

## **Bringing home the bacon! A contrastive study of the cognates *bring/bringe* in English and Norwegian**

**Signe Oksefjell Ebeling<sup>1</sup>**

Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages

University of Oslo

P.O. box 1003, Blindern

NO-0315 Oslo, Norway

E-mail: s.o.ebeling@ilos.uio.no

### **Abstract**

This paper highlights the value of a bidirectional translation corpus in contrastive studies in an investigation of the cross-linguistic relationship between two cognates in English and Norwegian: *bring* and *bringe*. Although monolingual and bilingual dictionaries prove to be excellent sources of information in respect of this relationship, the present study contributes further to our knowledge regarding the cognates' conditions of use. Drawing on material from the fiction part of the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC), the study reveals that English *bring* is far more frequent than its Norwegian counterpart. By exploring the close to 500 occurrences of the two words in original and translated texts, it becomes clear that the two verbs have a relatively low Mutual Correspondence. That is, overall, they only correspond to each other in translation in roughly 20% of the cases. This low correspondence rate is surprising, given the fact that we are looking at verbs stemming from the same origin in two closely related languages. The corpus correspondences suggest that there may be at least two main reasons for this. First, Norwegian *bringe* may be considered more formal than English *bring* and there is thus a preference for using less formal verbs in Norwegian to express the meaning of *bring*, notably the multi-word verbs *ha med* (REFL) 'have with (REFL)', *ta med* (REFL) 'take with (REFL)' and *komme med* 'come with'. Second, English *bring* is more versatile than Norwegian *bringe*, particularly in the sense that it more readily forms part of phrasal verbs and fixed phrases. It is also the case that English *bring* has come to be used with a wider range of meanings than Norwegian *bringe*, as attested in the dictionaries consulted. These 'extra' meanings include 'initiate legal action against someone' and 'force oneself to do something (unpleasant)'; however, neither of these

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions.

meanings is particularly salient in the current data. The findings underline the role a parallel corpus such as the ENPC can play in shedding light on contrastive nuances that contribute to a broader understanding of cross-linguistic relationships.

**Keywords:** English, Norwegian, cognates, verbs, bidirectional translation corpus, lexicogrammar, Mutual Correspondence, contrastive analysis

## 1 Introduction

This study takes two cognates as its starting point in order to show the potential of a bidirectional translation corpus in uncovering lexico-grammatical similarities and differences between two closely related languages. Although seemingly perfect cross-linguistic matches of each other, the English verb *bring* and the Norwegian verb *bringe* seem to have different conditions of use. Dictionary entries, as well as informal (corpus) observations, suggest exactly that, with English *bring* being the more frequent and versatile of the two. In fact, in the fiction part of two monolingual corpora of English and Norwegian – the British National Corpus (BNC) and Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus (LBK) – the lemma *bring* is around seven times more frequent than its Norwegian cognate, suggesting that English *bring* has a wider area of use.

The aim of the study is to uncover the true nature of these verbs in the two languages, through a detailed contrastive analysis of *bring/bringe* on the basis of data drawn from the fiction part of the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC). In this way, it will be possible to establish how they are used in the two languages, when they overlap in meaning and use, and when they do not. It will also be of interest to survey the extent to which they correspond to each other in translation and what other correspondences they may have. This may in turn pave the way for a semantic network of *bringing* across the two languages. Example (1) shows a case of a perfect, congruent translation correspondence between the two verbs, while example (2) shows a non-congruent correspondence.

- (1) *En dag, det var en torsdag, **brakte** budet to pakker.* (JW1)<sup>2</sup>  
One day, a Thursday, the messenger **brought** two cartons. (JW1T)
- (2) *I put a finger to his mouth: ‘Don’t **bring** it **up** again.* (ABR1)  
Jeg la en finger på munnen hans: ‘Ikke **snakk** mer om det. (ABR1T)  
Lit.: ‘Not talk more about it’.

---

<sup>2</sup> The corpus ID identifies the author (JW), the text by that author (1). Translations are marked with a T. For an overview of the texts in the ENPC, see Johansson (2007).

In (1), Norwegian *bringe* is a monotransitive verb in the past tense (*brakte*), corresponding to past tense, monotransitive *bring* (*brought*) in the English translation. In (2), on the other hand, *bring* is part of a phrasal verb (*bring up* = ‘mention’/‘discuss’) and the Norwegian translator has opted for the simplex verb *snakke* ‘talk’.

This paper has the following structure: Section 2 starts with a brief background to the verbs, mainly based on dictionary and general grammar sources, while Section 3 outlines the material and method used. The contrastive analysis of the *bring/bringe* data is contained in Section 4, followed by the concluding Section 5.

## 2 The cognates *bring* and *bringe*: Background

The apparent mismatch between these two verbs has puzzled me for a number of years, and a long-standing wish of looking more closely into their cross-linguistic relationship has now been fulfilled. Although a former student of mine wrote a short term paper on the use of *bring* in a contrastive perspective (Veamyhr 2009), a full-scale, corpus-based comparison of the two verbs does not exist. Veamyhr’s paper was narrower in scope than the present study, focusing on how the English verb forms *bring* and *brought* are translated into Norwegian, *i.e.* a unidirectional comparison. I take this opportunity to acknowledge Veamyhr’s preliminary work on the topic, which to a large degree confirmed the hunch that, despite their common origin and core meaning, *bring* and *bringe* do not seem to have the same conditions of use in English and Norwegian. The current study aims to provide a full and systematic bidirectional analysis of all forms of the two verbs. Before we turn to the analysis proper, some background is in order, mainly obtained from dictionaries.

*Bring* and *bringe* have been introduced as cognates, pointing to the fact that, etymologically, they have the same origin. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) the origin of *bring* is “common Germanic”, with the core meaning of “[t]o cause to come along with oneself; <...> it implies motion towards the place where the speaker or auditor is, or is supposed to be, being in sense the causative of *come*; motion in the opposite direction is expressed by *take*” (OED). Norwegian *bringe* – as well as its Danish and Swedish equivalents – is, according to Bjorvand and Lindeman (2007, 127), an old loanword from Middle Low German.<sup>3</sup> The fact that this verb is found in all the other old Germanic languages suggests that it at some point fell out of use in the North Germanic languages, but was reintroduced again in the Middle Low German period (*ibid.*).

---

<sup>3</sup> MLG is defined as “Low German in the period from the 12th cent. to 1500” (OED).

## 2.1 *Bring* and *bringe* in monolingual dictionaries

If we look up *bring* and *bringe* in modern, monolingual dictionaries, the entries for English *bring* are typically much longer than those for Norwegian *bringe*. I will refrain from speculating whether this is connected to the previous observation of *bringe* having been brought back into the language after having fallen into disuse for a period of time, but this may be worth bearing in mind. In the following, I will give a brief and condensed overview of each verb in one monolingual English dictionary (*oxforddictionaries.com*) and one monolingual Norwegian dictionary (*Bokmålsordboka*); see Tables 1 and 2.

<i>oxforddictionaries.com</i>	<i>Bokmålsordboka</i>	Notes
valency/transitivity	valency/transitivity	<i>oxforddictionaries.com</i> contains examples of mono-, di- and complex transitive uses of <i>bring</i> ; <sup>4</sup> <i>Bokmålsordboka</i> contains examples of mono- and complex transitive uses of <i>bringe</i>
four main entries (four sub-entries of the first sense)	three main entries	
seven set phrases	zero set phrases	Set phrases from <i>oxforddictionaries.com</i> include: <i>bring the house down</i> ; <i>bring it on</i> ; <i>bring something to bear</i>
eighteen phrasal verbs <sup>5</sup>	zero phrasal verbs	Phrasal verbs from <i>oxforddictionaries.com</i> include: <i>bring sth about</i> ; <i>bring sth on</i> ; <i>bring sbdy up</i>

Table 1. Main characteristics of *bring/bringe* in the two monolingual dictionaries

<sup>4</sup> Following Quirk *et al.*'s (1985, 54) definition, monotransitive verbs occur in the clause type SVO, ditransitive in the clause type SVOO (excluding prepositional phrases as indirect object (*ibid.*: 59)) and complex transitive in the clause types SVOC and SVOA.

<sup>5</sup> Phrasal verbs in the context of *bring* refer to phrasal transitive verbs in which the particle can either precede or follow the direct object (Quirk *et al.* 1985, 1153).

Meanings/definitions specified		Examples
<i>oxforddictionaries.com</i>	<i>Bokmålsordboka</i>	
1. take or go with (someone or something) to a place (incl. causative uses)	1. <i>ha med seg</i> ‘have with oneself’; <i>bære</i> ‘carry’	<i>she brought Luke home from hospital</i> <i>bringe varer</i> ‘bring goods’
	2. <i>gi</i> ‘give’/‘cause’; <i>fremføre</i> ‘offer’/ ‘communicate’	<i>The pilot brought the shuttle gently to rest in the clearing.</i> <i>bringe nye momenter inn i en sak</i> ‘bring new elements to a case’
2. Cause (someone or something) to be in a particular state or condition.		<i>I’ll give you an aspirin to bring down your temperature</i> <i>ingen vet hva framtiden vil bringe</i> ‘nobody knows what the future will bring’ <i>bringe ulykke</i> ‘bring bad luck’
	3. <i>få</i> ‘get’/‘cause’	
3. Initiate (legal action) against someone.		<i>riot and conspiracy charges should be brought against them</i>
4. Force oneself to do something unpleasant.		<i>she could not bring herself to mention it</i>

Table 2. Meanings and definitions specified in the two monolingual dictionaries with examples

From Tables 1 and 2, based on the two dictionaries, it can be inferred that the main differences between the English and Norwegian verbs are as follows:

- a) Only English *bring* can be used as a ditransitive verb;
- b) Only English *bring* is frequently found as part of a set phrase;
- c) Only English *bring* is frequently found as part of a phrasal verb;
- d) Only English *bring* can be used in the senses of initiating legal action and forcing oneself to do something unpleasant;
- e) Sense 1 of English *bring* overlaps with senses 1 and 2 of Norwegian *bringe*;
- f) Sense 2 of English *bring* overlaps with senses 2 and 3 of Norwegian *bringe*.

This list can of course only give us a rough indication of possible differences between the two verbs, but it will be put to the test in the systematic cross-linguistic comparison in Section 4.

## 2.2 *Bring* and *bringe* in bilingual dictionaries

Another useful source of information regarding the relationship between the two verbs is bilingual dictionaries. I will refer to one such resource, namely the bilingual English-Norwegian and Norwegian-English dictionaries available via *ordnett.no*.

In the English to Norwegian direction, nine main entries for *bring* can be found in *ordnett.no*, of which only the first and seventh have *bringe* as a suggested Norwegian translation. The other suggestions for entry 1 are *komme (hit/dit) med* ‘come (here/there) with’, *ha med seg* ‘have with oneself’, *ta med (seg)* ‘take with (oneself)’, and for entry 7 *formå* ‘persuade’, *få* ‘get’/‘cause’, respectively. This is, perhaps unsurprisingly, very much in line with what we learnt from the monolingual dictionaries (see Table 2 in particular). Further information that can be gleaned from the other entries in the English-Norwegian bilingual dictionary includes the fact that Norwegian has prefixed verbs with *bringe* corresponding to English *bring*, viz. *anbringe* as in *the points to be dealt with can be brought under three main heads*, *frembringe* as in *it brings bad luck* and *innbringe* as in *his writings bring him £30,000 a year*.<sup>6</sup> This last use was listed in *oxforddictionaries.com* as a subentry of sense 1. The prefixed verbs all have in common that they belong to a highly formal register, thus these senses of *bring* would most likely call for other translation correspondences in a less formal register such as fiction. Notably, the entry with an example of the ditransitive use of *bring* lists the following translation possibilities in Norwegian: *hente* ‘fetch’, *ta inn* ‘take in’, *ta frem* ‘take forth/out’, *sette frem* ‘set forth/out’, of which *hente* is used as a translation of *bring* in *bring me a glass of water; please*. There are a couple of other observations worth making, namely that sense 4 in *oxforddictionaries.com* is equated with *bringe* and *få* ‘get’/‘cause’ and also that several of the other equivalents are prefixed verbs or may be classified as phrasal verbs, e.g. *forårsake* ‘cause’, *medføre* ‘cause’ and *legge frem* ‘lay forth/out’.

Going from Norwegian *bringe* into English, *ordnett.no* has the following four entries:

- 1 (*hente* ‘fetch’)<sup>7</sup>  
bring, get, fetch
- 2 (*levere* ‘deliver’, *ta med* ‘take with’)  
take, deliver, convey (*budskap* ‘message’, *beskjed* ‘message’), carry (om transportmidler ‘about means of transport’)

---

<sup>6</sup> These three examples are taken from *ordnett.no*.

<sup>7</sup> The English glosses are mine.

- 3 (føre til ‘lead to’/‘cause’, føre med seg ‘lead with itself’/‘cause’)  
give, cause, bring about
- 4 (offentliggjøre ‘make official’)  
carry  
EKSEMPEL ‘example’ • *alle de lokale avisene brakte historien* all the local newspapers carried the story

Interestingly, only senses 1 and 3 have *bring (about)* as a suggested equivalent of *bringe*. However, from what we have seen in the other dictionaries, it seems plausible that *bring* can in fact cover all four senses. The most striking thing about the whole entry for *bringe* in *ordnett.no* is that it in addition to the four senses above lists a fair number of set phrases, including potential phrasal verbs. These are not mentioned under the entry for *bringe* in *Bokmålsordboka* and include expressions such as: *bringe en sak inn for retten* ‘take a case to court’, *bringe i sikkerhet* ‘bring into safety’/‘carry into safety’, *bringe frem* ‘bring forth’/‘bring (out)’, *bringe med* ‘bring along’/‘take (along)’.<sup>8</sup> This suggests that Norwegian *bringe* may enter into such phrases; the corpus investigation will tell us more about the extent to which this happens in Norwegian fiction.

### 2.3 Phrasal verbs with *bring* and *bringe*

As this investigation includes all uses of the verbs, a brief note on their phrasal-verb uses is in order. For the purposes of this study I will adopt Quirk *et al.*’s (1985, 1150ff) definition of phrasal verbs. Phrasal verbs are multi-word combinations consisting of a lexical verb and a particle behaving as a single unit. Phrasal verbs with *bring* are found in Quirk *et al.*’s type II category of “transitive phrasal verbs” in which “the particle can either precede or follow the direct object” (*ibid.*, 1153).

For comparison with one proposed Norwegian framework of multi-word verbs, Landmark (1998) refers to relevant combinations, such as *ta med* ‘take with’, as *løse transitive flerordsverb* ‘loose transitive multi-word verbs’ (corresponding to Quirk *et al.*’s transitive phrasal verbs), whereas other combinations relevant in our context, such as *komme med* ‘come with’, are referred to as *tette transitive flerordsverb* ‘tight transitive multi-word verbs (corresponding to Quirk *et al.*’s prepositional verbs).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Some of the verbs listed that may be classified as phrasal verbs, e.g. *bringe med* ‘bring along’ (Lit. bring with), are not considered phrasal verbs in the current study, but rather instances of monotransitive *bringe* followed by an optional Adverbial realised by a PP, in line with *bring (V) sth (dO) with REFL (A/PP)*. The sequences *bringe med* and *bring with* do not operate as single units. See Section 2.3 for the definition of phrasal verbs adopted in this study.

<sup>9</sup> It is, however, slightly unclear whether Landmark considers *komme med* in the sense of *bring* as a ‘tight transitive multi-word verb’, as it is not explicitly mentioned.



In some cases it may be hard to distinguish phrasal verbs from free combinations of verb plus spatial adverb. Quirk *et al.* (1985, 1154) propose that

*[w]here there is ambiguity between idiomatic and nonidiomatic interpretations of the same combination, insertion of an adverb will select the nonidiomatic one. Thus [1], unlike [2], can mean 'she reared the girls':*

*She brought the girls up.* [1]

*She brought the girls right up.* [2]

In their overview of multi-word lexical verbs, Biber *et al.* (1999, 412–413) identify 12 phrasal verbs with *bring* in total in their corpus, of which two are deemed “common”, *i.e.* occurring more than 10 times per million words (*bring up/out?*). As no comparable grammar to Biber *et al.* exists for Norwegian, it is difficult to assess how the number of phrasal verbs with *bringe* may compare with *bring*. However, even the bilingual *ordnett.no* dictionary, which does list some phrasal verbs with *bringe*, only lists a couple, some of which according to Quirk *et al.*'s definition may not qualify as phrasal verbs after all (see footnote 5). Thus, the dictionaries consulted above suggest that *bring* is more productive as a phrasal verb than *bringe* is.

### 3 Material and method

The following sections give an overview and description of the corpus and data set used in the current investigation, as well as an outline of what may be termed the “bidirectional contrastive method”.

#### 3.1 The English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus

The English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC) was compiled at the University of Oslo in the mid-1990s, under the directorship of Stig Johansson. It is a bidirectional translation corpus, consisting of comparable data originally written in English and Norwegian and their translations into Norwegian and English. The corpus is structured in a way that encourages research in the fields of contrastive linguistics and translation studies, from an applied as well as a theoretical perspective (see *e.g.* Johansson 1998, 8). The ENPC contains a fiction and a non-fiction part, of which only the former will be used for the purpose of this study. ENPCfiction contains text extracts of 10,000–15,000 words from 30 contemporary novels in each of the two languages.<sup>10</sup> These have been aligned at sentence level with their respective translations in the other language. In total,

---

<sup>10</sup> By contemporary is here meant fiction published in the 1980s and 1990s.



ENPCfiction amounts to 1.6 million running words, distributed across four components, or sub-corpora: English originals (EO), English translations (ET), Norwegian originals (NO) and Norwegian translations (NT). The fact that the sub-corpora are equal in size means that direct comparisons of raw frequencies are possible and valid. For a fuller and more detailed account of the ENPC, see *e.g.* Johansson 2007; Johansson *et al.* 1999/2000).

As only three of the sub-corpora in the ENPC are lemmatised and POS-tagged, the material was extracted using search strings including all verb forms of *bring* (*bring|brings|brought|bringing*) and *bringe* (*bringe|bringer|brakte|bragte|brakt|bragt*) through the Translation Corpus Explorer search interface (developed by J. Ebeling and L. Wilhelmsen).<sup>11</sup> In addition to ensuring comparability of the output of the searches, this procedure also ensures total recall and very good precision (close to 100%, but see Section 3.1.1 for one false hits).

### 3.1.1 The *bring/bringe* data set

The searches for all forms of the verbs in the four sub-corpora returned a highly unbalanced number of hits in the English vs. Norwegian data, as shown in Table 3.

Lemma	English originals (EO)	English translations (ET)	Norwegian originals (NO)	Norwegian translations (NT)
<i>bring/bringe</i>	202	187	46	48

Table 3. Number of occurrences of the lemmas *bring* and *bringe* in the ENPC sub-corpora

One occurrence in the Norwegian originals was excluded on the grounds that it was a “false hit”: *brakte* in example (3) is a form of the verb *brake* ‘thunder’, and is thus a homonym of the past tense of *bringe*.

- (3) *Snorkingen til Klegge lød bare som koselig humlesurr i forhold til tordenskrallene som **brakte** ut av munnen til Digralde.* (TTH1)

Lit.: ‘The snoring of Klegge sounded just as nice bee buzzing in comparison to the thunderclaps that **thundered** out of the mouth of Digralde’

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/omc/team/>

The lack of balance between English *bring* and Norwegian *bringe* in terms of frequency is in fact quite striking when compared to other cross-linguistic studies of cognates and other seemingly perfect matches across languages. It is striking because of the lack of overuse or underuse in the translations compared to the original texts in the same language. As pointed out by Johansson (2007, 32):

*With a bidirectional corpus like the ENPC, we can pinpoint differences between choices in original and translated texts in the same language. In some cases, we find **overuse** in translation, where a form is used more often in translations than in original texts, in other cases there is **underuse**, with the opposite frequency difference. <...> Overuse and underuse can be taken as evidence that the means of expression do not match in the source and target language and that there is a tendency for the source text to leave its mark on the translation.*

A case in point is Johansson's (2006) bidirectional study of English *well* and Norwegian *vel* in sentence initial position, where *well* was shown to be more than twice as common in English original texts than in English texts translated from Norwegian.<sup>12</sup> Johansson calls this phenomenon "translation effect", but stresses that "overuse and underuse are meant as descriptive terms and do not necessarily imply that there is anything wrong with translated texts where we find evidence of overuse and underuse" (2007, 33).

The distribution of *bring* vs. *bringe* across the four sub-corpora suggests that there is no such translation effect in the material, at least not in terms of frequency. What can be observed is a clear difference between the languages rather than between original and translated texts, suggesting that *bring* is triggered in translation by other Norwegian sources than *bringe*, and that it gives rise to other translation correspondences than *bringe*. This in turn may suggest that the two may not be as good matches of each other as one may be led to believe. The contrastive analysis in Section 4 will give us a clearer picture of how the two verbs relate to each other, and whether there is indeed no translation effect.

### **3.1.2 The bidirectional contrastive method**

The method applied here can be referred to as the 'bidirectional contrastive method', which exploits the parallel structure of the corpus to its full contrastive potential. This means that the verbs will be explored in both directions of correspondence, viz. starting from the original texts to establish how *bring* and *bringe* have been rendered in the translations, and starting from the translations to establish which item(s) in the source

---

<sup>12</sup> Johansson's (2006) study also includes a unidirectional comparison between English originals and German translations.



*bring* and *bringe* correspond to any verb. This means that the focus will be on the actual mutual correspondence of the lemmas *bring* and *bringe* (i.e. congruent correspondence in the strictest sense).

#### 4 Contrasting *bring* and *bringe* in the ENPC

##### 4.1 Degree of congruence between *bring* and *bringe*

The contrastive analysis starts with an overview of the (non-)correspondence of the two lemmas in ENPCfiction in Table 4.

(non-) correspondence of the lemmas	Direction of correspondence				Total
	EO → NT	ET ← NO	NO → ET	NT ← EO	
<i>bring</i> = <i>bringe</i>	18 (8.9%)	28 (15%)	28 (60.9%)	16 (33.3%)	90 (18.6%)
<i>bring</i> ≠ <i>bringe</i>	184 (91.1%)	159 (85%)	18 (39.1%)	32 (66.7%)	393 (81.4%)
Total	202	187	46	48	483

Table 4. Overview of correspondence and non-correspondence of the lemmas *bring* and *bringe* in the ENPC

Table 4 shows that only 90 (18.6%) of the 483 occurrences of the two lemmas are instances of *bring* corresponding to *bringe* or *vice versa*. Example (4) is a typical example of full congruence, where *brings* corresponds to *bringer*.

- (4) *Guilt **brings** us nearer to God.* (FW1)  
 Skyldfølelse **bringer** oss nærmere Gud. (FW1T)

However, in the great majority of cases (81.4%), such congruence is not found; non-correspondence takes many forms and some of these are illustrated in examples (5)–(8).

- (5) *He had **brought** her home to Compayne Gardens, where Fibich had behaved impeccably:* <...> (AB1)  
 Han hadde **tatt** henne **med** hjem til Compayne Gardens hvor Fibich hadde opptrådt uklanderlig: <...> (AB1T)  
 Lit.: ‘He had taken her with home <...>’
- (6) *“We don’t **bring up** children like that where I come from” the man said, glowering at me.* (BO1)  
 “Det er ikke sånn vi **oppdrar** barn der jeg kommer fra,” sa mannen og skulte til meg. (BO1T)  
 Lit.: ‘It is not such we upraise children where I come from <...>’

- (7) *And he left, accompanied not by his mate, Bert, who had **brought** him here, but by Alice, <...> (DL2)*

Og så gikk han, og det var ikke vennen Bert som fulgte ham ut, men Alice; enda det var Bert som hadde **fått** ham hit. (DL2T)

Lit.: '<...> it wasn't the friend Bert who followed him out, but Alice; although it was Bert who had **got** him here'

- (8) *"God love them," said my ma when my da told her about the smell of chips and vinegar that Mister O'Connell had **brought** with him onto the train. (RDO1)*

– Gud bevare dem, sa mor da far fortalte henne om lukta av chips og eddik fra herr O'Connell på toget. (RDO1T)

Lit.: '<...> and vinegar from Mr O'Connell on the train'

In (5), *bring* is translated into the phrasal verb *ta med* 'take with', while the phrasal verb *bring up* in (6) is rendered by the prefixed verb *oppdrar* 'upraise'. Both of these would be considered non-congruent choices in the framework outlined in Figure 1 above. Example (7) is interesting in terms of congruence, because *fått* is in fact a formally similar, congruent correspondence to *brought*, albeit not in the strictest sense as it is a different verb from *bring*. Finally, (8) is an instance of zero correspondence, where the translator has kept the meaning of the original by replacing the finite relative clause containing *had brought* with a prepositional phrase (*i.e. that Mister O'Connell had brought* translated into *fra herr O'Connell* 'from Mr O'Connell').

It is also revealed in Table 4 that a different tendency in terms of correspondence between the two verbs can be observed when going from Norwegian originals into English translations (NO → ET); *bring* is used as a translation of *bringe* in about 60% of the cases. Since we have seen that the meanings of Norwegian *bringe* tend to overlap with meanings of English *bring*, this is as expected. Indeed, a similar tendency would also be expected when looking at *bring* in Norwegian translations from English, but here the percentage of correspondence is only around 33%. In this case, then, we may suspect some translation effect, in that proportionally more instances of English *bring* than expected give rise to Norwegian *bringe* in translation, when compared to *bringe* in original texts. However, 33% is still well above the percentage recorded when taking English as a starting point, *i.e.* EO → NT and ET ← NO.

## 4.2 Patterns of use

We will now turn to the conditions of use in cases where *bring* corresponds to *bringe* and where it does not. In other words, is it possible to detect specific patterns that trigger correspondence or non-correspondence?

Table 5 outlines the different syntactic patterns into which *bring* and *bringe* enter and to what extent they correspond to each other within each pattern.

Syntactic pattern	Direction of correspondence			
	EO → NT	ET ← NO	NO → ET	NT ← EO
<b>Monotransitive</b>	4/87 (4.6%)	10/91 (11%)	12/16 (75%)	3/10 (30%)
<b>Ditransitive</b>	3/16 (18.8%)	4/21 (19%)	5/5 (100%)	2/3 (66.7%)
<b>Complex transitive</b>	11/93 (11.8%)	14/72 (19.4%)	10/22 (45.5%)	11/32 (34%)
<b>Fixed phrase</b>	0/6 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	18/202 (8.9%)	28/187 (15%)	28/46 (69.9%)	16/48 (33.3%)

Table 5. Correspondence of *bring/bringe* according to syntactic pattern

The first observation to be made from Table 5 is that some degree of correspondence is found in all the syntactic patterns, although the amount of congruence varies across all categories and according to direction of correspondence. We can establish that the most frequent pattern overall for both verbs is complex transitive, as in example (9) (with *back* as obligatory Adverbial), although the monotransitive pattern (example 10) outnumbers the complex transitive one in English translations. The ditransitive pattern (example 11) is the one that triggers the highest percentage of congruence, although more so in NO → ET and NT ← EO. Even if the numbers are small in both directions they point to the fact that ditransitive *bringe* is possible in Norwegian, contrary to what the dictionaries might have led us to believe.

- (9) *This time he wants to capture the animals and **bring** them back.* (MN1T)  
Denne gangen vil han fange dyrene og **bringe** dem tilbake. (MN1)
- (10) *One day, a Thursday, the messenger **brought** two cartons.* (JW1T)  
En dag, det var en torsdag, **brakte** budet to pakker. (JW1)
- (11) *Dette århundre har **bragt** oss damp, elektrisitet og gass.* (EFH1)  
This century has **brought** us steam, electricity, and gas. (EFH1T)

An important fact hidden behind the numbers in the monotransitive category in EO → NT and ET ← NO in Table 5 is the relatively high proportion of phrasal verbs with *bring* (23 out of 87 in EO → NT and 21 out of 91 in ET ← NO; see Table 10 below). These do not generally have a Norwegian correspondence with *bringe*; example (12) is the only one attested in the ENPC material. In addition, a phrasal verb with *bring* in ET has a phrase with *bringe* as its Norwegian source (13).

- (12) <...> *he was a Party apparatchik to his bootstraps, one of those **brought in** by the present Soviet leader when he had been Chairman of the KGB.* (FF1)

Han var Parti-apparatsjik til støvlesålene, en av dem den nåværende Sovjet-lederen hadde **brakt inn** da han var formann for KGB. (FF1T)

- (13) *Sophie was just about to laugh, but she understood why the question was being brought up now.* (JG1T)

Sofie begynte bare å le, men hun skjønnte hvorfor dette spørsmålet ble **brakt på bane** akkurat nå. (JG1)

Lit.: '<...> why this question was brought on pitch [*i.e.* brought up for discussion] exactly now'

In terms of Mutual Correspondence (MC) (Altenberg 1999), which quantifies the strength of attraction between two items in translation, there is an asymmetric relationship in that the correspondence is higher when going from the Norwegian texts to the English texts in all the syntactic categories, *i.e.* there is a translation bias. For illustration, I will use the complex transitive category. Table 6 shows an MC of 19.1%, with a sharp translation bias of 11.8% in EO → NT vs. 45.5% in NO → ET.

		EO → NT		NO → ET	MC
<b>Target</b>	11 x 100	11.8%	10 x 100	45.5%	19.1%
<b>Source</b>	93		22		

Table 6. Mutual correspondence of the lemmas complex transitive *bring* and *bringe*

Similarly, the reverse MC (rMC) (Ebeling & Ebeling 2015), *i.e.* the number of times our items have each other as source, is also skewed, as shown in Table 7, with 19.4% vs. 34%, albeit the translation bias is not as pronounced as in the case presented in Table 6.

		ET ← NO		NT ← EO	rMC
<b>Source</b>	14 x 100	19.4%	11 x 100	34%	24%
<b>Target</b>	72		32		

Table 7. Reverse MC of the lemmas complex transitive *bring* and *bringe*

Not only are the MC and rMC skewed, both measures are extremely low, considering the fact that we are looking at cognates, which for all intents and purposes would be thought to reach (r)MCs close to 100%.

Generally speaking, low correspondence rates could suggest a lexical gap between languages, or low (lexical) importance of the items compared (Altenberg 1999, 255). However, neither of these explanations seems viable in the current circumstances. What the measures do suggest, however, is that English *bring* has a correspondence paradigm that is more varied than that of *bringe*. We need to probe further into the actual correspondences of *bring* and *bringe* to gain more knowledge regarding the nature of these.



### 4.3 Correspondences of *bring* and *bringe* in the ENPC

An overview of actual correspondences of *bring* and *bringe* in the material is offered in Tables 8 and 9 for the simplex versions of the verbs, while Table 10 focuses on fixed and phrasal uses of *bring*.

Correspondences of simplex <i>bring</i>	EO → NT	ET ← NO
<i>bringe</i>	17	28
<i>ta</i> ‘take’	8	3
<i>ta med</i> (REFL) ‘take with (REFL)’	32 <sup>14</sup>	12 <sup>15</sup>
<i>få</i> ‘get’/‘cause’	9	9
<i>ha med</i> (REFL) <sup>16</sup> ‘have with (REFL)’	13	21 <sup>17</sup>
<i>bære</i> ‘carry’	4	3
<i>føre</i> ‘lead’	4	4
<i>føre med seg</i> ‘lead with her/him/itself’	1	2
<i>gi</i> ‘give’	3	10
<i>hente</i> ‘fetch’	2	11
<i>komme</i> ‘come’	4	1
<i>komme med</i> ‘come with’	27	18
<i>legge</i> ‘lay’	3	1
<i>stille</i> ‘place’	2	1
<i>være</i> ‘be’	1	2
<i>medbringe</i> ‘bring along’ (lit.: withbring)		3
<i>orke</i> <sup>18</sup> ‘have the energy/ability to do sth’		3
<i>sette</i> ‘put’		2
other (occurring no more than once in each sub-corpus)	31	21
Zero	12	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>164</b>

Table 8. Correspondences of simplex *bring* in Norwegian translations and sources

<sup>14</sup> Two occurrences of *ta med seg*.

<sup>15</sup> Six occurrences of *ta med REFL* (*meg* ‘myself’, *deg* ‘yourself’, *seg* ‘himself/herself, itself’).

<sup>16</sup> One occurrence of *ha med seg*.

<sup>17</sup> 16 occurrences of *ha med REFL* (*seg* ‘him/her/itself’, *meg* ‘myself’).

<sup>18</sup> The source *orke* gives rise to *bring* in the sense of *bring oneself to do something* (cf. sense 4 in *oxforddictionaries.com*).

Correspondences of simplex <i>bringe</i>	NO → ET	NT ← EO
<i>bring</i>	27	16
<i>take</i>	6	4
<i>be</i>	–	3
<i>carry</i>	1	2
other (occurring no more than once in each sub-corpus)	6	18
Zero	3	–
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>

Table 9. Correspondences of simplex *bringe* in English translations and sources

With reference to Tables 8 and 9, it is the former that seems to contain the more valuable contrastive information. Although Table 9 reveals that Norwegian *bringe* can have many different sources in English, it mainly shows what we already knew, *i.e.* *bring* is the most common correspondence of Norwegian *bringe*, and shows few other tendencies, apart perhaps from the use of *take* as a correspondence of *bringe*.

Table 8, on the other hand, does reveal some clear tendencies, namely that Norwegian appears to rely on multi-word verbs containing the particle *med* ‘with’ to cover the meaning of *bring*. While around 10% (17 out of 173) of the simplex uses of *bring* in EO → NT are rendered by *bringe*, more than 40% (72 out of 173) are rendered by *komme med*, *ha med* (REFL) and *ta med* (REFL). This, together with the fact that Norwegian *bringe* is conspicuously less used than English *bring*, suggests that *bringe* may be felt to be too formal, or even unnatural/unidiomatic, in modern Norwegian fiction, despite the fact that it would have been acceptable in most patterns and meanings in which English *bring* is used. By using the less formal phrasal (*ha/ta med*) and prepositional (*komme med*) verbs, idiomaticity in the sense of naturalness is achieved. The other direction of correspondence supports this, in that a similar preference for multi-word sources can be noted there.

It is interesting to note that the connection between *bring* and verbs such as *take*, *ta* and *komme* was already mentioned in the OED definition quoted in Section 2, *i.e.* *bring* is in a sense the causative of *come* or expresses motion in the opposite direction of *take*. This latter point is illustrated in example (14), where the English sentence with *bring* is in the passive voice, while the Norwegian translation with *ta* is in the active. In other words, *bring* and *ta* describe motions in opposite directions.

- (14) *There were not enough chairs and an extra had to **be brought** from upstairs.*  
 (RR1)  
 Det var ikke nok stoler, så de måtte **ta** ned en ekstra fra annen etasje. (RR1T)  
 Lit.: ... so they had to take down an extra from second floor

However, the criterion of ‘opposite direction’ does not always seem to hold, as example (15) attests. Here, *bringe* and *take* are perfect matches of each other, with no change of perspective.

- (15) *Men det vil bringe oss frem.* (EFH1)  
 But it will **take** us forward. (EFH1T)

The words and expressions occurring once as correspondences of *bring* and *bringe* are all very much in line with the definitions given in the dictionaries (see Table A in the Appendix for a list of these). What this study has uncovered, which one cannot expect to find in dictionaries, is the distribution of the various correspondences. While it is fairly safe to use *bring* in most contexts as a translation of Norwegian *bringe*, the opposite is not the case. The core meaning of *bring* is most commonly captured by one of the multi-word verbs mentioned above.

With regard to the more specialised, *i.e.* phrasal, uses of *bring* in particular, there is less of a pattern to discern. Table 10 gives an overview of the phrasal verbs and fixed phrases with *bring* in the material.

Phrasal verbs	# occurrences	Phrases	# occurrences
<i>bring about</i>	1 (EO)	<i>bring an end to</i>	1 (EO)
<i>bring down</i>	2 (EO); 1 (ET)	<i>bring to an end</i>	1 (ET)
<i>bring in</i>	2 (EO); 3 (ET)	<i>bring to court</i>	1 (EO)
<i>bring on</i>	1 (ET)	<i>bring to heel</i>	1 (ET)
<i>bring out</i>	2 (EO)	<i>bring to life</i>	2 (EO); 1 (ET)
<i>bring up</i>	16 (EO); 16 (ET)	<i>bring to mind</i>	1 (EO)
		<i>bring up short</i>	1 (EO)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23 (EO); 21 (ET)</b>		<b>6 (EO); 3 (ET)</b>

Table 10. Phrasal verbs and phrases with *bring* attested in the ENPC material (EO and ET)

The only phrasal use of *bring* that is relatively common is *bring up*, with 16 occurrences each in EO and ET. The others are only marginally attested. The Norwegian correspondences of *bring up* are relatively predictable, however. In the sense of rearing, which is by far the most common, the typical Norwegian correspondence is *oppdra* ‘upraise’, while in the sense of broaching a topic, *nevne* ‘mention’, *si* ‘say’ or *snakke* ‘talk’ are used.

Phrasal uses of Norwegian *bringe* are few and far between, with three occurrences in NO and four in NT. *Bringe på det rene* (corresponding to ‘find out’/‘explain’/‘clear up’)

is found three times, *bringe på bane* (corresponding to ‘come up’/‘bring up’) twice and *bringe for dagen* (corresponding to ‘elicit’) once. In addition, and as mentioned above, the phrasal verb *bringe inn* ‘bring in’ is found once in translated text. With reference to the discussion of *bringe med* ‘bring with’ in Section 2.2, it is tempting to suggest that *bringe med* (REFL), albeit strictly speaking not a phrasal verb, has some sort of fixed status in the Norwegian material. Five out of the 16 instances of monotransitive *bringe* in NO have *bringe med* (REFL), as in example (16).

(16) *Hvert nytt menneske som kom inn, **brakte med seg** et pust av friskt vintervær, røde kinn, klare øyne, frostbitte nesetipper.* (EHA1)

Each new person who came in **brought with them** a breath of crisp winter weather, red cheeks, bright eyes, a nose white with frostbite at its tip. (EHA1T)

It should be mentioned that one thing that sets *bringe med* (REFL) apart from the verbs with *med* that have been acknowledged as multi-word verbs – *ha/ta/komme med* – is the fact that these may correspond to simplex *bring*, while the *med*-phrase in *bringe med* is somehow superfluous.

## 5 Concluding remarks

This investigation has gone some way towards explaining the discrepancy in frequency between *bring* and *bringe*. Not only does *bring* seem to be the more favoured of the two because of its slightly broader scope of meaning,<sup>19</sup> but also because it more frequently enters into fixed and frequent phrases (cf. Sinclair 1999). Moreover, *bring* appears to be less restricted in terms of level of formality, as it readily corresponds to typically less formal options, *i.e.* phrasal verbs.

The study has revealed some clear correspondence tendencies, notably the fact that Norwegian in many contexts prefers a multi-word verb to cover the meaning of *bring*. However, whenever Norwegian *bringe* is used in original texts it naturally corresponds to a form of English *bring* in most cases.

The relatively long lists of words and expressions used once as correspondences of *bring/bringe* in the respective sub-corpora (see Appendix) suggest that certain lexicogrammatical contexts may trigger more lexically specific verbs, as illustrated in example (17) where *brought* has been translated into *kjørte* ‘drove’, a natural choice in a context in which a car features.

---

<sup>19</sup> However, it is worth noting that one of the senses “unique” to English *bring* (sense 3 in *oxforddictionaries.com*) is hardly attested at all in the current material.

- (17) <...> and the headmaster **brought** him to his auntie's in his car because there was no one at home in his own house. (RDO1)  
<...> og overlæreren **kjørte** ham til tanta hans i bilen sin fordi det ikke var noen hjemme hos Liam. (RDO1T)

It is beyond doubt that the broad network of verbs corresponding in one way or another to *bring/bringe* attests to the spectre of meanings covered by the core and general *bring* verbs, given the right context (and English *bring* in particular). Thus, the contrastive method has added to our previous knowledge as outlined in dictionaries in providing a broader network of *bring* verbs in English and Norwegian.

With reference to the title of this paper, the idiom *bring home the bacon* is not attested in the ENPC material. This is not surprising, given Aijmer and Altenberg's acknowledgement that bidirectional corpora "are seldom big enough to provide evidence of less common language features" (Aijmer & Altenberg 2013, 2). In the same vein, Johansson points out that "the corpus is rather small for lexical studies beyond the core vocabulary" (Johansson 2008, 57), and needless to say, idiomatic expressions such as *bring home the bacon* can hardly be considered part of the "core vocabulary". Nevertheless, the corpus has proved suitable for the more frequent uses of the verbs, although, ideally, the study should be supplemented in future research with data culled from large monolingual corpora of the languages under contrast.

A number of other avenues for developing this study further include a large-scale monolingual investigation of the whole semantic network of *bring* verbs in the two languages, as well as an expansion of the contrastive dimension of the study by adding more languages to gain a broader cross-linguistic perspective. To further enhance the current study, an even more detailed discussion of the immediate context and actual collocates of *bring* and *bringe* ought to be included. Finally, a future study would also need to look at the uses of *bring* and *bringe* in other text-types. Given the fact that *bringe* is thought to be stylistically more formal than its English counterpart, it would be particularly important to include text-types considered to be more formal than fiction.

While this study may not in actual fact have 'brought home the bacon', it has shown the potential of a bidirectional translation corpus in sharpening the description of two closely related verbs in their authentic contexts. It has revealed that the verbs have developed different preferred patterns and meanings from the same origin. The findings uncovered in the current study would be difficult to pinpoint without a parallel corpus such as the ENPC, which has proved ideal in gaining more knowledge about the relationship between the cognates *bring* and *bringe*.

## List of abbreviations

A	Adverbial
BNC	British National Corpus
dO	Direct Object
ENPC	English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus
EO	English originals
ET	English translations
LBK	Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus
MC	Mutual Correspondence
MLG	Middle Low German
NO	Norwegian originals
NT	Norwegian translations
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
PP	Prepositional phrase
REFL	Reflexive pronoun
rMC	Reverse Mutual Correspondence
V	Verb

## Data sources

- BNC *British National Corpus*, version 3 (BNC XML Edition). 2007. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. <<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>> (accessed 30 June 2017); BNCweb version 4.0. The CQP-edition of BNCweb (Versions 3 and 4) was developed by Sebastian Hoffmann and Stefan Evert. The original BNCweb interface (versions 1 and 2) was a joint project of three people: Hans-Martin Lehmann, Sebastian Hoffmann and Peter Schneider.
- ENPC *English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus* (1994–1997), Dept. of British and American Studies, University of Oslo. Compiled by Stig Johansson (project leader), Knut Hofland (project leader), Jarle Ebeling (research assistant), Signe Oksefjell (research assistant). <<http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/omc/enpc/>> (accessed 30 June 2017)
- LBK *Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus* <<http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/tjenester/kunnskap/samlinger/bokmal/veiledningkorpus/>> (accessed 30 June 2017); Rune Lain Knudsen and Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld: LBK2013: A balanced; annotated national corpus for Norwegian Bokmål. *Proceedings of the workshop on lexical semantic resources for NLP at NODALIDA 2013; May 22-24; 2013; Oslo; Norway. NEALT Proceedings Series 19.*

## References

- Aijmer, Karin & Bengt Altenberg. 2013. Introduction. In *Advances in corpus-based contrastive linguistics. Studies in honour of Stig Johansson*. Karin Aijmer & Bengt Altenberg, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1–6.
- Altenberg, Bengt. 1999. Adverbial connectors in English and Swedish: semantic and lexical correspondences. In *Out of corpora: studies in honour of Stig Johansson*. Hilde Hasselgård & Signe Oksefjell, eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 249–268.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bjorvand, Harald & Fredrik Otto Lindeman. 2007. *Våre arveord. Etymologisk ordbok*. [Our inherited words. Etymological dictionary]. Oslo: Novus.
- Bokmålsordboka*. 2016. Revidert nettutgave [revised online edition], University of Oslo and the Language Council of Norway, hosted by the University of Bergen. Available at: <http://ordbok.uib.no/> Accessed: 25 July 2017.
- Ebeling, Jarle & Signe Oksefjell Ebeling. 2013. *Patterns in contrast*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ebeling, Jarle & Signe Oksefjell Ebeling. 2015. An English-Norwegian contrastive analysis of downtoners, more or less. *Nordic Journal of English Studies (NJES)* 14 (1), 62–89.
- Johansson, Stig. 2006. How well can *well* be translated? On the English discourse particle *well* and its correspondences in Norwegian and German. In *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Karin Aijmer & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg, eds. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 115–137.
- Johansson, Stig. 2007. *Seeing through multilingual corpora: on the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johansson, Stig. 2008. *Contrastive analysis and learner language: a corpus-based approach*. Unpublished course material. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Johansson, Stig, Jarle Ebeling & Signe Oksefjell. 1999/2001. *The English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus: Manual*. Oslo: Department of British and American Studies, University of Oslo. Available at: <http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/omc/enpc/ENPCmanual.pdf>. Accessed: 30 June 2017.
- Landmark, Eivind. 1998. “Flerordsverb” i norsk. [“Multi-word verbs” in Norwegian]. *Norskraft* 95, 6–48.
- Ordnett.no*. 2017. Kunnskapsforlaget. Available at: <https://www.ordnett.no/> Accessed: 25 July 2017.
- Oxforddictionaries.com*. 2017. Oxford University Press. Available at: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/> Accessed: 25 July 2017.
- Oxford English Dictionary*, OED Online. 2017. Oxford University Press. Available at: <http://www.oed.com/> Accessed: 25 July 2017.



- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Sinclair, John. 1999. A way with common words. In *Out of corpora: studies in honour of Stig Johansson*. Hilde Hasselgård & Signe Oksefjell, eds. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 157–179.
- Veamyhr, Kirjan. 2009. The use of *bring* in a contrastive perspective (English-Norwegian). Unpublished term paper. Oslo: University of Oslo.

## Appendix

Direction of correspondence			
EO → NT	ET ← NO	NO → ET	NT ← EO
<i>bety</i> ‘mean’, <i>dra med seg</i> ‘drag with oneself’, <i>finne</i> ‘find’, <i>forvandle</i> ‘change’/‘transform’, <i>frakte</i> ‘carry’, <i>føye til</i> ‘add to’, <i>føye sammen</i> ‘combine together’, <i>gjøre</i> ‘do’, <i>gå inn for</i> ‘go in for’/‘support’, <i>integrere</i> ‘integrate’, <i>kalle frem</i> ‘call (forth)’, <i>kaste</i> ‘throw’, <i>kjøre</i> ‘drive’, <i>la</i> ‘let’, <i>lage</i> ‘make’, <i>levere</i> ‘deliver’, <i>lure</i> ‘trick’, <i>medføre</i> ‘cause’, <i>nå</i> ‘reach’, <i>påtvinge</i> ‘force (upon)’, <i>reise</i> ‘raise’, <i>rive</i> ‘drag’, <i>sende</i> ‘send’, <i>servere</i> ‘serve’, <i>skaffe</i> ‘produce’, <i>skape</i> ‘create’, <i>smelle</i> ‘slam’, <i>tenke</i> ‘think’, <i>trekke fram</i> ‘drag forth’/‘produce’, <i>trekke inn</i> ‘draw in’	<i>dunke</i> ‘bang’, <i>felle</i> ‘fell’, <i>finne</i> ‘find’, <i>frakte</i> ‘carry’, <i>følge</i> ‘follow’, <i>innbringe</i> ‘earn’/‘fetch’, <i>kjøre</i> ‘buy’, <i>medføre</i> ‘cause’, <i>mistenkeliggjøre</i> ‘suspect’, <i>oppvarte</i> ‘serve’, <i>reise</i> ‘raise’, <i>rekke</i> <sub>1</sub> ‘have the time to do sth’, <i>rekke</i> <sub>2</sub> ‘pass’, <i>sikre</i> ‘secure’, <i>skaffe</i> ‘get (hold of)’, <i>skulle</i> ‘should’, <i>skysse</i> ‘give a lift’/‘transport’, <i>stanse</i> ‘stop’, <i>tilføre</i> ‘add’, <i>tvinge</i> ‘force’, <i>våge</i> ‘dare’	<i>draw</i> , <i>get</i> , <i>mean</i> , <i>put</i> , <i>report</i> , <i>trouble</i>	<i>alarm</i> , <i>bear</i> , <i>come up</i> , <i>happen</i> , <i>hive off</i> , <i>impart</i> , <i>import</i> , <i>land</i> , <i>make</i> , <i>produce</i> , <i>put</i> , <i>put about</i> , <i>restore</i> , <i>silence</i> , <i>tell</i> , <i>unfoot</i> , <i>unnerve</i> , <i>walk</i>

Table A. Verbs occurring once in the sub-corpora

Submitted July 28, 2017