

[0753] CLITICISATION IN THE OLD EAST FRISIAN HUNSINGO
MANUSCRIPTS

Dirk Boutkan

1. Introduction

When preparing a grammatical sketch of R₁ (Boutkan 1996), I came across several synchronic rules for cliticisation of pronouns and certain adverbs (pp. 48ff.), both with respect to the use of competing clitics as well as the derivation of clitic forms from stressed forms. As far as I can see, this field never received adequate attention in OFris. linguistics.¹

In the following, I venture to make an inventarisation of the forms of clitics and their distribution in the two Hunsingo Manuscripts (henceforth H₁ and H₂, respectively; cf. Hoekstra 1950). Moreover, as I did in my Riustring grammar, I shall try to formulate synchronic rules with the help of which these forms can be derived from their stressed counterparts. Finally, I briefly compare the clitic rules of R₁ with those of H_{1,2}. For the sake of this comparison with R₁, the discussion of the situation in the Hunsingo Manuscripts seems obvious: within the Old East Frisian area, Riustring and Hunsingo are the outer East and West regions, respectively. Therefore, possible dialectal differences, if any, are most likely to appear in these sources. Moreover, the comparison is defensible, because both sources have quite some texts in common and date from roughly the same period (around 1300 AD).

I only interpret as clitic the forms that are formally different from the stressed ones. I do not take into consideration forms that are identical with the stressed ones though appearing in solid writing with a preceding word, because the criterion of solid vs. separate writing is not reliable for the interpretation of word boundaries (Boutkan 1996: 17). All quotations are after Hoekstra's edition (1950), cited from the glossary and checked against the text. I follow Hoekstra's convention to quote only the form of H₂ unless there

1. In the handbooks, we find references to clitic by-forms of stressed pronouns, often in incomplete surveys and without reference to rules for their synchronic distribution or derivation from their stressed counterparts (e.g. Markey 1981: 133-5, Steller 1928: 53-4). More elaborate is Van Helten (1890: § 125ff.), who formulates rules for their diachronic derivation. On detail problems, cf. Bremer (1893: 307; remark on the historical derivation of *-er* < **her* to *hi* – not from a stem **i* – under reference to the regular loss of *h*-, cf. § 3.1; furthermore 1928 on the representation of old clitic forms of the personal pronoun in Modern Frisian) and Visser (1990; on the Modern West Frisian article *'e* and its origin). Levin (1959, 1960) extensively treats the negative verbs (see § 2.3) in a comparative perspective.

are complications (H_2 must have been the exemplar of H_1 , cf. Hoekstra 1950: 25ff.). Unique forms of H_1 are also taken into consideration (e.g. from text parts that have no counterpart in H_2 , such as the major part of the Prologus to the *Seventeen Statutes and Twenty-four Landlaws*). Again after Hoekstra's convention, forms labelled with [e] are emendations, those with [n] receive extra attention in a footnote in Hoekstra's edition. In appendix I, I give an alphabetical list of the host words cited in §§ 2.1-4.

2. The evidence

2.1. Personal pronouns

2nd. person

sing. Nom. *thu* (III, 21[e], 125, XIII, 8, 10, 11, 12, etc.)
 encl. *-tu, thet-tu* (XIII, 13)

3rd. person

sing.

Nom. m. *hi* (II, 15, 18, 18, 32, 41, 42, 68[n], 85, 89, etc.)
hy (II, 15[n])
hie (H_1 XI, 67[n])
he (H_1 XI 67[n])

encl.

h- (prevoc.) *h-ut* (III, 7)
-e (postcons.) *ag-e* (XI, 199), *er-e-ne* (VII, 285), *ielt-e* (X, 23), *iev-e* (VII, 56, 83), *warth-e* (VII, 273, H_1 XV, 273), *ach-e-re* (III, 18), *iev-e-re* (VII, 289), *ieu-e-re* (XI, 176), *let-e-re* (H_1 IX, 11);
 + gemination in *thett-e* (IV, 14, 17[e], VII, 52, 54, 136, 178, 205, 238; H_1 XV, 205), *thett-e-re* (XXIII, 84, 86);
 however once *thet-e* (VII, 46)

er (postcons.) *ag-er-ne* (VII, 190), *and-er-ne* (VII, 163), *and-er* (H_1 XV, 162[e]), *skel-er-em* (VII, 208), *thach-er-em* (VII, 319), *maki-er-t* (XI, 204), *geu-er* (XXIII, 21), *rek-er-se* (XXIII, 74), *ielt-er* (H_1 XVIII, 23), *sett-er* (VII, 274[e]);
 + gemination in *thett-er-ne* (VII, 218), *thett-er* (H_1 XV, 51)

-re (postvoc., after *l*) *sa-re-t* (II, 3), *hebbe-re* (II, 13), *fare-re* (III, 9),
ande-re (III, 50), *bete-re* (III, 74), *riuchte-re* (III,

80), *alsā-re* (VII, 47), *sā-re* (VII, 147, 153), *skel-re* (VII, 284), *felle-re* (XI, 162), *sā-re* (XI, 200, 212), *makie-re* (XI, 212), *ande-re* (XXIII, 30), *ieue-re* (XXIII, 47), *gelde-re* (XXIII, 37), *geue-re* (XXIII, 50, 52), *sā-re* (XXIII, 57)

–*r* (postvoc.,
before –*ne*)

capie-r-ne (VII, 195), *sā-r-ne* (VII, 204)

Dat. m. *him* (II, 13, 41, 92, 99, III, 3, 10, etc.)

encl.

–*em* (postcons.)

iew-em (III, 33), *skel-er-em* (VII, 208), *thach-er-em* (VII, 319);

+ gemination in *thett-em* (IX, 210)

–*m* (postvoc.)

se-m (VII, 306)

Acc. m. *hine* (II, 12, 15[n], III, 28, 30, 51, 54, etc.)

encl.

–*ene* (postcons.) + gemination in *bislutt-ene* (H₁ IX, 14)

–*ne* (postvoc., *r*)

capie-r-ne (VII, 195), *er-e-ne* (VII, 285), *mā-ne* (IX, 204, 206, XIII, 29, 123), *samā-ne* (VII, 200), *sā-r-ne* (VII, 204), *se-ne* (XXIII, 93), *skelma-ne* (VII, 298), *dreith-e-ne* (IX, 206), *hine* < **hi hine* (II, 42, III, 101, VII, 96, IX, 210, XXIII, 3, 26, H₁ XI, 67[e,n]), *thett-er-ne* (VII, 218-9)

Dat. f. *hire* (II, 94, III, 18, 74, VII, 79, 310, etc.)

encl.

–*r*

mā-r (VII, 309)

Nom. n. *hit* (II, 12, 15, 45, 58[n], 103, III, 1, 80, etc.)

het (H₁ XI, 19)

encl.

–*et* (postcons.)

ag-et (IX, 196), *geu-et* (II, 41), *iew-et* (VII, 209), *kemth-et* (II, 60), *ther-et* (XXIII, 103), *werth-et* (VII, 141);

	+ gemination in <i>thett-et</i> (VIII, 8)
-ed (postcons.)	<i>iev-ed</i> (VII, 87)
-t (postvoc., s,l)	<i>alsa-t</i> (XXIII, 59), <i>as-t</i> (XXIII, 62), <i>is-t</i> (VII, 62, 67, 264, 317, IX, 98, 98, 150, X, 11), <i>mei-t</i> (III, 2, VII, 266), <i>sa-t</i> (III, 95, VII, 213, 264, XXIII, 70), <i>se-t</i> (X, 26), <i>scel-t</i> (VII, 320)
Acc. n.	<i>hit</i> (II, 50[e], 67, III, 24, 85, 127, 142, etc.)
encl.	
-et (postcons.)	<i>iew-et</i> (III, 17), <i>ievet</i> (H ₁ , XI, 8), <i>bad-et</i> (H ₁ IX, 17), <i>helden-et</i> (H ₁ IX 18, 24[e]), <i>ebeden-et</i> (H ₁ IX, 6), <i>ther-et</i> (XXIII, 101, 109); + gemination in <i>thett-et</i> (H ₁ XI, 8, 19[e])
-t (postvoc. [r, n])	<i>alsa-t</i> (VII, 34), <i>hiu-t</i> (III, 13, 16[e], VII, 326), <i>huasa-t</i> (III, 10), <i>felle-t</i> (II, 51), <i>ma-t</i> (II, 59, 61, III, 127, VII, 305, XXIII, 100, 141, 143), <i>nelma-t</i> (IX, 199), <i>sa-re-t</i> (II, 3), <i>wite-t</i> (II, 115), <i>hi-t</i> < * <i>hi hit</i> (II, 50, 99, III, 18, 52, 117, VII, 165, 209, X, 5, 27, XI, 197, 197, 200, H ₁ IX, 16); unexpected in <i>funden-t</i> (XIV, 69), <i>makie-r-t</i> (XI, 204)
-it	<i>bibad-it</i> (XIV, 9)
3plur.	
Dat.	<i>him</i> (II, 35, 59, 60, 61, III, 86, 154, etc.)
encl.	
-um	<i>scanct-um</i> (XIV, 34)

Outside the third person forms, we only find one attestation of a 2s form, viz. *-tu* in *thettu*.

In postconsonantal position, the 3rd person Nsm postclitic forms are *-e*, *-er*. We are probably dealing with free variants, cf. the doublet *ag-e* ~ *ag-er*. However, *-e* appears as a rule before the clitic *-re* (< **ther*). Both clitics cause gemination of the preceding *-t* of *thet*, cf. *thette*. However, we once find *thete*. The form *-re* occurs in postvocalic position as well as once in *skel-re*; appearing in a clitic string before the clitic *-ne*, we find *-r-* twice.

The Dsm form *-em* causes gemination in *thett-em*. The form is *-m* after vowels. On the Asm form *-ene* in *bisluttene*, see below in § 3.2 sub (2). The Dsf form appears once, viz. in *ma-r*.

Nsn *-ed* in *iev-ed* (1x) rather than **-et* may be considered as a scribal error or indicate neutralisation of the opposition between final /-d/ and /-t/ (cf. also II, 104 ...*ur demet and ur deled*...). The neuter form As *-et* occurs in *thettet* with gemination. The by-form *-t* is found after vowels and once after *n* in *funden-t* (as against 3x *-et* in *helden-et* [2x; once spelled as *helden net*], *ebeden-et*) and once after the clitic *-r* (as against 2x *-et* in *ther-et*, i.e. also after a form ending in *-r*).

All forms show a vowel change of stressed /i/ to <e>, which spelling probably stands for unstressed /ə/. The exceptions are: once *-it* in *bibad-it* and once *-um* in *scanct-um*. We can interpret these forms as representing phonetic colourings of /ə/. A fronted high realisation before dentals (Asn *-it*) as against a rounded back realisation before *m* (hence Dp *-um*) of /ə/ are not surprising from a phonetic point of view. Both forms occur in text XIV (*Fon alra fresena fridome*).

2.2 Demonstrative pronoun/definite article

sing.

Nom. m. *thi* (II, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, etc.)

encl.

-ti *and-ti* (VII, 96, 114, 307, XXIII, 132, 139, H₁ XVII, 40), *thet-ti* (XXIII, 105, H₁ XII, 9)

-i *thet-i* (IV, 9)

-te *and-te* (VII, 236, IX, 40), *nis-te* (VII, 285), *is-te* (VII, 310), *thet-te* (VII, 108, 160, XXIII, 79)

-de *an-de* (H₁ XI, 67[n,e])

Gen. m. *thes* (II, 1, 10, 40, 49, etc.)

encl.

-es *ut-es* (XIV, 35)

Dat. m. *tha* (II, 9, 15, 15[n], 19, 19, 19, 35, etc.)

subst. *tham* (III, 41)

encl.

-ta *and-ta* (XXIII, 132), *an-ta* (XII, 26), *en-ta* (X, 11), *hu-ta* (XIV, 38), *on-ta* (VII, 266), *thet-ta* (XXIII, 86), *et-ta* (VII, 199, XXIII, 9, 25, 86, 95)

-a *et-a* (IX, 25, 126, 211), *it-a* (XIV, 87), *mith-a* (III, 61, 145, XXIII, 38, 73)

-da an-da (VII, 258, 264)

m.(n.) tha (X, 13)

encl.

-a mith-a (III, 23, IX, 1)

Acc. m. thene (II, 20, 43, 67, 97, etc.)

 thine (XXIII, 11)

encl.

-tene an-tene (III, 149)

-ne ag-er-ne (VII, 190), and-er-ne (VII, 163), ina-ne (IX, 209), ieftha-ne (III, 78), ma-ne (VII, 71, 173, 278), uppa-ne (VII, 50)

Nom. f. thiū (II, 1, 4, 7, 11, 22, etc.)

 the (II, 54, VII, 304, XI, 115, 170, 208)

encl.

-te and-te (VII, 108), is-te (II, 26, 39, 48, 71, 77, 81)

Dat. f. there (II, 68, III, 54, 141, 144, IV, 13, etc.)

 ther (X, 20)

encl.

-tere thet-tere (XXIII, 81)

-dere an-dere (III, 63, VII, 255, XII, 20, H₁ IX, 9, 14), on-dere (XXIII, 42)

-re to-re (II, 64, IX, 194)

Acc. f. tha (II, 38, 66, III, 130, IV, 6, 6, VI, 1, 2, etc.)

encl.

-a et-a (IX, 126), with-a (VII, 312)

-da an-da (VII, 321)

Nom. n. thet (I, 6, II, 1, 4, 5, 10, etc.)

encl.

-tet is-tet (III, 6, 12, 20, 26, 37, 45, 56, 65, 69, 73, 77, 82, 88, 92, 99, 103, 107, 121, 124, 132, 137, 146, IX, 193, H₁ XI, 18), thet-tet (III, 94, 115, VII, 50, IX, 157[e])

-t sa-t (III, 95)

Gen. n. *thes* (II, 50, 52[n], III, 30, 67, 134, etc.)

encl.

-tes *ma-tes* (H₁ XI, 67[n])

Dat. n. *tha* (II, 9, 58[n], 64, 69, 97, III, 22, 50, 109, 113, etc.)

encl.

-ta *fon-ta* (VII, 44)

-a *et-a* (VII, 126), *mith-a* (VII, 198, IX, 107, XIV, 73, 88, XXIII, 41)

-da *an-da* (VII, 134), *en-da* (XI, 157), *in-da* (XXIII, 113)

Acc. n. *thet* (II, 30, 34[e], 65, III, 8, 22, 41, etc.)

encl.

-tet *thet-tet* (H₁ XI, 19[e], 67[n])

-t *hi-t* (VII, 141, 165), *limat* (IX, 208)

Plur.

Nom. *tha* (II, 15[n], 46, 67, III, 71, 85, 85, 149, etc.), *sintha* (H₁ IX, 32; MS *sin tha*)

encl.

-ta *thet-ta* (XIV, 40, H₁ XVI, 5), *send-ta* (III, 152), *en-ta* (X, 8)

Dat. *tha* (II, 28, 69, 96, 98, 98, III, 3, 11, 52, etc.)

tham (II, 74, VII, 185, XXIII, 90, 108, H₁ XV, 178[n])

encl.

-ta *an-ta* (III, 14), *et-ta* (II, 94, VII, 293, XXIII, 16, 30, 46, 48, H₁ XV, 293), *ma-ta* (II, 29)

-a *et-a* (VII, 72, 291, IX, 24, 24), *mith-a* (VII, 197, XXIII, 38)

-da *an-da* (II, 115, III, 32, 67, VII, 87), *en-da* (II, 31, 42, III, 39), *in-da* (IV, 5)

Acc. *tha* (II, 8, 97; III, 33, 39, 84, 141, VI, 3[e], 5, etc.)

encl.

-ta *and-ta* (XXIII, 41)

-a *in-a* (IX, 190), *with-a* (XIV, 52)

-da *an-da* (IX, 191)

In the Nsm, the vowel quality of the stressed form is retained in *-ti*, although we also find *-te*; *-de* appears once after *-n*. In the Dsm,n (stressed *tha*) the usual form is *-ta*, although further reduction to *-a* is found optionally after *-t* (cf. *et-a* beside *et-ta*) and as a rule after *mith*. Again a *d* appears after *n*: *an-da*, however beside *an-ta*, *en-ta*, etc. In the Asm, *-tene* appears once after *an*; elsewhere the form is *-ne* (after forms containing the clitic *-er-* or those ending in a vowel). The Nsf clitic *-te* is derived from the form *the* rather than from *thiu*. The distribution of the Dsf allomorphs is as follows: once *-tere* after *-t*, *-dere* after forms ending in *-n*, *-re* after vowel. The picture of the Asf form (stressed *tha*) is identical with that of the Dsm,n form (also stressed *tha*). The N/Asn form *thet* appears as *-tet* (after consonants), but as *-t* after vowels. In contradistinction to the Gsm (*ut-es*), we find Gsn *-tes* in *mates*. The N/D/Ap (stressed *tha*) is again identical with that of the Dsm,n, showing optional *-da* after nasals and reduction to *-a* after *-t*, *-th* (but also once in *in-a*, which may be a scribal error).

2.3 Proclitic *ne-*

hebbā 'have'

3 sing. pres. ind. *neth* (VII, 299); *net* (VII, 302)

3 sing. pres. subj. *nebbe* (II, 100, 109, XXIII, 130)

3 sing. pret. subj. *nede* (VI, 2)

wella 'want'

3 sing. pres. ind. *nel* (IX, 199)

3 sing. pres. subj. *nelle* (III, 18, 31, 52, 59, IX, 82, 154, 154, H₁ XI, 5)

3 sing. pret. ind. *nelde* (VII, 306)

wesa 'be'

3 sing. pres. ind. *nīs* (III, 83, VII, 213, 285, IX, 108, 211[n], X, 29)

3 sing. pret. ind. *nas* (V, 5, VII, 303)

wertha 'become'

3 sing. pres. subj. *nerthe* (VII, 319)

These forms show loss of the initial consonant *w-* or *h-* of the verbal stem (except in *nīs* < **ne is*), but the stem vowel remains as such after contraction with the vowel of *ne* (cf. *nas* < **ne was*). This picture can directly be compared with that of R₁. Cf. Levin (1959, 1960) for an exhaustive treatment of the phenomenon of these negative verbs.

2.4 *Adverbs and remaining categories*

I collected the following remaining evidence for cliticisation processes in adverbs, conjunctions and other lexical categories:

(1) *et* preposition 'at' (II, 94, III, 22, VII, 51, 72, etc.)
 procl. *e-there* (III, 141, 144), *e-thera* (III, 140, 143)

(2) *tha* adverb 'then' (II, 7, 8, 65, 67, etc.)

encl. *hit edeth* (VII, 311) = *hit-e deth* 'it then does'

This form shows a remarkable vowel change because the vowel quality *-a* remained in the forms of the article deriving from stressed *tha* /thā/ (see § 2). This picture is identical with that of R₁, cf. *thete* (XX, 56, 85).

(3) *te* [*< to, ti*] preposition 'to' (II, 95, 228, III, 34, 46), also + gerund (II, 15, 16, etc.)

encl. *thet-e* (III, 129)

procl. *t-wera* (III, 153)

(4) *thenna* adverb 'then' (II, 13, III, 17, etc.)

encl. (*hiut*) *tenna* (III, 13)

(5) *ther* adverb 'there' (I, 4, II, 43, III, 15, etc.)

encl.

-ter (*and*) *ter* (II, 80), (*is*) *ter* (VII, 230, IX, 73), (*thet*) *ter* (IV, 21, XXIII, 122, 129; H₁ XI, 18), (*was*) *ter* (XIV, 3, 68)

-er *thet-er* (II, 39, 100), *warth-er* (II, 8), *werth-er* (XXIII, 125)

-r *wersa-r* (VII, 323)

-re *ach-e-re* (III, 18), *iev-e-re* (VII, 289), *ieu-e-re* (XI, 176), *let-e-re* (H₁ IX, 11), *thett-e-re* (XXIII, 84, 86)

The distribution seems to be: *-ter* after dentals and *s*, but also *-er* after *-t* (i.e. *theter* beside *thet ter*); once *-r* after *-a*, but *-re* after *-e*. The forms are identical with those in R₁, where we find *-er* in *theter* (III, 16, 39; X, 35; XV, 1, 8, 56) in *sperthera* < **sperth ther a* (XIV, 28, 35), *werther* < **werth ther* (XVIII, 19), *thet ter* (X, 1, 4, 23) and *thetter* < **thet ter* (XV, 43). However, there is no evidence for the postvocalic variants *-r*, *-re* as found in R₁ in this MS. As in R₁, we find the doublets *alther* ~ *alder* (II, 16[e], VIII, 327[e], XXIII, 17 ~ II,

78, III, 12, XIV, 28, 91), the latter form probably showing a clitic process *th* > *d* after *l* (see § 3.1).

Cf. also:

theron adverb 'thereon' (IV, 6, XI, 72), *ther...on* (XII, 9, XXIII, 124, H₁ IX, 9)
encl. (*is*)*ter...on* (VII, 231)

thervnder adverb 'thereunder' (IV, 20)
encl. *ander vnder* (H₁ XII, 20)

The *d* of *der vnder* appears after *n*.

We furthermore encounter:

alther adverb 'there' (II, 16[e], VIII, 327[e], XXIII, 17)
encl. *alder* (II, 78, III, 12, XIV, 28, 91)

The *d* appears after *l*.

Cf. also:

alther umbe adverb 'therefore'; (VII, 209), *alther vmbe* (VI, 12)
encl. *alder umbe* (XIV, 94)

**alther up* adverb 'thereafter'

encl. *alder up* (XXIII, 84)

(6) *thet* conjunction 'that' (II, 2, 11, 12, etc.)

encl.

-tet *quet-tet* (H₁ XI, 67[n])

-det *an-det* (III, 59)

The *d* of *-det* appears after *n*.

Furthermore, we find a proclitic use in *the-thu* (XIII, 16).

(7) the doublet adverb *althus* ~ *aldus* 'thus' (IX, 31, XII, 20 ~ XIV, 37, 115, XXIII, 70) may represent a stressed versus a clitic use of the word *thus*, with a similar transition of *th-* to *d-* as in *alther* ~ *alder* (see above sub [5]). The same doublet is found in R₁ *aldus* ~ R₂ *althus*.

3. Clitic rules

Derivation of clitics from stressed forms with the help of synchronic rules is possible in most instances. I have left out instances such as *hit-e* < **-tha*, which can only be explained with the assumption of a unique vowel change, although the dental may have lost its friction regularly with optional reduction of the resulting *-tt-* (see below in 3.2 sub [2]): **hit tha* > **hit the* > **hitte* > *hite*. Furthermore, some forms simply cannot be derived from each other, e.g. *hi* ~ *-er*. In this particular instance, it is interesting to note that *-er* and *-e* appear to be free variants. It appears that *-er* is a historically cognate (both *hi* and *-er* < **hez*) but synchronically suppletive form, whereas *-e* arose from regular synchronic processes, viz. *h-* > \emptyset and *i* > *e* (cf. rules 5 and 8 respectively). Another example is the Dsf *-r* of the personal pronoun in *ma-r*. Given the stressed form *hire*, we can only understand the rise of this form up to a certain extent. As in the Dsm we can assume loss of *h-* and vowel loss in postvocalic position, cf. *him* > *-m*, but the additional loss of the final vowel of *hire* > ***re* remains without a parallel.²

3.1 The clitic rules

On the basis of the evidence presented in § 2, we can establish the following clitic rules:

(1) *th-* > *t-* after dental and alveolar stops This rule is amply attested, viz. in:

(1.1) 2s pers. pron. *thu*: *thettu*

(1.2) demonstrative pronoun/definite article

Nsm <i>thi</i> :	<i>and-ti, thet-ti</i> ; but <i>thet-i</i> <i>and-te, nis-te, is-te, thet-te</i>
Dsm <i>tha</i> :	<i>and-ta, hu-ta, thet-ta, et-ta</i> ; but <i>et-a, it-a</i>
Asm <i>thine, the</i> :	<i>bislut-tene</i>
Nsf <i>thiu, the</i> :	<i>and-te, is-te</i>
Dsf <i>there</i> :	<i>thet-tere</i>
Asf <i>tha</i> :	but <i>et-a</i>
Nsn <i>thet</i> :	<i>is-tet, thet-tet</i>
Gsm <i>thes</i> :	but <i>ut-es</i>
Dsn <i>tha</i> :	but <i>et-a</i>

2. Note in this connection that the Dsf of the stressed article shows loss of the final vowel once in *ther* as against the current form *there* (see 2.2), but that all clitic forms retain final *-e*: *-tere, -dere, -re*.

Asn *thet*: *thet-tet*

Np *tha*: *thet-ta, send-ta*

Dp *tha*: *et-ta, ma-ta*; but *et-a*

Ap *tha*: *and-ta*; but *in-a*

(1.3) *thenna* adverb

thenna: *(hiut) tenna*

(1.4) *ther* adverb

ther: *(and) ter, (is) ter, (thet) ter, (was) ter*; but *thet-er*

Cf. also *ther(...)* on: *(is)ter...on*

(1.5) *thet* conjunction

thet: *quet-tet*

(2) $\neg n, l + th \rightarrow \neg n, ld$

(2.1) demonstrative pronoun/definite article

Nsm *thi*: *an-de*

Dsm *tha*: *an-da*; but *an-ta, en-ta, on-ta*

Asm *thene, thine*: but *an-tene*

Dsf *there*: *an-dere, on-dere*

Asf *tha*: *an-da*

Dsn *tha*: *an-da, en-da, in-da*; but *fon-ta*

Np *tha*: but *en-ta*

Dp *tha*: *an-da, en-da, in-da*; but *an-ta*

Ap *tha*: *an-da*

(2.2) *thervnder* adverb

thervnder: *ander vnder*

(2.3) *thet* conjunction

thet: *an-det*

(2.4) *thus* adverb

thus: *aldus*

(2.5) *ther* adverb

ther: *alder, alder umbe, alder up*

(3) $\neg th + th \rightarrow \neg th$

(3.1) demonstrative pronoun/definite article

Dsm(n) *tha*: *mith-a*

Asf *tha*: *with-a*

Dsn *tha*: *mith-a*

Dp *tha*: *mith-a*

Ap *tha*: *with-a*

(3.2) *ther* adverb

ther: *warth-er*, *werth-er*

(4) *the-* > \emptyset / V,-*er-* __

(4.1) demonstrative pronoun/definite article

Asm *thene*, *thine*: *ag-er-ne*, *and-er-ne*, *ina-ne*, *ieftha-ne*, *ma-ne*, *uppa-ne*

Dsf *there*: *to-re*

Nsn *thet*: *sa-t*

Gsn *thes*: but *ma-tes*

Asn *thet*: *hi-t*, *lima-t*

(4.2) *ther* adverb

ther: *wersa-r*

The forms containing *-er-* require the actual form of the rule rather than the assumption of an intervocalic loss of *-th-* with subsequent vowel contraction (e.g. *to there* > **to-ere* > *to-re*), cf. § 4.

(5) *h-* > \emptyset

third person personal pronoun

Nsm *hi* > *he*: *ag-e*, *er-e-ne*, *ielt-e*, *iev-e*, *warth-e*, *ach-e-re*, *iev-e-re*, *iew-e-re*, *let-e-re*, + gemination: *thett-e*, *thett-e-re*; but *thet-e*

Dsm *him* > *-em*: *iew-em*, *skel-er-em*, *thach-er-em*, with gemination *thett-em*, with vowel contraction *se-m*

Asm *hine* > **-ene*: with vowel contraction *er-e-ne*, *ma-ne*, *sama-ne*, *se-ne*, *skelma-ne*, *dreith-e-ne*, *hine* < **hi ene*, with loss of *e* after *r* *capie-r-ne*, *sa-r-ne*, *thett-er-ne*

Nsn *hit* > *-et*: *ag-et*, *geu-et*, *iew-et*, *kemth-et*, *ther-et*, *werth-et*, *iev-ed*, with gemination *thett-et*, with vowel contraction *alsa-t*, *mei-t*, *sa-t*, *se-t*, with loss of *e* after *s*, *l* *as-t*, *is-t*, *scel-t*

Asn *hit* > *-et*: *iev-et*, *iew-et*, *bad-et*, *helden-et*, *ebeden-et*, *ther-et*, with gemination *thett-et*, with vowel contraction *alsa-t*, *hiu-t*, *huasa-t*, *felle-t*, *ma-t*, *nelma-t*, *sa-re-t*, *wite-t*, *hi-t* < **hi hit*, with loss of *e* after *n*, *r* *funden-t*, *makie-r-t*

(6) *thet* > *thett-*

third person personal pronoun

Nsm *hi* > *he*: *thett-e*, *thett-e-re*; but *thet-e*

Nsm *-er*: *thett-er-ne*, *thett-er*

As was noted earlier, Dsf *hire* > *-*ere* seems to comply to this rule as well, but in addition lost its final vowel in *ma-r*. Thus, the form cannot be directly derived from the stressed form and cannot be used as evidence.

(10) $*ne + w/hV^- > nV^-$.

The negative adverb *ne* can fuse with a following verb beginning with w^- or h^- , cf.

(10.1) h^-

hebba:neth, net, nebbe, nede

(10.2) w^-

wella: nel, nelle, nelde

wesa: nas

wertha: nerthe

We can also start from an intervocalic loss of $*w$ and $*h$ followed by the rule that the unstressed vowel of $*ne$ was eliminated, cf. (9), also *nis* (9.2). We must formulate a specific rule concerning proclitic $*ne$ only given the different evidence of *tvera* < $*te\ vera$ rather than $**tera$.

3.2 Problematic forms and categories

In a minority of the instances, we encounter conflicting evidence. This can be grouped into three categories:

(1) The triple representation *Dsm and-ta, an-da, an-ta* in the article/demonstrative pronoun requires an explanation. It seems reasonable to assume that *and-ta* does not represent a linguistic reality, i.e. a pronunciation [andta]. The form is likely to contain an 'etymological' spelling of the first member *and* after the example of other forms where the formation was still transparent as containing the hostword + the clitic $-ta$, e.g. *hu-ta*. The correctness of rule (2), yielding $-da$ after *n*, is confirmed in several categories and has a parallel in the language of R_1 (Boutkan 1996: 49). Hence, the forms with $-t$ must be considered as irregular. In order to explain *an-ta*, we could assume that it actually represents $and + ta > an(t)ta$ as against $an-da < an + ta$. This would parallel the situation in R_1 , where we also find $an-ta < and + tha$ as against $an-da < an + tha$. Part of the forms showing this variation $-nd- \sim -nt-$ have doublet ground forms in the language of H, cf. *and* ~ *an*, *end* ~ *en*, which might indeed have yielded doublets when clitics were attached, i.e. $an-ta, en-ta < and, end + -tha$ as against $an-da, en-da < an, en + -tha$. However, this explanation cannot account for *on-ta, fon-ta*, because *on* and *fon* do not have by-forms such as $*ond, *fond$. Therefore, it only seems possible to assume that

such spellings as *fon-ta*, *an-ta* are merely orthographical, showing the ‘normal’ form of the clitic, viz. *-ta*, although the pronunciation was [-da].

(2) In several instances, cliticisation appears to entail automatic gemination of the final dental in *thet* (rule 6). This synchronic rule suggests that, as in the language of R₁, geminates were phonemically relevant (cf. also Hofmann 1989, Van Helten 1890: 120, § 150). Besides, the same gemination rule is found in R₁ (Boutkan 1996: 49). On the other hand, the rule is not without exceptions, cf. *thet-e*. There appear to be more instances of *-t* for expected *-tt*, cf. sub rule (1.1, 1.4), (5), (6). The forms concerned are the following:

thet-i (IV, 9)

thet-e (VII, 46), *et-a* (VII, 72, 126, 291)

et-a (IX, 24, 24, 25, 126, 211) [note also *in-a* (IX, 190), which must be a scribal error]

ut-es (XIV, 35), *it-a* (XIV, 87)

thet-er (II, 39, 100)

Firstly, we must take a closer look at (the distribution of) the individual *-t*-spellings. The form *thet-i* (IV, 9) appears with a geminate in the parallel version of H₁ (XII,9): *thet ti*. We may be dealing with a scribal error. Text VII and IX show the bulk of the forms with single *-t* and actually form two parts of one text, the unique *Hunsingo fine-register*. Text XIV, *Fon alra fresena fridome*, shows two more instances. It may be relevant that the *Hunsingo fine-register* is a specifically Hunsingo text; *Fon alra fresena fridome* shows western influence (Buma/Ebel 1968: 16-7). As to *thet-er*, this form appears twice in text II. Its counterpart with gemination is *thet ter*. Sometimes, we find doublets in the same text, cf. *et-ta* (VII, 293) beside *et-a* (VII, 291) or *thett-e* (VII, 52) beside *thet-e* (VII, 46).

As a solution for this phenomenon, one could assume that the forms with single *-t* represent a linguistic reality, resulting from cliticisation processes in which **-tt* was simplified to *-t*, i.e. *et + tha* > **etta* > *eta*. This would imply that forms such as *et-ta* are etymological spellings. This is an unattractive assumption, disregarding the evidence of the majority of double spellings.

As an alternative, one could doubt the earlier conclusion concerning the phonemic relevance of geminates, at least in the texts concerned. Interestingly, *Fon alra fresena fridome* shows several incorrect spellings with respect to single or double writing of consonants: *saxinna* (line 3, 18, 30) as against correct *saxina* in II, 102, *effter* (l. 103), and perhaps *keningge* (l. 51, 85),

thuwingga (l. 80), although the specific spelling *ngg* may be a device to indicate the phonemic cluster /n+g/. In text IV we find hypercorrect *goddera* /gōdɛra/ in line 13, beside correct *godera* in line 16. One can imagine hypercorrect double spellings of etymological single consonants and, conversely, incidental single writing of double consonants during after the loss of the phonemic relevance of geminates. Now we can also turn to the hapax Asm form *-ene* (*-ne* after vowels as well as after the clitics *-er-*, *-r-*), assumed by Hoekstra in order to account for *bisluttene*. The geminate *-tt-* is remarkable. Whatever the status of geminates in the language of the Hunsingo records, the only productive gemination stated thus far concerns cliticisation to *thet*. Probably, the geminate *-tt-* is therefore hypercorrect as well. As an alternative, we can also assume that the scribe rendered the clitic form of the article, i.e. *-tene* (cf. § 2.2).

(3) There are some instances of unexplained variation or simply irregular forms. We find a variation *-et* ~ *-t* (N/Asn article/dem.pron.) after *n* and *r*, cf.

helden-et (H₁ IX 18, 24[e]), *ebeden-et* (H₁ IX, 6) ~ *funden-t* (XIV, 69)
ther-et (XXIII, 103) ~ *makie-r-t* (XI, 204)
 cf. also *scelt* (VII, 320)

The three *-et* forms after *n* are only attested in H₁: the text concerned (the *Prologus to the seventeen Statutes and twenty-four Landlaws*) has no parallel in H₂; one of the forms is an emendation (for: *helden net*). This makes these forms less reliable. On the other hand, this *-et* form is attested more than once. Loss of the vowel is also attested in *scel-t*, i.e. again after a resonant. Perhaps there was optional loss of the vowel of *-et* after resonants. This may also serve as an explanation of the forms *ther-et* ~ *makie-r-t*, although we can assume that we are dealing with additional differences in the conditioning: in *ther-et*, the clitic directly follows a stressed first member, whereas it appears in a clitic string after an unstressed vowel in *makie-r-t*. The vowel is also absent after *s*, e.g. *is-t*, which may be regular, because there are no instances of *-et* after *s*. For Gsn *ma-tes* < *ma* + *thes*, we would expect ***mas* according to rule 4. The form only appears in H₁ in a marginal note, which is very corrupt (Hoekstra 1950: 23).

As noted above, *in-a* rather than *in-da* (or *in-ta*) must be a scribal error.

4. Comparison with the evidence of R_1

The picture that emerges from the evidence of $H_{1,2}$ is strongly reminiscent of that of R_1 (Boutkan 1996: 48ff.; cf. also appendix II). For example, part of the cliticisation rules of § 3 are identical with those formulated for R_1 , viz. the rules (2,3,6,10), although the picture of regular gemination in *thet* is incidentally blurred, see § 3.2. There is no evidence for rule (7) in R_1 . Although it does not make a difference with respect to the bulk of the evidence involved, two more rules are better slightly reformulated in order to adequately account for the evidence of H. Rule (4) can be interpreted as a loss of *-th-* either or not with subsequent vowel contraction in all instances in R, whereas it must be interpreted as a loss of the sequence *the-* in H (see § 3.1 sub [4.1]). Similarly, rule (5) represents a reformulation of the rule *-hi-* > \emptyset as assumed for R_1 . Again, this makes no difference with respect to the bulk of the forms, for which we can assume that after the loss of the *h*-vowel contraction yielded the same result. For example, *hit* may represent either *hi(hi)t* or *hi(h)it* with contraction of *ii*. However, the actual formulation of the rule for H can also account for the loss of *h-* in such forms as *-e*, *-em* < *he*, *him*. As to rule (8) and (9), it must be noticed that from an orthographical point of view the language of R_1 seems to show the same vocalic developments as that of H. However, Riustring OFris. appears to have maintained qualitative oppositions in unstressed syllables, whereas H seems to have only /ə/.³ This implies that we cannot state whether the vocalic developments in R_1 and H once were identical or not, possible differences being lost as the result of the neutralisation of vocalic oppositions in H.

We find two major differences between the clitic rules of R_1 and H:

(1) The forms of the 3sm of the personal pronoun as well as their distribution differ from the forms found in R_1 , where we encounter *-ere* ~ *-re* (latter postvocally), cf. *heth there* (X, 50) < **heththere* < **heth ere* 'has-he' and *nechthere* (X, 52; scribal error) for **neththere* < **neth ere* < **ne heth ere* 'not-has-he', both with gemination as against *-re* in e.g. *alsare* < **alsā (e)re*, *betere*, *hagere*, *hebbere*. Another form *-er* ~ *-r* (latter postvocally) occurs before the clitic *-ne* 'him', cf. *brangth-er-ne* 'brings-he-him' (XIV, 51). As to *-r*, cf. *wndade-r-ne* < **wundade (e)r ne* 'wounded-he-him' and *blodgaderne* < **blodgade (e)r ne* 'wounded-he-him until bleeding'. The form *-er* is also used after *thet*, cf. *thet ter* < **thetter* < **thet er*, and *thet terne* < **thet er thene*, both

3. Perhaps, <e> in unstressed syllables in R_1 denoted a reduced vowel (Boutkan 1996: 27).

with gemination. We once find *-re* in postconsonantal position in *skilre* (IV, 227; cf. H *skelre*), cf. *skillere* (2x). The Nsm *-e* only occurs once in VI, 37: *thete* < **thet hi* ‘(so) that he...’.

(2) Cliticisation rule (1) appears to differ from that in R₁. In Riustring OFris., the attachment of the definite article to a form ending in a dental or alveolar as a rule results in a single dental or alveolar, cf. Nsm *anti* (**and thi*), *theti* (**thet thi*), *thete* (**thet the*), Gsm *antes* (**and thes*), *thetes* (**thet thes*), Dsmn *anta* (**and tha*), Dsf *etere* (**et there*), Dpf *eta* (**et tha*), Nsn *thetet* (**thet thet*); cf. furthermore *theter* (< **thet ther*). It was established in § 3.1 that the normal process in H is loss of friction of the dental, but that resulting geminates were left intact, e.g. *thet-ti*, *thet-ta*, *thet-tet*. Only a handful of forms shows a single *-t*, but these are rather exceptions than regular forms (cf. 3.2 sub [3]).

Both differences sub (1) and (2) can be interpreted as (minor) dialectal differences between Riustring and Hunsingo Old East Frisian.

Fryske Akademy
Ljouwert/Leeuwarden

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boutkan, D. 1996: *A concise Grammar of the Old Frisian dialect of the First Riustring Manuscript*. Odense.
- Boutkan, D. 1997: 'Puzzling datives in Old Frisian'. *Sound laws and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Ed. by A. Lubotsky. Amsterdam/Atlanta, 5-14.
- Bremer, O. 1893: 'Zu v. Richthofens *Altfriesischem Wörterbuch*'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 17, 303-46.
- Bremer, O. 1928: 'Urgermanische Satzbetonung im Friesischen'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 52, 309-10.
- Bremmer, R.H. Jr. 1992: *A Bibliographical Guide to Old Frisian Studies*. Odense.
- Bremmer, R.H. Jr. & Quak, A. 1992: *Zur Phonologie und Morphologie des Altniederländischen*. Ed. by -. Odense.
- Breuker, Ph.H. 1985: *Oriëntatie in de Frisistiek*. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden.
- Buma, W.J. 1954: *Het Tweede Rüstringer Handschrift*. Bewerkt door -. Oudfriesche Taal- en Rechtsbronnen. Uitgegeven door Dr. P. Sipma. Achtste deel. 's-Gravenhage.
- Buma, W.J. 1961: *De Eerste Riustringer Codex*. Bewerkt door -. Oudfriesche Taal- en Rechtsbronnen. Uitgegeven door Dr. P. Sipma. Elfde deel. 's-Gravenhage.
- Buma, W.J. & Ebel, W. 1963: *Das Rüstringer Recht*. Hrsg. von -. Altfriesische Rechtsquellen. Texte und Übersetzungen. Band 1. Göttingen - Berlin - Frankfurt.
- Buma, W.J. & Ebel, W. 1968: *Das Hunsingoer Recht*. Hrsg. von -. Altfriesische Rechtsquellen. Texte und Übersetzungen. Band 4. Göttingen - Berlin - Frankfurt.
- Gerbenzon, P. 1982: 'Oudfriesche handschriftfragmenten in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek te 's Gravenhage'. *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 50, 263-277.
- Helten, W.L. Van 1890: *Altostfriesische Grammatik*. Leeuwarden.
- Helten, W.L. Van 1909: 'Zur pronominalen Flexion im Altgermanischen'. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 26, 174-186.
- Heuser, W. 1903: *Altfriesisches Lesebuch mit Grammatik und Glossar*. Heidelberg.
- Hoekstra, J. 1950: *De eerste en tweede Hunsinger Codex*. Bewerkt door -. Oudfriesche Taal- en Rechtsbronnen. Uitgegeven door Dr. P. Sipma. Zesde deel. 's-Gravenhage.

- Hofmann, D. 1989: 'Die "spätgermanische" Silbenquantitätsverschiebung und die Doppelschreibung alter kurzer Konsonanten in den altwestfriesischen Quellen'. *Gesammelte Schriften. II. Studien zur friesischen und niederdeutschen Philologie*. Hamburg, 206-214.
- Holthausen, F. & Hofmann, D. 1985: *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd. ed. Heidelberg.
- Levin, S.R. 1959: 'Negative Contraction: An Old and Middle English Dialect Criterion'. *Journal for English and Germanic Philology* 57, 492-501.
- Levin, S.R. 1960: 'An Anglo-Frisian Morphological Correspondence'. *Orbis* 9, 73-78.
- Markey, T.L. 1981: *Frisian*. The Hague - Paris - New York.
- Nielsen, H.F. 1990: 'W.L. Van Heltens *Altostfriesischen Grammatik* Viewed from a Comparative Angle'. *Aspects of Old Frisian Philology*. ed. R. H. Bremmer jr., G. Van der Meer & O. Vries = *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 31/32 - Estrikken 69, 349-356.
- Richthofen, K. Von 1840: *Friesische Rechtsquellen*. Göttingen.
- Sjölin, B. 1966: 'Zur Gliederung des Altfriesischen'. *Us Wurk* 15, 25-38.
- Sjölin, B. 1969: *Einführung in das Friesische*. Stuttgart.
- Steller, W. 1928: *Abriß der altfriesischen Grammatik. Mit Berücksichtigung der westgermanischen Dialecte des Altenglischen, Altsächsischen und Althochdeutschen. Mit Lesestücken und Wortverzeichnis*. Halle.
- Visser, W. 1990: 'From Modern Frisian to Old Frisian: on cliticisation of the definite article'. *Aspects of Old Frisian Philology*. ed. R. H. Bremmer jr., G. Van der Meer & O. Vries = *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 31/32 - Estrikken 69, 506-536.

APPENDIX I

ach- must	in in
ache- must	ina in
ag- must	is is
al all	it at
alsa- if	kemth- occurs
an(d) and	let- led
ande and	lima- lays one
as- if	ma one
bad- order	maki-, makie- makes
bete- pays	mei- may
bibad- order	mith with
bislutt- encloses	nelma- does not want one
capie- buys	nis- is not
dreith- carries	on on
ebeden order	quet- says
en(d) and; on	rek- gives
er before	riuchte- frees oneself from charges
et at	with oaths
fare- goes	sa- if, so
felle- pays for	sama if one
fon from	scanct- pour out
funden- found	se- she; they; be
gelde- pays	send- are
geu- if	sett- puts
geue- gives	sin- are
hebbe- has	skel shall
helden- kept	skelma- = skel ma
hiu- she	thach- though, yet
hiut- she it	ther where
hu how	-thera the
huasa- whoever	-there the
ieftha or	thet that
ielt- pays	thett- that
ieu- if	to to
ieue- gives	uppa on
iev- if	ut out
iew- if	warth- became

was was
-wera true
wersa wherever

werth- becomes
wite-witness

APPENDIX II

In this appendix, I briefly repeat the clitic rules as I formulated them for the manuscript R₁ (Boutkan 1996: 48ff.).

(1) $*-D + /p-/ > -/t/$

(a) Forms containing postclitic $-tu \sim -tv$, obj. $-ti$ of the 2s pers. pron.; cf. *skal tu*, *skaltu* for **skalt thu*, *thurstu* for **thurst thu*, *thet tv* for **thet thu*.

(b) Forms containing postclitic variants of the definite article: Nsm *anti* (= *and thi*), *theti* (= *thet thi*), *thete* (= *thet the*), Gsm *antes* (= *and thes*), *thetes* (= *thet thes*), Dsmn *anta* (= *and tha*), Dsf *etere* (= *et there*), Dpf *eta* (= *et tha*), Nsn *thetet* (= *thet thet*).

(c) *thete* (= *thet tha* /thā/), with additional vowel change.

(d) *theter* (= *thet + ther*).

(2) $*-np- > *-nd-$

Attested in several forms containing the postclitic definite article, viz. Dpm *fonda*, *fon da* (= *fon tha*), Dsmn, Asf, Dpf, Apf *anda* (= *an tha* [as against *anta* (= *and tha*) according to rule (1)]), Dsf *andere* (= *an there*).

(3) $*-VpV- > -V\emptyset V-$

Attested in several forms containing the postclitic definite article, viz. Asm *thene* (= *the thene*), *thet terne* (= *thet ere thene*), Gpm *mire* (= *mī thera*), *wilira* (= *wili thera*), Gsn *his* (= *hi thes*). In the last three forms, the second of two clashing vowels was dropped (see below sub [9, b]).

(4) gemination

(a) $*p > thth / __ -ere$ (Nsm 3s postclitic pers.pron.).

cf. *heth there* = **heththere* < **heth ere* 'has-he' and *nechthere* (scribal error) = **neththere* < **neth ere* < **ne heth ere* 'not-has-he'.

(b) $*t > tt / __ -er(e)$ (Nsm 3s postclitic pers.pron.; enclitic adv. *er*)

cf. *thet ter* = *thetter* (= *thet er*) [pers.pron.] with gemination, and *thet terne* (= *thet ere thene*; see [3]).

(c) $*t > tt / __ -et$ (Asn 3s postclitic pers.pron.)

cf. *thet tet* = *thet hit*.

(5) $*-hi- > *-ϕ-$

This change is attested in forms containing a postclitic personal pronoun: *alsam* (= *alsa him*), *blodgaderne* (= *blodgade (e)r hini*), *brangtherne* (= *brangth er hini*), *mam* (= *ma him*), *hine* (= *hi hini*), *hiut* (= *hiu hit*), *hwasane* (= *hwas a hini*), *wndaderne* (= *wundade er hini*), *wrperne* (= *wurpe er hini*), *hwanat* (= *hwana hit*), *hit* (= *hi hit*), *wilira* (= *wili hiara*).

The developments *hini* > *-ne* and *wili hiara* > *wiliara* > *wilira* also involve vocalic changes, see below sub (9).

(6) $*ne + w/hV- > nV-$

Cf. *nas* (= *ne was*), *nebbe* (= *ne hebbe*), *nelle* (= *ne welle*), *nele* (= *ne wele*), *neli* (= *ne weli*), *nerth* (= *ne werth*), *net* (= *ne wet*), *neth* (= *ne heth*), *nechthere* = **neththere* (= *ne heth ere*, cf. [4] above).

We can also start from an intervocalic loss of $*w$ and $*h$ followed by the rule that the first of two clashing vowels (i.e. the unstressed vowel of $*ne$) was eliminated, cf. *nas*; also *nis* (9, c).

(7) $*-p + *p- > th$

When the adverb *ther* is attached, viz. in *sperthera* (= *sperth ther a*) and in *werther* (= *werth ther*).

(8) $*-l + *p- > -ld-$

Cf. the doublets *al(#)ther* [~ *alder*], ***althus* ~ *aldus*.

(9) Vocalic changes:

(a) $*ā, *i > e$

Cf. *thete* (= *thet tha* [see above sub (1, c)]). Furthermore *hwasane* (= *hwas a hini*), *blodgaderne* (= *blodgade (e)r hini*), *brangtherne* (= *brangth er hini*), *wndaderne* (= *wundade er hini*), *wrperne* (= *wurpe er hini*), *hine* (= *hi hini*).

(b) $V_1 + V_2 > V_1$

In *wilira* (= *wiliara* < *wili hiara* see above sub [5]) and *or* (< *ō(th)er*, see sub [5]). The Nsm 3s pers. pron. clitics, i.e. the doublet *-ere* ~ *-re* (latter postvocally) and *-er* ~ *-r* (latter postvocally) point to the same development, cf. *alsare* (= *alsā (e)re*), similarly: *betere*, *hagere*, *hebbere*, *hwedder sare*, *lattere*, *likere*, *mire*, *sare*, *skillere*, *thare*, *werthere*, *wilire*, *wisere* (**wesere*), *wrthere*; *wndade-r-ne* (= *wundade (e)r ne*) 'wounded he-him', *blodgaderne* (= *blodgade (e)r ne*) 'wounded he-him until

bleeding'. Also in Gpm *mire* (= *mi (th)era*), *willira* (= *wili (th)era*), Gsn *his* (= *hi (th)es*), cf. sub (3).

(c) $V_1 + V_2 > V_2$

In the case of attachment of the proclitic **ne*, cf. *nis* (= *ne is*) and perhaps *nas* (= *ne was*, cf. [6]).