinterpreted the unanalysable *ymbren*.

*langafriðdagr*, m. - *langafriðedag*, m. (‘Good Friday’)

This compound is the term for Good Friday in Norse and in both OE and ME. The word has been posited as an English loan by a number of scholars. Like *hvitasunnandeog*, *langafriðedag* is in fact recorded as a noun phrase rather than a compound proper in OE, and appears in Ælfric’s writings among others. Its first citation in the ONP is from the version of *Gulafingslag* in DonVar 137 4° from the latter half of the thirteenth century, and the remaining citations are all post-1300. It is in fact preceded by the synonymous *föstudagrinn langi*, which appears from the end of the 1100s and ended up as the standard phrase for Good Friday in modern Icelandic. I do not think that independent coinage can be fully discounted, and it is easy to see how both English and Norse might simply have affixed *lang/langr* as a straightforward description of what

---

528 ‘showers are called *imbress* in Latin. And we blend together Latin and Norse when we say *imbru daga*, that is *skur daga*,’ Eiríkur Jónsson and Finnur Jónsson (eds.), *Hauksbók, udgiven efter de Arnamagnæanska Håndskrifter no. 371, 544 og 675 4°, samt forskellige Papirshåndskrifter* (København: Thieles Bogtrykkeri, 1892-96), 172.
529 OED, long, adj.1. [2016].
530 LAW, 7; NCG, 28; IEWB, *langafriðdagr*; KTFS, 341; Hellberg, “Tysk eller engelsk mission?” 48.
531 ONP, *langafriðdagr*.
532 See: ONP, *föstudagr*. Seip notes that *fjódagr* on its own appears relatively infrequently in Olc., “Dagnavn”, *KLNM* 2, 615.
is a particularly full day of fasting and worship (something which *fóstudagrinn langi* perhaps conveys even more explicitly). On the other hand, given the countless options for word-formation in both languages, it would be unusual for both to hit upon the same description, and, like I suggested for *hvítasunnudagr/hvítansunnandæg* above, it is possible both words were formed alongside one another with intentionally cognate constituent parts.

*palmdagr, palmasunnudagr, m. - palmsunnandæg, m. (‘Palm Sunday’)*

Palm Sunday is a moveable feast falling on the Sunday before Easter. In Norse the more common word is *palmdagr*, which occurs a total of 26 times in the ONP, while *palmasunnudagr* is only cited on four occasions. Fischer suggested OE *palmsunnandæg* and *palmdæg* as the source for the Norse terms, and has been supported in his claim by Carr and Jóhannesson. An early instance of this word is recorded in Sigvatr Þórarson’s *Nesjavísur*, which focus on Óláfr inn helgi’s victory over jarl Sveinn Hákonarson at Nesjar in 1016:

Hirð Óleifs vann harða
hrið, en svá varðk bíða
(peítneskum félk) páska,
palmsunnudag (hjalmi).535

As well as offering a remarkably precise dating for the battle, this nicely demonstrates the comfort with which Norse-speaking poets integrated Christian nomenclature into their traditional verse forms (note also *páska*, ‘Easter’ < Lat. *pascha*).

---

533 For general information, see: Björnsson, *Saga daganna*, 42-43.
534 LAW, 54; NCG, 36; IEWB, *pálmsunnudagr, palmsunnudagr, pálmadagr*.
535 ‘Óláfr’s company won a tough battle on Palm Sunday, and so I waited for Easter; I donned a helmet from Poitou,’ Sigvatr Þórarson, *Nesjavísur*, edited by Russell Poole in *Poetry from the King’s Sagas 1, Part 2*, edited by Diana Whaley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 578.
In the DOE corpus we have one example a piec of *palm sünndæg* (as a noun phrase) and *palmdæg*, while the MED cites one example of *Palmes Sunendai* in the *Peterborough Chronicle* from 1122.\(^{536}\) Hellberg’s list of holiday names also demonstrates that MLG *palmensonnendag* and *palmedach* are equally likely sources for the ON term, and independent coinage as a calque on Latin *dominica in palmis* or *dies palmarum* cannot be discounted either.\(^{537}\) Given that Sigvatr is supposed to have spent time in England, it might be that he picked up *palm(sunnu)dagr* there; more likely, however, is that this word had been absorbed into the Norse lexicon for some time already. Overall the evidence is not strong enough to suggest that English is the sole source language, and, as Hellberg suggests, a polygenetic origin is perhaps a more likely explanation.\(^{538}\)

*skíripórsdagr*, m. - *shēr Thuresdai*, m. (‘Maundy Thursday’)

In Norse, both *skírdagr* and *skíripórsdagr* refer to the Thursday before Easter known as Maundy Thursday in Modern English.\(^{539}\) The former is by far the most common compound (*skírr*, ‘pure’ plus *dagr*), with 29 instances in the ONP. De Vries thought that the longer form, which appears eight times in the ONP, may have been derived from English usage.\(^{540}\) Björkman noted that there is no evidence for this word in OE, where the term was either *se punresdag tóforan ęastran* or simply *ēr ęastran*, though he argues that Taranger’s suggestion that OE was the source language

---

\(^{536}\) MED, *Palme-Söndai*. The Peterborough area is thought to have been fairly heavily Scandinavianised, though Veronika Kniezsa contends ON influence on the chronicle was slight, “The Scandinavian Elements in the Vocabulary of the Peterborough Chronicle,” *English Historical Linguistics 1992. Papers from the 7th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*, edited by Francisco Fernández, Miguel Fuster, and Juan José Calvo (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1994), 240.


\(^{538}\) Ibid, 46.

\(^{539}\) See: Björnsson, *Saga daganna*, 43.

\(^{540}\) ANEW, *skíripórsdagr*. 
‘cannot be positively confuted.’\footnote{Björkman, Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English, 125. In English, he suggests that the initial element might be from ON skærr, ‘pure, clear’, though this would depend on the ‘not very probable’ existence of an early Anglicised form of the word.} In ME, \textit{shere Thuresdai} occurs from the beginning of the thirteenth century, with later forms spelled \textless sk\textgreater appearing in northern English dialects from the fifteenth century onwards.\footnote{MED, \textit{sh}ē\textit{r(e) Thuresdai}; OED, \textit{Skir} \textit{Thursday [unrevised].}}

I am, on the whole, inclined to agree with Björkman’s conclusion that ‘nothing can be, with any amount of certainty, proved about this word in this or any other direction.’\footnote{Björkman, Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English, 125.} In fact, there is, as de Vries notes, every possibility that the word was loaned into English instead.\footnote{ANEW, \textit{skiríðs}dæg. ‘…falls nicht umgekehrt’ (‘if not vice versa’).} On the other hand, it might be that the term was consciously derived as an Anglo-Scandinavian term by churchmen familiar with both languages, an idea which may also help to account for \textit{hvítasunnudagr/hvítansunnandæg} and \textit{langafjádagr/langafrídegæg}.\footnote{Norse \textit{skir} being cognate with OE \textit{scir}, and \textit{dags} with \textit{dæg}.} As Hellberg argues in his discussion of these words: ‘Deras orden var internationell.’\footnote{‘these words were international’, “Tysk eller engelsk mission?”, 46.} While he is keen to stress the pan-Germanic nature of feast days, I will argue in Chapter 3 that — with the possible exception of \textit{palm} (\textit{sumnu})\textit{dagr} — we have a selection of words here that seem to have rather more interesting origins than a straightforward loan in either direction.
2.3.5 - Canonical hours

óttsǫngr, óttu(ǫngs)tíð - ũhtsang, ũhttíð (matutina)

prím - prím (prima)

undorn - undern (tertia)

miðsdagstíð - middégtíð, middægsang (sexta)

nón(tíðir) - nón(tíð) (nona)

aptan(ǫngs)tíð, aptansǫngr - æfentíð (vespera)

náttǫngr - nihtsang (completorium)

Taranger lists all of these words (in one form or another) as being dependent on English influence, and Carr and Buse follow suit.547 As we saw in Chapter 1, the English church played a role in the establishment of early religious foundations in Scandinavia, so the transferral of terms relating to the breviary may be expected. Some are perhaps more likely than others to have been loaned however. Óttusǫngr, referring to matins, is a good candidate for having been a loan translation of OE ũhtsang, with ũhta-ótta being straightforward cognates (< PGmc. unhtwōn).548 Although Carr notes that there is one instance of the word in OHG (ũhtisang), it is otherwise unique to English and Norse, thus strongly indicating a link between the two.549 There may well be a similar connection between ũhttíð and óttu(ǫngs)tíðir, though the former word appears to refer more generally to the time of early morning rather than the liturgical office

---

547 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkens Indflydelse paa den Norske, 347; NCG, 33-37; Fischer also cites a number of them, LAW, 7; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 190 and 226.
549 NCG, 36.
specifically.\footnote{ASD, ùhtid and ùhantid.} Óttusongr is also by far the more common form in Norse, with 65 attestations in the ONP and only nine for óttu(song)s/tíðr.

In the case of the simplexes, both \textit{prím} and \textit{nón} may have been loaned directly from Latin, not to mention other Germanic languages.\footnote{OED, \textit{prime}, n.1. [2007]; \textit{noon}, though the OED notes the latter may well be a PGmc. inheritance. While \textit{nón} is cited 70 times in the ONP, \textit{prím} occurs only eight times. Gammeltoft and Holck favour an English origin for the Norse word, “Gemstên and other Old English Pearls,” 145.} While the existence of parallel compound forms of \textit{nón-}/\textit{nón-} plus -\textit{tíð-}/-\textit{tíð(r)} might point towards English influence specifically, the lateness of the Norse compound is suggestive of an independent coinage.\footnote{Examples in the ONP begin in the late fourteenth century.} Undorn is similarly represented across the Germanic languages (see the cognates in the OED entry for \textit{undern} [unrevised]), and regardless only occurs twice in the ONP. The other compounds are similarly lightly attested in the ONP corpus, with \textit{middagstíð} appearing only once and \textit{aptantíð} twice.\footnote{OE \textit{middagstíð} appears only twice in the DOE corpus.} In OE the word had a more general meaning of ‘evening (time)’, though the DOE notes that it could also be used for the hour for evensong.\footnote{DOE, ëfen-tíð.} In ON the term seems to apply only to the canonical hour:

\textit{Síðan et byskup reisa landtialld sitt a vellenum siri stofunne ute, ok song þar aptantíðr.}\footnote{‘Afterwards the bishop raised his tent on the plains in front of the main room, and sang evensong there,’ Oscar Albert Johnsen and Jón Helgason, eds., \textit{Den støre saga om Olav den hellige efter pergamenthåndskrift i Kungliga Biblioteket i Stockholm nr. 2 4to med varianter fra andre håndskrifter} (Oslo: Norsk Historisk Kjeldeskriftinstitutt, 1941), 657.}

\textit{Audun þordi ei ath lata sia sig og var j kirkiuskoti og ættladi þaa ath ganga fyrir konung er hann geingi til aptantíða.}\footnote{‘Auðunn resolved not to give in and was in the wing of the church and intended then to go before the king when he went to evensong,’ Guðbrandur Vigfússon and C.R. Unger, eds. \textit{Flateyjarbok: En Samling af norske Konge-Sager med indskudte mindre Fortællinger om Begivenheder i og udenfor Norge samt Annexer} (Part 3) (Christiana: P.T. Mallings, 1868), 413.}
There appears to be no room for ambiguity in either case, particularly since the bishop in *Rauðulfs þáttr* is specifically mentioned to have been singing. As the compound is made up of two commonplace elements, and since it is also found in two late texts, it is possible that the word was coined independently of the OE term. The existence of the phrase *vesper tyd* in MLG means that the Norse term could equally have been a loan translation from that language.\(^{557}\) The fact that both instances of the word in Norse are in the plural might also indicate that Latin was first and foremost in the mind of the Norse scribes, since the word was almost invariably used in the plural when applied to the office of Vespers (as opposed to ‘evening’ more generally).\(^{558}\) In OE *ǣfentid* appears to be used largely in the singular, and translated the phrase *hora vespertina*, ‘evening hour’, rather than the noun *vesper(is)*.\(^{559}\) The ON word, then, may have originally been modelled on English usage, but any clue that this was definitely the case could have been obscured by interference from Latinate usage.

*Aptansŋgr*, which similarly refers to vespers, is a better candidate for having been a loan translation from OE *ǣfensang*. The qualifying elements *ǣfen-* and *aptann-*, while not cognate, are at least synonymous, and the compound has no parallel in other Gmc. languages.\(^{560}\) *Nåttŋgr* is somewhat more difficult to ascribe to purely English influence given the existence of the equivalent term *nachtsank* in MLG.\(^{561}\) In the ONP, *nåttŋgr* appears twice in the IHB from c.1200, but is not recorded again until the late thirteenth century, with most citations occurring in the fourteenth and fifteenth. It is possible that this reflects two stages of influence, with early

\(^{557}\) See the examples in MNDWB, *vesper*. The continental Germanic languages used the Latin term.

\(^{558}\) DMLBS, *vesper*, 4.

\(^{559}\) See the examples in the DOE, *ǣfen-tid*, b.

\(^{560}\) See the etymological discussion under OED, *even* [unrevised]. Thors notes the parallel between *aptansŋgr* and *ǣfensang*, KTFS, 268-69, 272; see also: Lilli Gjerløw, ‘Vesper’, KLN M, 667.

\(^{561}\) MNDWB, *nacht-, nach-, nassank*. 
remnants of English influence in the early period and MLG in the later Middle Ages, though of course it is equally possible that the word simply did not appear in any of our surviving texts from the intervening period.

Contrary to Taranger’s wishes, only some of the names for the canonical hours can categorically be said to be English. The terms are absolutely a product of the international nature of the church, combining the influences of Latin and WGmc. terminology, and are further evidence that we cannot always reduce influence down to one particular source language.

2.3.6 - Church service

*antefna*, f.; *antiföna*, f. - *antefn*, m., f. (‘antiphon’)

*Antefna* is attested eleven times in the ONP, with six examples of *antefna* and five of *antiföna*, and many cite the former version of the word as an English loan.562 *Antiföna* is almost certainly a borrowing from the Latin *antiphona*, which it matches both in terms of phonology and gender. *Antefna* is a good fit for having been a loan of OE *antefn*, and it has been cautiously argued that the existence of epenthetic forms spelled *antemno*, *antempna*, and *antemnv* supports this, demonstrating the development of OE *antefn* ≈ *anten* (resulting ultimately in PDE *anthem*).563 The importation of Christian musical tradition would have been important for conducting services (Jón Ógmundarson is said to have imported an instructor in music)564, as we saw in

---

562 LAW, 52; AEWB, *antiföna*; VEWA, *antefna*; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 63.
Chapter 1, there is significant manuscript evidence that the early church in Scandinavia had knowledge of ‘the liturgical services, music, and hymns of England.’

*kantiki*, m. - *cantic*, m. (‘canticle’)

The words in both languages are ultimately derived from Latin *canticum*, ‘song’, n., and only Fischer and Holthausen ascribe the Norse word a specifically English origin. In the ONP the word is not recorded until the early fourteenth century, where it took on the usual meaning of a song ‘som brugtes ved den kirkelige Gudstjeneste.’ A direct loan from Latin is possible, though we would have to account for a change in gender from neuter to masculine. Given that the Anglo-Saxon church appeared to have had some influence on the development of liturgical and musical practice, it is possible that *kantiki* was modelled on the English word, though the late attestation makes this less likely.

*kredda*, f. - *crēda*, m. (‘creed’)

In comparison to the relatively commonplace nature of this word in OE texts, the Norse word appears only three times in the ONP, all of which are attested in *Færeyinga saga*, which survives in the late fourteenth-century Flateyjarbók, but is thought to have been first composed at the

---


566 Lewis and Short, *canticum*; LAW, 52; VEWA, *kantiki*.

567 ONP, *kantiki*; OGNS, *kantiki*. ‘…that was used in church worship.’
beginning of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{568} Fischer, de Vries, and Buse suggest that it is English in origin.\textsuperscript{569} In \textit{Færeyinga saga} the word is used in an episode where the young Sigmundr Leifsson recounts to his mother Þóra what he has been taught about the Christian faith by his foster father Þrándr í Gótu. However, while he recites the \textit{pater noster} well enough to impress Þóra, the version of the creed he speaks is somewhat unorthodox, being instead a vernacular ‘going out prayer’.\textsuperscript{570} The ON word as recorded in the saga was treated to a short but thorough study by Peter Foote in 1969 which offers a solid foundation for the discussion to follow. He suggested that the geminate -\textit{dd}- probably marked the word out as a diminutive form referring to a ‘little, ordinary, homely’ creed in the vernacular which might have been recited in the morning before the day starts (hence ‘going out’).\textsuperscript{571} Foote concludes that Þrándr’s justification for his unusual creed, whereby he claims that ‘Kristr átti tólf lærisveina eða fleiri ok kunni sína kreddu hverr þeira’,\textsuperscript{572} is intended as a humorous representation of a ‘tolerant society’ where deviations from orthodoxy are not necessarily met with outrage, but gentle correction (Þóra pointedly uses the Latinate \textit{credó} in her response).\textsuperscript{573}

While it is certain that \textit{kredda} is ultimately derived from Latin \textit{crēdo}, ‘I believe’ (that being the first word in the Nicene Creed), it was loaned early into the WGmc. languages and an OE origin is therefore possible.\textsuperscript{574} The discrepancy in gender counts against the idea, though it may


\textsuperscript{569} LAW, 53; AEWB, \textit{kredda}; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 114.

\textsuperscript{570} Þrándr í Gótu, \textit{Kredda}, 802. ‘Gangat ek einn út; fjórir mér fylgja fimmi goðs englar. Berk bœn fyr mér, bœn fyr Kristi; syng ek salma sjau; goð séi hluta minn.’ (‘I don’t go out alone; four or five angels escort me. I say a prayer for myself, and for Christ; I chant seven psalms; may God guard my lot’).


\textsuperscript{572} ‘Christ had twelf apostles or more and each knew their own \textit{kredda},’ \textit{ÍF} XXV, 116.

\textsuperscript{573} Foote, “Þrándr and the Apostles,” 132; 138-39.

\textsuperscript{574} Ibid, 132.
be that Norse speakers heard OE masculine *crēda* in the nominative case and placed it in the weak feminine category by phonological analogy rather than with attention to abstract gender (which would have yielded *kreddi*). It could equally be the case, however, that the word was based on the Latin.

What we can say for certain is that the word was probably borrowed early, since, as an important profession of belief, the ability to recite the creed would have been a priority for new converts to Christianity.Ælfric notes the church requirement that that ‘ælc man sceal cunnan his paternoster and his credan,’ for example. As such the creed would undoubtedly have been one of the earliest pieces of literate material to reach the ears of lay Norse speakers, and therefore probably the one most open to changes or reimagining, as Brándr’s own example demonstrates. This all assumes, however, that newly Christianised Scandinavians would have been instructed by clergy with adequate training, and as the story of Sigmundr’s tuition suggests, there is no guarantee that someone would necessarily have instruction from a priest in the first place, let alone a well-educated one. Since the incident in Færeyinga saga is probably more representative of the religious reality of early thirteenth-century Iceland — by that point having undergone some two hundred years of Christianisation — we can only suppose that the conversion period of the tenth and eleventh centuries represented a time where religious education of the Norse-speaking peoples was even more problematic. As argued in Chapter 1, the vernacular was probably heavily relied upon by missionaries and their newly trained priests

---


during the period in which the institutional aspects of the church were still being developed, and this may have allowed a form such as kredda to take root among the newly converted populace. The word was probably influenced by both Latin and OE usage.

\textit{liksōngr - līcs} (‘funeral song, dirge’)

\textit{lofsōngr - lofsang} (‘hymn’)

\textit{messusōngr - massesang} (‘service of mass’)

A few scholars posit \textit{liksōngr}, meaning ‘a funeral dirge’, as a loan, though it is not without problems.\footnote{NCG, 36; LAW, 7.} OE \textit{līcsang} (with an identical meaning) occurs only eight times in the DOE corpus, and seven of these are in the glosses to Aldhelm’s \textit{Die laude virginitatis}, where it translates \textit{epichedion}, ‘funeral ode’, and \textit{tragoedia luctus}, ‘lament’.\footnote{Louis Goosens, \textit{The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm’s De Laudibus Virginitatis) edited with an introduction, notes and indexes} (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1974), 210, 370. The other DOE example is from Ælfric’s life of St Æthelthryth.} The ON word occurs first in AM 677 4to from the mid-1100s and does not reappear until the middle of the thirteenth century.\footnote{ONP, \textit{liksōngr}.} There is little either contextually or linguistically that might help to decide upon a connection or not, and we cannot entirely discount independent coinage, though it would, in my opinion, seem like too much of a coincidence.\footnote{One imagines that Norse speakers could easily have come up with an alternative like *dauðasōngr instead.} The thin attestation of the word in OE need not be a problem, especially given that there is compelling evidence for English words recorded only in glosses ending up in ON (see section \textit{bersynðugr} in 2.3.13 and \textit{hálsbók} in 2.3.15 for example).
**Lofsøngr** and **lofsang** are general terms for a hymn, a fact that is neatly illustrated by two examples from OE and Norse where the word co-occurs with its Latinate equivalent: [praise] ‘með ymnum oc lofsongum’/‘on ymnum 7 lofsangum’.\(^{581}\) The word occurs 233 and 52 times in the DOE corpus and ONP respectively, with the Norse word first appearing in the *Elucidarius* from the late 1100s, and has been posited as an English loan.\(^{582}\) Alongside the compounds mentioned in the previous paragraph, it is a reasonable candidate for having been a loan translation from the OE, and its semantic transparency — a ‘praise-song’ — makes it an attractive candidate for having been loaned during the conversion period.\(^{583}\) As we saw in 1.4, the English church seems to have been a big influence on early Scandinavian church music, though we should be sensitive to the possibility of polygenesis given the existence of other similar WGmc. forms such as OS *lofsang*.\(^{584}\) Slightly more problematic is *messusøngr*, which Cleasby-Vigfússon defines as ‘chanting the Mass’, though it appears also to have been used to refer to the service itself; here it accords with the OE word in meaning, but is only attested from the start of the fourteenth century, making it a less likely candidate to have come from English.\(^{585}\)

---


\(^{582}\) LAW, 7; KTFS, 254.

\(^{583}\) Dance notes the form *lofsong* in the Lambeth Homilies, which he suggests may show influence from ON *løft* in the qualifying element, “*Tomarzan hit is awene*: Words derived from Old Norse in four Lambeth Homilies,” *Foreign Influences on Medieval English*, edited by Jacek Fisiak and Magdalena Bator (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2011), 102. This strikes me as plausible, though I would posit as an alternative the theory that the *<t>* might represent an epenthetic intrusion in the English.

\(^{584}\) KTFS, 254.

\(^{585}\) See the ONP entry for *messusøngr*. 
Several scholars favour English as the source language for *messa*, while the ÍOB instead favours an OS origin and de Vries’ MLG. The primary problem with a specifically English origin is the quality of the root vowel, which is unique among the Germanic and Romance languages.

There are furthermore a number of examples of the OE variant *messe*, notably in the Peterborough Chronicle, and this was a common form throughout the ME period, almost certainly as a result of OF influence. Other WGmc. forms pose problems as well, as OS *missa* and OFris./MLG *missee* replicate the quality of the stem vowel of Latin *missa* (though OHG has forms with both <e> and <i>). This perhaps makes it more likely that the form was borrowed from Romance dialects like OF which favour <e>.

A lot is dependent on precisely when the word was loaned, since if it was early then a-umlaut might well have resulted in *missa > messa*. The word appears in two eleventh-century verses — Sigvatr Þórðarson’s *Erfidrápa* for St. Óláf and Oddr kíkinaskáld’s poem about Magnús Óláfsson — both in the sense of ‘feast’ rather than the ceremony of mass. We have already

---

586 LAW, 53; VEWA, *messa*; IEWB, *messa*; ÍOB, *messa*; AEWB, *messa* 1; Thors is ultimately uncertain as to the origin, KTFS, 246-8; Torp and Vikor suggest Latin was the direct source language for the ON word, *Hovuddrag i Norsk Språkhistorie*, 272. For ODan, Gammeltoft and Holeck favour an OE origin, “*Gemstín* and other Old English Pearls,” 148. Buse points to English for historical reasons, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 169.

587 See: OED, *mass* 1 [2000]. It is suggested that Vulgar Latin messe may have first entered a dialect (such as Kentish) which fronted /æ/ to /e/, and then was reversed by an analogy when it entered dialects that retained /æ/.


589 For a full list of forms, see: OED, *mass* 1.

590 See the etymological information in the OED entry; AN/OF *messe*.


noted Sigvatr’s use of Christian terminology in his compositions, not to mention his links with England, though there is nothing about the form or use of the word by either poet which might give us an inkling as to a source language. I am therefore inclined to place messa alongside numerous other words which were likely loaned very early, and from multiple sources.

2.3.7 - Texts

guðspjall / guðspell, n. - godspell, n. (‘Gospel’)  

OE godspell originally translated the Latin bona adnuntiatio or bonus nuntius, both meaning ‘good message’, which were in turn translations of the Greek εὐαγγέλιον. The OED notes, however, that the original OE god spell later came to be interpreted as god spell, ‘God’s story’. All previous scholars agree that the ON word was unequivocally loaned from OE. There is one important thing to add that perhaps bolsters this consensus however, and that is the existence of the form guðspell, which is attested four times in the ONP at the turn of the thirteenth century. In three of these occurrences it appears as guðspjað, twice in part of the Benedictine Rule (NRA 81 A) and once in an early version of Óláfs saga helga (DG 8). In the fourth instance it is found as guðspill in a homily preserved in AM 677 4°.

While guðspjall is a straightforward loan translation of godspell combining the cognate lexemes guð, ‘God’, and spjall, ‘speech, tale’, the forms with <æ> might be more reflective of

---

593 See the etymological information in the OED entry for gospel for more information [unrevised].
594 Kahle, Die altnordische Sprach im Dienste des Christentums, 369; LAW, 24; NCG, 35; IEWB, guðspjall; IOB, guðspjall, † guðspell; VEWA, guðspjall; Seip, Norsk Språkhistorie til omkring 1370, 210; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 104; Gammeltoft and Holck, “Gemstøn and other Old English Pearls,” 151.
English pronunciation. Given that NRA 81 B contains a missal fragment (Mi 1) which cleaves very closely to the textual ‘Winchester standards’ of Æthelwold’s tenth-century school, there may be good reason to suppose English influences on NRA 81 A.

*bók f. - bōc f. (‘book’)

handbók f. - handbōc f. (‘hand-book, manual’)
kirkjubók f. - cyricebōc f. (‘church-book’)
sǫngbók f. - sangbōc f. (‘hymn/song-book’)

One of the most important lexical items for a newly literate Christian culture is ‘book’, and sure enough words incorporating Norse bók have been suggested as loans from English by many scholars. Bók itself is almost certainly a native term in Norse, having been derived from PGmc. *bōk-, which according to Jóhannesson originally meant ‘tafeln aus buchenholz, worauf runen geschrieben wurden.’ Jóhannesson and Hellberg also suggest that the Norse word was influenced by English bōc, which according to the DOE had a large array of specific meanings, most of which are adequately served by the modern English book. I am inclined to agree with Jóhannesson in asserting that the English exercised some sort of semantic pressure on the native

595 About which Lilli Gjerlow wrote: ‘it is quite possible that the sacramentary underlying Mi 1 represents the sacramentary in use at Old Minster in St. Æthelwold’s Winchester, and also before him. It may have been the sacramentary read to King Æthelstan and his foster-son, the princeling Håkon, son of King Haraldr Finehair of Norway, who later in life, as king of heathen Norway, felt so ill at ease at the horse-flesh sacrifice of his subjects’ Adoratio Crucis. The Regularis Concordia and the Decreta Lanfranci. Manuscript Studies in the Early Medieval Church of Norway, 50.
596 ‘…boards of wood on which runes were written,’ IEWB, bók; EDPG, bōc-. For more information on the prehistory of the word, see the extended discussion in the OED, book [2004] and Green, Language and History in the Early Germanic World, 259-62.
597 DOE, bōc, 1.; Hellberg, “Kring tillkomsten av Glælognskrifa,” 35.
Norse term, though the use of the word in OS and OFris. with precisely the same meaning and phonology (bók) indicates that several simultaneous avenues of influence are possible.\footnote{598 OED, book.}

\textit{Handbók, kirkjubók, and sýngbók} are all suggested by Carr.\footnote{599 NCG, 35 and 37.} The first of these appears in an early thirteenth-century translation of Alcuin’s \textit{De virtutibus et vitiis}, though the overwhelming majority of its attestations in the ONP (eighteen of twenty-two) are from various fourteenth-century documents from the \textit{Diplomatarium Islandicum} (and one from the \textit{Diplomatarium Norvegicum}).\footnote{600 ONP, handbók.} Given the late distribution of attestations it might be more appropriate to view it as a borrowing from MLG \textit{hantbók}, though there may have been two waves of influence, first from English and then from Low German. We also cannot discount the idea that the earliest attestation is a calque of Latin \textit{manuale} given that the work in question was a translation from that language, which according to the OED was also ‘partly’ the case for the OE term.\footnote{601 OED, handbook [2013].}

Carr is the only scholar who has mentioned \textit{kirkjubók} as a possible loan, though even he admits it may have been ‘an independent formation in Norse.’\footnote{602 NCG, 35.} It is clear why it is not more widely posited. In OE the word apparently meant ‘service book’, though it is mentioned only once in the entire corpus and the modern term, \textit{church book}, does not appear to gain widespread currency until the sixteenth century.\footnote{603 OED, church book [2011]. Its attestation in OE is from a homily attributed to Wulfstan of York, \textit{Be mistlican gelimpan}: ‘…to æghwylicre neode man hæfð on cyricbocum mæssan gesette,’ (‘…for one has set masses in church-books for every need’) Napier, \textit{Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit}, 171.} In Norse the word appears four times in the ONP, all of which are late fourteenth- or fifteenth-century attestations: in one document from 1371 it
appears to have the meaning of a church deed, though in a set of statutes from the same century it does seem to mean ‘service book’.\textsuperscript{604} and there may be influence from MLG \textit{kerkenbôk}.\textsuperscript{605} The limited number of examples, however, raises the prospect that we are not actually dealing with a borrowing at all, and perhaps demonstrates how poor lexicographical decision making can impact word studies by treating general compounds as special technical terms with specific referents. Where we have a compound consisting of two common words in genetically similar languages, it is exceptionally difficult to decide on the direction of influence or even if there is any influence to begin with, and this is further obscured by the fact that a word like \textit{kirkjubôk} is such a general term that it could conceivably apply to any number of items: service books, preaching manuals, homiletic collections, psalters, and so on. For this reason I would suggest that \textit{kirkjubôk} cannot be confidently ascribed loanword status.

Both Carr and Jóhannesson suggest that \textit{sǫngbôk}, ‘hymn/song book’, was based upon English usage, though again this word is only attested very late on in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and largely in church inventories.\textsuperscript{606} As with \textit{kirkjubôk} and \textit{handbôk} there is a possibility that it was loaned from MLG or that it was coined independently.\textsuperscript{607} There is, however, one additional piece of useful contextual evidence from an OE source, which Buse also identified, that may give credence to the idea that \textit{sǫngbôk} and some of the other Norse terms containing the word \textit{bôk} originated with the Anglo-Saxon church.\textsuperscript{608} In his \textit{Letter to Bishop Wulfsige}, Ælfric writes about the texts a ‘mæsse-prêost’ is expected to know and have access to:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{604} ONP, \textit{kirkjubôk}.
\item \textsuperscript{605} MNDWB, \textit{kerkenbôk}.
\item \textsuperscript{606} ONP, \textit{sǫngbôk}.
\item \textsuperscript{607} MNDWB, \textit{sankbôk}.
\item \textsuperscript{608} Though Buse only uses it as evidence for \textit{saltère, pistolbûc} and \textit{massebûc}, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 11.
\end{itemize}
Hē [the mæsøreost] sceal habban ēac þæ wēpna tō þām gāstlicum weorcæ ærþæn þe hē bēo gehādod, þæt synd þā hālgn bec, saltere, 7 pistol-bōc, gödspell-bōc, 7 mæsse-bōc, sangbōc, 7 hand-bōc, gerīm, 7 pastoralem, penitentiale, 7 rǣding-bōc. Ðās bēc sceal mæsøreost nede habban, 7 hē ne mæg būton bēon.  

It is probably safe to assume that Ælfric’s instructions for which texts a priest should have access to was representative of pedagogical thought at that time in England — i.e. around the turn of the eleventh century. Jonathan Wilcox, writing about this precise passage, suggested that this collection would have been suitable for smaller minster communities 'since resources here would be pooled', and so need not imply that every parish church would have this exact collection.  

As we saw in Chapter 1, Ælfric’s recommendation was written in the period when the Anglo-Saxon church was beginning to take a leading role in the evangelisation of Norse-speaking areas, so the appearance of handbōc and sangbōc — along with saltere, pistol, gödspell, gerīm, rǣding, mæsøreost — may give a good indication of what newly trained missionaries and priests would have been expected to know and what their newly founded churches should have kept, and therefore goes some way towards supporting the idea that OE was the source language for these two words.

---

609 'He must have also those weapons for that holy work before he is consecrated, that is those holy books, a psalter, and book of epistles, a gospel-book, and mass-book, a song-book, and a manual, a computus, and pastoral-book, a penitential, and a reading-book. A mass-priest must have these books by necessity, and he must not be without them,' D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C.N.L. Brooke, Councils and Synods with other documents relating to the English Church, Part I A.D. 871-1204 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 206-7.

610 Jonathan Wilcox, ‘Ælfric in Dorset and the landscape of pastoral care,’ 58.
pistill, pistuli, epistuli, m. - pistol, epistol, epistola, m. (‘letter, epistle’)

pistlabók, f. - pistolbóc, f. (‘book of epistles’)

Latin epistola (< Gr. ἐπιστολή) was loaned into most Germanic languages. In both English and Norse we find strong and weak variations (with the strong predominating in both languages), as well as some instances retaining the initial vowel (at least graphemically). Fischer categorised pistill/pistuli as one of his ‘Englisch-Lateinisch’ borrowings, while others have pointed to English explicitly over the Latin. Pistuli is the earlier of the Norse forms, with the first citation in the ONP falling in 1200 (in the IHB); pistill, on the other hand, is not recorded until the beginning of the fourteenth century.

It is by no means clear that English can be considered the source language with any confidence. Buse suggests the aphetic form of the Norse word points to English over most other Germanic forms, though on the other hand there are few instances of the weak form of the word in OE (and in the DOE corpus at least, all four of these examples are in forms retaining the initial vowel). The word-initial cluster <ep> is rare in Norse anyway (as in OE), being largely limited to i-mutated epli and derivative compounds, so apheresis of the unstressed vowel could be expected regardless. Since Latin epistola was feminine, however, the influence of a Germanic form is quite likely, particularly given that missionaries would have expounded the

---

611 DMLBS, epistola; see the various forms in the OED, epistle [2014].
612 LAW, 54; Höfler, “Altnordische Lehnnwortstudien I”, 263; IEWB, pistill; ÍOB, pistill.
613 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 213.
614 On such syncopation at the start of words, see: Noreen, Altnordische Grammatik I, 135. The existence of epistol(a) in OE and epistuli in Norse can probably be ascribed to influence of Latin orthography rather than reflecting phonological reality. The DOE corpus has 12 examples of epistol(a) (discounting the Latin examples) and the ONP only three of epistuli (all of which are post-1350).
New Testament epistles at some point in their endeavours. Whether we can point to English specifically is another matter, however, and I would instead favour a polygenetic origin for the loan in Norse.

In OE, *pistolbōc*, ‘a book containing the Epistles’, occurs only twice in the DOE corpus, once in Ælfric’s letter to Wulfþe in which he lists the works a priest should have in his spiritual armoury. Ælfric would undoubtedly have had the Latin *epistolarius* in mind when constructing this list, and given his relationship with the vernacular it is entirely unsurprising that we should find the word in his work; whether the noun phrase was fully lexified in everyday OE as a compound is another question, though I would suggest it probably was. What cannot be sustained however is the idea that the Scandinavian word is a borrowing of the English. The ONP shows that the compound does not appear until the late fifteenth century in Norse texts, and only seven times in total. It is consequently much more likely that the word was independently coined, or alternatively calqued from the Latin.

*ræðingr*, m. - *ræðing*, f. (‘reading’)

Many scholars point to *ræðingr* as an English loanword, though it is thinly attested in the ONP. It is first found in a fragment of a translation of the Benedictine Rule (NRA 81 B) from around the turn of the thirteenth century, with a few other attestations mostly postdating 1300. Despite

---

615 Gjerlow, for example, has examined two lectionary fragments written in Anglo-Saxon which found their way to Scandinavia, and were probably produced in the tenth and eleventh centuries respectively; both contain lessons on the gospels and epistles, see: “Fragments of a lectionary in Anglo-Saxon script found in Oslo,” *Nordisk Tidskrift für Bok- och Biblioteskväsen* 44 (1957): 109-22.
the consensus, the switch in gender between the two languages is somewhat puzzling, since ON could, as Buse notes, have quite easily accommodated a feminine noun with the ending -ing (compare the synonym lesning, the substantive form of the verb lesa). It is possible that the change might have been due to a desire to avoid confusion with the related native derivation räðning, ‘an interpretation, explanation; rebuke’, though this is speculative. Overall, ræðingr is very probably a loan from English, though its history is somewhat unclear.

(p)salnr, m. - (p)sealm/(p)salm, m. (‘psalm’)

The Latin word psalmus (< Greek ψαλμός), ‘psalm, hymn’ made its way into many western and north European languages, and as such tracing any definite route of borrowing is complex. Most prefer English as the source language, while Jóhannesson does not settle on one particular source language. In Norse it appears in Þrándr í Gótu’s eleventh-century Kvedda, where he says ‘syng ek salma sjau.’ As we saw above, Ælfric makes clear that priests should have access to a psalter, and psalms were an integral part of Christian worship. They probably rank among the most memorable Christian texts that laypersons would encounter during worship, so it is unsurprising that Þrándr had learnt seven of them.

---

619 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 235.
620 From the verb ræða, ‘to advise; to command’, which is ultimately cognate with OE rædan, ‘to read’.
621 LAW, 54; VEWA, salm-r, IOB, sálmur; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 242; IEWB, psalm.
If the word was modelled on English pronunciation we would perhaps expect to find something approximating the breaking of OE /æ/ → /æɑ/, possibly *sjálmt.\footnote{The word psalm must also have been a very early adoption in OE since it exhibits breaking. This assumes an earlier form of *selm rather than salm, the phoneme in the Latin word being /a/, James Clackson and Geoffrey Horrocks, The Blackwell History of the Latin Language (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 273.} Norse-speakers may well have drawn an equivalent between broken /æɑ/ and native /a(ː)/, so any spelling could have been adjusted accordingly.\footnote{See, for example, bearn - barn, mealm - málmr, hearm - harmr etc.} Buse assert OE must be the source on the basis that the ON word lacks an initial <p>, though scribal spelling appears to be variable in both languages, and such aphesis would probably have occurred in ON independently regardless of the source language.\footnote{Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 211; Noreen, Altnordische Grammatik I, 211.} The simplest explanation may well be the most appealing in this instance, however, in which case the Latin word was probably the primary influence on the written form of the Norse, though once again some degree of polygenesis cannot be completely discounted.

\textit{saltari, m./n. \\& salteri, m./n. - saltere, m. (‘psalter’)}

Both the OE and ON words are ultimately derived from the classical Latin \textit{psaltērium}, ‘a stringed lute-like instrument’, which was also a recorded meaning in OE, before being applied to a book containing psalms.\footnote{Lewis and Short, \textit{psaltērium}; OED, \textit{psalter} [2007].} It is consequently general to most western European languages. Holthausen favours OE, Falk and Torp prefer a MLG or direct Latin loan, while Jóhannesson mentions the OE, Latin, and French words without any commitment to a definite source.\footnote{NDEWB, \textit{psaltari}; VEWA, salteri; IEWB, \textit{psaltari, saltari}.} Buse favours English on the basis that the Norse form lacks an initial <p>, though as we saw for \textit{salmr}, this is not conclusive evidence of loaning from that language.\footnote{Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 242; Noreen, Altnordische Grammatik I, 211.}
As with other loans we have encountered, it is likely that multiple layers of borrowing occurred, and this might be reflected in the occasional appearance of a neuter version of the word (accounting for eight out of 91 instances in the ONP). Alongside the neuter Latin word, the MLG salter could be both neuter and masculine in gender. Although OE saltere was strong and ON saltari was weak, the fact that they shared the same grammatical gender might well point to a connection between the two; the -ari ending is common to nouns of the weak masculine declension in Norse and it could be that the English -ere ending was interpreted as weak. The weak masculine form is found earlier than the neuter, appearing twice in Ívarr Ingimundarson’s Sigurðarbálkr from the mid-1100s, where Sigurðr Magnússon is said to have sung the psalter while being tortured. Although the evidence is admittedly quite thin, this does point towards English as having been the source language for the word. The neuter form does not occur until the thirteenth century, so it is possible we have a situation where the word’s gender was destabilised by influence from MLG or Latin, but this was never sustained or widespread enough to cause an absolute shift to neuter.

rim, n. - (ge)rím, n. (‘computus, calendar’)

In Norse rím, ‘computus, calendar’ occurs sporadically from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. In OE it meant ‘a number, computation’, and, as Ælfric’s list of books needful for

---

629 ONP, psaltari m. and n.; psalteri m. and n.
630 MNDWB, salter.
632 IED, rím.
633 For a brief explanation of the term computus in Latin in the Middle Ages, see: Mariken Teeuwen, The Vocabulary of Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 374-75.
all priests to know suggests, probably also a calendar. Cognates appear in Old Irish ríμ, ‘counting, number’, OS rīm, ‘number’, and OHG rīm, ‘series, number’. It is possible that the word was loaned from one of these source languages — and reinforced by contact with the others — with a general sense of ‘number, calculation’ before narrowing to mean only ‘calendar’ by the 1300s. The fact that this definition already existed in OE does, however, lend credence to the idea that the ON word was at least semantically influenced by that language, and its mention alongside other important books in the Ælfric passage quoted above may give indirect support for this proposition.

2.3.8 - Writing (practice)

bökstafr m. - bökstef m. (‘letter of the alphabet’)

ON bökstafr has parallels in OHG buohstab and OS/MLG bökstaf, as well as OE bökstæf; in each of these languages the word referred to ‘a letter of the alphabet’. It is usually assumed that this word denoted a beech stave upon which runic characters could be inscribed, ‘reflecting the theory that BOOK n. ultimately derives from the same base as BEECH n.’ As the OED goes on to point out, however, this is not supported by any extant evidence and the word and its cognates seemingly only ever referred to written Roman letters rather than runes, noting that the Germanic languages had forms equivalent to OE rūnstæf instead. Few scholars have favoured a specifically OE origin for the word, though the OED devotes a short section of its etymological

---

634 ASD, gerīm and rīm.
635 See the forms under: OED, bookstaff [2014].
636 OED, bookstaff.
treatment to arguing for an English origin ‘given the role of Anglo-Saxon missionaries in disseminating manuscript culture in other parts of the Germanic world.’

It is perhaps unsurprising to find that our first attestation of the word in ON is in the *First Grammatical Treatise*, particularly given that work’s compelling (if contested) links with Anglo-Saxon literary culture which we saw in Chapter 1. While I am inclined to side with the OED in its suggestion of *bököstafi* having been an English borrowing, the fact that we have several Germanic compounds, each formed with recognisable cognates and with semantically identical meanings, at least leaves space for the idea that we are dealing with a word with a complex, polygenetic origin.

*prik, n. - prica, m. (*dot*)

This word, meaning ‘a prick or dot in writing’, was suggested as a loan by Fischer. It appears only four times in the ONP corpus in manuscript AM 624 4°, a miscellaneous collection from around the turn of the sixteenth century. This is also true of the related compounds *prika-rím* (‘a computistic table with dots’), *prika-setning* (‘punctuation’), and *prika-staffr* (‘a calendar with points’), each of which appear once. I have not been able to pursue the precise context of

---

637 Fischer is non-committal about OE origins, LAW, 5; Carr favours OE, as well as giving a brief overview of the thinking behind *bököstafi* not being a PGmc. formation, *Nominal Compounds in Germanic*, 12, 34; Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*, 256; etymological dictionaries hedge their bets by providing the various cognates without settling on a particular source: IEWB, *bököstafi* and NDEWB, *bogstav*.
638 Hreinn Benediktsson, ed., *The First Grammatical Treatise*, 244. The OED suggests that the ON word only appears in ‘late sources’, though I doubt scholars would suggest that the FGT was anything other than a twelfth-century work.
639 LAW, 23; also, IEWB, *prik*.
640 ONP, *prik*.
641 See the entries for *prik* in IED and the ONP for definitions and attestations respectively. Note that a related form, *prikstafr*, has a few more attestations and slightly wider distribution.
these words as the manuscript is yet to be digitised, though it seems as though these are the scribe’s own idiomatic coinages. Although *prica* is used with the meaning of ‘point, dot, spot’ in OE, a borrowing from that language is unlikely considering the very late attestation in ON and the difference in gender.\textsuperscript{642} MLG *pricke* might be a better alternative, although this has problems in that the word does not seem to refer specifically to writing.\textsuperscript{643}

*punktr*, m. - *punct*, m. (‘full stop’)

This can mean either ‘point (in time)’ or ‘full stop’ and appears regularly in prose from the beginning of the fourteenth century onwards,\textsuperscript{644} with a single attestation in the 1100s in the *First Grammatical Treatise*. In this first usage it denotes a diacritic marking vowels that are pronounced *i nef* - i.e. with a nasal quality. The related terms *punctum*, n. and *punctus*, m. were used in Latin to denote ‘an instant, moment’,\textsuperscript{645} while the former was used from the thirteenth century onwards to refer to a section of text marked out by *puncta*.\textsuperscript{646} The DMLBS does give a more general definition of a ‘small dot’ or ‘diacritic sign’, again with an apparently late attestation.\textsuperscript{647} In OE it referred to a quarter of an hour or ‘a moment’ and was not fully integrated into the language from Latin (it has no independent entry in Bosworth-Toller, for example).\textsuperscript{648} Only de Vries and Óskarsson have seriously considered that it may be a loan from English.\textsuperscript{649} Buse

\textsuperscript{642} ASD *prica*.
\textsuperscript{643} MNDWB defines *pricke* only as ‘Spitze, Stachel’.
\textsuperscript{644} OGNS, *punktr*.
\textsuperscript{645} Lewis and Short, *punctum*.
\textsuperscript{646} Teeuwen, *The Vocabulary of Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, 320-21.
\textsuperscript{647} DMLBS, *punctum*.
\textsuperscript{648} OED, †*punct* 2 [2007]. The term is later used occasionally to refer to a diacritic in the early modern period.
\textsuperscript{649} ANEW, *punktr* (though De Vries also states ‘oder mnd.’); Veturliði Óskarsson, *Middelnederlæske Låneord i Islandsk*, 172.
suggests there is ‘no evidence’ for the word having come from English, and I am inclined to agree with his assessment.\textsuperscript{650}

Since later Norse attestations from the 1300s almost exclusively mean ‘a point in time, moment’, it is probable that the word was a direct borrowing from Latin rather than English, possibly with Low German influence.\textsuperscript{651} The First Grammarian’s use of \textit{punktr} in reference to punctuation may be an independent coinage based on Latin \textit{punctum}, perhaps reflecting his original reforming of early ON script.

\textit{rita/rita}, vb. - \textit{wrītan}, vb. (‘to write’)

In Turville-Petre’s speculations on the role of English clerics in the tuition of early ON scribes he mentions a few words which ‘appear to be influenced by English usage’: \textit{bökfell} and \textit{stafróf}, but also \textit{rita}, ‘to write’.\textsuperscript{652} This is a very frequent word in the prose corpus and the ONP records 123 citations for strong \textit{rita} and 195 citations for weak \textit{rita}, with the latter conjugation surviving into modern Icelandic. In addition to the English and Norse word, we also find OS \textit{wrītan} and OFris. \textit{wrīta} with similar definitions of ‘to write’ and ‘to score, scratch.’ All the Germanic words, including the ON, are derived from PGmc. \textit{*wrītan-}; the word appears in early runic inscriptions from Scandanvia, clearly being used with the sense ‘to carve runes.’\textsuperscript{653} It is not out of the

\textsuperscript{650} Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 425.
\textsuperscript{651} Though note the neuter gender. See MNDWB, \textit{punct(e)}.
\textsuperscript{652} Turville-Petre, \textit{Origins of Icelandic Literature}, 75.
question that the OE word influenced the use of the ON word, especially since OE is the only
WGmc. language where PGmc. *wrītan- developed a meaning of ‘to write.’ Simply
establishing a straightforward loan is hard enough, but semantic shifts are particularly difficult
to prove; there are, however, a few things worth noting that might hint in that direction.

In early ON texts, ríta/rita was competing with the continental Germanic loan skrifa
(<OS skrīfan, OFris. scrīva, all ultimately < Latin scribere); so, for example, the First
Grammarian uses ríta exclusively in his text, while Ari Þorgílsson tends to use skrifa in
Íslendingabók. This might well be reflective of the competing influences of English and other
WGmc. languages, with the First Grammarian utilising a native ON term based on Anglo-Saxon
practice and Ari cleaving to continental standards. While Ari’s one instance of ríta is entirely
synonymous with skrifa, there does appear to be a semantic distinction in the mid to late twelfth-
century ON translation of Honorius Augustodunensis’ Elucidarius. The translator tends to use
variations of the phrase sem ritat es, ‘as is written’ (for Latin ut dicitur) when citing biblical passages
(in addition to mæla or segja). Skrifa, on the other hand, is used only once to translate substernere,
‘to spread out (as an underlay)’, in a metaphor in which an artist paints a dark background to
make his white and red colouring stand out.

the Carlisle Cathedral runic inscription indicates that ríta could be used in reference to runic script in the twelfth
century. Katherine Holman, Scandinavian Runic Inscriptions in the British Isles: Their Historical Context (Trondheim: Senter
for middelalderstudier, 1996), 69-70. Michael P. Barnes notes that the form of the word ríta in the inscription (arait,

OED, shrieve [unrevised]; DMLBS, scribere.

Ari’s use of ríta comes when he is discussing an English saint: ‘…es Ívarr Ragnarssonr loðbrókar lét drepa
Eadmund enn helga Englakonung; en þat vas sju tegum <vetra> ens niunda hundraðs epir burð krists, at þvi es
ritit es í søgu hans,’ IF I, 4 (…when Ívarr, son of Ragnar loðbrók, had St Edmund, king of the [East] Angles killed;
and that was 870 years after the birth of Christ, as is written in his saga).

For a selection of examples: Evelyn Scherabon Firchow (ed.) The Old Norse Elucidarius. Original Text and English
Translation (Columbia: Camden House, 1992), 8, 36, 80.

Evelyn Scherabon Firchow and Kaaren Grimstad (eds.) Elucidarius in Norse Translation (Reykjavík: Stofnun Árnar
Magnússonar á Íslandi, 1989), 35.
It is likely, then, that the use of one or the other was partly based on local tradition and where educational pressure was coming from: Ari’s tendency to use *skrifa*, for example, might be due to the fact that his tutor Teitr’s father, the illustrious Ísleifr Gizurarson, is supposed to have studied in Herford in northern Germany. Similarly, the First Grammarian's interest in and knowledge of English scribal tradition perhaps explains his own preference for *ríta*. The appearance of a new meaning for native *ríta* could have been a relatively rapid shift, an example of a cultural borrowing of the sort that ‘usually appear abruptly when influential groups use them’ - in this case literate Norse speakers. On the whole, I favour the idea that English influence resulted in a semantic shift of the ON verb from ‘to carve [*runes*]’ to ‘to write’, though I acknowledge that this is ultimately unprovable.

*stafróf*, n. - *stafróf*, *stafræw*, f. (‘alphabet’)

This compound refers to the alphabet, with OE *stafræw* being quite transparently a ‘stave [*letter*] row.’ Fischer and Turville-Petre have suggested *stafróf* was a loan from OE, with Jóhannesson drawing a parallel between ON *róf* and OE *ræw*, both of which he defines as ‘reihe’.

The second element of the ON compound is the most problematic aspect of the connection between the two, however. While the modifying word in both languages is clearly the development of

---

661 ASD, *stafræw*.
662 LAW, 25; Turville-Petre, *The Origins of Old Icelandic Literature*, 75; IEWB, *róf*, *róf*. 
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PGmc. *staba-, the etymology of róf is, to put it mildly, uncertain; indeed, Fritzner’s entry for the word simply points to málróf and stafróf with no definition, while Jóhannesson is the only one, as we have seen, to give a categorical meaning of ‘line/row.’ Alongside Fritzner and Jóhannesson, Magnússon posits some sort of connection or analogy with the terms málróf, ‘big talk’, with the latter further suggesting that the word is ‘eiginl[ega]’ stafróð (róð, ‘row, line’).

There is no easy resolution of this problem, and it is made more complex by the presence of one instance of OE stafróf from the English-Latin gloss in MS. Cotton Cleopatra A.III (where it glosses elimentum). There is a simplex róf in OE, but it is a poetic adjective meaning, ‘valiant, strong’, so there can be no connection to stafróf. The Ruin contains the compound secgróf, which Bosworth-Toller suggests is ‘a host of men’ (or perhaps ‘battle-line’ if we assume róf means ‘row’ here), though Anne L. Klinck opts for ‘brave with the sword.’ The precise etymology of róf/róf is likely to remain obscure, though some general meaning of ‘row’ or ‘collection’ is probable. A relationship between the OE and ON is likely, but the exact nature of any connection is unclear.

---

663 EDPG, *staba-.
664 It’s not entirely clear what is meant by this, though presumably it indicates that the ‘natural’ ON form would have been stafróð.
665 Cited from example from DOE corpus search for stafróf, DOE gloss number 2208.
666 ASD, róf.
2.3.9 - Writing (material culture)

blek n. - blæc n. (‘ink’)

blekhorn n. ‘inkhorn’ - blæchorn m. (‘inkhorn’)

Blek, ‘ink’, is recorded in Norse prose from the thirteenth century in a number of texts, with the earliest probably being the *Strengleikar* where it translates French *enke*. Several suggest an English origin while Höfler posits either English or Frisian. The OED also favours English origins for the Icelandic word, and suggests that the rare word *bleck* might be a re-borrowing from Norse. Continental Germanic reflexes of the word include OS and MLG *blak*, so the mid-front vowel of English *blæc* may make that language a more likely source. The DOE notes that there are only eight occurrences in OE, which are largely confined to glosses, though there is one interesting example of the word in the Canons of Edgar where we find the instruction: ‘…and we lærað þæt hi to ælcon sinoðe habban ælce geare becc and reaf to godcundre þenunge, and blæc and bocefel to heora gerædnessum.’ As E.S. Olszewska once noted, the collocation ‘blek ok bökfell’ also occurs in the late texts *Guðmundar saga byskups*, *Gibbons saga* and the translation of *Strengleikar*; while this is no doubt due to the fact that these two terms are both practically and semantically linked (as in *Strengleikar*’s original ‘enke et parchemin’), the

---

668 See the entries under: ONP, *blek*.
670 See the etymological information under: OED, *black* [2011].
671 Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 79.
672 ‘…and we advise that they have at each council each year books and vestments for religious service, and ink and vellum for their purpose,’ Roger Fowler (ed.), *Wulfstan’s Canons of Edgar* (Oxford: Early English Text Society, 1972), 2.
673 See the examples under: ONP, *blek*.
combination of English loans (see bókfell, below) is striking.\(^{674}\) Both words were of course borrowed to describe unfamiliar accoutrements of literate culture, but the possibility that they were often linked in a restricted (not to mention alliterative) context might have contributed to their retention.\(^{675}\) Blek may represent an early loan in the contact between the two languages, probably originating at the very earliest stages of manuscript writing by Norse speakers, perhaps as early as the eleventh century.\(^{676}\)

It is more problematic to ascribe an English origin to the word blekhorn, which occurs twice in a single obscure OE text and three times in Norse, each time in a version of Mariu saga.\(^{677}\) This may indicate that the relatively common MLG blackhorn was the source, with Norse speakers replacing the elements of the compound with native equivalents.\(^{678}\) One would also assume that the term for a container for ink would naturally accompany a loan for the ink itself; however, so English is not entirely out of the question as a source despite its light attestation.

\[\text{bókfell(i)} \text{ n. - böcfel n. (vellum')}\]

Carr suggests that the ON compound was ‘probably borrowed’ from OE.\(^{679}\) Such caution should also be applied to the relationship between the ON and OE terms: the ONP attests bókfell(i) late in the thirteenth century meaning that it could have been an independent formation (it does not appear in other WGmc. languages). As noted above, however, the fact that the term

\(^{675}\) On alliterative loans, albeit in a poetic context, see: Turville-Petre, The Alliterative Revival, 84-87.
\(^{676}\) This is the opinion of Magnus Rindal: “The history of Old Nordic manuscripts II: Old Norwegian,” 802.
\(^{677}\) ONP, blekhorn.
\(^{678}\) MNDWB, blackhorn.
\(^{679}\) NCG, 34.
is collocated with *blek* in Norse perhaps supports the idea that these two words would have been loaned as a pair.

### 2.3.10 - Learning

*skóli*, m. - *scola*, *scōl*, f. (‘school’)

The Norse word for ‘school’ is attested late in the ONP, appearing first towards the end of the thirteenth century. While we can be certain that the word is a loan, it is difficult to identify its exact source, with Óskarsson noting that ‘der er betydelige forskelle i de etymologiske ordbøger med hensyn til sandsynlige mellemsprog.’

Most suggest an English origin, while Jóhannesson hedges his bets and offers both MLG and OHG *scuola* in addition to the OE form, and Seip prefers MLG. Fischer categorises it as one of his ‘Englisch-Lateinische’ loans. All are ultimately derived from the Latin *schōla*. By way of further uncertainty, all these forms of the word are feminine rather than masculine as it is in Norse.

As with many other words presented here, we are reliant on educated guesswork rather than textual evidence. Since we are working on the safe assumption that there must have been education of varying degrees of formality since the Christianisation of Norse speaking peoples

---

680 ‘There are significant differences in the etymological dictionaries with respect to the likely source language,’ Óskarsson, *Middelnedertyske Låneord i Íslandsk*, 138.
682 IEWB, *skōli*.
684 LAW, 54.
began in earnest, it is likely that the word was adopted relatively early. Jóhannesson probably gets closest to the actual process of borrowing even though his presentation of several related cognates may seem to be a fudge on first approach. We may be dealing with a situation similar to that suggested for many of the Latinate words we examined in previous sections: namely that this is an example of a polygenetic loan. It is possible to imagine a situation in which OE scöl, Latin schōla, and later MLG schôle were all loaned into the language at different points in time and in different areas, though the exact development is of course clouded by the late attestation. Öskarsson suggests that the word’s masculine gender in the Scandinavian languages points to Middle Dutch as the most likely source of influence, though he admits that this is ‘usandsynligt af historiske grund.’ My own (speculative) suggestion is that it could have been modelled on the oblique cases of the Latin word, which as a first declension noun is characterised by -a- in its inflectional series, rather than with slavish adherence to abstract grammatical gender. The important point to emphasise, however, is that the word was probably an early addition to Norse, perhaps being loaned as soon as the first informal schooling of Norse-speakers began in Scandinavia or elsewhere.

undirstanda, vb. - undirstandan, vb. (‘to understand’)

Gammeltoft and Holck select this word as a loan into ODan. from OE, though other word studies have tended to overlook it in the context of ON. I have included it here as it is relevant

---

686 In its entry for school, the OED notes that OS skola meant ‘a band’ or ‘host’ rather than a school.
687 ‘…unlikely for historical reasons,’ Öskarsson, Middelnedertyske Låneord i Islandsk Diplomprog, 138.
688 Poplack et al. note that languages deal with gender assignment of borrowing in different ways. French, for example, tends to use ‘analogical gender’ as a guide, while Spanish relies on phonological shape”; the latter model is what I would suggest here. “The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation,” 47-101.
to both the issue of language contact and (potentially) the communication of new ideas like Christianity and literate culture. The OED states that the Icelandic lexeme is simply ‘a foreign word’, while Cleasby-Vigfússon points to either OE or MLG as a source and Óskarsson simply notes that it is usually identified as an English loan. For ODan., Gammeltoft and Holck point to OE as the likely source language. Liberman and Mitchell offer the most thorough synopsis of research on the development of the word in English, though despite the prodigious efforts of historical linguists over the past century, it remains obscure.

The word is recorded 120 times in the ONP, mostly from the early fourteenth century onwards, though if we accept an early dating for the original composition of Kristni saga, then the date of first attestation can be pushed back to (at least) around the mid-1200s. The moment it is used is significant since it occurs when Þorvaldr Koðránsson brings the bishop he met on his travels to ‘Saxland’, a certain Friðrekr, to preach in the North Fjords:

Svá er sagt er þeir byskup ok Þorvaldr fóru um Norðlendingafjórdung, ok talaði Þorvaldr trú fyrir mónum því at byskup undirstóð þá eigi norrœnu. En Þorvaldr flutti djárfliga Guðs erendi, en flestir menn vikusk lítt undir af orðum þeira.

---

689 IED, undirstaða.
690 OED, understand [unrevised]; IED, undirstaða; Óskarsson, Middelnedertyske Låneord i Islandsk, 185.
691 Gammeltoft and Holck, "Gemstén and other Old English Pearls," 148.
693 See Siân Gronli’s introduction to her translation for a summary of the dating of the saga, Islendingabók - Kristni Saga, xxxii–xxxiii.
694 ‘So it is said that Þorvaldr and the bishop travelled around the North fjords, and Þorvaldr preached the faith for the people because the bishop did not understand Norse. And Þorvaldr delivered God’s message boldly, and many men were little moved because of those words,’ ÍF XV, 6.
This scene seems to indicate that the author of the saga did not view thirteenth-century Icelandic and Low German as mutually intelligible by the time he was writing. Certainly the context of the scene — a Saxon bishop collected from his home in northern Germany to preach in a Norse-speaking land — strongly suggests that we should consider a loan translation of MLG *understân* as the source word.

One other factor in favour of an English origin is that the word was used almost exclusively in that language with a general sense of ‘to understand’, while in MLG it could also mean ‘to be under (subordinate to) something’ or ‘to prevent or hinder something’ and competed with *vorstân*. The vast majority of twelfth- and thirteenth-century texts cited in the ONP, however, use the native Norse term *skilja* exclusively, though there is only one example that I have been able to find with the sense ‘to understand [a language].’ Since one of the main features of missionary and teaching work is surely a significant amount of time devoted to clarifying whether or not something is understood, it is likely that early Norse-speaking Christians were exposed to WGmc. variants of *understan*. It might be that this word took on a specialised meaning of understanding when referring exclusively to language contact, though it is difficult to state this with much confidence since it relies on an absence of evidence in the 1100s and one piece of evidence from the 1200s. I am inclined to agree with Gammeltoft and Holck’s

---


696 Hall also draws attention to the use of *undirstanda* in *Laurentius saga*, ibid, 17, though apparently in support of Low German influence.

697 ASD, *understandan*.

698 ‘unter etwas treten’ and ‘um etwas zu hindern, hemmen’ in Schiller and Lüben, *understân*. In modern High German *unterstehen* has similar meanings. *Vorstân* was also loaned as *fyrirstanda* in Norse, though it was used infrequently, CV, *fyrir-standen*; ONP, s.v. *fyrirstanda*; Hall, “Jón the Fleming: Low German in thirteenth-century Norway and fourteenth-century Iceland,” 17.

699 *Bartholomeuss saga postula* (c.1220), where it is said of God: ‘Alt sér hann oc alt veit hann fyrer. oc kan alla tvör mela oc scilia’, ONP, *skilja*. 
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assessment that the word in Scandinavian languages was loaned from OE, however, especially since, in contrast to the other WGmc. forms, the meaning in both languages is consistently ‘to understand.’

2.3.11 - Initiation

_biskupa_, v. - _ge_bisceopian_, v. (‘to confirm’)

The term _biskupa_ is one of the few words that I believe can be unequivocally ascribed English loan status. In both languages the verb is used with a meaning of ‘to confirm, administer the sacrament of Confirmation’, and it is unattested in other Germanic languages. It is does, however, occur only three times in OE sources (albeit in a number of different manuscripts), namely in two of Ælfric of Eynsham’s letters and an OE version of Theodulf of Orléans’ _Capitula_ (translating Latin _confirmare_). There is one instance of the word _ge_bisceopian, for which the OED affords a separate entry, though it has exactly the same meaning. The word was also used during the Middle English period, and sporadically down to the eighteenth century.

---

700 Taranger, _Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske_, 341; LAW, 52. Bernhard Kahle mentions no link with English, _Die alltnordische Sprach im Dienste des Christentums_ (Berlin: Mayer and Mayer, 1890), 367; VEWA, _biskupa_. Carl-Gustaf Andréén links the word to OE _biscoep_ [sic] but does not connect it to the verb, “Konfirmation,” KLN 8, 690.
702 DOE, _biscoep_, ‘3 occ. (in multiple MSS)’.
703 See the examples given in the DOE entry.
705 OED, _bishop_, v.1 [unrevised].
The word is attested early in an ON context, first in the NHB in the sermon *In dedicatione ecclesie* from the turn of the thirteenth century (but almost certainly copied from an earlier version).\(^{706}\) The context suggests that the word was the preferred verb for describing administering the rite of confirmation in the immediate aftermath of the conversion period, with the synonymous *ferma* not being attested until the beginning of the fourteenth century.\(^{707}\) The exact context of the first attestation obviously stresses the importance of the rite and the centrality of the bishop to performing the ceremony:

\[\text{Þér æiguð at föra born yður til ściarnar ok til byscups at byscupa. þa hafa born criðtindom ſín fullan beðe αf preft ok byscupe. ok þa ero þau forð til handa guði ok ero buin til himin-rikil eﬁ þau halda criðtín dom ſín ðiðan.}^{708}\]

Given the importance of the so-called missionary bishops as recounted in histories and the sagas, it is perhaps not surprising that the English word was the one that was loaned. Andrén suggested that the word was formed because only the bishop was allowed to give that particular sacrament, and there is no cause to disagree with this reasoning.\(^{709}\) We might also speculate that the use of the word also gained traction because it was the public function that laypersons were likely to see a bishop performing most frequently, particularly in a conversion context when adults would also have needed to undergo rites like confirmation which would otherwise have been performed earlier.

---

\(^{706}\) As with the other texts in the collection, Indrebro, *Gamal Norsk Homiliebok*, 39.

\(^{707}\) OGN, *ferma*. Taranger and Fischer both suggest this is based on MLG usage, though it is ultimately from Latin (con)firmare: *Den Angelaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, 341; LAW, 58.

\(^{708}\) ‘You should take your children to be baptised and to the bishop to be confirmed, then the child has full Christendom [i.e. been admitted fully into Christianity], both from the priest and bishop, and then they are taken to the hands of God and are prepared for the kingdom of heaven if they stay true to Christianity afterwards,’ Indrebro (ed.), *Gamal Norsk Homiliebok*, 100-101.

\(^{709}\) Andrén, “Konfirmation”, KLN 8, 690.
The relation between the verbs *kristna* and *cristnian* is another long-established convention. The DOE defines the word as ‘to perform the antebaptismal rite (incl. catechesis); this rite preceded, sometimes by years, the sacrament of baptism’ and ‘to perform the antebaptismal and baptismal rites.’ The semantic development of the word has been well documented by van Eck, who argues that by late OE it had simply come to mean ‘to baptise.’ In Norse the main sense was ‘to Christianise’, though Cleasby-Vigfússon note that in the sagas the meaning tends to more specifically mean ‘to christen, baptise.’ Åke Sandholm suggests that in both OE and ON it had a meaning of ‘to Christianise’ and ‘to catechise’, but that in Norse it more generally meant ‘göra till kristen.’ In support of the latter statement, he cites a few examples from Óláfs saga *Tryggvasonar* which seem to have a sense of ‘to convert’, as well as certain provisions in Frostaþingslög.

It is debatable whether such a distinction between ‘to Christianise’ and ‘to catechise’ can be drawn, as one must surely imply the other. Let us turn to the use of the word in its earliest contexts, all dating from around the turn of the thirteenth century:

> En þa helgað nafn han. ef heöpner mex criðnale.  

---

710 LAW, 53; Seip, *Norsk Språkhistorie til omkring 1370*, 209; ÍOB, kristinn; KTFS, 190; VEWA, kristna; AEWB, kristna; on the -n stem in this and other Anglo-Scandinavian verbs, see Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, 15 n.1. Thors notes the existence of metathetic forms in OFris. kerstna, MLG kerstenen (KTFS 190).

711 DOE, cristnian.


713 IED, kristna; also ‘gjøre til kristinn’, OGNS, kristna.


716 And let his name be sanctified, when heathen men kristnask,’ de Leeuw van Weenen, *The Icelandic Homily Book*, fol. 13v.
En á Englande toc hann á guð at trva. ok í borg þæirri er Róm hæitur. þar let hann criðna sic. Nu þegar hann var þvegin hinni hælgu ðkírn. Þa gerðiðc hann allr annar maðr.\textsuperscript{717}

Á hans dögum snorosk margir menn til kristni af vinsældóm hans, en sumir hofnuðu blótum, þótt eigi kristnaðisk.\textsuperscript{718}

In the first example from the IHB, the instruction that God’s name is sanctified when heathen men are kristnask can be taken to simply mean converted rather than to accept the antebaptismal rite specifically, though again, one would seem to imply the other. The example from the Norwegian Homily Book may in fact imply a distinction between becoming a Christian in principle (toc han á guð at trva) and undergoing specific initiation rites (let hann criðna sic); on the other hand, are we to understand that kristna here encompasses baptism too given the following statement (nu þegar hann var þvegin hinni hælgu ðkírn)? I would argue that the sense is diffuse enough in these examples to suggest the word might originally have encompassed anything from informal acceptance of the faith to baptism.

Our final example from Ágrip is again ambiguous, though catechism or baptism might be implied for those who snorask til kristni in comparison to those who simply tolerated the new religion. Again, however, if Óláfr Haraldsson could be thought to become a believer before undergoing either rite, then perhaps Sandholm’s definition does indeed hold water. Later examples in the ONP demonstrate that skíra was used synonymously with kristna in variant manuscripts of Ágrip, however, and we should also bear in mind that the law-codes of both Norway and Iceland were particularly keen that baptism be administered as soon as reasonably

\textsuperscript{717} ‘And in England he accepted god with faith and in that city called Rome, he læta kristna himself. When he was washed in the holy baptism, then he became a different man,’ Indrebo, \textit{Gammel Norsk Homiliebok}, 109.

\textsuperscript{718} ‘In his days many men converted to Christianity due to his popularity, but some stopped their sacrifices, though they did not kristnaðisk,’ ÍF XXIX, 8.
possible after a birth. Much like the English term, *krístna* would seem to imply both ‘to baptise’ and ‘to administer the antebaptismal rite’ in earlier Norse texts, and I think we can be confident of a connection between the two languages.\(^7\)

\[\text{signa, vb. - segrian, vb. (‘to bless’)}\]

\[\text{prímsigna, vb. - prímsegnen, vb. [ME] (‘to administer the antebaptismal rite’)}\]

In both Norse and OE, *signa/segian* are ultimately derived from Latin *signare*, with the specific meaning ‘to make the sign of the cross on or over.’\(^8\) Only Magnússon suggests that the Norse word might have arrived via OE *segian* (or OS *segno*).\(^9\) *Prímsigna* is mentioned far more frequently as a loan from ME, though there is reason to be doubtful about this.\(^10\) Thors offers a full definition of the word, in which it is aligned with the antebaptismal rite:

\[\text{Innan en person, vuxen eller barn, döptes, skulle prästen göra korstecken över honom, läsa exorcismformeln och lägga salt i hans mun. Detta kalledes primum signum. Först därefter fick dopet förrättas.}\]

\[^7\] It is possible that ME was also the source language: the MED and ONP show several examples of the phrase *lete kristmen/láta kristna*, though only from the thirteenth century onwards. This parallel is intriguing but not (necessarily) evidence of influence in either direction.

\[^8\] The word of course has a number of other meanings, DMLBS, *signare*, 2.

\[^9\] ŠOB, *signa*.

\[^10\] ANEW, *prímsigna* (under *prim*); ŠOB, †*prímsigna*; IEWB, *prímsigna*, mentions both ME and OF. Joseph H. Lynch is - as far as I am aware - alone in suggesting that *prímsigna* was loaned into English from ON, *Christianizing Kinship: Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 62.

\[^23\] ‘Before a person, whether an adult or child, was baptised, the priest would make the sign of the cross over them, read the formula for exorcism and put salt in their mouth. This was called *primum signum*. Only then could baptism be permitted,’ KTFS, 187; see also the OED definition, ‘To mark with the sign of the cross before baptism; to make (a person) a Christian convert’, *prime-sign* [2007].
He goes on to suggest that this act was performed on pagan Scandinavians during the Viking Age. Åke Sandholm gives an account of the word in the sagas, demonstrating that it appears to be used in reference to an initiatory rite that conferred certain advantages on Northmen who were not ready to take the larger step of baptism. He did not, however, devote much treatment to the loan status of *prīmsigna*, focusing instead on the French origins of the word.

The OED notes that the verb (which was only first recorded in Norse, ME and AN/OF during the course of the twelfth century) was probably derived from an unattested *primum signare*, ‘to mark first.’ The first example in the ONP from *Plácīdus saga* (in parallel with the Latin) confirms its initiatory connotations: ‘toc han þa oc prīmsignaðe…æfter skirninni. Óc skirði.’ (‘accipiens catecizauit eos; et exponens eis mysterium fidei, baptizauit eos in nomine sancte trinitatis’). This section is found in AM 655 IX 4to from around 1150, thought to have been produced in Trondheim, and displaying heavy Anglo-Saxon influences on the script, where it is clearly being used to translate *catechizare*. The English word itself is likely to have been borrowed from AN *primseinger*, so we cannot be certain that the Norse word was not received from that language instead (or additionally). Given the close contacts between the Anglo-Norman church and Scandinavia in the century or so after the Conquest, such a distinction

---

724 KTFS, 187-88.
727 Molland believes the phrase must have existed in an oral context, “Prīmsigning”, 440.
729 Ibid, lx.
might be moot however; instead we should perhaps see the word as reflective of that decidedly multilingual institution, and therefore not specifically of English or French extraction.

### 2.3.12 - Spiritual relations

**guðsíðjar**, f. - **godsibb**, m. (‘sponsorship; spiritual relation [OE])

- **guðdóttir**, f. - **godohtor**, f. (‘goddaughter’)
- **guðfaðir**, m. - **godséder**, m. (‘godfather’)
- **guðmóðir**, f. - **gadmóðor**, f. (‘godmother’)
- **guðsonr**, m. - **godsumu**, m. (‘godson’)

**guðsífr**, m. - **godsibb**, m. (‘spiritual relation’)

**guðsífja**, f. - **godsibb**, m. (‘spiritual relation’)

In Norse, the term **guðsíf** almost always occurs in the plural as **guðsífrjar**, meaning ‘sponsorship’ or ‘aandeligt Slægtskab.’

The relationship in question refers to the bond formed between a child and their sponsors at baptism or confirmation, or as a catechumen; in Latin this connection was known as *cognatio spiritualis.* In the Middle Ages, godparents were required to ‘vitner om at dåp var utført på rett måte, dessuten skulle de understøtte kirkens arbeide med å

---


oppdra barnet i kristen tro’, and it was therefore an important spiritual role to undertake. In the context of WGmc. languages, English was the originator of these terms. So while OHG, for example, does have instances of gotsip and gefatero (from OE influence), its regular terms for spiritual relations were toto (godfather), gota/tota (godmother), fillol/funtivillol (godson), and gotele (goddaughter). Taranger presented a convincing case that OE was the source for each of the terms referring specifically to the sponsor or their charges, and most have backed his assessment of OE influence for these compounds. The one exception appears to be guðsonr, which is only attested late in ON, and seemingly without referring to a spiritual relation.

The link between godsibb and guðsífi/guðsífja also seems straightforward, and like the words referring to the participants in a spiritual relationship, both are formed from cognates (PGmc. *guda- and *sebjō-). There are a couple of semantic points worth clarifying, however, though they do not drastically interfere with the idea of a connection between the OE and ON words. In OE, godsibb was the gender neutral term (in a non-grammatical sense) for a godparent. In ON, guðsífi and guðsífja are apparently gender-specific, with the second element deriving from sif, ‘affinity, connection by marriage,’ though neither were widespread. Indeed, we have serious reason to doubt the existence of the masculine form. There is only one instance of it in the ONP,

---

732 ‘…ensure that baptism was conducted correctly, and [to] support the church’s work to raise the child in the Christian faith,’ Helge Fehn, “Dåp,” KLM 3, 415; see also Lynch, Christianizing Kinship, 169-73, for more general information on the responsibilities of sponsors.
733 For their formulation in that language, see: Lynch, Christianizing Kinship, 87-90.
734 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 329-30. Frings also notes that some dialects of Flemish retain reflexes of godmúðor and godfíder, Germania Romana, 140.
735 Ibid, 330.
736 NCG, 35; NDEWB, gud; IEWB guðdötir (etc); Maurer, Über Altnordische Kirchenverfassung und Eherecht, 434-44.
737 See the ONP entry for guðsonr. Taranger mentions that it is not to be found in dictionaries, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 329.
739 IED, sif.
in the translation of the *Elucidarius*. Responding to the disciple’s question on marriage, the master includes a prohibition in his reply:

…en með guðsíjum er hivskapr bannaðr þvi at þat er andleg samtenging ok er o[-]maklegt at hverfa fra andlego ok til likamlega lýta.740

Here Firchow translates *guðsíjum* as ‘godfathers’, but a brief consultation of Honorius’s Latin original shows that this translates ‘commatres et filiolae’ — that is, godmothers and goddaughters.741 It seems that this instance is in fact the dative plural of the feminine form *guðsífi*, for which we have four examples, all of which are used in the context of forbidding men from having sexual relationships with their spiritual relations.742 Taranger’s categorisation of *guðsífi* as an alternative for ‘godson’ cannot be sustained.743

There is one further comment to make on the relationship between OE *godsibb* and ON *guðsíf*. In Cleasby-Vigfússon we find an independent lemma for the feminine plural *guðsíjar*, which is defined as ‘sponsorship’; the ONP, on the other hand, prefers singular *guðsíf*, though every example appears in the plural. Either way, the idea that *guðsíf* was a loan translation of the English term is not entirely convincing, as *godsibb* always referred to a sponsor rather than the concept of religious kinship (though simplex *sibb* could refer to a general relationship).744

740 ‘…but marriage with spiritual relations is banned because it is a spiritual connection and it is improper to turn from the spiritual and stoop to the carnal,’ Firchow, *The Old Norse Elucidarius*, 67.
741 DMLBS, *commatrina* and *filiola*; see Firchow and Grimstad, eds., *Elucidarius in Old Norse Translation*, 106, for the Latin original alongside the ON.
742 See the examples in ONP, *guðsífi*, f. Three of these are in law codes.
744 DOE, *god-sibb*; BT, *sib*. 
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OE compound *godsibbrāđen* (lit. ‘godparent-condition’) seemingly fulfilled the role of the abstract translation of *cognatio spiritualis*, but appearing only once in the DOE corpus.\footnote{DOE, god-sibb and godsibbr-rāđen. The simplex sibb did mean ‘relationship’, see: ASD, sib.}

Taranger noted that occurrences of *gudsif* and related words are largely found in the major Norwegian law-codes, and this is particularly true of sections forbidding marriage and sexual relations between spiritual relations.\footnote{Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, 329.} He drew a parallel with a section from the so-called *Northumbrian Priests’ Law* which prescribes similar restrictions:

\[\ldots \text{and we forbeodað ... ðæt nan man ne wiðige on neahsibban men ðonne wiðutan þam IIII cneowe; ne nan man on his godsibbe ne wiðige.}\footnote{And we forbid... that no-one may marry no related person within four generations; nor may one marry his spiritual relation,’ Libermann (ed.), *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 384.} \]

The similarity is noteworthy, and Helle is supportive of Taranger’s legal comparisons, noting *godsibb* alongside a number of other supposed English loans that appear in the *Gulatingslok*.\footnote{Helle, *Gulatinget og Gulatingslova*, 182; as noted in Chapter 1, Helle is also supportive of the idea that Norse law was composed in the vernacular because it was influenced by English practice, “The Organisation of the Twelfth-Century Norwegian Church,” 47.}

The relationship between Anglo-Saxon and Norse law is by no means proven, however, and Myking has drawn attention to how difficult it is to demonstrate direct influences between Norse literature and English or Continental sources.\footnote{Myking, *Var Noreg Krisna frå England?*, 105, 130.} The DOE, for example, compares this part of the *Northumbrian Priests’ Law* with part of the ninth-century penitential of Haltigar, bishop of Cambrai, so other directions of influence for the Norse law-codes are certainly possible.\footnote{DOE, godsibb. ‘...si quis commatrem spiritalem duxerit in conjugio, anathema sit’; on Haltigar’s influence in Anglo-Saxon England, see: Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship*, 146 and 164-65. The *Priests’ Law* itself appears to have been based on the Canons of Edgar, as well as various other Anglo-Saxon texts, see: Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, Volume I (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 396-97.}

Lynch has observed that prohibitions against spiritual relations were not a particularly pressing matter...
in Anglo-Saxon England, and eleventh-century concern with forbidding sexual contact between spiritual relations was largely an obsession of Archbishop Wulfstan (assuming his connection with the *Northumbrian Priests’ Law*). That this new-found anxiety coincided with the increasing entanglement of England with the Danish and Norwegian realms is perhaps no coincidence.

One important bit of circumstantial evidence to take into account is the occasional instances of Viking warlords converting to Christianity in the aftermath of defeat, a trend that is recorded relatively early with Haraldr klakk’s baptism with Louis the Pious as sponsor. In the context of Anglo-Scandinavian relations, there is of course a triumphant King Alfred sponsoring Guthrum in the aftermath of the latter's defeat and a number of others besides. During the Viking Age baptism was important in aristocratic circles as a political tool; *gūðfaðir*, for example, features in Hallfreðr vandræðaskáld Ótterrsson’s *Erfidrápa Óláfs Tryggvasonar*, where the skáld mourns his patron’s untimely end:

```
Hefk, þanns hverjum jofri
heipfiðnum varð ríkri
und niðbyrði Norðra
norðr, godlaður orðinn.754
```

---


753 See also the arguments made by Andersson, “The Viking Policy of Ethelred the Unready,” 284-94, and Tveito, “Olav den hellige — misjoner med <jerntunge>,” 339-84, in the context of Æthelred II’s reign. Hadley lists a number of baptisms she believes were integral to converting Scandinavian rulers, *The Northern Danelaw*, 310.

754 ‘I have lost a godfather, who was more powerful than each warlike ruler in the north beneath the kin-burden of Norðr,’ Hallfreðr vandræðaskáld Ótterrsson, *Erfidrápa Óláfs Tryggvasonar*, edited by Kate Heslop in *Poetry from the Kings’ Sagas 1, Part 1*, edited by Diana Whaley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 437. *Niðbyrð* is translated after Whaley’s suggestion, 438.
Hallfreðr is renowned for his reluctant conversion, so the description of Óláfr Tryggvason as his guðfaðir is significant not only as evidence for the early loaning of the word into ON, but also for contemporary evidence of the importance of spiritual relationships to the recently Christianised. Like later court poets, Hallfreðr also demonstrates his comfort at placing decidedly pagan imagery (Norðri, ‘dwarf’) alongside the Christian.

Pons-Sanz has noted that a number of Norse to English loans relating to familial relationships occur in the OE corpus, which perhaps add some credence to the idea that this particular word-field was ripe for appropriation.755 English seems to have been the source language for guðfaðir, guðmóðir, and guðdóttir. The connection between guðsibb and guðsif is less easy to assert given the discrepancy between their respective concrete and abstract natures. Since the simplex sibb and sif referred to concepts of ‘affinity’ or ‘relationship’, a semantic shift in the ON compound might be expected however.

2.3.13 - Qualities

bærsynðugr, adj. - bærsynnig, adj. (‘sinner, publican’)

This compound adjective is only mentioned by Carr in his work on compounds, though he provides no other information.756 In OE the word appears only in the tenth-century glosses to

755 On the other hand, note that most of this article is in fact concerned with words that probably cannot be considered loans, Pons-Sanz, “Friends and Relatives in Need of an Explanation,” 9.
the Northumbrian Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels as a substantive, where it translates Latin *publicanum*.\textsuperscript{757} The DOE offers the definition ‘publican, tax-collector, literally ‘[one who is] openly sinful’, and also ‘in collocations suggesting the barefaced sinfulness of publicans.’\textsuperscript{758} In Norse it is used in a similarly restricted sense in a homily from AM 677 4to (c.1200-25) on the Gospel of Luke 15.1 (as in OE):

\begin{quote}
Berfynndgir men como til Ihm [Jesus] ad hevra orþ hanf.\textsuperscript{759}

Berfynndgir como til lafnara varf oc nóþo þeir male hanf oc óto oc druko með honom.\textsuperscript{760}
\end{quote}

In each instance the ONP indicates that the word is used as a catch-all term to translate the original Latin ‘publicani et peccatores’.\textsuperscript{761} English influence is certainly possible: *bær* and *berr* are cognates, both with a meaning of ‘nude, bare’, but also with a figurative meaning of ‘manifest, open’, as is evident in the compound;\textsuperscript{762} the headwords *synnig* and *synðugr* are also related, being formed from the nouns *syn(n)* and *synð/synð* plus the common adjectival suffix derived from PGerm. *-þga/-aga*.\textsuperscript{763}

\textsuperscript{757} DOE, *bær-synnig*. For examples, see: Walter Skeat (ed.), *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*, synoptically arranged with collations exhibiting all the readings of all the MSS.; together with the early Latin version as contained in the *Lindisfarne MS.*, collated with the Latin version in the *Rushworth MS.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1871-87). For examples in Luke see pages: 79, 153, 175; Matthew: 53, 149, 173; Mark: 19.

\textsuperscript{758} The collocate words that appear in the examples in the DOE entry include *portcwen*, *synfull*, and *ēswīca* (ASD, ‘hypocrite, heathen’).

\textsuperscript{759} ‘Bersynðugr men came to Jesus to hear his words,’ Dorvaldur Bjarnarson (ed.), *Leifur fornra kristinna frœða íslenzkra*, 57; for more information on the manuscript see the introduction to: Jón Helgason (ed.) and Didrik Arup Seip (intro.), *The Arna-Magnæan Manuscript 677,4to*. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1949, 7-41 (particularly 25 for a list of the homiletic contents).

\textsuperscript{760} ‘Bersynðugr [men] came to our redeemer and they listened to his speech and ate and drunk with him,’ ibid, 57.

\textsuperscript{761} ONP, *bersynðugr* — see the notes in the examples. In OE, the tendency is to offer an interpretation of both words, for example: ‘publicanorum et peccatorum’ > ‘bæsynigra 7 synfullra’, Skeat, *The Holy Gospels*, 79 (Luke).

\textsuperscript{762} See: DOE, *bær; berr* and OGNs, *bær*.

\textsuperscript{763} OED, *sin* [unrevised]. The Norse word contains an alveolar fricative that links it to OFris. *sende*, OS *sundea/sundia*, and OHG *sunt(e)a/sund(e)a*. For a brief excursion on the etymology of ON *synð/synð*, see: Walter, *Lexikalisches Lehngut im Altwestnordischen*, 84-87. Walter argues that, contrary to arguments posited by others, there is no evidence for a pre-Christian use of the word in law. Although he believed the Germanic forms with a dental sound were related to English *syn* (p. 88), he was unable to account for it. Von See provides a possible reconstruction of the word in
Given the very similar contexts in which the compound is used in both languages, it seems very likely that the ON word is a loan-translation of the OE. There is a small chance they might have been coined independently: both consist of lexical elements common in both language, and the OE term is used substantively while the Norse term is used consistently as an adjective which usually qualifies *madr*/*menn*. I would argue in this instance that context takes precedence since the word is used narrowly to translate *publicanus* in both languages (with the Norse form incorporating the meaning of *peccator* as well). If English influence is accepted as likely, then there are a few important things on which we can speculate. The fact that *bærsynnig* is restricted to the Anglian dialect may give us a glimpse into otherwise thinly attested communication between the Northumbrian church and Norse speakers, and the nature of such contact is ripe for further consideration. We will return to this matter in Chapter 3.

*godkunnigr, godkynðr, adj. - godcund, godecundlic, adj. (*divine*)*

OE *godcund* is very common, with around 800 occurrences in the DOE corpus. It is formed from the simplex *god* and the adjectival suffix *-cund*, ‘of the nature of, derived from’, which is related to the OE *gecynd*, ‘nature, native constitution’ or ‘the nature of God, Christ, man, the soul’. The OE affix is shared with OHG and OS in precisely the same form, while in Norse the word is related to *kundr*, a masculine noun meaning ‘sohn, verwandter’, or an adjective

---

764 See the examples in the ONP, *bærsyngr*.
765 *Godcundlic*, with the superfluous adjectival suffix *-lic*, occurs only around 75 times.
766 DOE, *-cund; gecynd*, 1.a. and 1.c.; OED, *kind*, n.
meaning ‘abstammend von.’ It is found only in poetic texts, including the ninth-century Ynglingatál by Pjóðólfr ór Hvíni in the compound trollkundr, ‘troll-descended.’ The Norse word kunnigr, however, means ‘known’ or ‘wise, supernatural’, and is probably derived directly from the verb kunna, though Fritzner does point to a relationship with goðkunnigr, as well as kundr and kunnr.

Like bersynigr and some other words we have seen, Carr is the only scholar (to my knowledge) who has identified goðkunnigr as a possible English loan. He stated:

In the opinion of the present writer the German forms and the 12th century Norse goðkunnigr were borrowed from OE. where the compound was coined on the model of others ending in -cund to express the idea, important in the Christian Church, of the divinity of Christ.

His argument that OE was the source language for the continental WGmc. forms is quite persuasive, especially in relation to the OHG form gotchund. On the other hand, his statement that goðkunnigr has to have been loaned from English is a little harder to verify. The three examples in the ONP are all taken from Snorra Edda, where the word is used specifically to refer to Norse gods or supernatural beings:

…ok er þat allt goðkunnig ætt.

767 ANEW, kundr, 1. and 2.
768 Pjóðólfr ór Hvíni, Ynglingatál, edited by Edith Marold, in Poetry from the Kings’ Sagas 1, Part 1, edited by Diana Whaley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 12. For the dating of the poem, see pages 5-6.
769 OGNS, kunnigr, 3.
770 NCG, 11.
771 In short, he notes that early OHG compounds with a modifying element from PGmc. a-stems tend to retain the -a-, with gotchund being a notable exception, ibid, 11-12.
772 ‘…that is all the divine race,’ Snorri Sturluson, Edda: Prologue and Gylfaginning, edited by Anthony Faulkes (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2005), 13.
Hár segir: ‘Tólf eru Æsir guðkunnigr.’

In each instance here, kunnigr seems to mean ‘related to/derived from’ in a similar way to kundr or OE -cund; Cleasby-Vigfússon opts for the definition, ‘a family, being deemed the offspring of the gods.’

Of additional interest is another form found in Ynglingatál, where Þjóðólfr describes how ‘húsþjófr [fire]/ hyrjar leistum/ guðkynning [Ingjaldr]/ í gögnum sté.’ Norse kynning is a feminine noun meaning ‘acquaintance with, knowledge of’, but this sense does not seem to fit with the compound as it is used in this verse; instead, Edith Marold’s suggestion of ‘descendant of gods’ makes far more sense in context. There is no other record of kynning in Norse, either in a compound or as a simplex, which leads Marold to suggest it is derived from godkunnr. OE has four examples of a formally similar word, cynnig, meaning ‘noble, of good family.’ There is unlikely to be a connection between the words.

I disagree, then, with the idea that guðkunnigr is a loan from English; the formal differences and the lack of any Christian connotations in the way in which the Norse word is used seem to confirm this. That said, we find similar problems here as we did with the relationship between fasta and fæsten above: namely, the large variety of forms all ultimately descended from PGmc.

---

773 ‘…and these are god-descended, and second the race of elves, and third the race of dwarfs,’ ibid, 18.
774 ‘Hár says: ‘There are twelve divine Æsir,’ ibid, 21.
775 IED, god, B.I.
776 ‘Housethief stepped with fiery feet through the descendent of the gods,’ Þjóðólfr ór Hvini, Ynglingatál, 44.
777 Ibid, 45.
778 See the examples given in: DOE, cynnig.
*kanna, ‘to know’, and the substantive form *kunþa-, make the precise unpicking of formal and semantic relationships extremely tricky.\textsuperscript{779} It is likely, however, given the common descent of English and Norse, that godcund and godkunnigr developed independently.

\textit{þolinnmóðr}, adj. - ñolemód, adj. (‘patient’)

This compound adjective has occasionally been suggested as an English loan, with Thors giving the most detailed account of the OSw. form of the word, ñolomodh.\textsuperscript{780} The first element is derived from the PGmc. verb *þolenuan, ‘to endure’ (OE ðolian, Norse þola (> þolinn)), and the final element from *móda-, which developed the meaning ‘wrath; moodiness, grief’ in Norse and ‘mind, disposition; courage; pride’ in OE.\textsuperscript{781} In OE it appears as a gloss to Latin longanimis, ‘patient, long-suffering’, in the annotated version of Aldhelm’s \textit{De laude virginitatis} in MS Brussels Royal Library, 1650.\textsuperscript{782}

Thors notes that the OSw. word (and its substantive ñolinnmóð) may have been coined along the same lines as hugmóðr, ‘patience’, as well as the fact that OSw. mop tended to be loaned or modelled upon foreign patterns.\textsuperscript{783} On the Norse word specifically, he states: ‘mycket talar för att detta ord införts till Norden.’\textsuperscript{784} While it is certainly possible that the compound was coined separately, there is good reason to believe that the word was a loan translation of the OE term, and Walter was in complete agreement with Thors in his assessment.\textsuperscript{785} We have seen that

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{779} EDPG, *kunþa-.
\item\textsuperscript{780} Thors, KTFS, 607-9; Stefán Karlsson, \textit{The Icelandic Language}, 32.
\item\textsuperscript{781} IED, móðr, n.; ASD, móð; Orel, *þulénan; *móda.
\item\textsuperscript{782} Goosens, \textit{The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library}, 1650, 235.
\item\textsuperscript{783} KTFS, 608.
\item\textsuperscript{784} ‘many say that this word was introduced to the Nordic region,’ ibid, 608.
\item\textsuperscript{785} Walter, \textit{Lexikalisches Lehngut im Altwestnordischen}, 82.
\end{itemize}
several compounds appear to have been derived from English, and the fact that *polinmôðr* is first found in the context of the IHB is circumstantial evidence of links to that language given the apparent reliance of parts of the compilation on Anglo-Saxon sources.\textsuperscript{786}

2.3.14 - Spiritual figures

*engill*, m. - *engel*, m. (‘angel’)

Greek ἀγγελός, ‘messenger’, was loaned into Latin as *angulus*, which is the form upon which most Germanic equivalents are based. Holthausen and Magnússon assert an English origin for the word, though others are more cautious: Jóhannesson suggests either OE *engel* or OS *engil*, Falk and Torp characteristically give a large number of other Germanic forms, while Fischer places it under his category of ‘Englisch-lateinischi Lehnwörter.’\textsuperscript{787} Stefán Karlsson perhaps deals with the transmission of this word most appropriately when he simply categorises it under ON Christian terms that came from either Latin or another Germanic tongue, an assertion that could be applied to many of the other lexical items examined in this thesis.\textsuperscript{788}

There is nothing by way of contextual or semantic information that might help to elucidate the loan status of *engill*, and formal linguistic criteria are almost as unhelpful. The initial vowel is commonly represented with *<e>* in most of the Germanic languages, but there are a few examples of *<æ>* in OE texts and *<a>* in both OE and continental Germanic languages.

\textsuperscript{786} Hall, “Old Norse-Icelandic Sermons,” 673. For instances of the word in the IHB, see: de Leeuw van Weenen, *The Icelandic Homily Book*, 39r, 44v, 82v, 99r.

\textsuperscript{787} VEWA, *engill*; ÍOB, *engill*; IEWB, *engill*; NDEWB, *engel*; LAW, 52.

\textsuperscript{788} Stefán Karlsson, *The Icelandic Language*, 32.
(presumably simply under the influence of Latin orthography). The (unrevised) etymological information in the OED entry implies that an original loan form of *angil gave rise to the later engel in English. One has to assume that the process of i-mutation is being used to explain the change, with PGmc. *[a] plus a nasal consonant giving rise to [e].

The point at which the word entered Norse is uncertain, though it is recorded in poetry that is supposed to have been composed in the eleventh century, namely in Sigvatr Þórðarson’s Erfidrápa Óláfs helga, Arnórr Þórðarson’s Hrynhenda and Prandr i Gótu’s brief Kredda. The situation in prose texts is not much clearer: engill appears as engell in our earliest Norse manuscript, AM 237 a fol., and is similarly represented with an <e> grapheme in the Old Icelandic Homily Book. It is tempting to look to OE pronunciation or orthographical practice as an explanation for this form, but early Icelandic script regularly used <e> to represent unstressed /e/ (realised as [i]) until the early thirteenth century. Indirect OE influence is not completely out of the question, especially since the orthographic conventions of OIc. were likely developed in the eleventh century with some degree of English guidance. In all likelihood the word had entered Norse dialects some time before even the skaldic verse of the early eleventh

---

789 See the examples given in the DOE, engel, and OED, angel, n. [unrevised].
789 See the examples given in the DOE, engel, and OED, angel, n. [unrevised].
790 OED, angel, stating simply: ‘With Old English engel < angil.’ Other forms with [i] in the second syllable include Gothic aggilis and OHG angil, engil.
791 Lass, Old English, 41 and 64.
793 See: Þorvaldur Bjarnason, Leifur fornra kristinna frøba íslenskr, 166-67, and the numerous examples from the IHB in the entry for engill in the ONP.
795 Hreinn Benediktsson, Early Icelandic Script, 16 and 34-35.
century, but this is of course an argument from negative evidence, and a purely English origin cannot be ascribed with any degree of confidence.

\textit{hafotfæder}, m. - \textit{hēafodfæder}, m. (‘patriarch, father of the church’)

Norse \textit{hafotfædir} appears in some early texts in that language.\textsuperscript{796} A number of scholars have pointed to OE \textit{hēafodfæder} as the source for this compound, and there is next to no evidence for its having had widespread currency.\textsuperscript{797} The DOE gives one example of the word \textit{hafotfæder} in a word list from MS Bodley 730 (from around the beginning of the thirteenth century), where it glosses Latin \textit{patriarcha}.\textsuperscript{798} There are 4,260 individual instances of the simplex \textit{fæder} in the DOE corpus, and not one example features \textit{hēafod} as a qualifying element, whether as part of a compound or noun phrase. The usual word for the church patriarchs in OE was \textit{hēahfæder}, literally ‘high father’, or simply the Latin word \textit{patriarcha} itself. It is unlikely, therefore, that the Norse word was loaned from English, and in fact it is perhaps more likely that the direction of travel was in the other direction (assuming that there is actually any borrowing going on at all).

\textsuperscript{796} The ONP, \textit{hufudaðir}, gives citations from 1200 onwards, with the first few examples from the IHB.
\textsuperscript{797} Taranger, \textit{Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske}, 219; LAW 7; NCG, 35 (citing Fischer); IEB, \textit{hufudaðir}.
\textsuperscript{798} Tony Hunt, “The Old English Vocabularies in MS. Oxford, Bodley 730.” \textit{English Studies} 62 (1981): 207. There does not seem to be anything unusual about the form \textit{hafot}, and the MED has orthographical examples of the word with both stem \textit{<a>} and final \textit{<i>}. See: MED, \textit{hed}, n.1.
Kristr, m. - Crīst, m. (‘Christ’)

kristindóm, m. - crīstendóm, m. (‘Christianity’)

kristinn, adj. - crīsten, adj. (‘Christian’)

kristiligr, adj. - crīstlic, adj. (‘Christian’)

Latin Chrīstus (≤ Greek Χριστός, ‘anointed’) probably represents the most important loanword absorbed by newly Christianised Germanic speakers. No scholar has seriously made the argument that it was borrowed directly from OE, and it is likely that the word first entered the North and West Germanic languages at quite an early date, though whether from East Germanic, Latin or another language is something of a (likely intractable) moot point. The same is true regarding whether Kristr is from OE or not; only Buse, Holthausen and the ÍOB seriously posit English as the source, while Lange favoured OIr.799 We do know, however, that Kristr was appearing in Swedish runic inscriptions from the eleventh century, leading Hellberg to posit it had been loaned by the 900s.800 The word is included here because it formed the basis of a number of other English and Norse lexemes that have been suggested to have a connection. The first of these, kristindóm, meaning ‘the Christian faith’, is one that is fairly unanimously thought to have been loaned from OE, and I will make no attempt to challenge that here.801 The word is inscribed in runic script on the eleventh-century Kuli Stone on Smola in Norway, which was

799 Lange, Studien zur christlichen Dichtung der Nordgermanen 1000-1200, 283; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 145-46; IOB, Kristr; VEWA, Krist-r.
800 Hellberg, “Kring tillkomsten av Gielagskviða,” 36.
801 Taranger, Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske, 406; LAW, 53; NCG, 36; Seip, Norsk Språkhistorie til omkring 1370, 81; KTFS, 24-27.
erected to mark the official establishment of Christianity in that region; scholars differ slightly on the exact dating, but it nevertheless represents early linguistic borrowing.\footnote{The modern consensus is that it was erected in the mid-1030s: Brink, “New Perspectives on the Christianisation of Scandinavia and the Organisation of the Early Church,” 167; Skre, “Missionary Activity in Early Medieval Norway,” 10; Solli, “Fra hedendom til kristendom,” 23-24. Fridtjov Birkeli instead dated the stone to the second half of the tenth century in connection with Hákon inn góði, “The Earliest Missionary Activities from England to Norway,” 32.}

On the basis of this compound, it seems reasonable that \textit{kristinn} was similarly loaned from OE \textit{cristen}. Taranger suggested its presence in the Norse law codes as evidence of English influence, and others have followed suit in ascribing it an origin in OE.\footnote{Taranger, \textit{Den Angellsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske}, 215; LAW, 53; IEWB, kristinn; ANEW, kristinn; \textit{ÍOB}, kristinn; Helle, \textit{Gulatinget og Gulatinglovet}, 182. Kahle points to either OE or MLG, \textit{Die altnordische Sprach im Dienste des Christentums}, 322.} There is every possibility that another WGmc. language acted as the source however, not to mention the fact that it could have been formulated independently by simply affixing the \textit{-inn} adjectival suffix to \textit{kistr}.\footnote{Both Norse \textit{-inn} and English \textit{-en} are derived from PGmc. \textit{*-īnaz}, and one supposes that we cannot discount the idea that the adjective dates from quite early in the contact between speakers of NWGmc. and Christians in the south.} The same is also true of \textit{kristiligr}, which does not appear in Norse until the mid to late thirteenth century.\footnote{Mentioned by Fischer as an OE loan, LAW, 53.}

\textit{postuli, postoli, m. - postol, apostol, m.}

The Germanic variants of apostle are all ultimately derived from Greek \textit{ἀπόστολος}, ‘messenger’, via Latin \textit{apostolus}, ‘apostle; missionary’.\footnote{DMLBS, apostolus; OED, apostle [unrevised]; Feulner, \textit{Die Griechischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen}, 85.} The relationship between the English and Norse words is longstanding, with Fischer categorising it as ‘Englisch-Lateinische’ and others pointing more generally to the OE form \textit{postol}.\footnote{LAW, 54; ANEW, postoli; IEWB, postuli; \textit{ÍOB}, postul; VEWA, postoli; KTFS, 398.} What no commentator has mentioned, however, is the
fact that the aphetic form is exceptionally rare in OE and occurs only in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth gospels; the more Latinate apostol is by far the most preferred form in Anglo-Saxon texts.\textsuperscript{808} We have encountered a few words that only appear in glosses (bersyndugr, hafudfadir, stafrôf), so it is not out of the question that this ‘Northumbrian’ form might have been the primary influence on the Norse.

There are a couple of caveats: first, apheresis may well have occurred in Norse independently, especially if primary stress moved to the second syllable.\textsuperscript{809} Furthermore, in contrast to OE, the word was integrated into the weak masculine declension, though this need not be as problematic as it first appears; stem-final *-ul or *-ol would not have been acceptable for a strong masculine noun in Norse, so accommodation to the weak paradigm serves as a better alternative. Polysyllabic examples ending with -uli/-oli are close to non-existent in Norse however, and are limited to Latin loans such as kapítuli or artíkuli. A definite assertion of English as the source language cannot be sustained, and it is entirely possible that Latin apostolus or an aphetic form like OHG postul could also have provided models.\textsuperscript{810}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{808} ASD, postol; DOE, apostol.
\item \textsuperscript{809} Haugen, \textit{The Scandinavian Languages}, 222-23; Noreen, \textit{Altnordische Grammatik I}, 135.
\item \textsuperscript{810} Indeed, Latin has been favoured by Albert Morey Sturtevant, “Irregularities in the Old Norse Substantive Declensions,” \textit{Scandinavian Studies} 19 (1946): 83-84.
\end{itemize}
Miscellaneous - 2.3.15

*bleza/blessa/bletsa*, v. - *bletsian*, v. (‘to bless’)

The verb *bleza* and its variants has been posited as an English loan by numerous scholars.811 Both Thors and Buse give the reconstructed PGmc. form *blōþisjan*, showing development of the root vowel in English first to /ɔ:/ and then to /e:/ via i-umlaut, then shortening before a consonant cluster.812 Magnússon notes a relationship with both blóð, ‘blood’, and blæða, ‘to bleed,’ and we would certainly expect a native development of *blōþisjan* in ON to end up with /ɔ:/ in the root vowel, with no consequent convergence with /e:/ (then /e/) as in OE.813 It seems very likely, therefore, that *bleza* was loaned from English.

*hálsbók*, f. - *hals-, healsbōc*, f. (‘amulet’)

Taranger suggested that this lexical item may have been a loan from English, and the evidence for this is compelling.814 In ON it occurs largely in laws (seven of nine occurrences in the ONP), and is said by Fritzner to mean a ‘Bog som bæres… at man har den hængende om Halsen.’815 In Cleasby-Vigfússon, however, it is noted that ’the commentators explain it from its being worn round the neck, but no doubt erroneously;’ the entry instead goes on to add that it is ‘derived

---

811 Taranger, *Den Angelsaksiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den Norske*, 337; LAW, 24; IEWB, bleza; KTFS, 290; ÍOB, blessa.
813 ÍOB, blessa; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 81; Noreen, *Altjordische Grammatik I*, 26.
815 ‘…a book which is worn [in such a way] that one has it hanging around the neck,’ Fritzner, hálsbók.
from A.S. *hæls* = salus, qs. *háls-bóc* = healing book, holy book.”816 More recently, in the commentary to their translation of Grágás, Andrew Dennis and his fellow editors note that the word:

…might mean “neck-book” but the etymology is not certain. It is possibly a loan from Old English, which has a word like it, *h(e)alsboc*, used to translate *phylacteria*… where the first element has been associated with *hals* “health, salvation,” *h(e)alsian* “beseech, adjure, exorcise.” In Icelandic it must have covered small books with invocations used for private devotions or amulets or both. They might sometimes have been worn rather than carried.817

For the English compound, Bosworth-Toller gives the definition ‘a book which brings safety, an amulet, a phylactery,’ while the DOE offers ‘phylactery, amulet’, with only one example from a West Saxon translation of the Gospel of St Matthew (though in multiple manuscripts).818

In Norse, the compound is clearly a combination of *háls*, 'neck,' and *bók*, which may have been a misinterpretation of the English *háls*, 'health, salvation’.819 Since this word would have been phonetically identical with Norse *háls*, this could explain why it did not undergo loan translation as *heilsbók*, with the cognate modifier *heilsa*, ‘health’. However, in addition to the monophthongal form *háls-*, we also find the *healsbóc*, ‘neck-book’, in copies of the Old English Gospel of Matthew, where it glosses Latin *phylacterium*:

Omnia vero opera sua faciunt ut videantur ab hominibus dilatant enim phylacteria sua et magnificent fimbras.820

---

816 IED *háls-bók*.
818 ASD, *háls-bóc*; DOE, *heals-boc*.
819 ASD, *háls*.
820 ‘All their works are truly done so that they can be seen by men, they extend their phylacteries and value their hems most highly,’ Matt. 23:5.
This falls during Jesus’s denunciation of the Pharisees and scribes, and the *phylacterium*, while generally meaning ‘charm, amulet’, in this instance means ‘small leather box containing four passages of the Torah, worn by a Jew as reminder to observe the Mosaic Law.’

Given the context of this passage, with Christ railing against perceived insincere and ostentatious shows of faith, I think the idea that the first element of the compound represents *hāls*, ‘salvation’, is unlikely. Since *phylacterium* usually meant an amulet, it is my view that the modifying words was originally intended as *heals* and its monophthongal variant *hals*, ‘neck.’

This sense must be the same in Norse as well, for if we actually look at the context of the word in *Grágás*, we find different variations of a seemingly formulaic construction used when discussing what is suitable to take an oath upon. To take three examples:

- Þeir scolo taca crōs ihönd ser eða boc þa er meire se en háls boc.823
- Hann scal taca bóc ihond ser meire enn háls bóc.824
- Men scolo at boc vina eða þa alla at u[tar] dómi þeirre er heiloh orð ero aritin oc meire en háls bók.825

---

821 ‘All of them do work so that men might see them; they broaden their healsbæc and extend the hems of their garments,’ R.M. Liuzza, *The Old English Version of the Gospels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 47. In the footnote for 23:5 Liuzza gives the forms healsbæc and healsbec from different manuscripts of the text.

822 DMLBS, *phylacterium*, senses 1 and 2.

823 ‘They shall take a cross in their hand or a book that is greater than a háls boc,’ Finsen (ed.), *Grágás*, 76.

824 ‘He shall take a book in his hand [that is] more than a háls bóc,’ ibid, 79.

825 ‘Men shall swear all oaths at the outer court in a book in which holy words are written and greater than a háls bók,’ ibid, 80. Quite apart from the this, the past participle *aritin* is striking in isolation since we would simply expect *ritin* in Old Norse - does this perhaps show influence from OE *awrītan*?
The implication here is clearly that a hálsbók is not suitable for swearing an oath upon and a ‘proper’ book is preferable - meira en hálsbók. The idea that a hálsbók might have been a book that was worn is not, as far as I am aware, supported by any other source, and I am inclined towards the idea that the word refers to an amulet, possibly with some sort of (runic?) inscription, as implied by bók. This need not imply some sort of pre-Christian charm however, and might well be an inscription containing the kind of ‘liturgical formulae’ that were ‘kept as protection against illnesses, accidents, fires or black magic.’

I think there is ultimately evidence enough to suggest that English healsbōc was related to the ON word, though the precise details of this relationship are uncertain.

offra, v. - offrian, v. (‘to offer’)

Latin offerre, meaning (among other things), ‘to present or bestow as gift or sacrifice’, found its way into all the Germanic languages. In both OE and ON it meant ‘to offer’, either in a general sense or more specifically as an oblation. Fischer, Holthausen and Buse were happy to settle on an OE origin for the Norse word, Magnússon simply states that it was ‘ættað úr’ the Latin, but others give multiple possibilities (OS offrōn, MLG offeren) without commitment to a single source language. Thors notes every major WGmc. language other than High German as possibilities. There is very little contextual evidence that can help us narrow this down further, though it is notable that the word does not appear until the mid-thirteenth century (in

---

827 DMLBS, offerre, 5; for the various Germanic forms, see: OED, offer, v. [2004]. Kahle, Die altnorðische Sprach im Dienste des Christentums, 362-63; Frings, Germania Romana, 40.
828 LAW, 54; VEWA, offra; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 193; ÍOB, affur; NDEWB, offer; IEWB, offra.
829 KTFS, 491-92.
Although the Norwegian law codes are often connected with English influences, this late date might also make MLG a more likely source. I would be inclined to suggest a polygenetic origin for this word.

predika, vb. - predician, vb. (‘to preach’)

Latin praedicare had a meaning of ‘to make known, declare’ or ‘to proclaim, preach’, meanings which both OE and ON retained (insofar as they can be separated). Fischer placed the word in his list of ‘English-Lateinisch’ loans, though others have been less convinced of a specifically OE heritage. In addition to the English term, Jóhannesson lists OS predikón, MLG predeken, OHG bredigón as equally possible originators; Magnússon, De Vries and Buse point to OE or Low German, while Höfler settles definitively on the MLG word. There are good reasons to suppose that a language other than English was the source, not least the fact that the word is not attested in Norse sources until the last quarter of the thirteenth century in the ONP. There is also very little evidence for the word in OE, with only two examples of the verb recorded in the DOE corpus by my count. For this reason, I would be inclined to agree with Höfler that the word was from a Low German source instead.

---

830 DMLBS, praedicare.
831 LAW, 54.
832 IEWB, predika, predika; ÍOB, predika; ANEW, predika; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 343; Höfler, “Alt nordische Lehnwortstudien III”, 229.
Both the noun and verb are among the few simplexes that we can confidently ascribe an English origin due to clear-cut phonological criteria, and it has consequently been noted by most philologists looking at borrowings in Norse.\textsuperscript{833} The words are ultimately from PGmc. \*\textit{taikna}-, ‘sign’, but since the diphthong */ai/ developed into [\textepsilon i] in Norse and [\textalpha:] in OE, \textit{täkn} has to have come from OE.\textsuperscript{834} In addition to the monophthongal word we also have the less common \textit{teikn}, which some have seen as a loan itself,\textsuperscript{835} particularly given that it is not recorded until the early fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{836} It is not impossible that everyday spoken Norse did retain a native form with a stem diphthong, though this is of course more difficult to explicate. We might tentatively speculate that an indigenous form existed alongside the loanword and went unrecorded until the later Middle Ages, perhaps due to \textit{täkn} gaining popularity with literate churchmen during the conversion period, but this seems something of a stretch.\textsuperscript{837}

\textit{reglulif}, n. - \textit{reglilti}, n. (‘monastic life’)

Bosworth-Toller defines \textit{reglilti} as ‘a life according to ecclesiastical rules’, and it is attested only seven times in the DOE corpus (six of which occur in the same clause in the Laws of Edgar,

\textsuperscript{833} Noreen, \textit{Altnordische Grammatik I}, 52; LAW, 22; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 273; VEWA, \textit{täkn}; IEWB, \textit{täkn}; IOB, \textit{täkn}.
\textsuperscript{834} EDPG, \*\textit{taikna}-.
\textsuperscript{835} LAW, 22.
\textsuperscript{836} See: ONP, \textit{teikn}.
\textsuperscript{837} Note, for example, that native Norse \textit{beitr} occurs earlier than the OE loan \textit{bátr} (PGmc. \*\textit{hátaz}); LAW, 20.
Æthelred II and Knútr relating to accusations against a ‘folciscne mæsseprēost…, þe regollif næbbe’).\textsuperscript{838} In Norse, it occurs only once, in a translation of a Latin \textit{vita} of Saint Arsenius from ca.1400: ‘þeir menn… hafa heilagt reglulif munklis sidar’ (\textit{iugum sanctum monachorum}).\textsuperscript{839} Only Carr cites this as an English loan, but the light attestation of the compounds in both languages makes this somewhat unlikely, and in Norse especially it appears to be an \textit{ad hoc} creation to gloss \textit{iugum sanctum}.\textsuperscript{840}

\textit{sāl, sāla, f. - sāw[o]l}, f. (‘soul’)

The ultimate etymology of \textit{soul} remains a controversial question to this day, though there is agreement on a reconstructed PGmc. *\textit{saiwalō}\.\textsuperscript{841} Fischer states that the ON word was loaned from English \textit{sāwol}, with Jóhannesson agreeing.\textsuperscript{842} Magnússon simply suggests that it arrived ‘með kristni’.\textsuperscript{843} Ultimately, he settles on the monophthongal OWN form likely being from OE\textsuperscript{844}; the East Norse forms (\textit{sjæl}) may have come instead from OS \textit{síala/seola} or OFris. \textit{siele}. McKinnell et al note that over 150 Swedish rune-stones contain the formula ‘may God help his/her soul’, though some of these eleventh-century carvings contain monophthongal forms.\textsuperscript{845}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{838} ‘A common mass-priest…, who does not hold to regollif,’ Liebermann (ed.), \textit{Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen}, 266.
\item \textsuperscript{839} ‘Those men hold the holy regollif of monkish practice’ [ON]/ ‘Holy yoke of monks’ [Latin], Unger (ed.), \textit{Heilagra Manna Søgur}, 548 (for the Latin see the ONP entry for regollif).
\item \textsuperscript{840} NCG, 36.
\item \textsuperscript{841} See discussion under OED, \textit{soul} [2012] and ÍOB, \textit{sāl}; also EDPG, *\textit{saiwalō}–.
\item \textsuperscript{842} IEWB, \textit{sāl, sāla}; Buse, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 236.
\item \textsuperscript{843} ÍOB, \textit{sāl, sāla}.
\item \textsuperscript{844} Ibid, 454.
\end{itemize}
Both Thors and Haugen acknowledge the sheer variety of forms found in runic inscriptions, with the latter noting that such diversity indicates an exceptionally complex prehistory.  

Research by Eric Segelberg into the form of sál(a) in runic inscriptions points to some quite interesting patterns however. He notes that forms such as sal, saul, sol:

…gå tilbaka på fornengelska såwol, såwl, medan sel, sil etc. komma från fornfrisiska eller medellågryska sēle och utgör formen i Hamburg-Bremen. Slutligen kommer sial från fornsachsiska sia.$^847$

These ‘English’ forms seem to dominate in Norway and Uppland in particular, while the MLG are more common in Denmark.$^848$ Thors was likely correct, then, in his assumption that ‘saul, sol och sal äro fornengelska’ and ‘sial sial’ are OS.$^849$ I am inclined to agree with Segelberg and Thors’ assessments. The variety of different forms — particularly in a runic context — point to quite a diverse borrowing process, perhaps demonstrating our best ‘contemporary’ evidence for what a polygenetic origin for a word might have looked like.
Both the OE and Norse words referred to an act of penance and, by extension, the rite of
confession.850 There are a number of cognate terms in the other Germanic languages, though
only the English and Norse terms have a meaning relating to atonement.851 It is for this semantic
reason that some have assumed that the Norse word is likely to have been influenced by OE,
and there is little reason to doubt this.852 Walter draws the compelling parallel between the ON
phrase ganga til skriptar (whence skripta(r)-ganga) and OE gān tū scrifle (i.e. ‘[to go to] confession’).853
As we have already seen in our discussion under section 2.3.3, there are also parallels between
ME schrift and hosel and ON skriptaðr ok husladr, which perhaps lends further weight to English
influence. There is a discrepancy in gender which is difficult to account for (the related Latin
noun, scriptum, is neuter); I would suggest that this change might be based on analogy with other
Norse words in the lexical field of ‘punishment’ such as hegnd, hirting or refsing.854

850 ASD, scrift; IED, skript, III.
851 OED, scrift [unrevised]; in other Germanic languages (like in Latin scriptum) the term referred only to writing
(see, for example, MNDWB, schrift).
852 LAW, 55; IEWB, skrift, skript; Thors suggests that the word must be connected to the missionary period, KTFS,
222-24; Walter is confident of an OE origin, Lexikalisches Lehnwort im Altwestnordischen, 112-14. Buse, “English Loan
Words in Old Norse,” 257.
853 Walter, Lexikalisches Lehnwort im Altwestnordischen, 115.
854 See Buse on gender analogy, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” 54-55.
Chapter 3: English loanwords in Old Norse

Having completed the study of individual lexical items, I will now address the broader implications of my reassessment and how English borrowings complement the literary-historical narrative described in the first chapter. Although it should be clear by this point that we are dealing with a reduced number of unequivocally English loans, the corpus is arguably richer, more revealing, and, in some ways, more perplexing than previous studies have shown. As the corpus is examined over the course of this chapter, I will seek to address the following questions: what implications do the loans have for our conception of Anglo-Scandinavian language contact in the Viking Age and beyond? What are the significant patterns of borrowing with regards to Christianisation and the dawn of literacy? How does the loanword evidence complement — and complicate — the literary-historical narrative formed in Chapter 1? And finally, where are the next fruitful avenues of research for this material? Before we move on to the substance of the loanwords themselves, I will first propose new categorisations for our loans which seek to take into account both those loanwords which are likely to have been borrowed from English and those from other source languages.

3.1 - Classifying the loanwords

In Chapter 2, I noted that it is exceptionally difficult to say for certain whether a word is loaned from OE or not unless we have cast-iron morphological and phonological criteria. Very few words in our corpus actually provide us with such clear-cut grounds (examples include: reykelsi,
and tákn). Discussing the loaning of ON material in English, Richard Dance has been keen to emphasise that:

Precise classification is less important than the realisation that we are dealing with a scale of likelihoods when it comes to Norse derivations, and that not all can be afforded the same degree of confidence in their attribution. 855

A healthy dose of caution is proper, then, but such an attitude should not be so overwhelming as to prevent any sense of conviction whatsoever. So while good morpho-phonological evidence has been lacking in many cases, I have been able to draw upon both (lexico-)semantic and sociolinguistic analysis in order to assess the origins of our loanwords. 856 Indeed, it is worth defending Taranger’s analysis of language, even if ‘språk-samanlikningane hans er sekundære i hove til det andre materialet han har lagt fram.’ 857 There are problems with his treatment of loans, not least his underestimating the influence of continental WGmc. speakers, 858 but on the whole Taranger’s recourse to literary-historical material is entirely understandable given the opaque nature of much of the available linguistic evidence. I choose to highlight this now, as consideration of contextual evidence is inevitably a significant feature of the reclassification of the loanwords offered below.

The five different categories that I have developed, including the words I have assigned under each of them, are listed below. It is important to emphasise that this is not a straightforward hierarchical order — that is, from the most likely English to least likely, or vice versa. As will

856 For a brief explanation of different typological approaches to loanword classification, see: Fischer, “Lexical borrowing and the history of English: A typology of typologies,” 97-98.
857 ‘…his language comparisons are of secondary importance to the other material which he presented.’ Myking, Var Noreg kristna fra England?, 99.
858 Ibid, 99.
become clear over the course of the chapter, such an organisation would not necessarily do justice to some of the nuances of borrowing and word-formation which are on display, and I have consciously opted for an order which lends itself to a more compelling discursive argument. The rationale behind these groups will be discussed below.

NON-ENGLISH SOURCE LANGUAGE:
aptantíð, byskupsýsla, gödknúinnr, guðsífi, guðsífiða, guðsinnr, kirkjubók, kirkjumóðir, kross, messusóngr, messuvín, miðdagstíð, náttsongr, pistlabók, predika, prík, punktr, reglulíf, undorn

POLYGENETIC LOANWORDS:
abbadís, altari, byskúp, byskupaðómur, byskupaþóll, bjalla, blekhorn, bókstafir, engill, erkiþyskúp, djákn, subjákn, funtr, handbók, kanóki, kantiki, kapellán, kirkja, klauntri, klerkr, kredla, kríisma, kristlijgr, kristinn, Kristur, messa, munkr, mysteri, nón, nunna, obláta, offra, palmasunudagr, pistill, postuli, prestr, prim, prófastr, (p)salmr, rím, sát(a), saltari, signa, prímsigna, skóli, söngbók

ENGLISH SOURCE:
antefn, bleza, byskapa, guðspaþall, imbrudagr, ljóðbyskúp/ljóðyskúp, munklífði, kristna, reykelsi, tákni/tákna, skriði/skrifta, þolímóðrr

PROBABLE ENGLISH SOURCE:
abóti, aptanskongr, blek, bökkell, byskupsríki, gangdagar, guðfóttir, guðsafir, guðmóðir, guðsíf, húsl, húsla, hófuðkirkja, kirkjuganga, kirkjusókn, kristindómur, langafjáðagar, lofsang, messuprestr, óttusóngr, ríta, reðingr, undírstanda
UNCLEAR OE-ON CONNECTION:

bersynðugr, fasta, hvítasunnudagr, hálslók, hófuðafir, liksøngr, skírínórsdagr, stafróf

In categorising our loans, the primacy of the English question for the context of the present thesis is obvious. As we have consistently seen throughout Chapters 1 and 2, however, the conversion and Christianisation of Scandinavia was very much an international effort. It would therefore be remiss to ignore the large number of loans (numbering nearly half our corpus) which clearly have knotted or unclear relationships to other possible source languages. These are the words that I have thus far been labelling ‘polygenetic’, and it is under this particular heading that they are listed. Alongside this large grouping there is the smaller category of OTHER SOURCE LANGUAGE. This group takes into account words which are native ON developments, are loaned from a language other than English, or cannot be safely ascribed to a particular source.

I have developed three different categories for words that are good candidates for being English loanwords. My system is modelled, in part, on the principles devised by Dance for Type A, B, C, and D groupings for ON loans in ME, though his ‘C’ category does not easily translate to a context where ON is the recipient language.\(^859\) I define my own labellings thus: those classed under ENGLISH SOURCE I consider to be near certainties, whether due to clear-cut formal

---

\(^859\) To briefly summarise his groupings: Type A words demonstrate ‘formal comparative evidence’, Type B words are unrecorded in OE but are in ON, and Type D words are uncertain. Type C words are attested in early OE and therefore one has to look for ‘loan or influence’ from ON when considering later OE or ME; given our thin record of ON pre-1100, it would only have limited application in our study, especially since all our poetry and most of our runic inscriptions come after the point of contact with England and the rest of Christian Europe. Words that may diagnostically fit into Dance’s Type C group (such as ríla or sál(n)) are treated under other categories. Dance, “‘Tomar-þan hit is awene’: Words derived from Old Norse in four Lambeth Homilies,” 88-90. Buse developed his own categories of definitely English (A), probably English (B), and English as a possible source, “English Loan Words in Old Norse,” ii-iii.
criteria or persuasive contextual grounds. Loans classed under PROBABLE ENGLISH SOURCE lack morpho-phonological evidence, but may demonstrate other persuasive (historical or semantic) links and seem unlikely to be the result of contact with other languages, Germanic or otherwise.\(^{860}\) Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, I have designated a small number of words labelled UNCLEAR OE-ON CONNECTION. This might be because the words appear at roughly the same time in the written record (with some ON words perhaps even predating the English), or where some formal or semantic connection seems almost certain but the precise nature of the relationship is murky: either way, a connection between the OE and ON words seems almost certain. Within all the abovementioned classifications there is space for nuance, and I make no claims of absolute certainty; there are, for example, words in the POLYGENETIC LOANWORDS category that I think are likely to have had an original English source, but for which evidence is too thin to properly support this. Before getting to grips with the specifically English loans, I will first consider the non-English portion of the corpus.

3.1.1 - NON-ENGLISH SOURCE LANGUAGE

aptantid, byskupsysla, godkunnigr, guðsifi, guðsifja, guðsonr, kirkjubók, kirkjuvǫrðr, kross, messusongr, messuvín, miðdagstíð, náattsongr, pistlabók, predika, prík, punktr, reglulíf, undorn

This small collection of words consists of those that I feel fairly confident were derived from a source other than English, or those for which the evidence is so slight that it is difficult to make any pronouncements about their origins. Some, like kross, predika or punktr, can be ascribed, with

some certainty, to specific languages (in these cases OIr., MLG, and Latin respectively). Others, such as aptantīð, guðsom, kirkjubōk, kirkjusvōrð, miðdagstīð, and reglulīf do have parallels in English, but are either constituted of common elements or appear so infrequently that any firm connection with an external source language cannot be maintained. Goðkunnigr and undorn appear to be native ON words with no clear evidence of semantic interference from OE. Prik is lightly attested and, according to the most up to date information in the ONP, used rather idiosyncratically by just one late writer. There may be an argument for relocating some of these words under other groupings — undorn and prik could conceivably be placed in the polygenetic category for example — but their exclusion is in no small part based on their rarity.

3.1.2 - POLYGENETIC LOANWORDS

abbadís, altari, byskup, byskupdōmr, byskupsóstull, hjalla, blekhorn, bōkstār, engill, erkhyskap, djākn,

subdjākn, funjr, handbōk, kanóki, kāntiki, kapellān, kirkja, klaustr, klerkī, kreddā, krīsma, krīstilīg, krīstīm,

Kristr, messa, munkr, mysteri, nōn, nunna, oblāta, offra, palmasunnudagr, pistill, postuli, prestr, prim, prófāstr,

(p)salmr, rīm, sāl(a), saltari, signa, prīmsigna, skōli, sōngbōk

Polygenetic loans are those which, in the words of D.H. Green, ‘could have been adopted by different languages at different points in time’, not to mention over diverse geographical areas. With the possible exception of sāl(a), polygenetic

---


862 Gammeltoft and Holck, “Gemstēn and other Old English Pearls,” 137. The authors do not use the term polygenesis, but supply a useful chart explaining the process (p. 138).
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words in the present corpus are almost unanimously words designating entirely new ‘objects, institutions or ideas’, or what might be called core Christian vocabulary. These are perhaps the very definition of words which emerge from contact situations which ‘happened offstage’ and whose ‘circumstances can only be hypothesised’.

As I have noted in Chapter 2, previous scholars have actually dealt with this material in a way that suggests a complex loaning process, often by simply noting a number of possible routes of borrowing. A few have confronted the problem head-on: when discussing the origins of ON/OSw. *byskap/biskop*, for example, Thors is understandably pessimistic about assigning a source language, suggesting that ‘man får nöja sig med att fastslå, att vi inte kunna säga något om, varifrån *biskop* lånat,’ not least because ‘de västgermanska formerna i flera fall äro identiska.’ The idea that we are highly unlikely to be able to identify a specific source language is appropriate, though he perhaps overstates a little when he writes that this means we can ‘säga något’ about from where *byskap* was loaned. Hans Schottmann suggests a process whereby ‘different avenues of influence will have run parallel and sometimes crossed’, which gets closer to describing the different linguistic currents better than most. In his article considering a number of loans in OSw. relating to feast days, Stefan Hellberg cuts closest to the heart of the matter when it comes to addressing borrowings with tangled etymological histories: ‘Deras orden var internationell’ — these words were *international*.

---

865 ‘…one must be content to declare that we cannot say anything about where *biskop* is borrowed’ … ‘the West Germanic forms in many cases are identical,’ *Den Kristna Terminologien i Fornsvenska*, 48-49.
866 Schottmann, “Nordic language history and religion/ecclesiastical history II: Christianisation,” 405.
867 “Tysk eller engelsk mission?”, 46. Hellberg is here referring to names for feast days,
Most of the words I have categorised as polygenetic are deeply embedded within the lexicon ofWGmc. speakers as part of a wider north-west European Christian community, ‘denoting basic terms of ecclesiastical life and liturgy which were possibly borrowed in heathen times,’ due to their being ‘general and characteristic of Christian culture.’\textsuperscript{868} Many are not straightforwardly ‘Germanic’, often having ultimate Latin, Greek, or Romance origins that brings them close to the status of \textit{Wanderwörter}.\textsuperscript{869} As mentioned above, this is all evident in the work of previous philologists who have worked on these loans in ON, but it is rarely tackled as head-on as it is by Hellberg (or indeed Green, albeit regarding an earlier period). That is not to say that there are no problems with such an approach; as Durkin cautions:

\begin{quote}
…it is very likely (although rarely demonstrable) that most words show some degree of polygenesis… that they are not coined once and for all, but enter a language on numerous separate occasions.\textsuperscript{870}
\end{quote}

And further:

\begin{quote}
It is often difficult to tell whether we have a case of a single or multiple word histories when a morphologically identical word occurs in several cognate languages.\textsuperscript{871}
\end{quote}

These are, however, some important counter-arguments to the instinct to defer to polygenesis as an analytical panacea for obscure word histories. Since ON is only recorded in written contexts from the twelfth century onwards, the prehistory of many of these lexical items will remain obscure to us. Their commitment to vellum and subsequent standardisation disguises the

\textsuperscript{868} Wollmann, “Early Christian Loan-Words in Old English,” 178.
\textsuperscript{869} Hock and Joseph, \textit{An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics}, 254; Haspelmath, “Lexical borrowing: concepts and issues,” 45.
\textsuperscript{870} \textit{The Oxford Guide to Etymology}, 68.
\textsuperscript{871} Ibid, 72.
multiplicity of forms that may have once existed in spoken language, and we are therefore reliant on evidence filtered to us through the practices of the scribes who wrote and copied them.\textsuperscript{872}

Occasionally we are able to catch a glimpse of what might constitute a polygenetic origin. As we saw in section 2.3.15, runic evidence for \textit{sál(a)} shows a variety of monophthongal and diphthongal forms being used in relatively restricted geographical areas, possibly reflecting the influence of different WGmc. forms. That OWN ended up with a monophthongal form may, however, point to primary English pressure, whether direct or indirect, at least on the scribes who began compiling manuscripts in Norway and Iceland. A similar story might be told of a commonplace word like \textit{prestr}: surely its monophthong points to a language other than English, and therefore we should look to continental WGmc. or Romance forms with \textit{<e>}\textsuperscript{8}? On the other hand, it is morphologically unlike OS \textit{prēstar} or MLG \textit{prēster} (> OSw. \textit{praestar}), which have an extended stem (-\textit{Vr}-). On this basis, it can be argued that OE/ME \textit{pre(o)st} or AN \textit{preste} are indeed the more likely source forms for ON \textit{prestr}. \textit{Kirkja}, another widespread word, has a similar problem in that its form can, with some analogical phoneme replacement, conceivably be reconstructed as any one of OE \textit{cyrice/cirice}, OS \textit{kirika/kerika} and OHG \textit{kirihha}. That a number of these words (including, but not limited to \textit{altari}, \textit{engell}, \textit{messa}, (p)s\textit{lāmr}) seem to have relatively stable forms suggests some degree of regularisation, perhaps implying close-knit communities of ON-speaking clergymen (or even early standardising scriptoria) where regular spoken forms could develop through a process of accommodation.\textsuperscript{873}

\textsuperscript{872} Wescott notes that modern Standard English words may have a ‘plurality’ of ‘dialect antecedents’, “Lexical Polygenesis: Words as Resultants of Multiple Linguistic Pressures,” 87.
\textsuperscript{873} A process that may even have been carried out in England, as Abram has speculated: “Anglo-Saxon Influence in the Old Norwegian Homily Book,” 20-21.
Polygenesis is the most useful concept for categorising these words, though it certainly requires further development. It is vulnerable to charges of being a theoretical equivocation, though I would argue that it is a more elegant way of describing a problem which scholars have often skirted around or seen as intractable (and not without good reason). Labelling a loanword as polygenetic is a useful shorthand for indicating that it is etymologically complex, rather than simply listing a number of possible cognates and leaving the process of the word’s genesis obscure. It also makes explicit that a lexical item is likely the product of multiple points of contact, rather than being the result of one easily reducible instance of adoption from which a word diffuses ever outwards to other speakers. In the case of ON, these words also signal integration into a wider Christian culture; to repeat Hellberg’s words again: ‘Deras orden var internationell.’ This need not only imply competing missionary efforts from England and the continent, since we have seen in Chapter 1 that the Anglo-Saxon church was itself a multilingual environment, accommodating other WGmc. speakers into its structures. Polygenetic words in ON are therefore representative of the common stock of Christian-centred nomenclature across all the WGmc. languages.

It is worth briefly discussing the placing of ábóti and abbadís in this category, as they potentially have some interesting implications about word formation in the context of mission and language contact. I noted in section 2.3.1 that previous scholars have theorised that the forms of these words are a result of folk etymology, particularly the medieval conception of etymology which supposes that the history of a word can ‘reveal’ its meaning; the second syllable

---

of ábóti is therefore modelled on bót, and the final syllable of abbadís on dis.\(^{875}\) As a result of such reinterpretation, the precise source language is impossible to identify with any confidence. I do not necessarily disagree with this theory, though it is not without problems, not least the fact that these are the only two words in our corpus which may demonstrate this particular form of reanalysis. The following observations are therefore speculative. First, and most obviously, we can say that such alterations are a conscious decision on the part of someone, maybe simply as a result of linguistic playfulness on the part of educated clergymen. Second, and more interestingly, they might represent an attempt to convey some underlying sense because of the ‘newness’ of these words; it is perhaps pedagogically useful in a Christianising environment to be able to say that an abbot provides remedy, or an abbess has a certain feminine nobility. These sorts of lexical changes must also be the result of the effort of more than one speaker — quite possibly an ecclesiastical community — and therefore what we might call ‘collaborative’ word formation, a concept that will be of particular use in section 3.1.5.

3.1.3 - ENGLISH SOURCE

antefn, bleza, byskupa, guðspjall imbrudagr, ljöðbyskup/ljöðbyskup, munklíf(i), kristna, reykelsi, tákna/tákn, skrift/skrífta, þolinmóðr

These are loanwords which I am confident are loaned from English. There is, of course, a scale of likelihood even within this group, and this is dependent on the quality of the evidence on

\(^{875}\) Law, 52; ANEW, ábóti; Jóhannesson, abbadís. On etymology, see of course: Isidore of Seville, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, edited and translated by Stephen A. Barney, W.J. Lewis, J.A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof, with the collaboration of Muriel Hall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 54-55.
offer. We first and foremost have to look to formal morpho-phonological evidence, though we have few lexical items that actually demonstrate such proof; it seems that they are limited to antefn, imbrudagr, ljóðhýskupa, reykelsi, and tákn/tákna. It might also be possible to place munklíf(i) in this category due to the fact that líf(i) is being used in a sense that is unusual in the context of ON (as argued in section 2.3.2). The rest are lacking morpho-phonological evidence: býskupa, guðspjall, kristna, skript, and þolímóðr are included because they only have parallels in English and seem unlikely to have been coined independently.

It is striking that there are so few words in this category.\(^{876}\) There are some interesting points we can infer from them however, not least the fact that they add distinctive English texture to the picture of Christianisation which the polygenetic words paint as a decidedly international affair. Býskupa and kristna (in combination with prímsigna) are perhaps the most straightforward signifiers of the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman churches’ contributions to the the conversion efforts in ON-speaking areas, their initiatory senses pointing to a missionary focus in these institutions that — as we saw in Chapter 1 — has been almost completely obscure to us in the historical record (at least in England).\(^{877}\) There is also an important, if rather prosaic, point to be made about the fact that both býskupa and ljóðhýskupa are derivatives from býskupa: in the Middle Ages, bishops were deemed to have primary responsibility over evangelisation efforts,\(^{878}\) and later ON histories and sagas of course gave bishops from England an important position in their own conversion narratives. Both these terms provide good circumstantial evidence of this. A lack of regular appearances by bishops in rural areas in Anglo-Saxon England meant that many

\(^{876}\) Though there would be more if words in the expanded corpus were included - see the appendix.


\(^{878}\) Hadley, The Vikings in England, 225.
Christians must have remained unconfirmed,\textsuperscript{879} so the remote vastness of much of Scandinavia was only likely to have exacerbated this problem; as a result is seems likely that \textit{byskup} could only be loaned if the link between the rite of confirmation and its practice by bishops was strong. Confirmation at the hands of a bishop must have been an experience that was limited to populations close to the centres where they were based, at least in the initial stages of Christianisation.\textsuperscript{880} The existence of \textit{ljóðbyskup}, although plainly used in a later sense as a more specific term for \textit{byskup} (in distinction from \textit{erkibyskup}), may at least be indicative of the role of Anglo-Saxon England in the consecration and promulgation of the episcopal offices in early Christian Scandinavia.

The remaining words in the category help to illustrate other isolated forms of contact, though the reasons for borrowing are occasionally difficult to account for. The loaning of \textit{skript} / \textit{skripta} might show that Anglo-Saxon churchmen were integral to the pastoral care of Scandinavians in the early conversion period, as the moral policing of newly proselytised peoples must have been a particularly important way of extending clerical influence and hence maintaining order. Penance was certainly a habitual concern of our two great late-OE writers, \AE{}lfric of Eynsham and Archbishop Wulfstan of York, though it was a particular focus of episcopal anxiety across Western Europe from the eighth century onwards.\textsuperscript{881} \textit{Guðspjall} is the only loan in this category that is indicative of the indebtedness of ON literate culture to England, with the gospels of course constituting what must have been one of the most important collection

\textsuperscript{880} At the court of the Norwegian kings, or possibly centralised minster-like churches: Bagge and Nordeide, “The kingdom of Norway, 156; Brink, “New Perspectives on the Christianisation of Scandinavia and the Organisation of the Early Church”, 174.
of texts to which a missionary or recently trained ON-speaking cleric could have had access.\footnote{Walter notes that the early Scandinavian church would probably have needed the Gospels alongside the psalms, Book of Job, and Revelations, \textit{Lexikalisches Lehngut im Altwestnordischen}, 16.}

The term \textit{imbrudagr} offers good indirect support to the idea that some of the other loans related to feast days may in fact be original English loans, even if the exact nature of their transmission is debatable (see in particular sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5, below), and is testament to the importance of the Anglo-Saxon church in helping to establish the liturgical calendar among ON-speaking peoples.

The involvement of English ecclesiastics in the foundation of early monastic centres partly explains the loaning of \textit{munklíf(i)} before its eventual replacement by the more Latinate \textit{klastr(i)}, but it may well represent an earlier loan in that we can assume Norse-speakers encountered monastic foundations early on (sometimes in a decidedly violent manner). \textit{Þolinmóðr} can likely be explained in the context of having to adequately communicate the idea of being \textit{patiens} or \textit{longanimis}, especially since it has the benefit of being fairly transparent from a semantic perspective; we will see some similar compounds in section 3.1.5.\footnote{KTFS, 607.} Finally, while \textit{tákn} is deemed to be safely English on the basis of the quality of the stem vowel, we can only speculate as to why the (seemingly native) \textit{teikn} appears somewhat later.

\footnotesize

\footnote{Walter notes that the early Scandinavian church would probably have needed the Gospels alongside the psalms, Book of Job, and Revelations, \textit{Lexikalisches Lehngut im Altwestnordischen}, 16.}

\footnote{KTFS, 607.}
3.1.4 - PROBABLE ENGLISH SOURCE:

abóti, aptansongr, blek, bökfell, byskupserki, gangdagr, guðdóttir, guðfadir, guðmódir, guðsif, húsl, húsla, hófuðkirkja, kirkjuganga, kirkjusókn, kristindóm, langafriðagrá, lofsang, messuprestr, óttusongr, ríta, ræðingr, undirstanda

Words that fall under this category are slightly more numerous than those in the ‘English’ grouping. They all lack formal morpho-phonological evidence of borrowing, as well as demonstrating somewhat weaker contextual or semantic evidence. There may also be related cognates in other languages with which Norse-speakers were in close contact, thus complicating the precise route of borrowing somewhat. The border between these and the loans in 3.1.3 is, however, rather porous.

In one case we have a word that is uncommon, though that in itself is not a problem: ON-speakers could have coined messuprestr independently, though the fact that it is only sparsely attested in the ONP, and in a Norwegian legal context that some have argued saw Anglo-Saxon involvement at its earliest stages, perhaps indicates that the word is based on English practices (messepreost of course being exceptionally common). For some other words I have had to make rather bold assertions. Blek and bökfall(i) are both problematic in their own ways, with the former having other possible sources and the latter only occurring relatively late in the thirteenth century; my decision to include them here is based on the fact that the words occur in collocation with one another in both OE and ON, and that consequently this might make them more likely

---

884 Helle, Gulatinget og Gulatingslova, 182. It might be that messuprestr is representative of a nonce borrowing which never gained ‘more general adoption’, Durkin, The Oxford Guide to Etymology, 46.
to have been fellow travellers during the loaning process. I admit, however, that the evidence for this is thin, and therefore far from satisfactory.

One important characteristic of both this and other ‘English’ categories is a preponderance of compounds, especially those concerning spiritual relationships, feast days, canonical hours, and words relating to churchgoing. It is perhaps no coincidence that many of these compounds could be quite easily calqued from OE to ON, since more often than not they consist of lexical elements which are direct cognates, sometimes to the extent of being almost identical in terms of form. Compounds such as hēafodecyrice-hofuðkirkja, cyricgang-kirkjuganga, and cyricsōn-kirkjusókn are each made up of commonplace lexical items, meaning that we have to be particularly wary of the fact that they might have been formulated separately in both languages. Too much scepticism in this regard is equally unproductive, however, and close parallels in how these words are used — particularly for kirkjuganga and kirkjusókn — means that I have ended up categorising them in this section.

Terms relating to spiritual relations are, I would suggest, almost certainly modelled on English, though they have been included here due to a number of uncertainties with regards to the exact nature of the influence. This is most apparent with godsibb-guðsif, where there is a definite difference in terms of referent, with the former denoting the actual actors in a spiritual relationship and the latter referring to the kinship tie itself (despite the fact that, as simplexes, both OE sibb and ON sif refer to an abstract relationship). One further complication is the fact

885 Carter has argued that words prone to being collocated might be considered part of ‘core’ vocabulary, though this is of course dependent on whose core vocabulary we are discussing (in this case surely educated OE and ON speakers), “A Note on Core Vocabulary,” 40. See also D.A. Cruse on the ‘semantic cohesion’ and ‘mutually selective’ nature of collocations, *Lexical Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 40-41.

886 Kirkjusókn’s earliest attestation also has particularly interesting parallels with OE homilies as well, see 3.2.
that, in OE, *godsibb* is only lately and lightly attested, and during a period in which OE and ON speakers would still have been in regular contact. A semantic shift happened in one of these languages, and the late nature of the evidence suggests that it was in ON. However, it need not be quite that clear-cut. Like some of the words we will examine in section 3.1.5, it may be that this is a compound which was coined specifically with both OE and ON in mind. Whether a semantic shift was from spiritual relation to spiritual relationship or vice versa is consequently trickier to establish. For the specific terms referring to godparents and godchildren, borrowings from OE seem the most plausible explanations, though ME may instead be the source for some of these terms, or alternatively ON could have coined these terms independently. The decision to include these terms here rather than in the following section is therefore largely down to circumstantial evidence. Godparents had a key role in fostering a Christian upbringing for their charges, including teaching the *Pater noster* and the Creed.\textsuperscript{887} Sullivan notes that Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon missionary principles held that some degree of doctrinal teaching was necessary before baptism could be administered,\textsuperscript{888} so spiritual relations could have acted as a useful network of laypersons in the field while local church infrastructure was still developing and before numerous priests could be adequately trained.\textsuperscript{889}

*Aptansongr, gangdagr,* and *óttusongr* are all included as likely candidates on the basis that they lack many parallels in other Germanic languages. Alongside *imbrudagr* (see above), *gangdagr* adds further weight to the idea that English-speaking churchmen had an important role in helping to organise Christian worship over the course of the ecclesiastical year, something that will become

\textsuperscript{887} For a full description of the pastoral responsibilities of spiritual relations, see: Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship*, 169-73.

\textsuperscript{888} “Carolingian Missionary Theories,” 279-80.

\textsuperscript{889} Skre notes that a ‘dense network of priests’ would have been necessary for full-scale conversion efforts, “Missionary Activity in Early Medieval Norway”, 14.
even more pronounced once we consider some further feast days in section 3.1.5. Both aptansǫngr and óttusǫngr also indicate English influence on the structure of daily religious worship, which would have become important once ecclesiastical (and later monastic) life was properly instituted. Alongside these two, I also include term lafsang, largely on the basis of the apparent indebtedness of early Norwegian religious music to Anglo-Saxon models, though the existence of other WGmc. cognates could make the polygenetic category more appropriate. One final word lacking parallels elsewhere is ræðingr, which would be very close to being admitted under the ENGLISH SOURCE category were it not for the somewhat puzzling fact that it is masculine in gender, as opposed to OE ræðing, which is feminine. Understanda is undoubtedly a loan for morphological reasons, since it follows a distinctly WGmc. pattern of verb-formation, and I have taken the decision to allocate the ON word a PROBABLE ENGLISH origin because they consistently share the the same meaning, whereas the MLG cognate did not.

The final group of words in this section are those for which we are most reliant on somewhat uncertain evidence: húsl, húsla and ríta. These lexemes neatly encapsulate one of the central problems of historical contact linguistics that I pointed out in 2.1.1, namely the difficulty of accounting for semantic shifts in cognates of closely related languages where one of those languages was in a state of pre-literacy at the point of first contact. Although our runic evidence is scanty at best, we at least have evidence that native ON húsl seems to have referred to a sacrifice and ríta could refer to the act of carving runes. We know, with some degree of certainty, that a semantic shift took place, but whether this is due to internal or external pressures is difficult to

---

890 See 1.4 and the entry for antefna in 2.3.6.
891 Friesen, Rökstenen, 28-29, 57. The dates for evidence for use of ríta in reference to runic inscriptions are of course both very early (Reistad/Eiklund) and relatively late (Carlisle), which is problematic: Antonsen, A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions, 52; Schulte, “Pragmatic Runic Literacy in Scandinavia c.800-1300,” 159; Barnes, Runes, 117 (see section 2.3.8 in the present thesis).
prove with absolute confidence. I believe that the most straightforward explanation is the impact of English-speakers, with the native ON terms undergoing a process of loanshift in order to ‘accommodate the meaning of a foreign word.’\textsuperscript{892} The notion of ‘foreignness’ is somewhat more slippery in a context where we have cognate lexical items that are not only almost formally identical, but also have some degree of semantic overlap. To moderns, the associations between a pagan sacrifice and the Eucharist, or between carving runes and writing letters, seem relatively straightforward analogies. Haugen was perhaps incorrect to state that borrowing in general required ‘some minimum of bilingual mastery’, though loanshifts like these probably do require competent bilingual speakers.\textsuperscript{893} In a missionary context like the Danelaw, it would make sense for bilinguals with an intimate knowledge of both English and ON to latch onto cognate terms where possible, particularly if there were already useful ‘inbuilt’ semantic crossovers. While Haspelmath notes that bilingualism was probably necessary for the ‘widespread use of loanwords for new concepts’, it would make sense that this problem might be reduced somewhat where we have formally and semantically linked cognates.\textsuperscript{894}

\textbf{3.1.5 - UNCLEAR OE-ON CONNECTION}

\textit{bersynðugr, fasta, hvitasunnudagr, hálsbók, hófuðfaðir, liksøngr, skírþórsdagr, stafróf}

Our final group is in some ways the most intriguing: it consist of words where it is difficult to establish the exact nature of the connection between OE and ON, even though one does seem

\textsuperscript{892} Hock, Principles of Historical Linguistics, 398; see also Hock and Joseph, An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics, 263.
\textsuperscript{894} “Lexical borrowing: concepts and issues”, 47.
to exist. Indeed, it may well be that in these cases, the designation of ‘loanword’ is not an adequate descriptor of the ON lexical items — in fact, there may be a far more interesting implications, particularly for the compounds. For two words — fæsten-fasta and stafrœvw/stafrœf-stafrœf — the problem may be intractable, as they present formal linguistic difficulties that are not easily resolved. In section 2.2.4, I noted that Dance and Jack (among others) have cautiously posited ON influence on ME forms of fast lacking stem-final <-n>. The influence of OE fæsten may have in turn caused a loanshift in a pre-existing ON fasta or encouraged word-formation via the adjective fastr; either route is at least plausible, though unprovable due to a dearth of pre-literate evidence. Much like with húsl and ríta, however, we do know for a fact that ON fasta was used in reference to a new cultural concept by the time literacy was established among Norse-speakers, and some sort of interference from English seems like the most credible explanation.

Stafrœf presents slightly different difficulties, and the precise meaning of the headword is particularly troublesome, despite the (probably correct) confidence of Jóhannesson and Magnússon in positing some sort of meaning equivalent to ‘row’ or ‘line.’ More problematic still is the fact the word is rare in both languages, though stafrœw’s presence in the OE translation of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum shows it had likely been in use by at least the late ninth century. Puzzlingly, our one instance of OE stafrœf occurs in the mid-tenth century, in the context of a glossary; there is a possibility that this could be a loan of an equivalent ON word, but this would probably have to assume some degree of literacy among at least some Norse speakers in the 900s, if not before.\(^895\) Stafrœf is ultimately placed in this group as a result of the intractable

\(^895\) As noted in the first chapter, Archbishops Oda of Canterbury and Oskytel of York had Norse names, and the former was himself the son of a member of the Viking Great Army, “The Anglo-Saxons and the Christianization of Scandinavia,” 215.
difficulties with its form, though it is more likely than not that English was the lexifying language for the compound.

The remainder of the words presented in this category exemplify a particularly intriguing problem. There are good reasons to place bersynðugr and hálsbók in our ‘English’ grouping; as I argued in Chapter 3, neither have parallels in other Germanic languages, and there is very good contextual evidence to support the idea of OE as the source. There is also a very clear-cut temporal distance between their occurrence in OE and their (limited) use in ON. Overall this points to a ‘straightforward’ loan process. There are, I think, good reasons why their existence is perhaps a little more revealing about some aspects of OE-ON language contact than we have hitherto encountered. Although OE bersynnig and h(e)alsbōc are not products of the same literary mileu — the former is found in a tenth-century Northumbrian context, the latter in a West Saxon one — both are used in the translations of gospel passages dealing with publicans and Pharisees respectively.

Let us deal with bersynnig-bersynðugr first, the translation for publicanus which Walter thought was ‘ganz amüsant.’ Part of the beauty of this word is its transparency of meaning in both OE and ON, with the compound very plainly transmitting the idea that publicani were ‘offenkundige oder ganz schlimmer Sünde.’ This semantic transparency is key, I think, and Nagucka has noted that Aldred’s glossing style does not go in for ‘one-to-one mechanical renderings’, but ‘rather conscious, occasionally very careful “interpretative translations.”’ As

---

897 ‘open or very bad sinners,’ ibid, 299.
well as being a culturally alien term even for educated Northumbrian clergy, *publican* was furthermore not easily analysable from a linguistic perspective and thus needed more imaginative treatment.\(^{899}\)

A construction such as *bersynnig* seems like a particularly blunt way of communicating all the information one needs to know about the Christian view of the *publicani* without having to be concerned about the niceties of their historical role in Roman Judea. For novices and the laity, ‘bare sinner’ sums things up adequately, and is quite the opposite of the idea that all OE glosses of Latin were simply loan translations.\(^{900}\) It is possible this word may have been more common than the textual evidence suggests, and its straightforward translation from OE to ON would have been particularly useful in the mission field where concise, easy to follow explanations were presumably needed for certain difficult concepts. This perhaps raises questions about the community — both religious and local — in which the gospels were glossed. Aldred would have been in regular contact with ‘dwellers of Scandinavian ancestry’, possibly bilinguals, and possibly even within the community of St Cuthbert itself.\(^{901}\) Recently, in her discussion of another of Aldred’s works Karen Jolly has argued:

> The glossing in Durham, MS A.iv.19, and therefore potentially in the Lindisfarne Gospels, may have been produced in conversation with an audience and intended thereafter for oral use in the community as they engaged in study and reflection of the texts.\(^{902}\)

---

899 Ibid, 198.
899 Lucia Kornexl “‘Unnatural words?’ Loan-formations in Old English glosses,” in *Language Contact in the History of English*, edited by Dieter Kastovsky and Arthur Mettinger (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), 200-1.
900 Pons-Sanz, *Analysis of the Scandinavian Loanwords in the Aldredian Gloses to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, 130.
She adds that the process of glossing as a fraternal activity would have included a number of others ‘as auditors or interlocutors.’ If OE-ON bilinguals were present, then this may have influenced the formation of a word like bærsynnig, which could be effortlessly loan-translated and might prove pedagogically useful in a number of contexts, including a Christianising one. I am aware, of course, of pushing such thin evidence to breaking point, and I am (not unproblematically) assuming a practical use to the glosses beyond the scholars of the community of St Cuthbert. Further examination of the Northumbrian glosses to examine OE words that may have functioned in a similar manner would be needed. The potential ‘collaborative’ nature of its genesis — that is, springing from a context in which both OE and ON were spoken — means that it has been categorised here.

Our other compound with biblical significance, h(e)alsbœc-halsbók, is notable for similar reasons, though it is restricted to West Saxon usage. In 2.3.15, I argued that this word must have referred to some sort of amulet or charm, whether pagan or Christian in nature. Given the argument made for bærsynig-bærsynðugr above, however, we might question whether it was a pre-existing compound applied to the phylactery of the Pharisees, or if it was instead formulated to explain the biblical concept to ignorant laypersons. Certainly by the time the word appears in Grágás it must have had wide enough currency that people knew precisely what it meant, especially given that the laws had to be understood by a substantial audience. I suspect that the

903 Ibid, 334.
904 Such words may also have been more likely to be absorbed into the native phonological systems of ON and OE, as Shana Poplack and David Sankoff note for straightforward borrowings, “Borrowing: the synchrony of integration,” Linguistics 22:1 (1984), 102.
905 Discussing ON loans in the gloss, Pons-Sanz suggests the words may have been ‘familiar in everyday speech but of dubious normative status’, Analysis of Scandinavian Loanwords in the Aldredian Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, 129.
906 I note, for example, that Nagucka indicates pharisaei is translated as ae-craftigo rather than something like *lau-wis or *lau-motor, though even still it would be easily translated for use among ON speakers. One manuscript of Jens saga baptista from the mid-fourteenth century contains the phrase ‘Pharisei oc logspekingar’, shortly after the use of ‘bersynðugir menn’. Unger (ed.), Postola sígyr, 911.
word probably had more wide-spread currency, since it would likely be helpful for missionaries to align a specifically Biblical term with contemporary practices seen as misguided or superstitious. As I argued in the above paragraph, such simple analogies would have been particularly practical in the mission field. In an ON context, it may provide some evidence for the encroachment of written culture — albeit in a minor form — into the legal material of Iceland, a development which could have happened relatively early as one would suspect that the incorporation of Christian material into the largely oral law tradition would have been a priority for missionaries and high-ranking Norse-speaking converts. I would argue that, combined, bærsynnig-bersynðagr and hl(e)lðbóð-hálsbók represent a glimpse into a small part of the Anglo-Saxon church’s (or, rather, churches’) now-hidden conversion efforts during the Viking Age, when clarity would have been of the utmost importance. There is some reason to suppose that they are representative of words that were deliberately chosen to be comprehensible to both OE and ON speakers, and may be residual evidence of the missionary ‘training’ which Abrams and Hadley have both asserted must have taken place.907 Indeed, we may even think of this in terms of missionary ‘experience’, and Pons-Sanz has proposed two compounds in OE (carlfugol and cwenfugol) as stemming from ‘English missionaries’ who may have learnt ON;908 certainly we should expect a two-way street in terms of linguistic influence. At the very least the compounds seem to act as proof of some degree of intellectual reflection on the use of language in a situation where both the source and recipient were similar enough to have plenty of obvious cognate overlap.

The final group of compounds consists of more feast days: *hwítansunnandeg-hvítasunnudagr*, and *shere Thuresdai-skíriþórsdagr*. In comparison to the other words in this section, these are problematic because they occur very late in OE or in early ME, to the extent that the ON terms might even precede the first English recordings (definitely so in the case of *shēre Thuresdai*, possibly for *hvítasunnudagr*). The meaning of these words is again quite transparent, and I postulate that they might well be products of a decidedly Anglo-Scandinavian practice to offer readily interpretable names for Christian celebrations, which would also encompass *gangdæg-gangdagr* and *langafrígedeg-langafrijádagr* (though not, of course, *ymbrendæg-imbrudagr*). The establishment of a regular calendar of feasts would likely have been one significant priority in newly converted areas, as they would have provided the ceremonial glue to bind new Christians together and exert pressure on others to be involved in celebration and fasting. While Hellberg was certainly correct to place the names of feast days within an international, European context, we can arguably see a distinctly Anglo-Scandinavian character in the names of these holy days in OE and ON.

### 3.2 - Implications for OE-ON language contact

Having reorganised our loanword material, it is now necessary to consider two related problems: how the material complements the literary-historical narrative outlined in our first chapter, and what the consequences may be for our conception of language contact between English and Norse speakers in the Viking Age and beyond. Of course, as I made clear in 3.1.2, we should also consider polygenetic words as an inextricable element of this contact. First I will briefly deal with the tricky subject of mutual intelligibility, before moving on to consider some of the wider sociolinguistic implications, including the way in which we construe prestige.
3.2.1 - Mutual intelligibility

The problem of mutual intelligibility is likely to remain an ongoing controversy, but portions of the loan material do at least seem to reinforce some previous assumptions about the nature of the level and type of understanding in OE-ON interactions. Our polygenetic words are rather less useful in this respect since they are more representative of ‘straightforward’ absorption of lexical items that are not linguistically analysable. More interesting are those words classified under PROBABLE ENGLISH and UNCERTAIN OE-ON CONNECTION which would have been semantically transparent in both languages, often to the point where the words are formally very similar — and especially so where cognates are used to form compounds. Townend provides the most thorough account of ‘cognate subsitution’ in his analysis of ‘Scandinavianised’ OE place-names in England, and it is possible to see a similar process happening in pairs like bærsynig-bersynðagr, godspell-gudspjall, and hvítanumnandag-hvítasunnudagr. This sort of calquing, where two languages are so similar that the very idea of ‘loan translation’ becomes unstable, also calls into question the idea that it is inherently a borrowing process associated with a dominant language.

I think the evidence of the loanword material largely supports the settled opinion that there is some degree of ‘pragmatic’ understanding between OE and ON speakers, a local manifestation of the likely widespread medieval phenomenon of ‘receptive multilingualism.’

909 Townend, Language and History in the Viking Age, 43-68.
As I argued in section 3.1.5, it seems likely that sensitivity to mutual intelligibility dictated the formulation of some of these compounds, with the intention that they be easily understood by speakers of both OE and ON. In such an environment, the concept of language ‘agentivity’ in the loaning process becomes rather less useful, giving way instead to a sort of ‘collaborative’ process of word-formation.912 I believe that this may also point to more fully bilingual OE-ON speakers than others have argued, since the ability to form such compounds must surely be based on an intimate knowledge of both languages, though no doubt ‘passive familiarity’ must have played a part for some.913

3.2.2 - Language and identity in the conversion era

Roger Lass has been rather scathing about the use of prestige as an analytical tool for borrowing, arguing that a lack of knowledge about the ‘sociolinguistic details’ of historical interactions means we can do little more than ‘floppy hand-waving.’914 This view is not without some merit, though I think nuanced application of the term to language contact situations can still be useful, and I am by no means alone in this view. In terms of contact between OE and ON in Viking Age England, there are competing views as to the precise relationship between speakers of the two languages; many have favoured the idea that it was largely adstratal, with the languages having roughly equivalent social currency.915 Lutz has recently pushed back against this statements of support in favour see: Björkman, Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English, 8; Bibire, “North Sea Language Contacts in the Early Middle Ages: English and Norse,” 97; Dance, Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English, 98.
912 On source versus recipient language agentivity, see: Winford, “Contact and Borrowing”, 171; Dance, “English in Contact: Norse”, 1728.
913 Anthony Warner, “English-Norse Contact, Simplification, and Sociolinguistic Typology” [Forthcoming], 76.
914 Lass, Historical Linguistics and Language Change, 186.
915 Hock and Joseph, An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics, 274; Hock, Principles of Historical Linguistics, 409-10; Townend, Language and History in Viking Age England, 203-4; Peter Trudgill, Sociolinguistic Typology. Social
characterisation, noting that ON borrowings in OE relating to the legal system are ‘the most obvious examples for superstratal influence’ of the former language.\textsuperscript{916} As a result she notes that much of the loanword evidence in English (and OE especially) points to the presence of an ‘Anglo-Danish ruling class’ as opposed to the ‘mere immigration of Vikings as free peasants.’\textsuperscript{917}

In his treatement of whether or not an Anglo-Scandinavian creole could have existed in England, John Hines made an interesting point which has largely been overlooked in the context of debates over prestige. It’s worth laying out his reasoning at length to provide some context for the argument to follow:

A model of the interaction of Scandinavian and English language in the Viking period may then distinguish lects at two levels at least: a level of basilectal, restricted and utilitarian language produced by a shift in OE targeted upon Scandinavian or containing the residue of the atrophy of Sc. under English dominance, and a higher level in which English is the dominant, lexifier language but within which Sc. items also carry definitive status.\textsuperscript{918}

A page later he also posits a two-stage development, with ON maintaining an initial position of prestige as ‘the language of conquerors and colonists’ before being displaced during a ‘process of Anglo-Scandinavian acculturation.’\textsuperscript{919} He goes on to argue that the seemingly quick conversion of the Norse-speaking peoples of the Danelaw was at least in part a result of their willingness to appease a ‘native population, who in this case were possessed of a high and stable

\textsuperscript{Determinants of Linguistic Complexity} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 53. For a brief overview of the terms adstrate, superstrate, and substrate, see: Durkin, Borrowed Words, 13.


\textsuperscript{917} “Language Contact and Prestige”, 568.

\textsuperscript{918} Hines, “Scandinavian English: a creole in context,” 415.

\textsuperscript{919} Ibid, 417.
culture,’ leading in turn to the formation of a ‘Scandinavian English’ as a signifier of Anglo-
Scandinavian identity.\footnote{Ibid, 418-19.} I will not be drawn into the debate over the existence of a recognisable
creole in Anglo-Saxon England, but Hines’ position is welcome because it begins to unpack the
complexity of the relations between the speakers of the two languages, and makes the question
of prestige somewhat more fraught by showing prestige in this context was not a one-way street.

I believe one key bit of evidence missing from this discussion has been the Christian
borrowings making their way into ON during the period of intense contact from the ninth
century to c. 1100. This is not without good reason given that our evidence for ON largely
postdates the main age of conversion and Christianisation, but as I have sought to demonstrate,
many of these loans seem to reflect some of the conditions of that period. I therefore argue that
our evidence points to a rather more complex state of affairs which neither straightforward
adstratal or superstratal-substratal relationships adequately describe, and which Hines only
begins to open up. In a forthcoming article, Anthony Warner suggests that the borrowing of
‘basic lexis’ from ON into OE indicates a situation where ‘the distinction between recipient and
source language is blurred.’\footnote{Warner, “English-Norse Contact, Simplification, and Sociolinguistic Typology,” 88.} Accepting this point, I will argue a point that should be manifestly
clear by now, but needs stating more plainly: the sheer number of ‘basic’ loanwords relating to
Christianity — whether English, polygenetic, or otherwise — means that characterising ON as
the superstrate in this contact situation cannot hold water, at least not once the conversion
process had started in earnest. The importation of a brand-new religion, along with all the socio-
cultural changes such an upheaval entails, means we have a set of circumstances in which OE
also functioned in a ‘superstratal’ capacity, possessed as it was of the ‘high and stable culture’
which Hines describes. Alaric Hall has stressed the importance of ‘churches and churchmen’ in the picture of language contact in the British and Irish Isles in the seventh and eighth centuries, and this is no less true during the Viking Age. Indeed, religious factors driving language change are something which have been largely overlooked in linguistic research in general, and it is high time they were given more consideration.

The borrowing of polygenetic terms, in particular, is evidence for the deep structural changes which Norse-speaking society was to undergo as it was Christianised over the centuries. This is of course partly a classic example of loaning based on ‘need’, since many borrowings referred to concepts that were entirely alien to pre-Christian Norse-speakers, but I agree with Donald Winford’s assessment that need and prestige are somewhat limited analytical terms and we instead need to consider ‘sociolinguistic and sociopolitical aspects of the contact.’ As mentioned above, Lutz points to the importation of a Scandinavian elite, particularly during the reign of Knútr inn ríki, as evidence for the superstratal power of ON. Although it is easy to describe Scandinavian dominance in secular terms, it is important to emphasise that it was no means limited to worldly affairs. We saw in Chapter 1 that ON-speakers had an active role in the church in England and the Danelaw and were thus readily absorbed into ‘native’ culture.

---

922 Ibid, 418.
926 Lutz, “Language Contact and Prestige”, 568. See also Bolton, The Empire of Cnut the Great, 41.
927 This is essentially Hines’ ‘acculturation’ process, though he pushed the church’s role in this somewhat less than he could have, “Scandinavian English: a creole in context”, 418.
Knútr’s conquest is the most obvious manifestation of this, but we should not forget largely anonymous Scandinavian lords in the Danelaw and their patronage of stone sculpture, nor the presence of clergy with ON names in high positions as early as the tenth century. Recent research has sought to emphasise ‘international Anglo-Scandinavianism, especially at an elite level’ post-1016, and it is this internationalism that I believe is key to thinking about English and polygenetic loans in ON even before Knútr’s conquest.

One aspect of language change that might be useful for conceptualising the diffusion of loanwords among ON-speakers is the division between so-called innovators (or ‘leaders’ in Labovian parlance), who are ‘in a particularly strong position to diffuse innovation’ due to a plethora of ‘weak [social] ties’, and early adopters, who are more ‘central members’ of a social group. This dichotomy was developed with the desire to explain phonological changes within and between communities as the central concern, but can be used appropriately, albeit somewhat more bluntly, in discussion of lexical exchange as well. Although the substantial loaning of Christian nomenclature focused on the institution of the church is a fairly ‘obvious’ action from the perspective of ‘need’, it is important to emphasise that these words are absolutely an expression of a new social identity, much in the same way that Hines argues for the interaction of ON- and OE-speakers leading to a new ‘Anglo-Scandinavian’ identity. We should not play

---

928 On sculpture, see: Hadley, *The Vikings in England*, 214-23. Archbishops Oswald and Oscytel were, of course, of Anglo-Scandinavian descent, Barrow, “Survival and Mutation”, 161-62. I am indebted to Matthew Townend for pointing out that Ælfric Puttoc’s eleventh-century list of festermenn, containing a number of ON personal names (including six with the title presbyter), seems to support the idea of a considerable Anglo-Scandinavian elite around York. For the full list and commentary, see: D.A. Woodman (ed.), *Charters of Northern Houses* (Anglo-Saxon Charters 16) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 380-82. See also: Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 200.


down the magnitude of the sea-change that a shift in religion would have represented, nor the potential for the development of separate group identities — including linguistic identities — which it would have fostered. That separate ecclesiastical identities might have constituted part of this process seems almost certain.

There is doubtless more work to be done on mapping out the types of ‘social networks propagating and reinforcing’ the use of new vocabulary in medieval conversion contexts, so what follows constitutes my preliminary thoughts on the matter. The innovators during the conversion and Christianisation of Norse-speakers in the Danelaw and Scandinavia would be represented by those figures who feature in the main conversion narratives we saw in Chapter 1: men such as the missionary bishops, no doubt alongside various anonymous clergymen, not to mention numerous adventurers and merchants who, with the exception of itinerant court poets, go largely unrecorded in texts. In the Danelaw, it might well be that the development of any sort of ‘Anglo-Scandinavian’ identity was in no small part led by churchmen. Our ‘early adopters’ — those with ‘strong network ties and a respected position in their social position’ — in this case would have been those other figures who loom large in the sagas concerned with conversion: kings and minor nobility, but possibly also law-speakers and, in an Icelandic context at least, the godar. None of this analysis is revolutionary, though it does at least set out a plausible route of transmission for Christian vocabulary which, as far as I am aware, no-one has hitherto attempted to illustrate plainly. This is perhaps because many of our polygenetic

\(^{932}\) Pax Leonard is particularly good on the formation of linguistic identity, *Language, Society and Identity in Early Iceland*, 42-46.


loanwords are so ubiquitous as to be overlooked, and I would argue it is significant that so many of them are associated with the structure of the church rather than with spiritual aspects of Christian faith. The borrowing of such lexis points to real institutional change.

If the loaning of Christian words is the most candid example of Norse-speakers expressing a new social identity, then a desire for prestige is absolutely the best way to characterise this process.935 I have been keen to emphasise that the English church was just one part of a distinctly international missionary effort, and the number of polygenetic loans we see in ON is a testament to Scandinavia’s integration into a wider Christian Europe. As Anders Winroth emphasises, the Scandinavians were not simply ‘passive recipients’ of Christianity, and in many cases they actively sought Christianity and the material and social benefits it could offer; it was a case, ultimately, of ‘northerners willingly… embracing European civilization’.936 There are some limits to this analysis, however, and it might be better to distinguish initial borrowings as resulting from ‘need’—i.e. when pagan Scandinavians needed to describe aspects of a strange new faith—from the later diffusion of these loans on the basis of ‘prestige’, when these words became crucial signifiers of Christian identity and association with ecclesiastical structures.937

Those loans which are more specifically ‘English’ in character point firmly to the Anglo-Saxon church’s importance in initiating new members of the faith, not to mention the institutional establishment of the liturgical calendar and policing of new spiritual relationships. Perhaps most importantly, the strong tradition of written OE may well have imbued it with a

vernacular ‘weight and authority’ which is reflected in those loans associated with ON literate

culture.\textsuperscript{938} If Treharne’s characterisation that English was an ‘authorised and validated written

medium for elite networks’ is accepted, then this must have had no small ideological effect on

the way in which Anglo-Scandinavian churchmen could approach ON too.\textsuperscript{939} The presence of

ON loans in Aldred’s gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels — alongside the intriguing \textit{bærsynnig} — may well have signified some sort of acceptance of ON as an equal to OE, at least in

Northumbria, and Pons-Sanz has convincingly argued that the Community of St Cuthbert

represented an important ‘peripheral’ group of innovatory speakers of the sort we discussed

above in the broader context of the mission field.\textsuperscript{940} Warner has more recently suggested that

OE-ON koineisation may have taken place more quickly among smaller populations like St

Cuthbert’s, perhaps even leading to a nascent ‘Anglo-Scandinavian sense of northern

identity.’\textsuperscript{941} The church as a catalyst of linguistic change during the Viking Age and beyond,

significantly in the case of English, less so in Norse, is one of the major stories still to be properly

elucidated.

---

\textsuperscript{938} Treharne, “The authority of English, 900-1150”, 554-55.

\textsuperscript{939} Ibid, 570.

\textsuperscript{940} Sara M. Pons-Sanz, “A sociolinguistic approach to the Norse-derived words in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and

Rushworth Gospels,” in \textit{New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics. Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21-26


(Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004), 178-79. See also her more recent analysis in \textit{The Lexical Effects of

Anglo-Scandinavian Language Contact on Old English}, 253-54. The idea that Aldred consciously avoided ON words, put

forward by E.G. Stanley, can probably be laid to rest, E.G. Stanley “Linguistic Self-Awareness at Various Times in

the History of English from Old English Onwards,” in \textit{Lexis and Texts in Early English. Studies presented to June Roberts},


\textsuperscript{941} Warner, “English-Norse Contact, Simplification, and Sociolinguistic Typology”, 86, quote from 84.
**3.3 - Coda: ‘As we are all of one tongue’**

At the end of Chapter 1 I argued that the prologue to *The First Grammatical Treatise* seems to indicate that early Icelandic scholars were aware of the close connections between Old Norse and English, and that the First Grammarian’s positive attitude towards the vernacular may ultimately have its origins in the intellectual milieu of Anglo-Saxon England. I will briefly consider how my subsequent loanword study might affect our interpretation of this prologue.

There are relatively few borrowings in the lexicon of the First Grammarian, and even those which can be identified are problematic in terms of ascribing a source language. English-influenced lexis can account for only four words at most: *(bók)stafr, punktr, ríta, stafróf.* In his endeavour to ‘codify’ Old Icelandic and form a ‘linguistic identity’ for Icelanders, he largely avoids foreign words and sticks resolutely to his own vernacular, though I would suggest his noticeable preference for *ríta* over *skrîfa* perhaps points to him being the product of a more English-influenced textual tradition than Ari (for whom the reverse is true). While the number of loanwords is low, the First Grammarian does single out two textual genres which we have encountered time and again when searching for the first citation of a borrowing, whether English or not: ‘lög… ok þýðgar helgar’ (particularly the latter). It is little surprise that the First Grammarian would be familiar with the need for homiletic material in Iceland, but it does point to the fundamental fact that this important Christian genre, with its significant — if often obscure — links to English textual culture, was a big part of his scholarly environment.

Stephen Pax Leonard has argued that the First Grammarian attempted both to ‘codify’ ON vernacular and to ‘establish a firm linguistic identity for Norsemen,’ concluding: ‘The First Grammatical Treatise incorporates speakers of English as part of this linguistic identity.’\textsuperscript{944} I have contended that much of the loanword material examined in the course of this thesis supports this view of a shared linguistic identity between at least some English- and Norse-speakers, partly on the basis of mutual intelligibility, and partly on the basis of a shared institutional vocabulary.\textsuperscript{945} Pax Leonard’s statement only tells half the story however, since the prologue to the FGT is concerned with more than two Germanic vernaculars. Although, as I argued in Chapter 1, the First Grammarian consciously looked to English as an ‘authoritative’ vernacular model for Old Norse, he also integrated both alongside some of the most important international languages of medieval Europe: Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Throughout this thesis I have also been keen to stress that, while a specifically ‘English’ strain of influence can be seen in a few key areas, the polygenetic loanwords point to the complex multilingual nature of the conversion of Scandinavia. The prologue stands as a testament to the multiplicity of linguistic and literary currents which influenced Norse-speakers in their transition from orality to literacy. The First Grammarian presents a remarkably self-confident manifesto for the regularisation of Old Norse, signalling not only the language’s appearance as a serious vernacular, but also its speakers’ entry into the wider European cultural sphere.

\textsuperscript{944} Pax Leonard, \textit{Language, Society and Identity in Early Iceland}, 126.

\textsuperscript{945} Ibid, 124-26.
Conclusion

The present thesis has endeavoured to establish a plausible group of English borrowings relating to Christianity and literacy, challenging some of the assumptions which have underpinned studies of these loans since the work of Absalon Taranger. Central to my reassessment has been the acknowledgement of the international nature of the missions to the Norse-speaking peoples, even within the Anglo-Saxon church, and the consequent formation of a group of largely Latinate polygenetic borrowings representing the range of languages used in the mission field. While reassessing the ‘Englishness’ (or otherwise) of the collected lexical items has been a crucial task in itself, I have also sought to demonstrate the more general relevance of loanword studies for our study of conversion era England and Scandinavia in general.

Chapter 1 surveyed the historical evidence for the Anglo-Saxon missions in the Danelaw and Scandinavia, with a focus on language contact between English- and Norse-speakers. I argued that the Anglo-Saxon church should be characterised as a decidedly international, multilingual institution during the Viking Age and beyond, encompassing English-, German-, and Norse-speakers. A significant number of the clergymen who took part in the evangelisation efforts were likely to have been Anglo-Scandinavians. Most Anglo-Saxon missionaries were probably well prepared for communicating with pagan Norse-speakers, even if the sources are largely silent on the problem of missionary training. I made the case that some of the most famous Anglo-Scandinavian figures of the conversion in twelfth- and thirteenth-century West Norse historiography — Grimkell, Bjarnharðr bókvísi, Hróðolfr of Bœr — are characterised by their literacy, and briefly synthesised recent secondary scholarship on Anglo-Saxon textual
culture’s influence on early Old Norse in support of this. Finally, I used a case study of the prologue to the twelfth-century *First Grammatical Treatise* to argue that English- and Norse-speakers were probably well aware of the close genetic relatedness of their languages, and suggested that Anglo-Saxon attitudes to the use of the vernacular may well have influenced early Scandinavian writers.

In Chapter 2 I provided a thorough reanalysis of purported English loanwords in Old Norse, taking into account lexical items from the broad fields of Christianity and literacy. Using a combination of linguistic and historical analysis, I found that the number of categorically ‘English’ loans should be drastically reduced, though they are undoubtedly more enlightening with regards to the role of the English church in the conversion period. It is clear that there are few reliable diagnostic criteria that allow accurate identification of loanwords, English or otherwise, a problem which is exacerbated by the fact that there are numerous (mostly Latinate) words which have complex prehistories and may well have been transferred through multiple languages. Where formal linguistic evidence was not enough, I appealed to contextual evidence, arguing that in some cases there are good reasons to suppose that English was the ultimate source language. Some distinct patterns seemed to emerge, including the fact that words under the conceptual fields of ‘feasts’ (2.3.4), ‘initiation’ (2.3.11), and ‘spiritual relations’ (2.3.12) seem to be among those which demonstrate the most English influence. Words under the domains of ‘clergy’ (2.3.1) and ‘architecture’ (2.3.2), on the other hand, were very difficult to ascribe to a specific source language, and I raised the theory of polygenesis as a possible way of conceptualising their origins. As well as establishing the extent of English loanwords for the purpose of the thesis, this chapter is designed to act as a useful reference for future scholarship on English loans in Old Norse.
Chapter 3 organised and interpreted our newly reanalysed data. I sought to offer a more nuanced categorisation system of the loanword material, suggesting five main groupings. I proposed the category POLYGENETIC LOANWORDS (3.1.2) for those lexical items which appear to have a complex prehistory, or which at least seem very likely, for historical reasons, to have been the result of multiple borrowings and reborrowings. I argued that polygenesis was a more satisfactory explanation than many other scholars have put forward, even though the suggestion may have been implicit in their equivocations, and pointed to Stefan Hellberg’s appeal that we should see these words as international. I devised three new groupings for words with varying degrees of English influence: ENGLISH SOURCE (3.1.3), PROBABLE ENGLISH SOURCE (3.1.4), and UNCLEAR OE-ON CONNECTION (3.1.4). The division between the former two rests largely on the degree of formal linguistic criteria, though I emphasised that the gap between the categories is rather porous. I suggested that the UNCLEAR OE-ON CONNECTION category was in some respects our most interesting, arguing that this small group of loans may give us a glimpse into the multilingual world of Anglo-Scandinavian clergy. The interpretative part of this chapter (3.2) supported Alaric Hall in suggesting that more attention should be given to religion and churchmen as a driver of language change, and sought to bolster John Hines’ and Anthony Warner’s arguments about the emergence of an ‘Anglo-Scandinavian’ identity. I argued that even commonplace polygenetic words associated with institutional Christianity need to be considered in light of arguments over the relative prestige of English versus Norse. Finally, a reinterpretation of the First Grammarian’s prologue was presented in light of my loanword analysis, arguing that his reference to English (alongside Latin, Greek, and Hebrew) signalled the emergence of Old Norse as a serious European vernacular.
This thesis has sought to give the study of English loanwords in Old Norse some of the same detailed attention which Old Norse borrowings in English have received. Crucially, I have attempted to push the study of these loans beyond a simple quest for a source language, important though that task is in itself. The present work is in many ways a conscious response to Taranger’s monumental work, and I have endeavoured to use the borrowed lexical items to draw a fuller and more nuanced picture of the Christianisation of Scandinavia, drawing attention to the special role of the English church, but also incorporating the wider international conversion effort. Moreover, special effort has been made to try and tie the study of English and polygenetic loans in Old Norse to the contact situation in the Danelaw, and I have stressed that the process of borrowing was very much a two-way process.

In many ways this thesis is designed to be a spring-board for further study of English loanwords in Old Norse, and there is a host of material still to be properly explored (see the appendix). A more general study of all loanwords in pre-thirteenth century Norse texts may be particularly fruitful, and being able to take into account Latin, Irish, and Low German words in addition to English may help to properly elucidate the various influences on early Scandinavian textual culture. A proper study of loans in poetry could be particularly illuminating, especially given that court skalds represent the sort of creative, mobile figures who could lead language innovation.

Loanwords are one of the richest by-products of language contact. This thesis has provided the most detailed overview of English borrowings in Old Norse for over sixty years, and demonstrates their wider relevance to the study of Christianisation and the genesis of literate culture among Norse-speakers. It has furthermore bridged the North Sea gap between
Britain and Scandinavia, linking the conversion of the Danelaw with Christianisation across the wider Norse-speaking world.


## Appendix

### Purported English loanwords in Old Norse

The following is a list of 338 Old Norse words which scholars have suggested were loaned from English, with a reference to the text that mentions the word. I have endeavoured to make it as comprehensive as possible, sourcing the words from the main dictionaries and word studies consulted during the course of this thesis.

It is worth emphasising that the list is entirely uncritical in the sense that it makes no assumption as to whether the word is actually likely to be English or not, and is instead intended to be a useful resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abbadís</td>
<td>Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEBW ANEW, KTFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abbindi</td>
<td>VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ábóti</td>
<td>Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aftan(s)</td>
<td>Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akkeri</td>
<td>VEWA, LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akrttiand</td>
<td>NCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almandr</td>
<td>ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alvítr</td>
<td>NCG, VEWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antefna</td>
<td>Taranger, LAW, VEWA, ANEW, ÍOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>api</td>
<td>VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ár</td>
<td>VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bælsalmr</td>
<td>ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barlak</td>
<td>VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bæcti</td>
<td>ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bastaðr</td>
<td>IEBW, NDEWB ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bætr</td>
<td>LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEBW, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belti</td>
<td>LAW, IEBW, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bersynðugr</td>
<td>NCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bëljfi</td>
<td>LAW, VEWA, IEBW, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bjalla</td>
<td>Taranger, LAW, VEWA, ANEW, ÍOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>björr</td>
<td>LAW, VEWA, IEBW, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blakt</td>
<td>VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blek</td>
<td>LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, ANEW, ÍOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blekhorn</td>
<td>NCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bleza</td>
<td>Taranger, LAW, ANEW, IEBW, KTFS, ÍOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bökfel</td>
<td>NCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bökstafr</td>
<td>LAW, NDEWB, NCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boltsa</td>
<td>LAW, ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bolli</td>
<td>LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borg</td>
<td>ANEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brokkr</td>
<td>VEWA, ANEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
guðmóðir   Taranger, LAW, NCG
guðsífa    Taranger, LAW, NCG
guðsonr    Taranger, LAW, NCG
guðspjall  Taranger, LAW, NCG, VEWA, IEWB, ÍOB
guðvefr    ANEW
háaltari   NCG
hálshbók   Taranger, LAW, NCG
handbjalla NCG
handbók    Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB, KTFS
handklæði  Taranger, LAW, IEWB, NCG, KTFS
handlín    Taranger, NCG, IEWB
harrí      LAW, NDEWB, IEWB, ANEW
háss       LAW, ANEW
helvíti    Taranger, NDEWB, IEWB, ÍOB
hróð       LAW, NDEWB, IEWB, ANEW
hröðprestr Taranger
hringa     LAW, ANEW
hrjóða     ANEW, ÍOB
hásl       Taranger, LAW, VEWA, ANEW, KTFS ÍOB
hvítasunndagr  Taranger, NCG, IEWB, ÍOB
hjóðfjúdir Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB
hjóðkirkja Taranger, LAW, NCG
hjóðlín    Taranger, LAW NCG
imbrudagr  Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
ínóg       LAW, VEWA,
jarknasteinn NCG, VEWA, ANEW
káli      LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kalíðýr    Taranger, LAW, VEWA, ANEW
kanna     LAW
kanóki     Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
kantarakápa Taranger, LAW, VEWA, ANEW
kantíki    Taranger, LAW, VEWA
kápa       LAW, VEWA, ANEW
kapellán   Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, KTFS, ANEW, ÍOB
kastali    LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kaupangyr ANEW
kempa      LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kennimadr  Taranger
kyrкра     Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kirkjúbók  NCG
kirkjufriðr NCG
kirkjuganga NCG
kirkjuland  NCG
kirkjusókn Taranger, NCG
kirkjusøgr NCG
kirkjusøgr NCG
kísta     LAW, IEWB, ANEW
klaustr  Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEWB ANEW, ÍOB
klefi  LAW, IEWB
klerkr  Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, IEWB, KTFS, ANEW
klítr  LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, ANEW
kleða  VEWA, ANEW
kleði  LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kofi  LAW, VEWA
koparr  LAW, VEWA, IEWB
kornfljóund  NCG
korporall  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ÍOB
kredda  LAW, VEWA, ANEW
kristindómur  Taranger, LAW, NCG
krisma  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
kristinn  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
kristna  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, KTFS, ÍOB
krog  IEWB, VEWA, ANEW
kroppa  VEWA, ANEW
kross  VEWA, ANEW
krukkja  LAW, IEWB, ANEW
kufl  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kurteisi  IEWB, ANEW
kviga  ANEW
kylna  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
kyndill  LAW, ANEW
kýrtil  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
lámadr  LAW, ANEW
laði  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
langafjáðagur  Taranger, LAW, IEWB, NCG, KTFS
langskip  NCG
lávarðr  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
leiðtogi  LAW, NCG, IEWB
léð(n)  LAW, VEWA, IEWB
léona  ANEW, VEWA, IEWB
léóparðr  ANEW, VEWA, IEWB
líksongr  Taranger, LAW, NCG
litja  ANEW, VEWA, IEWB
ljóðbyskup  Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB, ANEW, KTFS
loddari  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
lofsongr  Taranger, LAW, KTFS
lokarr  ANEW, VEWA, IEWB
leki(s)dómur  NCG
lekna  LAW, VEWA, NDEWB
leknir  LAW, NDEWB
leknisfingr  LAW, IEWB
lera  LAW, IEWB, VEWA, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
leirisveinn  Taranger
leðvirki  ANEW, VEWA, IEWB
mánadagr  LAW, IEWB, NCG
manga  LAW, VEWA, ANEW, IEWB
mangari  LAW, VEWA, ANEW, IEWB
mátér  VEWA, ANEW, IEWB
messa  Taranger, LAW, IEWB
messuhkull  Taranger, LAW, NCG
messuprest  Taranger, LAW, NCG, KTFS
messusóngr  Taranger, LAW, NCG, KTFS
messuvín  Taranger, NCG
míla  LAW, VEWA, ANEW, IEWB
misseri  VEWA, ANEW, IEWB
mjöoddrekkta  ANEW, IEWB
mortit  LAW, VEWA, ANEW
mót  LAW
móða  LAW
munklið(i)  Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, IEWB, NCG
munkr  Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
múrr  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
myrba  LAW, VEWA
mynstr  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
mynt  VEWA, ANEW
náttsgóngr  Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB
náttvaka  NCG
nón(tíð)  Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB, ÍOB
nunna  Taranger, LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, ANEW
nepa  LAW, NDEWB, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
öffra  Taranger, LAW, VEWA
óblása  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, KTFS
ostra  LAW, VEWA, ANEW, IEWB
óttusóngr  Taranger, LAW, NCG, KTFS
/óttu(songs)tíð
óbinsdagr  NCG
pá(fugl)  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
páll  IEWB, VEWA, ANEW
palmari  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
palmar  LAW, IEWB, ÍOB
palm(assunna)dagr  Taranger, LAW, NCG, IEWB
palmtré  NCG
pálstafir  IEWB, ANEW
pápa  LAW, IEWB
parrak  VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
pell  LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
penningar  LAW, ANEW
penta  VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
pentari  VEWA, ANEW
pera  LAW, VEWA, IEWB
pez  VEWA, ANEW
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pilíza  LAW, IEB, ANEW
píll  VEWA, ANEW
pín  VEWA, ANEW, ÍOB
pína  IEB, ANEW
pínr  VEWA, ANEW
pípa  IEB, ANEW
píparr  LAW, IEB, ANEW
pístill  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ÍOB
plaga  IEB, ANEW
plástr  IEB, ANEW
plokka  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
plóma  IEB, VEWA, ANEW
pollr  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
port  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
portgreiði  NCG
portkona  IEB, ANEW, NCG
posi  LAW, ANEW
postuli  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW, ÍOB
préðika  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW, ÍOB
prestr  Taranger, LAW, VEWA IEB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
píetr  LAW, VEWA, ANEW
prik  LAW, IEB
prim  Taranger, LAW, VEWA
prímsigna  IEB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
prjónn  VEWA, IEB, ANEW
próf  LAW
prófastr  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
púki  LAW, VEWA, ANEW, ÍOB
pulíza  VEWA, ANEW
pund  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
pundari  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
punktr  VEWA, IEB, ANEW
pynda  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
pytttr  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
reglulíf  NCG
rétviss  NCG
reykelsi  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
ribhaldi  VEWA, ANEW
rigr  ANEW
rím  Taranger, LAW, IEB, ÍOB
rokr  VEWA, ANEW
rós  VEWA, IEB, ANEW
róða  Taranger, LAW, IEB, ANEW, ÍOB
ræsimaðr  LAW, ANEW
ræðingr  LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW
sál(a)  Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEB, ANEW, KTFS, ÍOB
sálask  LAW, ANEW
salmr | LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
sápa  | VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
saltari | Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
sekkı | LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
serkr | LAW, ANEW
siglı  | VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
skipari | ANEW
skırı | VEWA, ANEW
skrífórdagr | Taranger, LAW, ANEW
skırırn | ANEW
skólí  | LAW, VEWA, IEWB
skons | VEWA, ANEW
skrífα | LAW, ANEW
skrín  | Taranger, LAW, VEWA, ANEW, ÍOB
skrifl | Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
skrúð | ANEW
skutil | LAW, IEWB, ANEW
skvíari | VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
skýrta | VEWA, LAW
snúð  | IEWB, ANEW
snæða | IEWB, ANEW
snæðingr | IEWB, ANEW
sokkr | LAW, VEWA, IEWB
sóli   | ANEW
sparrhaukr | ANEW
spíz  | VEWA, ANEW
stafróf | LAW, IEWB, ÍOB
stallari | LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
stedda | VEWA, LAW
stívarðr | LAW, IEWB, ANEW
stofa  | LAW, IEWB
stóli  | LAW, VEWA, IEWB
strjóna | VEWA, ANEW
strákr | LAW, IEWB
stræti | LAW, VEWA, ANEW
subþákn | Taranger, LAW, IEWB
sumnudagr | ANEW
sútari | LAW, IEWB
svinka | LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW
sylí   | LAW
syndafúllr | NCG
syndalauss | NCG
söngbök | Taranger, LAW, NCG
tabárðr | ANEW
tafíl | LAW, VEWA, ANEW
túkn | Taranger, LAW, VEWA, IEWB, ANEW, ÍOB
targa | LAW
| tasla | LAW, VEWA, IEWB |
| tersél | VEWA, ANEW |
| tígl | LAW, VEWA, ANEW |
| tin | ANEW |
| tíðasongr | NCG |
| tolfr | LAW, VEWA, IEWB |
| tráðr | VEWA, ANEW |
| tunna | LAW, VEWA, IEWB |
| turna | VEWA, IEWB, ANEW |
| týrýsdagr | ANEW |
| úfr | ANEW |
| umbogi | ANEW |
| url | LAW, IEWB, ANEW |
| vafrlogi | VEWA, IEWB, ANEW |
| vág | ANEW |
| vákr | LAW |
| vend | LAW, VEWA, IEWB |
| verðld | ANEW |
| vikudagr | NCG |
| vimpill | VEWA, IEWB, ANEW |
| vín | ANEW |
| vindæðr | NCG |
| þolmýðr | KTFS |
| þrá | VEWA, ANEW |
| þingmanna-lið | LAW |
| þórsdagr | ANEW |
Abbreviations

Languages

AN  Anglo-Norman
EGmc.  East Germanic
ME  Middle English
MLG  Middle Low German
NWGmc.  North-West Germanic
ODan.  Old Danish
OE  Old English
OEN  Old East Norse
OF  Old French
OFr.  Old Frisian
OHG  Old High German
Ol.  Old Icelandic
OIr.  Old Irish
ON  Old Norse
OS  Old Saxon
OSw.  Old Swedish
OWN  Old West Norse
WGmc.  West Germanic
WS  West Saxon

Dictionaries and word studies

AEEW  Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch
ANEW  Altnordisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch
ASD  An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary
DOE  Dictionary of Old English
DMLBS  Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources
EDPG  Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic
HGE  A Handbook of Germanic Etymology
IED  An Icelandic-English Dictionary
IEWB  Isländisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch
ÍOB  Íslensk orðsflibók
KTFS  Den Kristna Terminologien i Fornsvenskan
LAW  Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen
MNDWB  Mittelniederdeutsch Wörterbuch
NCG  Nominal Compounds in Germanic
NDEWB  Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch
OGNS  Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog
ONP  Ordbog over det norrøne Prosasprog
OED*  Oxford English Dictionary

*Revised entries are indicated with square brackets including the year of revision.
SEO Svensk Etymologisk Ordbok
VEWA Vergleichendes und Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altwestnordischen

Texts

FGT The First Grammatical Treatise
ÍF Íslensk fornrit
IHB Old Icelandic Homily Book
KLN M Kulturhistorisk Leksikon for nordisk middelalder fra vikingetid til reformationstid
NHB Old Norwegian Homily Book
PASE Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England

Grammatical terms

adj. adjective
f. feminine
m. masculine
n. neuter
vb. verb
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