Verbal Hyperbaton in the Viking Age Runic Inscriptions

Eric Lander

1. Introduction

A handful of runic inscriptions display syntactic discontinuities in the noun phrase which linguists might choose to categorize as *scrambling* and which rhetoricians might call *hyperbaton*.[1] Adams (1971) defines *verbal hyperbaton* in Latin as cases where a non-predicative adjective is separated from its head noun by a verb, such as in Cicero's *in eadem es navi* 'you are in the same boat'. While hyperbaton in Latin primarily has the function of marking one or the other of the disjoined elements as somehow prominent in the discourse (see also Devine & Stephens 2000 on Classical Greek), additional factors – such as rhythmic and stylistic considerations – also play a role. In general, it seems that the "device was artistic rather than natural to ordinary speech" (Adams 1971: 1). Hyperbaton is also found in the older runic material (e.g. KJ 127 Sjælland **hariuha haitika farauisa**,

[1] I am grateful to audiences at Grammatikkollokviet in Uppsala (September 19, 2023) and Högre seminariet in Gothenburg (April 15, 2024) for valuable comments and discussion. Special thanks to John Ankarström, Marco Bianchi, Johan Brandtler, Elisabet Engdahl, Per Holmberg, Magnus Källström, Anastasia Makarova, Lasse Mårtensson, Stellan Petersson, Alexandra Petrulevich, Henrik Rosenkvist, Ulla Stroh-Wollin, Matteo Tarsi, Fredrik Valdeson, Veturliði Óskarsson, and Henrik Williams. I would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers for insightful comments and suggestions from which this paper has greatly benefited. Abbreviations: # = infelicitous, / = syllable with primary stress, \ = syllable with secondary stress, _ = missing final syllable in hypometrical verse, Am. = *Atlamál*, Fáfn. = *Fáfnismál*, Hárb. = *Hárbarðsljóð*, Háv. = *Hávamál*, O = object, Reg. = *Reginsmál*, V = verb, V_{inf} = infinitival verb, × = unstressed syllable.

Lander, Eric. 2025. Verbal Hyperbaton in the Viking Age Runic Inscriptions. *Scripta Islandica* 75: 5–38. https://doi.org/10.63092/scis.75.33049
ISSN 0582-3234 (tryckt); ISSN 2001-9416 (digitalt)

with the verb **haitika** 'I am called' splitting **hariuha** from its apposition **farauisa**; KJ 67 Noleby **runo fahi raginakudo**, with the verb **fahi** 'I paint' interrupting the noun phrase 'rune of divine origin'), a fact which Braunmüller (2004) has attributed to contact with Latin. Schulte (2005a), however, presents convincing reasons to be skeptical of this hypothesis. There is every reason to believe that the phenomenon was homegrown (see also Hopper 1975: 66–67, with references, and Sonderegger 1998). In this paper I focus not on the older runic material but rather on the Viking Age runic inscriptions. There is no need to posit direct influence from Latin in order to account for the phenomenon's existence in these inscriptions either, but the term *hyperbaton* is nevertheless a useful term insofar as it has an established usage in the classical tradition. In this paper I intend it to be a descriptively neutral term.

The paper considers half a dozen cases of hyperbaton in the Viking Age runic inscriptions,[2] along with some parallels in Old Norse, especially Eddic poetry. The texts considered are both poetry and prose, but all of them are plausibly categorized as stylistically marked in some way. I will argue that the range of cases, both poetic and prosaic, can be given the same basic analysis in terms of post-syntactic movement of prosodic constituents, along the lines of Agbayani & Golston (2010, 2016). The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces two attestations of hyperbaton in Vg 32 and Sö 61, both of which display versification. I derive these orders by movement which is triggered by alliterative considerations. Movement targets a prosodic constituent, a claim which finds support in a third inscription (U 512). Section 3 begins by presenting cases of hyperbaton in the prose texts of three runic inscriptions (U 735, Sö 46, and Öl 10), and it continues by discussing different ways in which hyperbaton can be triggered in prose. The relationship to left branch extraction (LBE) and verb second (V2) is also considered, especially with regard to work by Kristján Árnason (2002) and Dewey (2006). Section 4 concludes the paper.

[2] Broadly speaking, the Viking Age spans the period 725–1130. The main inscriptions discussed in this paper are stylistically dated to the period between 980 and 1080 (see Gräslund 2006 for general background).

2. Hyperbaton in early Nordic poetry

In this section I discuss the use of hyperbaton in three versified runic inscriptions. I argue that the word order should be thought of as motivated by considerations of phonology, more specifically alliteration, a view that aligns with and complements the analysis of hyperbaton put forth by Agbayani & Golston (2010, 2016).

2.1. Dem V N (Vg 32 and Sö 61)

Evert Salberger (1959) discusses the nature of the discontinuous noun phrase in the inscription Vg 32 (Kållands-Åsaka parish), the text of which is given in full in (1). Wenning (1930: 8) suggests that the word order might be a "kompromissform" between an ancient (verb-late) order and the newer (verb-second) one. A more likely proximate cause for the word order is versification (Brate & Bugge 1887–1891: 367–368, Naumann 2018: 156–157), where *þenna* alliterates with *Þōrðr* and *Þōrunn*, and *allgōðan* alliterates with *Ærra*. Svärdström – to Salberger's great dismay – does not mention versification in her 1958 treatment of Vg 32 in SRI 5. By 1970, however, she has clearly identified this text as instantiating a helming of *fornyrðislag* (introduction to SRI 5: xxxvi; see also Salberger 1976: 39, fn. 27).

(1)[3] **þurþr × uk × þurun × þana × risþu × stin × efti × era × alkuþan : trik**

Þōrðr ok Þōrunn þenna ræistu
stæin æftiʀ Ærra allgōðan dræng

'Þōrðr and Þōrunn raised this stone after Ærri, a very good lad.'

As Svärdström (SRI 5: 50) points out, **alkuþan** is an uncommon word in the runic corpus (more common options for 'very' being *harða* or *miok*). Salberger (1959: 234) sees this *all-* as a choice allowing for alliteration with *Ærra* in the on-verse, and he sees a parallel in the sequence **estriþ × iftʀ × inkuar × alkoþan × trenk** on U 143, where *all-* in the off-verse alliterates with *Æstrīð* and *Ingvar* in the on-verse.[4]

As Naumann (2018: 15) points out, runologists are constantly faced with

[3] Runic Swedish forms are given in normalized form, following Peterson (2006, 2007).

[4] Where relevant, I will refer to odd-numbered half-lines as *on-verses* and even-numbered half-lines as *off-verses*. See Fulk (2016) for an overview of the system originally devised by Sievers (1893) as it relates to Eddic poetry.

"Unwägbarkeiten" and the concomitant challenge of controlling for "akzidentielle Phänomene" in the texts they investigate. Had the word order of Vg 32 been a unique occurrence in the runic corpus, one might wonder about its status as an 'accidental phenomenon'. However, as Salberger observed more than 60 years ago, this kind of discontinuity is not unique but attested elsewhere in early Nordic. The same linear sequence of syntactic categories (Dem V N) is also found on Sö 61 (Ösby, Husby-Oppunda parish), given in (2), and a similar one (Adj/Det V N) is found on Sö 35 (Tjuvstigen, Trosa-Vagnhärad parish), given in (3), which forms a pair monument with Sö 34. Like Vg 32, these inscriptions show versified text according to Brate & Bugge (1887–1891: 185–186, 155–157) and Naumann (2018: 172–173, 162–164). See also Hübler (1996: 43–45).

(2)[5] **þorstain : lit · þina : rita : stain : eᚠila : stetr : eftiʀ : þorbiarn : salui · auk : simiþr : at · sen boroþur**

Þōrstæinn lēt þenna rētta
stæin hæfila stændr æftiʀ Þōrbiorn
Salvi ok Smiðr at sinn brōður

'Þōrstæinn had this stone erected. Stately it stands after Þōrbiorn. Salvi and Smiðr after their brother.'

(3) **lit · igikeʀ · anan · raisa · stain · at · suni · sina · su[n·]a · kiarþi · kuþ · hialbi · ant · þaira × þuriʀ · hiu ·**

Lēt Ingigæiʀʀ/Ingigærðr annan ræisa stæin
at syni sīna, sÿna gærði.
Guð hialpi and þæiʀa. Þōriʀ hiō.

'Ingigæiʀʀ/Ingigærðr had another stone raised after his/her sons, made (them) visible. May God help their spirits. Þōriʀ cut.'

It is true that the word order Dem V N is attested in Eddic poetry as well (Salberger 1959: 232–233; see also Schulte 2005b: 187 on *Vǫluspá*), although more needs to be said about the exact structures involved in this genre (see Section 3.2 below). I provide only one Eddic example here (4), with additional cases to be discussed in more depth below (stanza numbers for the Eddic are taken from the Codex Regius edition of Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson et al. 2019).

[5] For some discussion of the problematic element **eᚠila** see Hübler (1996: 44) and Naumann (2018: 21, 173).

(4) *at* ***sá*** *gengr* ***gumi*** *ok* *mælir* *við* *mik*
that that walks man and speaks with me
'that that man comes and speaks to me' (Háv. 154)

For Salberger, the Eddic attestations make it highly unlikely that the word order found on Vg 32 is a mistake or a "korrekturändring" (*contra* Larsson 1931: 33), rather it must be quite the contrary, namely a deliberate stylistic choice and in all likelihood a "versindicium" (Salberger 1959: 234).

It is worth pointing out that Wulf (1998: 94), in his review of Hübler (1996), keeps the demonstrative and its head noun within the same half-line (compare also (3) above), leaving *æftiʀ* to bear the stress and alliterate in both Vg 32 and Sö 61 (see also Wulf 2003: 978).

(5) a. ***Þ****ōrðr ok* ***Þ****ōrunn* *þenna rœistu stœin*
æftiʀ ***Æ****rra* ***a****llgōðan dræng*
b. ***Þ****ōrstœinn lēt* *þenna rētta stœin*
æ*fila stændr* ***æ****ftiʀ Þōrbiorn*
S*alvi ok* ***S****miðr* *at* ***s****inn brōður*

That a preposition should be stressed, as in (5), is no doubt an irregularity, but it is in keeping with Wulf's reasoned views on runic poetry: "Wir haben es mit wenigen Ausnahmen mit anspruchsloserer Kleindichtung zu tun, in der nicht immer alle Regeln streng befolgt wurden" (Wulf 2003: 1004). For Sö 61, one could avoid a stressed preposition by adopting the metrical structure in (2) instead of (5b). For Vg 32, however, there are issues not only with (5a) but also with (1), where the on-verse *stœin æftiʀ Ærra* shows a stressed yet non-alliterating element (*stœin*) to the left of the alliterating element *Ærra*, something which is strictly speaking not allowed (see e.g. Fulk 2016: 255). Still, we can observe that (1) scans straightforwardly as / × / × || / × / × || / × × / × || / \ × /, whereas (5a) yields the more awkward / × / × || / × × × / _ || / × / × || / \ × /.[6] I will not attempt to settle the question

[6] To be more precise, it is the off-verse *þenna rœistu stœin* (/ × × × / _) (and, for that matter, *þenna rētta stœin* in (5b)) that is problematic. There are two main reasons. For one, as Fulk (2016: 254) notes, there are "rarely more than two" unstressed syllables in the first dip of a verse, but in this case we have three. Nevertheless, it has been observed in the literature (Suzuki 2014: 26, 86, 91; Males 2023: 123) that there was a relatively high degree of freedom in *fornyrðislag* with regard to how many syllables could occupy the first dip position in verse types A, B, and C, as long as the relevant elements were prosodically light. The second issue is that the half-line in question is three-positional, lacking an unstressed syllable in final position. Fulk (2016: 258–59) points out that diachronic processes can sometimes account for

here, but the fact that both options are imperfect lends credence to Wulf's stance on the less-than-rigorous nature of runic poetry. Suffice it to say that there are different ways of thinking about the precise metrical patterns involved here, but there can be little doubt that both texts are representatives of alliterative verse.

Vg 32 and Sö 61 do not appear to be monuments of especially high (or particularly low) prestige. Although it is difficult to diagnose the social status of runic monuments (see Williams 2013 for general discussion), we might make note of the name *Smiðr* 'smith', which in all likelihood does not belong to the upper echelons of society.[7] The names *Þōrstæinn* and *Þōrbiorn* (Sö 61), moreover, are common names in the runic inscriptions, as are *Þōrðr* and *Þōrunn* (Vg 32). Recall here also that Svärdström considers it likely that Ærri (Vg 32) was a simple farmer. Now, the fact that Sö 61 is a bit less formulaic (making use of the phrase *(h)æfila stændr æftiʀ* NN) and also slightly longer than Vg 32 might indicate a difference in social status, but both of these inscriptions give the overall impression of medium-status monuments.

If my social classification of these two monuments is correct, then alliterative verse is not exclusively restricted to high-status inscriptions. This is not so surprising, as long as we accept that speakers of East Nordic in Viking Age society had a range of different registers available to them depending on the communicative context (see Schulte 2006, 2008 for discussion). In the cases of Vg 32 and Sö 61, we have plausibly "middle-class" speakers who are employing a more formal register in order to fulfill perceived requirements on the kind of language considered appropriate for memorials. It is also worth emphasizing in this regard that the elements involved in the versification are just those of the standard raiser formulas ('NN raised this stone in memory of NN' for Vg 32 and 'NN had this stone raised in memory of NN' for Sö 61) but reshuffled in more poetic fashion. Michael Schulte has dis-

such patterns, but this does not appear to be relevant here. Still, the fact remains that hypometrical/catalectic half-lines are attested in verse types A, C, and D (Sievers 1893: 68, Suzuki 2014: 196, Males 2023: 123). Perhaps neither of these two issues on its own is enough, but in combination they cast some doubt on the analysis in (5). A reviewer also suggests the possible scansion / × / × \ (D*4).

[7] There are no clear indications from the (almost entirely eastern) Viking Age inscriptions that *Smiðr*, which especially in the Danish material appears as an epithet, is indicative of higher social status. This does not mean, of course, that smiths and their skills were not valued by society, but these individuals belonged to the class of free men. After all, as *Rígsþula* tells us, Smiðr and Drengr were sons of Karl (= Churl) (in Collinder's 1957: 109 translation: 23 *hon giftes med Karl; Snör hette hon …* 24 *Barn fingo de, de bodde och trivdes – Hall hette de och Dräng, Höld, Tegn och Smed*). Thanks to Magnus Källström (p.c.) for discussion of this point.

cussed the role of formulaic elements in the runic inscriptions, with various alliterative phrases not necessarily meeting the standard of full-blown verse but still functioning "as a structuring device and a mnemonic tool" (Schulte 2007: 69). A distinction between "hochstilisierender, stabender Rede" and a text which goes beyond alliteration by also regulating "durch Ikten und Wortgewicht" is also made by Naumann (2018: 14).[8] Vg 32 and Sö 61 certainly go beyond "structuring devices", fulfilling enough of the alliterative and rhythmic criteria to be considered *bona fide* poetry, but they are poetry of a perhaps less creative and (as Wulf might say) unsophisticated sort.

2.2. Analysis: Alliteration-triggered movement

An attempt at a more formal syntactic analysis will help to shed some light on the nature of verbal hyperbaton in the language of the Viking Age runic material. Let us first consider Vg 32 and Sö 61.

Considering that demonstratives almost always show postnominal positioning in the Viking Age inscriptions (see Stroh-Wollin 2016: 163, Table 5; see also Perridon 1996), we can assume generalized NP-movement to the left periphery of the nominal extended projection at this stage of the language, as sketched in (6).

(6) $[_{NP}$ *stæin*$]$ $[_{DP}$ *þenna* $[t_{NP}]]$

From here there are different analyses available for modeling the movement of *þenna* to a position to the left of the verb. On the one hand, it could be posited that the demonstrative is a DemP in Spec-DP and undergoes phrasal movement (7a) (see, among many others, Leu 2015 on demonstratives as internally complex), or we could imagine that the entire DP, including the trace of the moved NP, undergoes movement (7b).

(7) a. $[_{\mathbf{DemP}}$ ***þenna***$]$ [Verb $[[_{NP}$ *stæin*$]$ $[_{DP}$ t_{DemP} $[t_{NP}]]]]$

b. $[_{DP}$ ***þenna*** $[\boldsymbol{t}_{\mathbf{NP}}]]$ [Verb $[[_{NP}$ *stæin*$]$ $[t_{DP}]]]$

Whichever option one chooses in (7), the crucial point is that *þenna* in Vg 32 and Sö 61 is still to the right of the subject, so we cannot assume fronting of the demonstrative to any of the typical left-peripheral positions in the C-domain of Rizzi (1997). Instead we would have to assume movement to

[8] Metrical structure without rhyme is also a possibility: Herschend (2001: 30), for instance, points out that Torbjörn skald's Hillersjö inscription (U 29) has a strophic structure of the traditional type (Herschend's Types 1 and 2) but without alliteration or other forms of rhyme.

some lower middle field position, at the left edge of VP (for Sö 61) or TP (for Vg 32) (see also Agbayani & Golston 2010: § 3.3 for similar reasoning). While such positions have been proposed in the literature (see e.g. Belletti 2001 on low focus in Italian), it is difficult to argue on positive evidence from the runic material for the existence of such a position.

Typical triggers for this sort of movement are contrastive focus or contrastive topicality (see Pereltsvaig 2008 and Fanselow & Féry 2013, among others, for discussion of left branch extraction in Slavic; see Devine & Stephens 2000 on Classical Greek), but there is no obvious reason to attribute a contrastive reading to 'this' in either Vg 32 or Sö 61. The case of Sö 34 and Sö 35 is interesting in this regard, since these two inscriptions make up a pair monument, where the former informs us that *Styrlaugʀ ok Holmbʀ stæina ræistu at brǭðr sīna* 'Styrlaugʀ and Holmbʀ raised (the) stones in memory of their brothers' and the latter shows fronting of **anan** 'another' in *Lēt Ingigæiʀʀ annan ræisa stæin at syni sīna* 'Ingigæiʀʀ had ANOTHER(?) stone raised in memory of his sons'. As indicated by the small capitals in my translation, it is conceivable that fronted *annan* functions as a contrastive topic ('yet another stone') or focus ('not the other but rather this stone'). That being said, the case of Sö 35 could also be explained entirely on the basis of alliteration, where fronting of *annan* allows for alliteration with the vowel-initial name *Ingigæiʀʀ* in the first half-line. My point is simply that this is the *kind* of evidence we need if we are going to make arguments invoking information structure: since Sö 34 and Sö 35 are a pair monument, we have a discourse environment where topic and focus are potentially relevant. Such a context would make it possible to find convincing evidence of topic- or focus-driven word order. With this in mind, it should be clear that Vg 32 and Sö 61 are not as amenable to such an analysis. If Vg 32 had been one of two runestones, then perhaps the argument could be made that Þōrðr and Þōrunn had raised THIS stone (as opposed to some other), but there is no evidence that this might be the case for either Sö 61 or Vg 32. What Vg 32 and Sö 61 do show, however, is a word order which is easily understood from the point of view of restrictions imposed by alliterative verse, which is to say that the fronting of *þenna* in both Vg 32 and Sö 61 has the crucial function of allowing for proper alliteration.

Let us explore this idea in more depth. The regularly expected word orders for Vg 32 and Sö 61 would be *ræistu/rētta stæin þenna* or *ræistu/rētta þenna stæin* (unattested as such but *ræisa þenna stæin* is attested in a dozen Viking Age inscriptions from Uppland, along with a handful of *ræisa þessa stæina*). The former option does not yield an alliterating first lift,

and the latter only does so if the ictus is not on the verb. There are two permutations that unambiguously allow for alliteration: *þenna stæin ræistu/rētta* or *þenna ræistu/rētta stæin*. The former option is problematic for two reasons. First, as already mentioned, Dem N order is highly unusual in the runic material (Stroh-Wollin 2016, Perridon 1996). Second, OV (whether V is finite or non-finite) is remarkably unusual in the runic material.[9] For instance, a search for ON *reisa/reisti/reistu stein (þenna)* in the Scandinavian Runic Text Database yields over 1000 hits, while ON *stein (þenna) reisa/reisti/reistu* yields only three hits (for *stein reisa*, all three of which are rather uncertain, but two attestations are included in Tab. 1).

Tab. 1[10] is not exhaustive, but it suffices to demonstrate that OV with a determined object is extremely uncommon in the runic material, which is to say that most of the runic attestations of OV have an object which is a bare noun.[11, 12] Objects which are to the left of the verb and which also have a

[9] This in spite of the fact that the earliest Old Swedish, i.e. the stage immediately following the "Runic Swedish" stage, was a language tending towards OV_{inf} (see Wenning 1930, Delsing 1999, Magnusson Petzell 2011). As Cecilia Falk (2011: 175) notes, OV_{inf} was quite dominant in *Äldre Västgötalagen*, and the word order was found "redan i runsvenska, om än belagd med färre exempel" (with U 654 provided as an example on p.176). Interestingly, Sangfelt (2019) – partly motivated (see Sangfelt 2019: 169, citing Valdeson 2017) by the situation in the Viking Age runic inscriptions – argues that Old Swedish was neither strictly OV nor VO. In unpublished work, Valdeson (2017, also citing Wessén 1965: 219) suggests that VO order in the Viking Age material had become a fixed part of the memorial formula ('X let raise Y in memory of Z'). It seems likely that genre plays a role in the gap observed between the two stages.

[10] *stein rétta*: U 92, U 273, U 377 †, U 418, U 515, U 572, U 885; *stein rétti*: U 514; *stein réttu*: U 378, U 889 (somewhat uncertain); *brú gera*: Sö 30, Sö 141, Sö 300, Sö 312, Sm 130, U 45, U 92, U 114 (with *laðb[r]ō*), U 118, U 142, U 145, U 146, U 217, U 267, U 272, U 310, U 317 †, U 330, U 377 †, U 505, U 572, U 791, U 828, U 839, U 856, U 859, U 861, U 1017 (somewhat uncertain), U 1031, U THS30;83 †, Vs 27/28, G 203; *brú gerði*: Ög 132, Vg 4 (with *stæinbrō*), Hs 12, G 309; *brú gerðu*: Sö 142, Sö 328, U 236, U 363 †, U 378; *stein reisa*: Sö 60 (somewhat uncertain), Sö 141 (somewhat uncertain); *stein hǫggva*: U 45, U 114, U 206 †, U 211, U 249, U 277, U 294, U 295 (x2), U 318, U 365 †, U 509, U 604, U Fv1959;188, U THS10;58; *helli hǫggva*: Sö 359; *rúnar rista*: U 112; *braut ryðja*: Sö 311, Sö 312, U 101, U 149 †; *brú þessa gerði*: Ög 214, U 127, U 164, U 165, U 261; *brú þessa gerðu*: U 135; *kuml þetta gera*: U 585 † (though uncertain); *kuml þessi gera*: DR 36. Excluded from the table: U 594 (**s... ...[is]...** is too uncertain), U ATA4741/44 (**---n · ---ụa** is too uncertain), Sö 213 (*stæin hiogg* is fronted object with verb-second, i.e. not VP), Ög 53 † (**[inl hk]** is too uncertain), Ög 183 (not perfectly clear what **uruni** is). Also excluded from the table are the inscriptions which I discuss later in this article: U 735, Sö 46, Öl 10 †.

[11] Indeed, even the handful of cases of a determined object to the left of the verb are fewer than they appear, since four attestations of *brú þessa gerði* belong to Jarlabanke's self-raised runestones, and an additional attestation of *brú þessa gerðu* is on a stone raised by Jarlabanke's father.

[12] Curiously, this brings to mind a rule proposed by Delsing (1999: 205, his (84)) for a later

Tab. 1. Some OV orders in runic inscriptions from the Viking Age

OV order	Search string in normalized Old Norse	Hits	Totals
OV where O = N	*stein rétta / rétti / réttu*	7 / 1 / 2	
	stein setja / setti / settu	0 / 0 / 0	
	brú gera / gerði / gerðu	32 / 4 / 5	
	stein reisa / reisti / reistu	2 / 0 / 0	
	stein hǫggva / hjó / hjoggu	15 / 0 / 0	
	helli hǫggva / hjó / hjoggu	1 / 0 / 0	
	kuml reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	kuml gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 0 / 0	
	rúnar rista / risti / ristu	1 / 0 / 0	
	braut ryðja / ruddi / ruddu	4 / 0 / 0	**74**
OV where O = N Dem	*stein þenna rétta / rétti / réttu*	0 / 0 / 0	
	stein þenna setja / setti / settu	0 / 0 / 0	
	brú þessa gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 5 / 1	
	stein þenna reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	stein þenna hǫggva / hjó / hjoggu	0 / 0 / 0	
	helli þessa hǫggva / hjó / hjoggu	0 / 0 / 0	
	kuml þetta reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	kuml þetta gera / gerði / gerðu	1 / 0 / 0	
	kuml þessi reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	kuml þessi gera / gerði / gerðu	1 / 0 / 0	
	kuml þessa reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	kuml þessa gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 0 / 0	
	rúnar þessar rista / risti / ristu	0 / 0 / 0	
	braut þessa ryðja / ruddi / ruddu	0 / 0 / 0	**8**
OV where O = Dem N	*þenna stein rétta / rétti / réttu*	0 / 0 / 0	
	þenna stein setja / setti / settu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessa brú gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þenna stein reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þenna stein hǫggva / hjó / hjoggu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessa helli hǫggva / hjó / hjoggu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þetta kuml reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þetta kuml gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessi kuml reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessi kuml gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessa kuml reisa / reisti / reistu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessa kuml gera / gerði / gerðu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessar rúnar rista / risti / ristu	0 / 0 / 0	
	þessa braut ryðja / ruddi / ruddu	0 / 0 / 0	**0**

prenominal demonstrative, moreover, appear to be completely unattested.[13] Given this gap, it is reasonable to assume that alternatives like *þenna stæin ræistu* or *þenna stæin rētta* were ruled out for grammatical reasons. One interpretation of the available evidence, then, is that [[Dem N] V] order (e.g. *þenna stæin ræistu*) was impossible or sufficiently unnatural in early East Nordic for the authors of Vg 32 and Sö 61 to consciously choose the discontinuous order (*þenna ræistu stæin*) instead. But how is it derived?

If we assume a syntactic output of V N Dem in Old East Nordic, then the word order of Vg 32 and Sö 61 can be seen as involving fronting of *þenna*, as sketched in (8).

(8) a. *Þōrðr ok Þōrunn* ***þenna*** *ræistu stæin* ~~*þenna*~~ …

b. *Þōrstæinn lēt* ***þenna*** *rētta stæin* ~~*þenna*~~ …

Again, the basic word order of the second half-line in (8) is *ræistu/rētta stæin þenna*. Either the noun or the verb could be considered stressed, but either way the first lift in the off-verse would not alliterate. Such a configuration would violate the basic rule for "even verses (off-verses)" that "the first syllable bearing primary stress must alliterate" (Fulk 2016: 255). The solution in both cases is to move a prosodic word (ω), the demonstrative determiner, to the left, making it the first lift of the off-verse (we can furthermore assume that each half-line is a phonological phrase φ; see e.g. Golston & Riad 2003 on Old English). From this position, *þenna* is able to alliterate with the proper name(s) in the on-verse.[14]

The movements I propose in (8) are in line with Agbayani & Golston's (2010, 2016) views on hyperbaton in Greek and Latin, which they analyze as postsyntactic phonological movement of discourse-prominent elements. They argue that hyperbaton belongs in the phonological component,

stage (15th and 16th centuries) of Swedish, according to which an object argument is licensed either by having an occupied D(eterminer)-position or by moving the object to the left of the (non-finite) verb.

[13] It has been known at least since de Boor (1922: 8), Wenning (1930: 5, see also 67), and Larsson (1931: 34, 45–52) that OV in main clauses tends to appear in coordinated contexts, more specifically as a second VP conjunct. This pattern of [VO & OV] has been termed *kiastisk ordställning* by Wessén (1965: 220).

[14] A demonstrative determiner as a lift of course amounts to a bending of the regular rules of alliterative poetry. We would probably want to classify this item not as an article and thus in metrical terms a so-called *clitic* (unstressed element), but rather as a pronoun and thus a *particle* (potentially stressed element). See Fulk (2016: 253) for general discussion.

strictly after narrow syntax, on the grounds that the phenomenon flouts a number of expectations concerning syntactic movement. For example, as already alluded to above, hyperbaton is able to target elements which are not syntactic constituents. Moreover, the movement involved can be "extremely local" (see Agbayani & Golston 2010: § 3.1, 2016: § 3.5), sometimes skipping over just a single word.[15] The phonological movement is, according to them, due to a constraint called Prom-L: "Prominent material occurs to the left of its interface position" (Agbayani & Golston 2010: 158, 2016: 33),[16, 17] where 'interface' refers to the syntax-phonology interface. According to generative assumptions going back to Chomsky (1965), syntactic structure is at this point no longer relevant to the derivation; only phonological information is accessible in the phonological component.

A similar type of prosodic movement is attested in Eddic poetry. While

[15] As Agbayani and Golston point out, such movements defy so-called *anti-locality* (Grohmann 2002, Abels 2003).

[16] One might wonder if the mirror image of Prom-L is also a possible constraint, i.e. shifting non-prominent material to the right. Consider for instance the discontinuous phrase **[k]unburka faþ[i stin þina in kuþa]** ***Gunnborga*** *fāði stæin þenna* ***hin gōða*** on Hs 21, with right-extraposition of the prosodic unit *hin gōða*, separating it from *Gunnborga* (see Åhlén 1994: 48). Assuming that the narrow-syntactic output is *Gunnborga hin gōða fāði stæin þenna*, only right-extraposition of the prosodic unit (*hin gōða*) would produce the observed word order, since there is no unit (*Gunnborga fāði stæin þenna*) to move to the left, whereas assuming the (dubious) narrow-syntactic output *Hin gōða Gunnborga fāði stæin þenna* would be compatible with either approach. In *Guðfastr, Sæulfr* ***ræistu*** *at Holmstæin, brōður sinn,* ***stæin*** on Sö 51, similarly, either leftward movement of (*at Holmstæin, brōður sinn*) from its base position at the end of the sentence or rightward movement of (*stæin*) to the end of the sentence would produce the observed configuration. The proper analysis of extraposition would seem to have some bearing on how we analyze hyperbaton. Ultimately, however, this is a much wider issue than the one I am concerned with here, and I must leave the questions raised in this footnote for future research.

[17] Another question I will not address here is tmesis, which is when an intervening element breaks up a single word. The term is often associated with a phenomenon observed in Gothic verbs, where a "preverb may be separated from the verb whilst retaining its close cohesion with the verb" (Booij & van Kemenade 2003: 1), e.g. *diz-uh-þan-sat* 'and then seized' (Miller 2019: 266). Tmesis also applies to more dramatic discontinuities, usually in skaldic poetry, where not clitics but rather an entire word or phrase can split up a single word or name, e.g. *þá vas* ***Ið-*** *með jǫtnum /* ***-unnr*** *nýkomin sunnan* 'then Idunn, newly arrived from the south, was with the giants' (Clunies Ross 2005: 111, giving an example from Þjóðólfr ór Hvini's *Haustlǫng*). Reichardt (1969: 200–201) points out that tmesis in Old Norse results in "grammatically recognizable word elements" (his example being *Stiklar* [X] *stǫðum*, where *Stiklarstǫðum* is morphologically decomposable as a noun in the genitive singular plus a noun in the dative plural; *Iðunnr*, moreover, is equivalent to *ið* 'restless movement' + *unnr* 'wave(s)'), whereas tmesis in Latin can result in "grammatically unnatural" elements.

granting that runic poetry is demonstrably a genre of its own (see Naumann 2018: 20, 29), there are a number of Eddic cases of verbal hyperbaton which parallel the runic cases in that they display short-distance movement motivated by verse structure. Consider the case of verbal hyperbaton in (9), from *Fáfnismál*.

(9) *Eitri ek fnæsta er ek á **arfi** lá*
poison I sniffed.out when I on inheritance lay

***miklum** míns fǫður*
great my.GEN father.GEN

'I blew out poison when I lay on the great inheritance of my father' (Fáfn. 19)

Let us assume something like the syntactic output in (10a) for the *er*-clause. While it would perhaps not be impossible to imagine an off-verse like *er ek lá á arfi* (× × × × / ×) in *ljóðaháttr*, it would be much less irregular to have two lifts (where the first lift must alliterate with *eitri*).

(10) a. *er ek lá á arfi miklum míns fǫður*

b. *Eitri ek fnæsta* || *er ek **á arfi** lá ~~á arfi~~* || *miklum míns fǫður*

As shown in (10b), with stressed syllables underlined, the movement of *arfi* (along with a presumably proclitic preposition *á*; see discussion in next section) resolves this issue, ultimately giving us two lifts (a noun and a finite verb), with alliterating staves in *ei-* and *a-*.[18] The example from *Reginsmál* in (11), also *ljóðaháttr*, can be analyzed in the same way: the stressed element *gjǫld* has been moved in order to alliterate with *gull*.

(11) *Gull er þér nú reitt en þú **gjǫld** hefir*
gold is to.you now brought and you reward have

***mikil** míns hǫfuðs*
much my.GEN head.GEN

'Gold is now brought to you, and you have a great reward for my head' (Reg. 6)

[18] A reviewer points out that such movement resembles displacement, whereby the finite verb *lá* should be automatically endowed with stress by Kuhn's Laws. Indeed, *lá* is a finite verb in an embedded clause, which in *fornyrðislag* forces it to bear stress (Fulk 2016: 253). While such rules are not necessarily relevant for *ljóðaháttr* (Fulk 2016: 261), I agree that more than just alliteration might be at the root of this operation. The same goes for *hefir* in (11).

In addition to the 'proactive' hyperbaton seen in (9) and (11), there also appear to be cases of 'preventative' hyperbaton. Consider (12) (in *mála-háttr*).[19]

(12) *okkr* *mun* *gramr* ***gulli*** *reifa* ***glóð-rauðu***
us will king gold.DAT enrich ember-red.DAT
'The king will enrich us with ember-red gold' (Am. 14)

In (12) it seems that the head noun in 'ember-red gold' is fronted to the left of the verb in order to prevent the second half-line from containing two alliterating lifts (i.e. *okkr mun gramr reifa* || *gulli glóðrauðu*).

As noted above, Agbayani and Golston assume that 'prominent' elements are targeted for post-syntactic movement due to their being marked for topic or focus. It is not impossible, of course, that Vg 32 and Sö 61 have topic- or focus-driven movement of *þenna*, but hard evidence for such an analysis is hard to come by. What is perfectly straightforward, however, is an analysis which treats the movement of *þenna* as triggered by alliterative considerations. Such considerations, however, should not be accessible to the syntactic component: alliteration is reliant on phonological information, and phonological information should be invisible to the syntactic module. Thus, an analysis in terms of movement in the phonological component, where phonological information is accessible, is perfectly natural and appropriate for such cases.

2.3. Supporting evidence for prosodic movement from U 512

An interesting piece of additional evidence for the phonological approach to verbal hyperbaton comes from U 512. Only the bottom part of this inscription could be published in 1946 (SRI 7: 367–368), but a few years later, thanks to an especially low water line at the time, two large additional pieces of the runestone were observed at the bottom of a bay a couple of kilometers away from the base of the stone. These pieces were recovered and reunited with the rest of the runestone, resulting in a mostly complete text (see Jansson 1954).

[19] The alliterating staves in (12) are clearly *g-*, and thus *glóð-* must be the first syllable with primary stress in the off-verse × × / \ ×. This means that *reifa* occupies the first drop, even though it is a non-finite verb, which would normally be stressed. See Suzuki (2014: 456) for more such examples.

(13) A **fryb. . . . . .i × huk fr̥. . . . . .f̥-þr × þiʀ ristu × sti- -. . .n̥a × iftiʀ × kuþ-ar × . . .a̧þur × sin kuþan × huk tuma + þ̣. . .-þur × sin ×× kuþ . . .i ot × þiʀa × huk × salu × hu. . . . . .uþiʀ × bitr × þan × þiʀ × -ar- × h. . .**

B **. . .ir × skal × sta͡nta × stin × uiþ- bryku × suniʀ × at × faþuʀ satu · kuþan · kaiʀ -. . . . . .**

C **--u̧-aʀ × mirki × at × bua-. . . . . .**

Frøyb[iorn] … ok Fr[øy] … f[i]ðr þæiʀ ræistu stæi[n þe]nna æftiʀ Guð[m] ar [f]aður sinn gōðan ok Tumma b[rō]ður sinn. Guð [hialp]i and þæiʀa ok sālu o[k Guðs m]ōðiʀ bætr þan þæiʀ [g]ær[t] h[afa].

*[H]ēr skal **s**tanda* *stæinn við[r] bryggiu.*
*S**y**niʀ at faður* *sattu gōðan.*

Gæiʀ(-) … mærki at bōa[nda] …

'Frøybiorn ... and Frøy ... -fiðr, they raised this stone after Guðmar, their good father, and Tummi, their brother. May God and God's mother help their spirits and souls better than they have done. Here the stone shall stand by the bridge. Sons placed it after their good father. Gæiʀ(-) ... landmark after husband.' (Based on Jansson 1954: 92.)

The part I would like to focus on is *at faður sattu gōðan*, where the head noun is to the left of the finite verb and the adjective is to the right of the finite verb. *Syniʀ at faður sattu gōðan* on U 512 appears to be a line of *fornyrðislag*, found within "en halvstrof utan lyte" [= 'an immaculate half-strophe'] according to Jansson (1954: 95). Jansson's somewhat zealous word choice invites dissent, and indeed, a couple of metrical imperfections may be noted. The first on-verse (*[H]ēr skal standa*), for instance, appears to have only a single lift, scanning as × × / ×. In the second on-verse (*Syniʀ at faður*), moreover, both the first and the second lift appear to be resolved, ultimately yielding a catalectic of the form / × / _ (alternatively, *faður* acts as a light second lift). Either way, as two reviewers have also noted, this is not perfectly standard *fornyrðislag*. Still, it falls comfortably within the boundaries of the form.

Interestingly, the preposition *at* is involved in this movement. Any syntactic analysis one might be tempted to propose is complicated by the fact that P and N do not together form a syntactic constituent to the exclusion of the adjective. While this resembles what has sometimes been termed "extraordinary LBE" in the literature (Bošković 2005: § 6; see Borsley & Jaworska 1988, Corver 1990: 335–338, among others), we will see that the construction in the runic inscriptions has different properties. As seen in (14a), the runic example does not involve a left-peripheral position in the same way that a typical LBE construction in Serbo-Croatian (14b) does.

Furthermore, the movement of P and N together (14a) is not allowed in Serbo-Croatian (14c). See also Agbayani & Golston (2010: § 3.3 and 2016: 13, fn. 3) for relevant discussion. Examples (14b) and (c) are from Bošković (2005: 30–31).

(14) a. *Synir* ***at faður*** *sattu* ~~*at faður*~~ *gōðan*

b. ***U veliku*** *on udje sobu*
in big he entered room
'He entered the big room.'

c. ****U sobu*** *on udje veliku*
in room he entered big

Let us instead treat U 512 in the same way we treated the other cases of verbal hyperbaton in the runic material. We can start by observing that a monosyllabic preposition *at* is involved. Selkirk (1996) explores at length the different possible ways in which a function word, such as a preposition or a conjunction, can enter into a prosodic structure with a lexical word. A monosyllabic function word like *at* can be thought of as a syllable which is cliticized to the lexical word (which is always a full prosodic word unto itself; see also Dewey 2006: 84, her (103), for a similar case from *Atlakviða*). Selkirk argues that the structural status of this stray syllable can be different depending on the language or dialect at stake. We can here adopt Agbayani & Golston's (2010, 2016) approach wherein the function word (a single syllable, σ) enters into a recursive word structure with the lexical word (corresponding to (18b) in Selkirk 1996: 196), which for our purposes results in $(at\ (faður)_{\omega})_{\omega}$.[20] A reasonable assumption might be that this prosodic unit has been moved leftwards, as illustrated in (15). We can assume that each half-line corresponds to its own phonological phrase.

[20] Note that U 512 shows both the (older) monosyllabic preposition *at* and the bisyllabic **iftiʀ** *æftiʀ*, a variant which should also be perfectly appropriate in this context. In fact, *at* and *æftiʀ* appear to be basically interchangeable as far as their semantics. As Peterson (1996: 247) puts it: "Palms [1992] enkla konstaterande att *at* var en kort och praktisk variant till *æftiʀ* tycks, utifrån vad som hittills kunnat utrönas, komma sanningen närmast. Till sitt innehåll är formerna synonyma." We know that both *at* and *æftiʀ* were available to the runemaster responsible for U 512, since both prepositions appear in the inscription. The fact that he employs monosyllabic *at* in the verbal hyperbaton construction may not be a coincidence, assuming that a monosyllabic function word like *at* is more likely to form a prosodic word with *faður* than *æftiʀ* is. While *æftiʀ* can no doubt form a phonological phrase (φ) along with its object *faður*, it is possible that a unit of type φ was too large to be moved into the first half-line.

(15) (…)$_{\varphi}$ (…)$_{\varphi}$
(*Syniʀ*)$_{\omega}$ **(*at* (*faður*)$_{\omega}$)$_{\omega}$** (*sattu*)$_{\omega}$ (*at* (~~*faðuʀ*~~)$_{\omega}$)$_{\omega}$ (*gōðan*)$_{\omega}$

As discussed above, the movement is in all likelihood motivated by alliteration. The syntactic output *Syniʀ sattu at faður gōðan* would demand alliteration on *f-*, even though there are no other words starting with *f-*. Swapping one prosodic word (*at faður*) with another (*sattu*), however, produces a pattern with alliterating lifts in *s-* (***S****yniʀ* – ***s****attu*).

3. Hyperbaton in early Nordic prose

Interestingly, the mirror image of the order discussed in Section 2.1 above is also attested in the runic inscriptions. The order N V Dem, in which the head noun is to the left of the verb and the demonstrative determiner to the right of the verb, is found in three inscriptions (also noted in SRI 1: 55), all of which appear to be prose. While it is challenging to extract the subtleties of register, formality, and social stratification from the runic material (but see Schulte 2008 and Williams 2013), I think it is possible to argue that verbal hyperbaton in this kind of runic prose is a stylistic choice belonging to higher or more formal registers of the language.

Some authors draw very strict boundaries between the syntax of poetry and prose. Salberger (1959: 231), for instance, explicitly states that facts about word order in versified texts can teach us nothing about word order in prose,[21] a position I think we are wise to reject. More recently, researchers like Kristján Árnason (2002) and Dewey (2006) have demonstrated important links between the rhythms of poetry and prose. Poetry can reveal deep synchronic properties of prosaic prosody and also cast light on the development of word order constraints such as V2. With this in mind, I will assume that it is entirely possible and even desirable to present a unified analysis of hyperbaton. While hyperbaton may be triggered by different considerations depending on the poetic vs. prosaic status of a text, the basic operation (i.e. post-syntactic movement of prosodic constituents) remains the same.

[21] "Ordställningstyper i vers – dit hör även versifierade runinskrifter – visar ingenting om ordställningsregler i prosa" (Salberger 1959: 231).

3.1. N V Dem in U 735, Sö 46, and Öl 10 †

Consider first U 735 (see Brate & Bugge 1887–91: 127–129, Hübler 1996: 64–65, Wulf 2003: 987, Bianchi 2010: 86, Naumann 2018: 265–256), given in (16).

(16) **· ueþralti · lit · uʀ · lakarni · stan · almikin · uʀ · staþi · fyra · auk ·· arker · þau · litu · kubl · raisa · þisa · at · siktryk · sun · sen ·**

Veðraldi lēt ūʀ Langgarni
stæin allmikinn ūʀ staði fōra
ok Arngærðr þau lētu kumbl ræisa þessa at Sigtrygg, sun sinn.

'Veðraldi had the massive stone brought from its place out of Langgarn, and (he and) Arngærðr, they had these monuments raised after Sigtryggʀ, their son.'

U 735 recounts first how Veðraldi had a massive stone transported from Langgarn in order to raise monuments with his wife Arngærðr in honor of their son. The inscription could be seen as an example of conspicuous consumption, trumpeting the fact that Veðraldi had the financial means to transport a large stone and to construct a runic monument, surely a sign of high social prestige. Another status marker is the text's originality. In contrast with Vg 32 and Sö 61, the verse on U 735 is not formulaic or generic at all, but highly specific to the situation, describing the costliness of this individual project. Notably, this first part of the text is clearly composed in *fornyrðislag*, while the last part, containing the discontinuity, appears to be prose. Assuming that Balli, to whom U 735 is attributed, would not switch abruptly from a formal to an informal register, it is reasonable to classify the end of this text as belonging to a higher style of prose, consistent with the versified text preceding it.

Sö 46, given in (17), also tells of long-distance travel, with Ǣskæll and Gnauðimandr honoring their departed brother, who had died out west in England.

(17) **iskil : auk : knauþimanr : raistu : stain : þansi : at : bruþur : sin : suera : as : uarþ : tauþr · o · eklanti kuml · kiarþu : þatsi** [**: ki**]**til** [**s**] **ḅ**[**akʀ**]

Æskæll ok Gnauðimandr ræistu stæin þannsi at brōður sinn Sværra, es varð dauðr ā Ænglandi. Kumbl giærðu þatsi Kætill [ok] Spakʀ.[22]

[22] Brate (SRI 3: 35) supposes the last element to be [**slakʀ**], which he sees as a possible mistake for *[**stakʀ**]. The reading [**s**]**ḅ**[**akʀ**] *Spakʀ* is Källström's (2007: 358–359) suggestion.

> ‘Æskæll and Gnauðimandr raised this stone after their brother Sværri, who died in England. Kætill (and) Spakʀ made this monument.’

It is difficult to classify Sö 46 straightforwardly in terms of register and genre. It is also difficult to determine if *kumbl* is meant to alliterate with *Kætill*. The rest of text, at least, does not seem to be versified, and the inscription is not included in Naumann (2018). Given the context of an expedition to England, one could argue that this memorial is indicative of higher than average social status in Viking Age society. If this is true, then the prose – if this is prose – might be of a more formal or stylized character.

Consider also Öl 10 †, the third and final inscription showing the configuration N V Dem.

(18) [**: eimunr : auk : kuna- . . . þeiʀ · -uku · kirþu · þisn · eftiʀ : kinu : fatran**]

> *Æimundr ok Gunna[rr] … þæiʀ [k]umbl(?) gærðu þessa æftiʀ* **kinu fatran**.
>
> ‘Æimundr and Gunnarr ... they made these monuments after ...’

Williams (2004) offers *Gīna* ‘the yawning/gaping one; the voracious/greedy one’ as the name underlying accusative [**kinu**] in Öl 10 †. Williams also criticizes as wholly unsubstantiated Brate’s (SRI 1: 143) claim that *kumbl* (assuming [**-uku**] should be read **-uml**) should alliterate with [**kinu**], there being no strong reason to assume that (18) is versified (Williams 2004: 79). The social standing of the people involved in this inscription is harder to discern, especially considering that the probably masculine accusative [**fatran**] has not been satisfactorily explained. The fact that *Æimundr* was a name shared by a Swedish king, Emund the Old, also mentioned in a handful of the Ingvar runestones, is suggestive of a higher level of prestige (Williams 2013: 71, citing Wessén in SRI 7: 427, mentions names like *Eiríkr* and *Hákon*, both associated with Scandinavian royalty, as candidates for high-prestige names). An important caveat here, however, is that Öl 10 † has been lost for quite some time. This in combination with the fact that both the reading and interpretation of not one but multiple parts (**-uku**, **kinu**, **fatran**) of Öl 10 † are uncertain should lead us to be cautious.

Källström also points out that there may be enough room in this part of the inscription for an additional rune, possibly giving *Ōspakʀ* ‘unwise, untamed’. However this sequence should be read, the ending on **kiarþu** demands a plural subject. A conjunction *[ok]* has therefore been supplemented between *Kætill* and the following name. This was the case already with Erik Brate (SRI 3: 36), who provides ‘Kättil (och) Stack’.

Even with these caveats in mind, the hyperbaton seen in the inscriptions U 735, Sö 46, and Öl 10 † seems to be associated with *formal* prose.[23] That hyperbaton can contribute rhetorical flare without necessarily forcing the label 'verse' has been obvious for quite some time. Wessén (1965: 220), for instance, describes Noleby's **runo fahi raginakudo** as "högtidligt, rytmiskt och allittererande, sannolikt traditionellt; därmed sammanhänger utan tvivel ordställningen." It is of course difficult to categorize the genre of the older runic texts, but Wessén gives us a relatively nuanced view of the use of hyperbaton here, one that would not be out of place in the more recent literature. Stefan Sonderegger, for example, sees such stylistic discontinuities as part of an ancient "indogermanisches Erbe" that provided Germanic with "eine große, vor allem poetisch genutzte Möglichkeit" that could also be used "in Stilisierungen der Prosa" (Sonderegger 1998: 44). The exact function of hyperbaton and how it might be triggered in prose texts, however, is a question that still needs to be addressed.

3.2. "Intonational V2" and information-structural triggers

It is well known that discontinuities targeting the left edge of the clause are attested in the sagas (19) and even in the medieval runic material (20) (for discussion and examples see Nygaard 1905: 355, Faarlund 1990: 94–96, Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson 1995: 9–11, Kristján Árnason 2002: 210, Platzack 2008, among others).[24]

(19) a. ***Góðan*** *eigum vér* ***konung***
good have we king
'We have a good king' (*Heimskringla II* CCVIII: 362)

b. ***Hversu marga*** *munu vér* ***menn*** *þurfa?*
how many will we men need
'How many men do we need?' (*Njáls saga* LXI: 153)

c. ***enga*** *hafði hann* ***brynju***
no had he chainmail
'He had no chainmail' (*Laxdœla saga* LV: 166)

[23] As Per Holmberg (p.c.) has kindly pointed out to me, the Rök runestone (Ög 136) appears to show verbal hyperbaton in the passage *hvar* ***hæstʀ*** *sē* ***gunnaʀ*** *etu vēttvāngi ã* 'where the horse of the battle [i.e. the wolf] sees food on the battlefield' (Holmberg et al. 2018–19: 26–27; see also Holmberg 2015: 95). While this sentence does not appear *within* the famous Rök stanza, it can easily be considered poetically adjacent.

[24] Stylistic fronting may result in patterns which are superficially similar, but it is clearly different in that it targets an empty subject position (Holmberg 2000).

d. ***Engan*** *hefi ek* ***náttverð*** *haft*
no have I supper had
'I have had no supper' (*Egils saga* LXXVIII: 244)

e. *Ok* ***þessi*** *hefir* ***hólmganga*** *síðast framið verit á Íslandi,*
and this has duel last performed been on Iceland
er þeir Hrafn ok Gunnlaugr bǫrðusk
which they H. and G. fought
'And this was the last duel performed on Iceland, the one which H. and G. fought' (*Gunnlaugs saga ormstungu* XI: 95)

(20) Vg 94 (Ugglum parish, early 13th century)
+ þrir : liggia : mænn : undir : þæmma :+ ¶ + stene : gunn͡arr : sihvat͡r : ha͡llstenn+
Þrīr liggia mænn undir þæima stæini Gunnarr Sighvatr Hallstæinn
'Three men lie under this stone: Gunnarr, Sighvatr, Hallstæinn.'

Such word orders are typically associated with a particular information structure. For example, the sentence in (19c), from *Laxdœla saga*, contrasts quite saliently with the previous discourse, since it comes after a description of all the weapons and equipment that Bolli *does* equip himself with: Bolli takes his helmet, shield, and sword, but *not* his chainmail. Consider also the following cases from the Poetic Edda (see also Salberger 1959: 232–233), where the dislocated element in the prefield is probably licensed by focus in (21a) and by topicality in (21b).

(21) a. *Hversu snúnuðu yðr konur yðrar*
how turned for.you women your
'How were your women for you?'
Sparkar *áttu vér* ***konur***
lively had we women
'Lively were our women' (Hárb. 18–19)

b. *gladdak ina gullbjǫrtu gamni mær unði*
gladdened.I the gold.bright joy maiden was.satisfied
'I gladdened the gold-bright girl, and she was happy'
Góð *áttu þeir* ***mankynni*** *þar þá*
good had they love there then
'Good fortunes in love they had there' (Hárb. 31–32)

In the generative tradition, such constructions are termed *left branch extraction* (LBE) (see Ross 1967: 207–217 on the Left Branch Condition), since

a left branch modifier has been extracted out of the noun phrase to a left-peripheral position. Nygaard identifies the phenomenon by way of a number of examples where "et attributivt adj[ektiv] sættes først for at udhæves, og det subst[antiv], som det hører til, stilles efter verbet" (1905: 355). Platzack (2008) discusses the phenomenon in Scandinavian, arguing that changes in the syntactic structure of the noun phrase have led to the loss of LBE in the modern languages, largely following Bošković (2005, 2008) and his work on the NP/DP parameter. Lander & Haegeman (2014) argue that the availability of LBE and scrambling in Old Norse is in fact indicative of its typological status as an NP language, which is to say a language without grammaticalized definite articles, something that has broad consequences for the grammar outside of just the noun phrase. From a generative perspective, the dislocated element is commonly said to move to a kind of Spec-CP (more precisely, to TopP or FocP in the left periphery of Rizzi 1997).

Syntactic approaches to LBE abound in the literature, but there are also non-syntactic approaches on offer.[25] Dewey (2006) calls cases like (19–21) "intonational V2" since the unstressed finite verb is in second position after the first *stressed word* rather than the first *syntactic constituent* (see Dewey 2006: 83–86 for the Eddic cases). Whereas clear cases of syntactic V2 with relatively large constituents in the prefield are also attested in the older poetic material, this is a newer kind of V2 compared to intonational V2, which Dewey considers to be an archaism, a byproduct of metrical restrictions ultimately stemming from the workings of Kuhn's Laws (see Kristján Árnason 2002, Dewey 2006, 2016 for discussion; see Rice & Svenonius 1998 for a distinct yet relevant phenomenon in modern Northern Norwegian). Even though syntactic V2 begins to push out intonational V2, the latter option (or at least some version of it) remains an option well into later stages, as seen in (19) for the sagas.[26] And while intonational V2 or LBE can be seen as metrically driven, Dewey (2006) does not deny the role that information structure may play in the interaction between word order, semantics, and prosody. What is interesting for our purposes is that Agbayani & Golston (2010, 2016) see movement of prosodic constituents in the phonological component as triggered by topic or focus features which have piggy-backed their way from the syntax. This offers a unified way to look at both short-distance hyperbaton in the

[25] Platzack (2008: 364 fn. 12) cites personal communication with Lars-Olof Delsing concerning the possibility of a PF-movement-based analysis.

[26] Veturliði Óskarsson (p.c.) informs me that LBE is ruled out in modern Icelandic except as a deliberately archaicizing feature. The handful of cases that turn up in a corpus search of modern Icelandic are jocular or performative/poetic (or both) in nature.

middle field (of the 'they **this** raised **stone**' type, often because of alliteration) and the longer-distance type of hyperbaton involving the prefield (of the '**this** raised they **stone**' type, usually attributable to topic or focus).

First it is important to note that intonational V2 can interact with purely alliterative triggers without information structure playing much of a role. Consider Vs 15 (Björksta parish), the B-side of which is given in (22) (see Naumann 2018: 20 for discussion; see especially Wulf 2003: 986–987 for discussion of the metrical structure of the second line).

(22) B × **sten : hafir** × **riton** × **þon** × **stonta** × **mo** × **bali ḥi- rauþi** × **yftir** × **bruþ[u]r** × **bali**

***S**tæin hafiʀ rēttan, þann **s**tanda mā,*
***B**alli hi[nn] Rauði æftiʀ **b**rōður. (Balli.)*

'Balli the Red has erected the stone, which will stand, in memory of his brother. (Balli.)'

The beginning of this text shows an archaic version of the periphrastic perfect, with the verbal adjective *rēttan* agreeing with the object *stæin*.[27] If we assume a syntactic output with VO order as in (23a), we can begin the derivation by positing movement of *stæin* to the prefield position and movement of the finite verb to the second position in the clause (in (23b): S = strong position, w = weak position; see also Kristján Árnason 2002 for discussion).

(23) Vs 15: *Stæin hafiʀ rēttan, þann standa mā, Balli hi[nn] Rauði* (surface order)

a. Syntactic output
Balli hi[nn] Rauði hafiʀ stæin rēttan, þann standa ma

b.

S	w	S
Prefield	Finite verb	Middle field...
Stæin	***hafiʀ***	*Balli hi[nn] Rauði ~~hafiʀ stæin~~ rēttan …*

At this point it would be reasonable to assume right-extraposition of the heavy subject *Balli hinn Rauði* to the right of the relative clause. This ultimately yields *Stæin hafiʀ rēttan, þann standa mā, Balli hi[nn] Rauði*. This combination of intonational V2 and right-extraposition of a heavy subject – both operations which are plausibly metrically motivated – ultimately results in a structure which correctly alliterates. Alliteration, in other words, is

[27] The archaic form of the perfect can be thought of as '(Balli) has [(the) raised stone]', whereas the later form of the perfect could instead be bracketed '(Balli) [has raised the stone]'.

what drives the movements required to get from the syntactic output to the surface word order of Vs 15.

Consider now Sö 46, where alliteration is one possible motivation for the observed word order, but not the only one. First of all we can note that the fronted element *kumbl* does not appear in the middle field but rather in clause-initial position, immediately followed by the finite verb, *giærðu*. I assume that this is an instantiation of intonational V2.

(24) Sö 46: *Kumbl giærðu þatsi Kætill [ok] Spakʀ.* (surface order)

a. Syntactic output
Kætill [ok] Spakʀ giærðu kumbl þatsi.

b.

S	w	S
Prefield	Finite verb	Middle field…
Kumbl	***giærðu***	*Kætill [ok] Spakʀ ~~giærðu kumbl~~ þatsi*

Again, it is characteristic of intonational V2 that only part of a syntactic constituent, in this case the noun *kumbl*, has been fronted to the prefield position; as seen in (24b), the demonstrative determiner *þatsi* stays *in situ*. Still, the word order of Sö 46 is not yet fully accounted for, since the subject should occupy the rightmost position (as opposed to (19) above, where the subject precedes the non-fronted part of the object). Given the phonological heaviness of the subject, right-extraposition is the next step in the derivation, as sketched in (25).

(25) *Kumbl giærðu* [*~~Kætill [ok] Spakʀ~~*] *þatsi* **[*Kætill [ok] Spakʀ*]**

If I am on the right track by invoking both intonational V2 and right-extraposition of a phonologically heavy element, then metrical factors are again crucial for correctly deriving the word order of Sö 46. Furthermore, if *kumbl* and *Kætill* really are meant to alliterate, then positing prosodically motivated movements would certainly not be out of place. It is more likely, however, that Sö 46 is pure prose, with only happenstance alliteration in ***k****umbl* – ***K****ætill*. Thus, another explanation is needed, and we must also ask what other kinds of triggers might be available.

One possibility to explore is that the word order on Sö 46 is motivated by properties of information structure. Upon closer examination, both Sö 46 and U 735 (I leave Öl 10 † to the side considering some of the uncertainties discussed above) show some evidence for the idea that the fronted noun could be seen as discourse-prominent. Observe that both inscriptions show *stæin* in a syntactically neutral position towards the beginning of the text, while *kumbl* exhibits a marked word order, i.e. fronting, later on in the text.

Interestingly, it has been suggested in the literature that *stæinn* 'stone' and *kumbl* 'monument' are not just synonyms and do not (always) refer to one and the same thing. Kitzler Åhfeldt (2000: 118) points out that *kumbl* is used with the verb 'do' whereas *stæin* is used with verbs like 'carve', and that the former might not usually refer to a runestone at all but rather to a burial mound or a royal standard (on this Kitzler Åhfeldt cites Palm 1992: 177). If this is true, then there might very well be a clear contrast intended between 'stone' and 'monument' in both Sö 46 and U 735, where something is first stated regarding the runestone, on the one hand, and then a distinction is drawn with regard to the monument. Sö 46 might be interpreted along the lines of 'They made the stone, but the *kumbl*, that was Kætill and Spakʀ'. U 735 could be thought of as 'Veðraldi had the massive stone transported from afar, and along with Arngærðr they also had *kumbl* (pl.) made'. In both cases, hyperbaton can be seen as triggered by features encoding information-structurally relevant properties related to topic or focus. And if *kumbl* is marked with a topic or focus feature, then it could be targeted by prosodic movement according to Agbayani & Golston (2010, 2016).

Another interesting case is the runic inscription U 112 (Ed parish), a versified inscription with a number of high-status markers, including that the commissioner, Ragnvaldr, was a *liðs forungi* (cf. Sö 338) who had been in Greece. The text is "gesamthaft hochstilisiert" and shows a remarkable word order in *rūna[ʀ] rīsta || lēt Ragnvaldr* (Naumann 2018: 231; see also Hübler 1996: 42, who characterizes the word order as "wohl im gesamten schwedischen Inschriftenmaterial einmalig"). U 112's word order is a clear case of V2 with a fronted VP, an exceptionally rare syntactic phenomenon in the context of early Nordic. Þórhallur Eyþórsson (2009: 70–73) has pointed out that VP-fronting is nonexistent in Old Icelandic with the exception of the more archaic language of the Poetic Edda, specifically in poems composed in *ljóðaháttr* (where VP-fronting is attested, usually with OV order; Þórhallur Eyþórsson 2009: 73, fn. 7). Interestingly, the fronted VP of U 112 can be analyzed as a topic, since the first part of the inscription, in prose, has already mentioned that *Ragnvaldr lēt rīsta rūnaʀ*. In addition to this information-structural trigger, it could be argued that not fronting the VP would have led to an illicit alliterative schema, with two alliterating lifts in the second half-line (as in the prose: *Ragnvaldr lēt rīsta rūnaʀ*). Thus, VP-fronting is in some sense forced due to poetic considerations. It would seem, then, that both types of triggers are involved for U 112, or at the very least that we cannot, in principle, decide which of the two is the "true" trigger. Various Eddic cases probably also fit under this rubric.

3.3. A note on middle-field hyperbaton in Old Icelandic prose

As a final note, it is difficult to find prose attestations in the sagas of hyperbaton in the middle field, i.e. cases of the 'they **this** raised **stone**' type. One of the few cases I have come across is (26).[28] It is hard to determine if this should count as formal or stylized prose, but the fact that it concerns the formalities of a legal process is suggestive.

(26) *ok mun hann* ***þann*** *hafa* ***málatilbúnaðinn*** *ok er sá réttr*
and will he that have lawsuit.preparation and is that right
'(that's how) he has initiated the suit in a correct manner' (*Njáls saga* XXIII: 65)

It seems that verbal hyperbaton in prose has a strong tendency to be of the intonational V2 or LBE type, which is to say that the dislocated element is in clause-initial position and the remainder of the syntactic constituent has been stranded lower down in the clause. Non-clause-initial hyperbaton, such as the example in (26), is clearly attested in the Viking Age runic material and in the Poetic Edda, but my working hypothesis is that it seems to be less common in the sagas. While more work is needed to establish this as a fact, it is worth briefly exploring the implications of this hypothetical asymmetry.

It could be argued that intonational V2 "boosted" certain types of verbal hyperbaton (of the '**this** raised they **stone**' type), in that the V2 constraint encouraged fronting of a prosodic word to the left of the finite verb. Of course, intonational V2 (and thus clause-initial hyperbaton) was already competing with syntactic V2 in the Poetic Edda (Dewey 2006), but the former pattern seems to have been frequent enough for it to have survived into the language of the sagas, though by this time it was probably a syntactic relic. Since they target different parts of the clause, hyperbaton in the middle field probably never received the same kind of boost from intonational V2. Indeed, while

[28] Thanks to Veturliði Óskarsson for bringing this example to my attention. A quick search in the Saga Corpus for [pos = "f" & fall = "o" & tala = "e" & kyn = "k"] [pos = "s"] [pos = "n" & fall = "o" & tala = "e" & kyn = "k"], i.e. a pronoun in the masculine accusative singular plus a verb plus a noun in the masculine accusative singular, turns up the example in (26), but no other convincing cases. Similar results are obtained by searching for Dem V N in the feminine (kyn = "v") and neuter (kyn = "h") accusative singular, as well as for Adj (pos = "l") V N in the masculine/feminine/neuter accusative singular. Most hits are not hyperbaton (many strings being of the sort 'bade **him** send for **master**'), with one or two cases of stylistic fronting also turning up. Such searches do not, of course, constitute a comprehensive or particularly well-designed study of hyperbaton in the middle field. More research is needed.

middle-field hyperbaton ('they **this** raised **stone**') is attested in the Poetic Edda, it appears to be less frequent than prefield (intonational V2/LBE-type) hyperbaton. If the trend continued this way, then we can reasonably expect middle-field hyperbaton to have even fewer remnants surviving later on in the saga texts (by which time *all* types of hyperbaton have probably decreased). Future quantitative research should be done to establish the basic frequency facts across text types and to elucidate the developments over time. I leave this question open for now.

4. Conclusion

Verbal hyperbaton in the Viking Age runic material has not been given much attention in the literature, even though there are a number of interesting linguistic and stylistic connections to be made to other forms of early Nordic, especially Eddic poetry. In this paper I have argued that hyperbaton was available primarily in poetry but also in stylized prose. This suggests that the prose cases are imitations or emulations of poetic style, where higher or more formal registers of prose introduce the availability of poetic (or poetically inspired) word orders.

Different triggers of verbal hyperbaton have been discussed: alliterative constraints, information structure (topic and focus), and a combination of both trigger types. Analyzing poetic hyperbaton as triggered by alliteration is relatively straightforward, but alliteration is obviously not a driver of movement in the prose cases. Relevant in this regard is that Agbayani & Golston (2010, 2016) propose an analysis involving post-syntactic movement, where features which are relevant to the syntax can have effects in the phonological component. As we have seen, alliteration appears to be a major driver of hyperbaton in early Nordic, both in the runic and in the Eddic material. If hyperbaton is best seen as movement in the phonological component rather than syntactic movement, then the poetic cases motivated by alliteration can be considered the purest forms of hyperbaton, driven exclusively by phonological and metrical factors. This is the kind of hyperbaton seen in Vg 32, Sö 61, U 512, Vs 15, and probably the Eddic cases in (10–12). The prose cases of hyperbaton, in my view, are extensions of the poetic cases, where information-structural features trigger a stylized word order that resembles the word order freedom which is so characteristic of poetry. Examples of this type include the prose on U 735 and Sö 46, not

to mention various attestations in the sagas, which must also be seen as stylized prose, with a marked word order licensed by topicality or focus. There are also cases where both alliteration and information structure may play a role in licensing verbal hyperbaton, such as U 112.

References

Abels, Klaus, 2003: *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding*. PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Adams, James N., 1971: A type of hyperbaton in Latin prose. In: *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 17(197). Pp. 1–16.

Agbayani, Brian & Chris Golston, 2010: Phonological movement in Classical Greek. In: *Language* 86(1). Pp. 133–167.

Agbayani, Brian & Chris Golston, 2016: Phonological constituents and their movement in Latin. In: *Phonology* 33(1). Pp. 1–42.

ATA = Antikvarisk-topografiska arkivet, Riksantikvarieämbetet, Stockholm (via *Runor*)

Belletti, Adriana, 2001: Inversion as focalization. In: A. C. J. Hulk & J.-Y. Pollock (eds), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*. Pp. 60–90. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bianchi, Marco, 2010: *Runor som resurs: Vikingatida skriftkultur i Uppland och Södermanland*. (Runrön 20.) Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.

Booij, Geert & Ans van Kemenade, 2003: Preverbs: An introduction. In: G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2003*. Pp. 1–11. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London & Moscow: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

de Boor, Helmut, 1922: *Studien zur altschwedischen Syntax in den ältesten Gesetztexten und Urkunden*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus.

Borsley, Robert D. & Ewa Jaworska, 1988. A note on prepositions and case marking in Polish. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(4). Pp. 685–691.

Bošković, Željko, 2005: On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. In: *Studia Linguistica* 59(1). Pp. 1–45.

Bošković, Željko, 2008: What will you have, DP or NP? In: *Proceedings of NELS* 37. Pp. 101–114.

Brate, Erik & Sophus Bugge, 1887–1891: *Runverser: Undersökning af Sveriges metriska runinskrifter*. Stockholm: Ivar Hæggström.

Braunmüller, Kurt, 2004: Zum Einfluss des Lateinischen auf die ältesten Runeninschriften. In: O. Bandle, J. Glauser & S. Würth (eds), *Verschränkung der Kulturen: Der Sprach- und Literaturaustausch zwischen Skandinavien und den deutschsprachigen Ländern. Zum 65. Geburtstag von Hans-Peter Naumann*. Pp. 23–50. Tübingen & Basel: Francke.

Chomsky, Noam, 1965: *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Clunies Ross, Margaret, 2005: *A History of Old Norse Poetry and Poetics*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Collinder, Björn (transl.), 1957: *Den poetiska Eddan*. Forum.

Corver, Norbert, 1990: *The Syntax of Left Branch Extractions*. PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Brabant (Tilburg University).

Delsing, Lars-Olof, 1999: Från OV-ordföljd till VO-ordföljd: En språkförändring med förhinder. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 114. Pp. 151–232.

Devine, A. M. & Laurence D. Stephens, 2000: *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dewey, Tonya Kim, 2006: *The Origins and Development of Germanic V2: Evidence from Alliterative Verse*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Dewey, Tonya Kim, 2016: Kuhn's Laws and verb second in continental West Germanic. In: Kristján Árnason, S. Carey, T. Kim Dewey, Haukur Þorgeirsson, Ragnar Ingi Aðalsteinsson & Þórhallur Eyþórsson (eds), *Approaches to Nordic and Germanic Poetry*. Pp. 13–31. Reykjavik: Institute of Linguistics, University of Iceland Press.

DR + number = inscription in Jacobsen & Moltke (1942).

Egils saga = Sigurður Nordal, 1933: *Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar*. (Íslenzk fornrit II.) Reykjavik: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag.

Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson, 1995: Old Icelandic: A non-configurational language? In: *NOWELE* 26. Pp. 3–29.

Faarlund, Jan Terje, 1990: *Syntactic Change: Toward a Theory of Historical Syntax*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Falk, Cecilia, 2011: Att skriva svensk syntaxhistoria. In: *Årsbok 2011 KVHAA*. Pp. 173–186. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.

Fanselow, Gisbert & Caroline Féry, 2013: A comparative perspective on intervention effects on left branch extractions in Slavic. In: W. Sulym, M. Smolij & C. Djakiw (eds), *Non Progredi Est Regredi: Festschrift für Alla Paslawska*. Pp. 266–295. Lviv: Pais.

Fulk, R. D., 2016: Eddic metres. In: C. Larrington, J. Quinn & B. Schorn (eds), *A Handbook to Eddic Poetry: Myths and Legends of Early Scandinavia*. Pp. 252–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

G + number = inscription in *Gotlands runinskrifter* (SRI 11–12).

G 309 = inscription in Snædal (2002: 82–83).

Golston, Chris & Tomas Riad, 2003: Scansion and alliteration in *Beowulf*. In: *Jahrbuch für internationale Germanistik* 35(1). Pp. 77–105.

Grohmann, Kleanthes, 2002: Anti-locality and clause types. In: *Theoretical Linguistics* 28. Pp. 43–72.

Gräslund, Anne-Sofie, 2006: Dating the Swedish Viking-Age rune stones on stylistic grounds. In: M. Stoklund, M. L. Nielsen, B. Holmberg & G. Fellows-Jensen (eds), *Runes and their Secrets: Studies in Runology*. Pp. 117–139. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, Haraldur Bernharðsson & Vésteinn Ólason (eds),

2019: *The Codex Regius of the Poetic Edda (Konungsbók Eddukvæða GKS 2365 4to)*. Copenhagen & Reykjavik: Arnamagnæan Institute Copenhagen and Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies Reykjavik.

Gunnlaugs saga ormstungu = Sigurður Nordal & Guðni Jónsson, 1938: *Borgfirðinga sǫgur: Hœnsa-Þóris saga, Gunnlaugs saga ormstungu, Bjarnar saga Hítdœlakappa, Heiðarvíga saga, Gísls þáttr Illugasonar*. (Íslenzk fornrit III.) Reykjavik: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag.

Heimskringla II = Bjarni Aðalbjarnarson, 1979: *Snorri Sturluson: Heimskringla II*. (Íslenzk fornrit XXVII.) Reykjavik: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag.

Herschend, Frands, 2001: Pegas på tusentalet – attityder till runstensdiktning. In: *Fornvännen* 96. Pp. 23–33.

Holmberg, Anders, 2000: Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: How any category can become an expletive. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(3). Pp. 445–483.

Holmberg, Per, 2015 (publ. 2016): Svaren på Rökstenens gåtor: En socialsemiotisk analys av meningsskapande och rumslighet. In: *Futhark: International Journal of Runic Studies* 6. Pp. 65–106.

Holmberg, Per, Bo Gräslund, Olof Sundqvist & Henrik Williams, 2018–2019 (publ. 2020): The Rök runestone and the end of the world. In: *Futhark: International Journal of Runic Studies* 9–10. Pp. 7–38.

Hopper, Paul J., 1975: *The Syntax of the Simple Sentence in Proto-Germanic*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.

Hs + number = inscription from Hälsingland; discussed in Åhlén (1994).

Hübler, Frank, 1996: *Schwedische Runendichtung der Wikingerzeit*. (Runrön 10.) Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.

Jacobsen, Lis & Erik Moltke, with Anders Bæksted & Karl Martin Nielsen, 1942: *Danmarks runeindskrifter: Text*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaards Forlag.

Jansson, Sven B. F., 1954: Ett uppländskt runstensfynd. In: *Elias Wessén: 15 april 1954*. Pp. 86–96. Lund: Carl Blom.

Jansson, Sven B. F., 1959: Hammarbystenen och Hammarbykistan. In: *Fornvännen* 1959. Pp. 188–199.

Kitzler Åhfeldt, Laila, 2000: The Sparlösa monument and its three carvers: A study of division of labour by surface structure analysis. In: *Lund Archaeological Review* 6. Pp. 99–121.

KJ + number = inscription in Krause & Jankuhn (1966).

Krause, Wolfgang & Herbert Jankuhn, 1966: *Die Runeninschriften im älteren Futhark*. Göttingen: Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Kristján Árnason, 2002: Kuhn's Laws in Old Icelandic prose and poetry. In: *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14(3). Pp. 201–241.

Källström, Magnus, 2007: *Mästare och minnesmärken: Studier kring vikingatida runristare och skriftmiljöer i Norden*. PhD dissertation, Stockholm University.

Lander, Eric & Liliane Haegeman, 2014: Old Norse as an NP language: With observations on the Common Norse and Northwest Germanic runic inscriptions. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112(3). Pp. 279–318.

Larsson, Carl Gustaf, 1931: *Ordföljdsstudier över det finita verbet i de nordiska fornspråken*. PhD dissertation, Uppsala University.

Laxdœla saga = Einar Ól. Sveinsson, 1934: *Laxdœla saga, Halldórs þættir Snorrasonar, Stúfs þáttr*. (Íslenzk fornrit V.) Reykjavik: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag.

Leu, Thomas, 2015: *The Architecture of Determiners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Magnusson Petzell, Erik, 2011: OV-ordföljd i svenskans historia. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 126. Pp. 141–191.

Males, Mikael, 2023: The earliest Old Norse metrics. In: *Filologia Germanica / Germanic Philology* 15. Pp. 121–144.

Miller, D. Gary, 2019: *The Oxford Gothic Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Naumann, Hans-Peter, 2018: *Metrische Runeninschriften in Skandinavien: Einführung, Edition und Kommentare*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Njáls saga = Einar Ól. Sveinsson, 1954: *Brennu-Njáls saga*. (Íslenzk fornrit XII.) Reykjavik: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag.

Nygaard, Marius, 1905: *Norrøn syntax*. Kristiania: Aschehoug & Co.

Palm, Rune, 1992: *Runor och regionalitet: Studier av variation i de nordiska minnesinskrifterna*. (Runrön 7.) Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.

Pereltsvaig, Asya, 2008: Split phrases in colloquial Russian. In: *Studia Linguistica* 62(1). Pp. 5–38.

Perridon, Harry, 1996: Noun phrases in Runic Swedish. In: Kjartan G. Ottósson, R. V. Fjeld & A. Torp (eds), *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics, University of Oslo, January 11–12, 1995*. Pp. 248–261. Oslo: Novus Forlag.

Peterson, Lena, 1996: *Aft/æft*, *at* och *æftiʀ* på de nordiska runstenarna – regional variation eller vad? In: M. Reinhammar, G. Eklund, L. Peterson, M. Thelander & C. Åneman (eds), *Mål i sikte – Studier i dialektologi tillägnade Lennart Elmevik*. Pp. 239–252. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Peterson, Lena, 2006: *Svenskt runordsregister*. 3rd ed. Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.

Peterson, Lena, 2007: *Nordiskt runnamnslexikon*. 5th ed. Uppsala: Institutet för språk och folkminnen.

Platzack, Christer, 2008: Left Branch Extraction of nominal modifiers in Old Scandinavian. In: Þórhallur Eyþórsson (ed.), *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory: The Rosendal Papers*. Pp. 357–374. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Reichardt, Konstantin, 1969: A contribution to the interpretation of skaldic poetry: Tmesis. In: E. C. Polomé (ed.), *Old Norse Literature and Mythology: A Symposium*. Pp. 200–226. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.

Rice, Curt & Peter Svenonius, 1998: Prosodic V2 in Northern Norwegian. Ms., University of Tromsø.

Rizzi, Luigi, 1997: The fine structure of the left periphery. In: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Pp. 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Ross, John Robert, 1967: *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
Saga Corpus = Fornrit corpus searchable through Korp (Språkbanken, University of Gothenburg). Stofnun Árna Magnússonar and CLARIN-IS. Available at: https://malheildir.arnastofnun.is
Salberger, Evert, 1959: Runstenen i Kållands Åsaka. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 74. Pp. 227–235.
Salberger, Evert, 1976: **ukiþila**: En dunkel runföljd med ett kvinnonamn. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 91. Pp. 33–41.
Sangfelt, Adrian, 2019: *Syntaktiska strukturer i tiden: OV- och bisatsledföljd i svenskans historia*. PhD dissertation, Uppsala University.
Scandinavian Runic Text Database, 2020: Department of Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University. <http://www.nordiska.uu.se/forskn/samnord.htm>.
Schulte, Michael, 2005a: Die lateinisch-altrunische Kontakthypothese im Lichte der sprachhistorischen Evidenz. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 127(2). Pp. 161–182.
Schulte, Michael, 2005b: The classical and Christian impact on *Vǫluspá*: Toward a comparative topomorphical approach. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 120. Pp. 181–219.
Schulte, Michael, 2006: Oral traces in runic epigraphy: Evidence from older and younger inscriptions. In: *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 18(2). Pp. 117–151.
Schulte, Michael, 2007: Memory culture in the Viking Age: The runic evidence of formulaic patterns. In: *Scripta Islandica* 58. Pp. 57–73.
Schulte, Michael, 2008: Stylistic variation in runic inscriptions? A test case and preliminary assessment. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 123. Pp. 5–22.
Selkirk, Elisabeth, 1996: The prosodic structure of function words. In: J. L. Morgan & K. Demuth (eds), *Signal to Syntax: Bootstrapping from Speech to Grammar in Early Acquisition*. Pp. 187–213. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Sievers, Eduard, 1893: *Altgermanische Metrik*. Halle: Niemeyer.
Sm + number = inscription in *Smålands runinskrifter* (SRI 4).
Snædal, Thorgunn, 2002: *Medan världen vakar: Studier i de gotländska runinskrifternas språk och kronologi*. (Runrön 16.) Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.
Sonderegger, Stefan, 1998: Dichterische Wortstellungstypen im Altgermanischen und ihr Nachleben im älteren Deutsch. In: J. O. Askedal (ed.), *Historische germanische und deutsche Syntax: Akten des internationalen Symposiums anläßlich des 100. Geburtstages von Ingerid Dal, Oslo, 27.9.–1.10.1995*. Pp. 25–47. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
SRI = Various authors, 1900–: *Sveriges runinskrifter*. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.
SRI 1 = Söderberg, Sven & Erik Brate, 1900–1906: *Ölands runinskrifter*.
SRI 2 = Brate, Erik, 1911: *Östergötlands runinskrifter*.
SRI 3 = Brate, Erik & Elias Wessén, 1924–1936: *Södermanlands runinskrifter*.
SRI 4 = Kinander, Ragnar, 1935–1961: *Smålands runinskrifter*.
SRI 5 = Jungner, Hugo & Elisabeth Svärdström, 1940–1970: *Västergötlands runinskrifter*.

SRI 6–9 = Wessén, Elias & Sven B. F. Jansson, 1940–1958: *Upplands runinskrifter*.
SRI 11–12 = Jansson, Sven B. F., Elias Wessén & Elisabeth Svärdström, 1962–1978: *Gotlands runinskrifter*.
SRI 13 = Jansson, Sven B. F., 1964: *Västmanlands runinskrifter*.
Stroh-Wollin, Ulla, 2016: The emergence of definiteness marking in Scandinavian – New answers to old questions. In: *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 131. Pp. 129–169.
Suzuki, Seiichi, 2014: *The Meters of Old Norse Eddic Poetry: Common Germanic Inheritance and North Germanic Innovation*. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 86. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
Sö + number = inscription in *Södermanlands runinskrifter* (SRI 3).
U Fv1959;188 = inscription in Jansson (1959).
U + number = inscription in *Upplands runinskrifter* (SRI 6–9).
U THS10;58 = inscription in Vingedal (1971: 58–59).
U THS30;83 = inscription in Åström (2004: 83) and in the digital supplement to *Upplands runinskrifter* <https://www.raa.se/app/uploads/2013/02/U-THS3083-Hagby-T%C3%A4by-sn_URs_.pdf>
Valdeson, Fredrik, 2017: OV and VO word order in Viking Age runic inscriptions. Slides presented at *OV and VO in the Scandinavian Languages and Beyond* (Uppsala University, Gotland campus, September 27, 2017).
Vg + number = inscription in *Västergötlands runinskrifter* (SRI 5).
Vingedal, S. E. (ed.), 1971: *Runristningarna i Täby: En vägledning*. Täby Hembygdsförenings skriftserie 10.
Vs + number = inscription in *Västmanlands runinskrifter* (SRI 13).
Wenning, E. Alf, 1930: *Studier över ordföljden i fornsvenskan: Predikatets bestämningar i äldre och yngre fornsvenskan*. PhD dissertation, Lund University.
Wessén, Elias, 1965: *Svensk språkhistoria III: Grundlinjer till en historisk syntax*. 2nd ed. Stockholm, Göteborg & Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
Williams, Henrik, 2004: Till tolkningen av personnamnet **kina**. In: *Blandade runstudier* 3. (Runrön 18.) Pp. 77–86. Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.
Williams, Henrik, 2013: Runstenarnas sociala dimension. In: *Futhark* 4. Pp. 61–76.
Wulf, Fred, 1998: Review of Hübler (1996). In: *Alvíssmál* 8. Pp. 93–98.
Wulf, Fred, 2003: Runenverse und Runenritzer. In: W. Heizmann & A. van Nahl (eds), *Runica – Germanica – Mediaevalia*. Pp. 969–1006. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
Þórhallur Eyþórsson, 2009: The syntax of the verb in Old Icelandic: Evidence from poetry. In: T. Kim Dewey & Frog (eds), *Versatility in Versification: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Metrics*. Pp. 61–77. New York: Peter Lang.
Åhlén, Marit, 1994: Runinskrifter i Hälsingland. In: *Bebyggelsehistorisk tidskrift* 27. Pp. 33–50.
Åström, Hans, 2004: *Runristningarna i Täby*. Täby Hembygdsförenings skriftserie 30.
Ög + number = inscription in *Östergötlands runinskrifter* (SRI 2).
Öl + number = inscription in *Ölands runinskrifter* (SRI 1).

Summary

Verbal hyperbaton is a kind of word order discontinuity where a verb intervenes between a nominal modifier – e.g. an adjective or a demonstrative determiner – and its head noun, e.g. 'they **this** raised **stone**' or '**this** raised they **stone**'. This phenomenon is found in a handful of East Nordic runic inscriptions (Vg 32, Sö 61, U 512, U 735, Sö 46, Öl 10, Vs 15) representing both poetry and prose. I argue that verbal hyperbaton was a device probably belonging to higher registers or styles, and that the phenomenon should be analyzed in terms of movement of a prosodic – not syntactic – constituent (Agbayani & Golston 2010, 2016). This post-syntactic movement can be triggered for different purposes: to achieve alliteration, to mark topic/focus, or a combination of these two. Relevant comparisons can also be made with cases of verbal hyperbaton in the West Nordic material, specifically the Poetic Edda and the sagas.

Keywords: alliteration, Eddic poetry, hyperbaton, meter, movement, runic, syntax, Viking Age

Eric Lander
Uppsala University
Department of Scandinavian Languages
ORCID-iD 0000-0001-8898-5307