[0744]   **TWO RIUSTRING PROBLEMS REVISITED**

Dirk Boutkan

I. The verbal endings plural, 3rd pers. sing. ind. pres. ⁻at ~ ⁻ath in R₁

1. The Old East Frisian language of the *First Riustring Codex* (henceforth R₁) displays the following consonant phonemes (Boutkan 1996a: 35; I do not include the geminates):

		LAB	DENT	ALV	PAL	VEL
stops	⁻voice	p		t	ć	k
	+voice	b		d	ǵ	g
fricatives		f	þ	s		x
		[v]	[ð]	[z]		
liquids			r			
			l			
nasals		m	n			
semivowels		w			j	

The spelling of the dental and the alveolars is as follows: /þ/ <th>, /t/ <t>, /d/ <d>, /s/ <s,c> (Boutkan 1996a ibid.). In the course of Old Frisian, the dental fricative /þ/, which held an isolated position within the system, merged with /d/ medially - and in some cases initially - and with /t/ in initial as well as final position, cf. R₁ *thredda* 'third', *wertha* 'become', *mith* 'with', which forms occur in *Jus Municipale Frisonum* as *tredda* ~ *thredda*, *wirda* and *mith*, *mit*, *midt* and variants. The variational spellings in the examples from *Jus* indicate the loss of the phonemic opposition between the original dental fricative /þ/ and its later merger products /t⁻/, (/d-/,) /⁻d⁻/ and /⁻t/, respectively. The /⁻t/ is actually to be interpreted as /⁻T/, realised as [⁻t], as the result of the additional rule of final devoicing of /⁻d/ to /⁻t/ yielding an archiphoneme /⁻T/. This rule has not yet operated in the language of R₁ (Boutkan 1996a: 39⁻40, see also section 4).

2. The dental and the alveolars are often involved in assimilation rules or cliticisation processes, where they may be altered according to well⁻definable rules, e.g. the assimilation of *⁻þ to ⁻t after *s*, *ch*, *t*, *d*, *l*, *n*, which affected e.g. the verbal 3s ind. pres. ending ⁻th in such forms as *barnt*, *falt*, *wist*, etc. However, a problematic category has long been recognised (already Van Helten 1889: 284ff.; also Boutkan 1996a: 46, 116⁻7), viz. the curious variation between the verbal

endings ⁻*ath* (expected and abundantly attested) and ⁻*at* (10 times) in the 3 sing. ind. pres. and plur. ind. pres. It is an optional variation, as appears from ⁻*at* beside ⁻*ath* in *clagath ~ clagat*. The ⁻*at*⁻forms are the following:

3 sing. *fori brangat* (XIV, 40), *clagat* (XIV, 42), *lathat* (X, 38);

plural *louiat* (IV, 211), *somniat* (XI, 10), *fiuchtat* (XIV, 44), *steruat* (IV, 137), *werthat* (IX, 44), *werthat* (XI, 18), *willat* (IV, 37).

3. In my grammar (1996a: 116⁻7), I left the problem unsolved, only stating that some forms suggest a text⁻bound phenomenon although this cannot account for all forms. It is also impossible to explain the forms from contextual phenomena such as sandhi processes. I furthermore wish to add here that most of the stem forms involved (belonging to both weak classes as well as strong verbs) do not suggest dissimilatory changes of the ending ⁻*ath* to ⁻*at*. Van Helten (1889: 286), in my view correctly, discards a fourth possibility: we can hardly be dealing with an analogical spread of the ⁻*t* resulting from such regular assimilations as the one mentioned in section 2. (e.g. *barnt*). This explanation does not account for the forms of the stem classes that never show such assimilations such as those of the weak second class.

4. Van Helten's (1889: 284ff.; 1890: 85) solution to the problem was that we would be dealing with a historical doublet, viz. *⁻*andi* > *⁻*and* >> *⁻*ad/at* (without preceding stress) ~ *⁻*anþi* > *anþ* > *⁻*ath* (with preceding stress), i.e. a doublet reflecting grammatical change; later, the use of both endings would have become optional ("facultativ"). This view has several drawbacks. First, Van Helten sees himself forced to assume that expected *⁻*and* lost its ⁻*n*⁻ after the analogy of *⁻*ath*, which is an extra complication. Second, Verner variation underlying the doublet must be reconstructed for PGmc. already (e.g. Boutkan 1995: 319). It is improbable that a PGmc. doublet was retained in OFris., underwent an analogical modification and subsequently became optional, all without being given up (cf. also Boutkan 1996a: 117). Third, the explanation could only be valid for the stage of the language in which the opposition of final /⁻d/ and /⁻t/ was neutralised (see section 1), i.e. a stage where final ⁻*at* could represent earlier *⁻/⁻ad/. As noted earlier, this is not the case in R$_1$, in which we find fully consistent spellings of expected *⁻*d*, such as in the ending ⁻*ad* of the past participle of the second weak class of verbs, cf. *bi folgad, bi rauad ~ be rauad ~ vmbe ravad ~ umbe rauad, bi rethad, bi thingad, edomad, fullad, egadurad, e iuenad ~ e ifnad, elagad, elirnad, emakad, enedgad ~ nedgad, ergerad, lengad*, etc. (Boutkan 1996a: 40).

5. In my view, the correct solution can be arrived at if we change Van Helten's perspective by assuming that we are not dealing with a phenomenon that is restricted to a morphological category, i.e. the verbal endings concerned, but with a more general process that belongs to the realm of (synchronic) phonology. Van Helten explicitly denies the possibility that the doublet spelling reflects the neutralisation process pointed out in section 1., in other words that the form ⁻at would be an indication of the loss of the distinction of /⁻aþ/ and /⁻at/. The oldest records indeed show a retention of the opposition /⁻t/ ~ /⁻þ/ (cf. also Sjölin 1969: 26). However, the verbal ending is an example of a specific environment, viz. the position in a weakly stressed syllable. In view of the general tendency in the Old Germanic languages, it is *a priori* likely that the neutralisation process began in unstressed syllables, whereas the opposition may have been retained elsewhere.

6. The question remains why we only find *t*-spellings in the verbal ending ⁻*ath*. The answer turns out to be that this ending, and hence the sequence */-´⁻aþ/, is very common, whereas we hardly find any evidence of absolutely final *⁻þ after other unstressed vowels. A scrutiny of the forms of R$_1$ yields the following crop:

*/-´⁻uþ#/ only in *synuth* (XX, 53), *sinuth* (XX, 29, 40)

*/-´⁻iþ#/ only in 3 sing. *lemith* (V, 108) and the problematic and therefore inconclusive form *swilith* (X, 45) for actually expected **swilt* (cf. Boutkan 1996a: 132 and II section 2).

Thus, the absence of *t*-spellings after other unstressed vowels can simply be attributed to the virtual lack of evidence.

7. A further question is that of the exact interpretation of the phonological reality that is rendered by the variation ⁻*at* ~ ⁻*ath*.

One could claim that we are dealing with synchronic [⁻at], for which two spellings became available after the neutralisation of the opposition that was expressed by these spellings at an earlier stage, viz. ⁻*ath* and ⁻*at*. This is not very likely. First, the overwhelming majority of the spellings shows the phonetically 'wrong' rendering of the ending as ⁻*ath*, whereas only ten instances would render the actual pronunciation, viz. ⁻*at*. Furthermore, such a preference would presuppose a long orthographic tradition, in which the scribes apparently still remembered and preferred the 'correct' spelling ⁻*ath* after the change to [⁻at]. As the MS R$_1$ is one of the earliest OFris. records, reflecting a language stage that can be considered as the most archaic representative of OFris. known to us, such an assumption would remain rather hypothetical.

A better solution seems to be that the doublet <⁻t ~ ⁻th> renders either a sound for which there was no sign, e.g. interdental [t̠], or free variants [⁻t] and [⁻þ], both possible phonetic realisations of the neutralisation product. I prefer the latter interpretation, which is straightforward and in accordance with the later evidence of Frisian in which one of the variants, viz. [⁻t], apparently became generalised.

8. Finally, I again point to a handful of forms in which we find a free variation of *th ~ d*, viz.:

with etymological **th*: acc. plur. *dad dolga ~ dath dolga*, adv.,conj. *alder ~ alther*;
with etymological **d*: plur. ind. pret. *wrthon ~ wrdon*, 3 sing. subj. pret. *wrde ~ wrthe⁻re* dat. sing. *thiothe*, dat. plur. *dathon* to adj. *dad*.

In Boutkan (1996a: 45⁻6), I attempted to explain part of these forms, taking *dath dolga* as an etymological spelling for regular *dad dolga* and the variation in the doublet *al(#)ther[... ~ alder[...* as representing a difference between a stressed and an enclitic form of *ther* combined with *all(⁻)*. The verbal forms of *wertha* are more problematic, but the spelling ⁻*th*⁻ for expected **d* may be analogical after other paradigmatic forms, which mainly display ⁻*th*⁻, e.g. inf. *wertha*, plur. ind. pres. *werthath*. Only the spellings *thiothe* for **thiode* and *dathon* for **dadon* remain unexplained.

I maintain the view (1996a: 45) that these two forms are too scanty evidence for the assumption that they result from the merger of **⁻þ⁻* and ⁻*d*⁻ in ⁻*d*⁻ (cf. section 1). The form *thiothe* may be a scribal error, the scribe repeating the initial *th* (Van Helten 1890: 100).

9. I conclude that the language of R₁ lost the opposition of /⁻t/ and /⁻þ/ after unstressed vowels. This is expressed by an optional spelling ⁻*at* for the verbal plural ind. pres. ending ⁻*ath*, probably indicating a free variant [⁻at] beside [⁻aþ]. There is no evidence for further neutralisations involving /þ/, such as the loss of the opposition between /⁻d⁻/ and /⁻þ⁻/, which is abundantly attested in the later OFris. records.

II. Riustring fili *again*
1. In a recent volume of *Us Wurk*, Buma (1998) published his second contribution to the ongoing discussion concerning the interpretation of the *hapax legomenon*

dat. sg. *fili* (R₁ X, 55) in the phrase *alla fennon anda fili* in the *Pan‑Frisian Dike Law*. He defends his earlier view (1952) that the word is a form of *fal* (*fall‑*) 'fall' in a special meaning 'deep (place in the) sea'. His article is basically a discussion and rejection of my interpretation as formulated in Boutkan (1996b). In the following, I will briefly react to Buma's arguments. For details, I refer to my article as well as to Buma's (who e.g. gives a complete translation of the text and a detailed commentary on the Riustring version of the *Pan‑Frisian Dike Law* on pp. 19‑20).

For the sake of reference, I repeat the passage concerned (R₁ X, 52‑54; cf. Buma 1961: 121) and its translation here:

Ac nechthere nauwet sa felo buta dike . heles londes and grenes turues . thet terne dik mithi halda mugi. Sa hagere binna dike thritich fota turues . and thritich fethma to gerse . thet skil wesa alla fennon anda fili . er sante vites di .

And if he does not have so much solid land and green turf outside the dike that he can maintain the dike with that, then he is entitled to 30 feet of turf and 30 fathom of grass inside the dike. This is in force *alla fennon anda fili* before St. Vitus' day.

2. In my 1996b‑article, I accepted Holthausen's (1953) argument against Buma's interpretation, viz. that *fili* shows a single *‑l‑*, whereas we would expect a double *‑ll‑* if the word was indeed a form of *fall‑* 'fall'. This view is characterised as "...geradlinig, zu radikal, fast hätte ich gesagt zu junggrammatisch" by Buma (p. 21). Rather than "junggrammatisch", Holthausen's starting point (and mine) is a structuralist one. It is crucial that the language of R₁ clearly distinguishes between single and geminate consonants on a phonemic level (Boutkan 1996a: 38ff., especially 40). With respect to the rendering of this opposition, the spelling of R₁ is phonemic and virtually reliable, cf. e.g. *al* with exceptionless *all‑* in the inflected cases (over 150 times)[1], *mon* with exceptionless oblique *monn‑* (over 50 times), i.e. over two hundred correct spellings in two words alone. Buma's use of the words "geradlinig" and "zu radikal" is based on the fact that we find five (he adduces six, but one is from R₂) instances where geminates seem to be rendered

---

[1]. When counting, I did not include the forms showing subsequent reduction of *all‑* to *al‑* in such forms as gen. plur. *alra*, which represents a regular process (cf. Boutkan 1996a: 41).

by single graphs.[2] However, three of them, forms of the verb *nella* 'want not', viz. 3 sing. subj. present *nele* (2x) and *neli* (1x) as against *nelle* (7x) are *sprachwirklich* rather than orthographical. In the paradigm of the groundword *willa*, we find a paradigmatic variation of the phonemes /-l-/ and /-ll-/, e.g. 3 sing. ind. pres. *wili*, 3 sing. subj. pres. *wille*. We appear to be dealing with mutual influence between the stem forms *nel-* and *nell-*. That we are indeed dealing with a phonological difference between single and double consonant phonemes (rather than orthographic variation) is confirmed by the different results of the well-known rule of Riustring 'vowel balance'. According to this rule, the ending *-i* occurs after phonologically short (*nel-i*), *-e* after long stems (*nell-e*). The form *nel-e* can be understood as the result of the additional tendency towards 'vowel harmony', according to which *-e* may appear after short stems containing the stem vowel *e* (cf. Kock 1904). Thus, from R₁ only two exceptions showing single writing of an expected geminate remain. However, their argumentative value is not strong, either. The form 3 sing. ind. pres. *swilith* (hapax) to a further unattested **swella* (cf. also Van Helten 1890: 209) is problematic in several respects; however, we would at any rate expect a single /-l-/ <-l-> in the regular form **swilt* (cf. Boutkan 1996a: 132 with discussion and further considerations). In the hapax acc. sing. masc. *nene* beside expected *nenne* (the remaining 15 times) a graph may have been left out, which is a well-attested *lapsus* in R₁ (cf. Buma 1961: 16).[3] The phonemic relevance of the opposition between geminates and single consonants as well as their virtually correct spelling being undeniable for the language of R₁, the interpretation of *fili* as /filli/ must be considered as an ill-founded and *ad hoc* emendation.

---

[2]. Buma claims that I make a mistake by stating that "...confusion of single and double consonants is not attested in R₁", which he interprets as "Verwirrung (besser: Wechsel) von einfachen und doppelten Konsonanten ist in R₁ nicht zu belegen". I was aware of the existence of the exceptions and made notice of them in my grammar (1996a, e.g. on p. 42 and passim). However, I used the term "consonants" in the linguistic sense, pointing to the obvious retention of the original phonemic opposition between single and geminated consonants.

[3]. The form of R₂ - which bears no direct relevance to the situation in R₁ - Buma refers to is the dat. sing. of *szerekspel,-spil* (cf. Buma 1954: 127). This form is attested four times, viz. as *szerekspele* (V,36; VIII,36), *szerekspili* (V,45), *szerekspile* (VIII,49) as against no instances of *-ll-*. It is most straightforward to assume that the stem apparently ends in single *-l-* in the language of R₂. In this connection, we may compare the MDu. equivalent *kerspel*, which shows single *-l-* in the inflected forms (cf. Verwijs - Verdam s.v.) and Modern Dutch *kerspel*, plural *kerspelen*. It seems reasonable to assume that the geminate was reduced as the second member of a compound.

Buma adduces a sixth form, which would illustrate the converse situation, viz. the rendering of a single consonant by double writing in 1 sing. subj. pres. *skille* (IV, 189) 'must' (cf. also Boutkan 1996a: 143). However, the geminate may be analogical after *wille* and hence render a phonological reality (Van Helten 1890: 239).

3. Another serious drawback of Buma's view is that the interpretation of *fili* as a spelling of /filli/ would render the form one of the very few instances where the 'vowel balance' (see above) would be disturbed in absolute final position. If the medial consonant, whatever its spelling, would have been a geminate and, hence, the stem would be long, we had expected **file* or **fele*, cf. such forms as the dat. sg. *bonn̄e* (several attestations, cf. Buma 1961: 170) rather than **bonn̄i*. A handful of exceptions to this rule in absolute final position can be explained or is otherwise problematic (Boutkan 1996a: 27‒8). Hence, we can safely draw the conclusion that the final *‒i* of *fili* indeed points to a short stem, i.e. a stem containing a short vowel and ending in a single consonant.

4. I followed Heinertz' syntactic analysis of the phrase as *all̄a fennon and̄a fili*, i.e. 'all (adv.)‒in meadows and‒in *fili*'. Buma objects that this interpretation would imply the assumption of the only instance of "Anlehnung" of *‒a* to *and* 'and' in R₁. If one wishes to interpret the "Anlehnung" as a process of cliticisation, this does not seem a serious problem. The conjunction *and* often takes clitics (cf. Buma 1961: 163), e.g. *anta = and tha* (dat. sing. masc. of the definite article). As to the uniqueness of *and̄a* 'and‒in', one must note that in the limited corpus of R₁ several phenomena of cliticisation are attested only once, although nobody doubts their interpretation, e.g. the encliticisation and automatic gemination in *thet tet = thet̄et* for non‒clitic *thet hit* 'that it' (IV, 148; cf. Boutkan 1996a: 49). However, there is no need to assume an encliticisation process. We may simply be dealing with solid writing of (non‒clitic) *a* as in e.g. the formula *alla iechta* 'all in confesso' (= 'all beyond doubt'). In R₁, we often find different types of deviations with respect to solid or separate writing (Boutkan 1996a: 17). The incorrect solid writing of separate words is remarkably often attested in phrases containing the preposition *a* (cf. the exhaustive list in Buma 1961: 19, containing 5 instances involving *a* on a total of 13 errors).

5. Buma's third argument against my interpretation is that it would be problematic from a contextual point of view. However, in section 8. of my article (pp. 12‒13) I actually left open the question of the choice between the two (linguistically) possible translations of *alla fennon anda fili*, viz.

(1) for all pastures and for the marshy soil
(2) as a whole for pastures and marshy soil

On contextual grounds, Buma (p. 23) concludes that:
"Das Recht zur Erd‒ und Grasgewinnung galt nicht für alle Wiesen, sondern
a) nur an Stellen, wo kein Außendeichland war;
b) ausschließlich für Nichtanlieger"

It follows that the first translation becomes less likely, but there is no objection against the second one. Exception a) may fit into Buma's *translation* of *fili* as 'deep (place in the) sea' rather well, but it does not rule out other interpretations, such as my translation of *fili* as 'marshy soil'.

6. I furthermore noted (1996b: 4‑5) that Heinertz' syntactic interpretation (see above) is attractive as it suggests that we are dealing with an (archaic) alliterative collocation of two semantically cognate concepts, which is a well‑attested phenomenon in R_1 (cf. Boutkan 1996b loc. cit.). In my interpretation, the formula *a fennon and a fili* simply denotes that the right to gain land concerns the two average types of land available, i.e. either meadow (*fennon*) or marshy clay (*fili*), the *fennon* providing sods ("*grenes turues*"), the *fili* providing solid ground ("*heles londes*"). Thus, the coexistence of the pairs *grenes turues ~ heles londes* and *fennon ~ fili* may be interpreted as a text‑internal clue to the meaning of *fili*, in the actual text presented in the form of a chiasm (cf. Boutkan 1996b: 13). However, perhaps the use of the obviously archaic and standardised phrase *a fennon and a fili* was primarily stilistically motivated rather than representing an exact attempt to describe the types of land.

7. Finally, Buma challenges my interpretation of *Sinkfal*, cf. R_1 dat. pl. *Sinkfalon*, which I interpret as a form with single ‑*l*‑. Beside the R_1‑form, we find more or less contemporary by‑forms with ‑*ll*‑, e.g. H_2 *cincfallum*. Buma (1998: 24) brings in against my taking the form with single ‑*l*‑ as original that:

> "In einer derartigen Sachlage [i.e. the coexistence of contemporary forms with ‑*l*‑ and ‑*ll*‑ DB] kommt es völlig darauf an, welche Schreibung man beim Etymologisieren als Ausgangspunkt annimmt."

However, the "Sachlage" referred to is not the correct point of departure for etymological research. It is obvious to take the form with single ‑*l*‑ as original for several reasons. First, the earliest attestations, preceding the period of confusion referred to by Buma, are those in the *Lex Frisionum* (around 802), such as ...*Inter Fli et Sincfalam...*, ...*Hoc inter Laubaci et Sincfalam...* showing ‑*l*‑. Second, of the two possibilities it is the form with ‑*ll*‑ that can easily be explained as secondary, viz. as due to folk‑etymological reinterpretation of the second member as *fall*‑ 'fall' (cf. Boutkan 1996b: 13 fn. 60). Third, the element *fal* is very frequent in hydronyms belonging to Krahe's "*Alteuropäische Hydronymie*", where it must certainly be reconstructed with a single **‑l*‑ (cf. Boutkan 1996b: 13 fn. 60, also 15). This element is the most obvious second member of the compound hydronym *Sinkfal*.

8. Thus, I basically maintain the views expressed in my article of 1996, concerning a most intriguing passage in Old Frisian literature that has puzzled scholars since Von Richthofen (1840: 740).

Fryske Akademy/ NWO-RU Leiden
Ljouwert

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boutkan, D.F.H.	*The Germanic 'Auslautgesetze'.* Amsterdam, 1995.
—	*A concise grammar of the Old Frisian dialect of the First Riustring Codex.* Odense, 1996a.
—	'Riustring *fal, fili* and *sincfalon*'. *Us Wurk* 45 (1996b), 1‒21.
Buma, W.J.	'Ta it Rüstringer dykrjocht'. *It Beaken* 14 (1952), 180‒187.
—, ed.	*Het Tweede Rüstringer Handschrift.* Oudfriese Taal‒ en Rechtsbronnen 8. The Hague, 1954.
—, ed.	*De Eerste Riustringer Codex.* Oudfriese Taal‒ en Rechtsbronnen 11. The Hague, 1961.
—	*Vollständiges Wörterbuch zum westerlauwersschen Jus Municipale Frisonum.* Leeuwarden, 1996.
—	'Zum Rüstringer Wort *fili*'. *Us Wurk* 47 (1998), 19‒24.
Buma, W.J. & Ebel, W., eds.	*Das Rüstringer Recht.* Altfriesische Rechtsquellen 1. Göttingen‒Berlin‒Frankfurt, 1963.
Heinertz, O.N.	'Friesisches'. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 35 (1915), 304‒336.
Helten, van W.	'Zur Lexicologie und Grammatik des Altostfriesischen'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 14 (1889), 232‒287.
—	*Altostfriesische Grammatik.* Leeuwarden, 1890.
Holthausen, F.	'Zur altfriesischen Wortkunde II'. *Germanisch‒Romanische Monatschrift* 15 (1927), 235‒7.
—	'Zu altfriesisch "fili"'. *It Beaken* 15 (1953), 28.
Kock, A.	'Vocalbalance im Altfriesischen'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 29 (1904), 175‒193.
Richthofen, K. von	*Friesische Rechtsquellen.* Göttingen, 1840.
Sjölin, B.	*Einführung in das Friesische.* Stuttgart, 1969.

Steller, W.	*Abriß der altfriesischen Grammatik. Mit Berücksichtigung der Westgermanischen Dialecte des Altenglischen, Altsächsischen und Althochdeutschen. Mit Lesestücken und Wortverzeichnis.* Halle, 1928.
Verwijs, E. & Verdam, J	*Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek.* The Hague, 1885-1929.