

**[0665] RELATIVE MARKERS IN THE LANGUAGE OF 'FRIESE BRIEVEN...'**

A. Bor

*Introduction*

The aim of this article is to give a brief report on relative markers in the Frisian letters in *Friese Brieven uit de vijftiende en zestiende Eeuw (Estrik XLII)*. Grins, 1967 (henceforth to be referred to as FrBr). This implies that all those letters that are essentially written in Dutch, be it of the Northern variety,<sup>1</sup> with a Frisian colouring at best, have not been included. Besides the items marked N (nrs. 9, 17, 19, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38) this category also includes nrs. 46 (lines 1-31) and 51. The Frisian sentences in nr. 52 (lines 8-11) have been included. For the sake of comparison I shall add a survey of the use (or non-use) of relative markers in the Dutch letters in a supplement at the end of the article.

The letters in FrBr are not addressed to a general public but to a particular person, often a relative, or to a group of persons. This is often reflected in the opening address and/or closing phrase(s). Sixteen of them are addressed to a friend or to friends,<sup>2</sup> as e.g. in 2.1: *Wythet heema gueda vrinud...* (know Heema, good friend...), or in 42.1: *VHeste Jnsundere ende lyaeye goede vryundt* (honourable special and dear good friend). Most of the other recipients are addressed as: *broer* (brother), *zuager* (brother-in-law), *nifft* (cousin) or *miech, meg* (relative). Most of the people addressed are in the closing lines commended to the care of almighty God or best wishes are expressed for their state of health, usually by wishing them sound sleep (e.g. in 10.14: *habbet tusen guede nacht* = have a thousand good nights); these two ideas may be combined, as in 23.10-1: *God almachtich sperry joe mey dae jono lang in salige ghesontheed* (almighty God may spare you and yours long in blessed health). These regularly recurring words at beginning and end are in essence variations of polite standard phrases, as appears from e.g. 25.15-6: *kenne god etc.*

As regards subject matter these letters are quite different from the Old East Frisian texts, which practically contain law texts only, and JUS, which is to a large extent composed of similar texts.<sup>3</sup> The letters on which this article is based

---

<sup>1</sup>. See Introduction p. 5, bottom lines.

<sup>2</sup>. The word 'friend' should not always be taken too literally, as in e.g. the opening lines of letters 4 and 15. It is used there (and elsewhere) as a polite form of address rather than as an indication of particular feelings of liking and understanding.

<sup>3</sup>. A. Bor, 'Relative markers in Old Frisian', *Us Wurk* 35 (1986), pp. 57-74; 'Relative markers in Old East Frisian', *Us Wurk* 36 (1987), pp. 21-48; 'Relative markers in the Old West Frisian manuscript Jus Municipale Frisonum', *Us Wurk* 36 (1987), pp. 71-90.

often contain some complaint or a request that have, directly or indirectly, to do with some point of law; but some also deal with private matters.

Their language is a far cry from that of the law texts with its abundance of standard phrases. It is formal to a large extent, but the personal element is obvious; and although it does not have the character of colloquial language, it has a free-flowing aspect to it which makes us expect that compared with the language of the Old East Frisian law texts and that of JUS, there will be certain notable differences. Is this evident in the use of relative clauses in general and of relative markers in particular? This article also tries to give an answer to this question.

1. Clauses that have the formal appearance of a main clause but the function of a subordinate relative one do occur, but are rare in comparison with the same phenomenon in the Old East Frisian texts and JUS. The verb in such relative clauses is in the *wesa*-paradigm (6.4-5, 11.12-3), or a verb that is synonymous with it (*lidza* in 46.33). Another passage that may apply is:

36.150-2: soe waesser *een guedt eerlick borgher van Dort dier mej ws uwer kaem* ..... ende *wennet aen dijo porte* alsoer seide dierme neij Aelden bosch faert (so was there a good, honest citizen of Dordrecht who crossed with us ..... and ↓lives near the gate, as he said, where one goes to Oudenbosch).

In this passage occur two relative clauses coordinated by means of the conjunction *ende*. In the second of those the relative marker may have been deleted and its word order is that of a main clause. This phenomenon is also found in Middle Dutch.<sup>4</sup>

2. The antecedent of the relative marker is a noun(group), a pronoun or a clause.

2.1 The noun(group) serving as the antecedent ranges from just a noun, including a proper noun, to a noun preceded, and sometimes followed, by one or more qualifications. A few illustrations are: *knechten* (50.6), *gabbe* (36.133), *een guedt eerlick borgher van Dort* (36.150-1).

---

<sup>4</sup>. See for this Stoett (*Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst*, reprint of the 1923 ed.. 's-Gravenhage, 1968), § 69. Another possibility is too see the clause *ende wennet aen dijo porte* (36.151-2) as a main one in which the subject ('he') is left unexpressed. This is a familiar phenomenon in these letters. To give just a few examples: 3.9 (ick) wil; 36.92 (hij) ijoe; 15.5 (hit) Js; 11.5 (hia) dwaed.

Occasionally the antecedent is not a noun, but a word formally used as such in a certain context. The non-expressed noun is to be supplied from this context, usually in what precedes and once in what follows. The antecedent is a numeral in 37.42: *een heel* (tusent knechet, lines 42 and 39); 36.5: *een oer* (schwttte, line 4); 36.118: *Trije* (knechten, lines 114-5); 20.2: *dae c* (pennengen, line 11). The antecedent is an adjective in 36.39-41: *elck then besten stillende sonder eenich mentie toe meitzen vant oer dier ws.... toe haelden ijown waes* (satisfying each one as well as possible without making any mention of the other which had been given us to observe). In this passage the noun is not explicitly mentioned in the context, but has to be inferred from it, and must have been a noun like *foraword* (= agreement).

2.2 The pronoun that serves as the antecedent is one of four different kinds: it is a demonstrative pronoun (as e.g. *het selftge* in 36.31), and particularly a determinative one (e.g. *dae jenne* in 7.6, *die geene* in 48.5, *het ijen* in 49.5); it can also be a possessive pronoun (e.g. *het ijons* in 36.97) or an indefinite one (*emmen* in 23.6, *een ijegelicken* in 36.36).

2.3 The antecedent can be a preceding clause. One example is:

49.2-3: ... dier wt verstien, *dat ijemme ijette alle gerre wol te pas wierne, dier* mij seer liaeff is wessen om heeren. (... learned from it [= your letter] that you were all still in good health, which has been very pleasant to me to hear).

Sometimes the reference is not to the immediately preceding clause, but to the contents of a clause that is further back. An example is:

46.37-42: ... als ick wal weet dattet land jn foertijden js aff slaten by een genoempt tyepke die welcke mij ende salige juke ende douwa to bannerhuys baede *datter dat land most slate van dae Jenne* dyr jacob nw bruckt hij hede son fulle dier naet datter byslaen mochte *twelck* wy vors. ouwer mits zijn beed habbet gund om zijn schamelheyt (... as I know very well that in former times the land was fenced in by a person [lit. one] named Tyepke, who requested me and the late Juke and Douwa to Bannerhuys for permission to fence in the land in the [common] pasture which Jacob uses now, he did not have so many animals [= cows] that he could claim his legitimate portion of the common pasture, which [= the request] we, the aforementioned, on account of his request have granted because of his poverty).

It is possible for the relative marker not to refer to a preceding but to a following clause, as appears from

36.33-4: *mijn heer ende hijae allen vorscreuen meenden dier* aeck wol toe lijowen stiet *dattet naet guedts meitze solde dan alle quaedt* (my

lord and all those mentioned before thought, which is also to be believed, that it would lead to nothing good but to all that is bad).

In one passage the antecedent is a clause which partly precedes and partly follows its qualifying relative clause:

36.90-1: *Om gildt toe krijen van mijn heer voer ijoe ben ick dij oerde reis (dier ick ferre foerijetten hab toe schriwen) weer wessen bij mijn heer (to receive money for you from my lord I have the second time [which I before this have forgotten to write] again been to my lord).*

3. The total number of relative clauses in FrBr is 129. They are introduced by a particle (76), a pronoun (20) or an adverbial word (33). In contrast to those in the Old East Frisian texts and JUS the relative clauses in FrBr are for the most part non-restrictive ones. This is not unexpected. In a law-text it is essential for perceptions and quantities to be unambiguously clear, and there is little need for non-essential, complementary information. In those letters, on the other hand, the reference is often to persons mentioned by name about whom further details are given that are not essential for their identity, or to events and situations about which the relative clause gives some additional information, functional in its context but not necessary for identification. Another important factor to account for this high percentage of non-restrictive relative clauses is the fact that one third of the number of relative clauses in FrBr have a clause for their antecedent. The restrictive or non-restrictive character of the relative clause does not influence the choice of the relative marker to introduce it.

The relative clause usually follows its antecedent immediately, but it may be separated from it by minimally one word.

3.1 Most relative clauses in FrBr are introduced by the particle *deer* (also spelled *der*, *dier*, *dir*, *dyr*, *dyer*). Roughly speaking the occurrence of these spellings is as follows: before 1510 *deer* predominates and after that is used occasionally in letters up to 1530, after which year it occurs once only, viz. in 1585 (52.9); in the 1520's both *deer* and *der* occur; *dier* is rarely used before 1526, but is by far the most frequently used spelling from that year onward; *dyr* and *dyer* are not used before 1540; *dir* occurs once, strangely enough in 1489 (1.3).

The function of the relative particle *deer* etc. in its clause is that of subject or direct object. Only once *dier* serves as the indirect object:

24..7-11: ... bygeryende dat disse ..... quitantie .... jn handen van ymck nift mey steld wirde *dier* wy dae vorscriouen trye hondert gounen .... tense to seynden ... (... desiring that this receipt may be handed to cousin Ymck to whom we intend to send the three hundred guilders mentioned before).

3.2 A relative clause in FrBr can be introduced by a pronoun, originally either a demonstrative pronoun (*die, dat*) or an interrogative one (*hat, welk* and its variant spellings).

*Die* as a relative pronoun occurs only once, in

3.14-5: screuen mitter haest onder myn persona sijghel her Simen *dien* ick aldeer om baeden hab (written in a hurry under the seal of my priest, father Simon, whom I have asked for it).

The antecedent is a masculine proper noun; the relative pronoun serves as the direct object in its clause.<sup>5</sup>

*Dat* as a relative pronoun occurs three times. The antecedent is 'all' (3.11), 'thing' (39.1) or part of a clause (3.12); its function in the relative clause is that of direct object and subject.

*Hat* ('that') as a relative pronoun occurs in one passage:

23.2-3: Gonst lyaefte ende vriondschap ende in allis *hat* ick goedis formey (favour, love and friendship and in everything good that I am capable of).

This is one of the standard opening phrases of a personal letter, which is also indicated by the addition of *etc.* The translation may obscure the fact that *hat* refers to the pronoun *allis* (*goedis* is a partitive genitive of the noun *goed*, under the influence of *allis* denoting a quantity). *Hat* is used as the direct object in its clause.

By far the most frequently used relative pronoun is '*welk*', which is clearly derived from Middle Dutch; it occurs fifteen times in all. It is usually preceded by a definite article/demonstrative pronoun. Thus we find *de welcke, die welcke* referring to a masc. sing. noun (36.24,<sup>6</sup> 48.6; 46.39) or to a plural noun (48.3); and

<sup>5</sup>. A second passage may be relevant in this context, viz. 24.7-11 (see section 3.1 of this article). It is impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether *dier* is a relative pronoun (fem. sing. dative) or the relative particle. Most likely it is the latter seeing that *tier* occurs as a relative particle in two passages that are very similar to the one in 24.7-11. These passages are:

36.111: ... een faemn *dier* her salm foerdrinckt hiedt int diept (... a girl who had drowned herself in the channel).

36.122-3: Ende sijn nift *Popck* ..... *dier* mej Thijets moijs wenne (and his cousin *Popck* ....., who lived with aunt T.).

<sup>6</sup>. The word *ghaerkompst* does not occur in the Old Frisian dictionaries; *komst* (arrival) is a feminine noun. Middle Dutch *gadercomste* (coming together) is a feminine noun (J. Verdam, *Middelnederlandsch Handwoordenboek*, 's-Gravenhage, 1961, p. 176). On the basis of this evidence we may assume *ghaerkompst* to be of feminine gender. But in 36.22-5 we read: ... oftet mijn heer ende Riedt

*het welcke, ijtulke* or (with proclitic *t*) *twelck, tuelck* referring to a neut. sing. noun or to a preceding clause (49,7, 36.15, 36.124; 37.6; 44.20, 46.41, 46.48; 25.5). The pronoun without a preceding article refers to a fem. sing. word (*velke* in 39.22). In the two remaining passages the pronoun occurs as the non-nucleus part of a nominal word group. The nucleus of this word group is a noun which is either a repetition of the antecedent (a noun mentioned before), or a noun in which the preceding antecedent is recapitulated for clarity's sake. These passages are:

- 7.3-6: ... dat ws is commen van ws genedigen heren dy stadholder *en brieff* wt byclachte van Idaerdera deel ..... wt *welka stadholders brieff* ws is macht jouwen ... (... that to us has come from our gracious lord the stadholder a letter on account of a complaint of Idaarderadeel ..... in which stadholder's letter we have been given authority...)<sup>7</sup>
- 16.1-7: Jacla eeb zin ..... letet joe ..... riochtlik wita hoe datter jtlick lioed sen nier bijerien fan twera ponnameta *land* to sibranda burem ..... ende ack op VII florenen rent *jnt goed* der hein nvter tyt op wennet *welken landen* ack for fallen solden wessa on vs genedigen heren ... (Jacla Eebzin ..... lets you ..... know according to the law that some persons desire to exercise the right of acquisition to two 'pondematen' of land at Sibrandaburen ..... and also to seven florins' worth of rent in the property on which Hein lives at the moment, which lands are also supposed to have fallen to our gracious lord...).

---

aeck guedt tocht *eenich oer ghaerkompst* toe haelden ofte voerschriwen *bij den welcken* ick het geenninge dier ws toe antwirdt ijown waes ofte foerfaern hiedden solde openbierrie (...whether my lord and the council also thought fit to hold or convene some meeting or other in which I should reveal that which had been given us for an answer). This licence in the use of grammatical forms occurs more often, as appears from, for example, the following: *skot* is a masculine noun (according to Holthausen-Hofmann, p. 98, and to Köbler, p. 199; although Von Richthofen, p. 1032, makes it a neuter noun; however, *schat* in Middle Dutch, and Old English *sceatt* seem to occur as masculine nouns only), but 5.3 reads: dath scholde schaen *om een schot* (that is supposed to happen because of a tax), and 5.14-6: soe wil is *dath schot* ..... reke ende jaen (so I shall hand over and give the tax.....); or are the dictionaries wrong in this instance, or incomplete at least? (we should note that Zanema's *Frysk Wurdboek*, p. 902, enters *it skot* for 'a certain tax of former times'). A relevant example of careless use of grammatical forms occurs in 25.11-2. The word *quitantie* (receipt) is a feminine noun, as appears from e.g. 22.12-3, 23.8, 24.11; but 25.11-2 reads: soe seynd jck joe *den selve quitantie* (so I send you the same receipt).

<sup>7</sup>. It is striking that, with the exception of the two passages with its adjectival use, the pronoun occurs in letters from 1526 or later.

The function of this relative pronoun in its clause is that of subject or part of the subject (16.6-7), or direct object. In two passages (7.5, 36.24) it is part of an adverbial adjunct.

There are a few passages in this material that demonstrate an interesting use of the relative marker. Sometimes an antecedent (a noun or a clause) is qualified by a relative clause which itself functions as the direct object clause (opening with *dat*) of a preceding transitive verb. An example is

49.6-9: ... dat frater Sixtus dij oen wessen hat om Sillige faers testament, te hebben, *het welcke ick frijounlick fen dij bijer datste hem op ninnerleije wijse wotte ijaen* ... (... that brother Sixtus has turned to you to have our late father's testament, which I desire kindly from you that you will not give him in any way).

This passage contains essentially two sentences: *a* brother S. has turned to you for the testament. *b*. I desire that you not give him the testament. The direct object of the subordinate clause in the second sentence (the testament) is replaced by an anaphoric pronoun (which) and this pronoun takes the head position of the second sentence, thus linking the two sentences.

The clause formally opening with the relative marker contains a verb denoting a desire or a supposition.<sup>8</sup> Similar examples are:

44.19-21: dan stiet gitte omtrent tachtich golnen in handen van enen broer jaenckis van tzyll gild *twelck dae van dyeperde naet consenterye wille dattet die sted ontfangt* ... (then about eighty guilders of the money for the lock still rest in the hands of a certain Broer Jaenkis, which those of Dieperde are not willing to allow the city to receive [lit. that the city receive it] ... ).

11.20-4: ... datze mij willa helpa bystand to alswlke leelka secken to straffien ende to corrygerien Ende om godes era willa dis fowden mey bystand to dwaen om dat dae tzerka landen aldus naeth wyrda foercapa ende verbrocht *deer jck ganselicke vermoed dat joen liaeffta naeth weegrya schil* (that they [= members of the Court of Friesland] will help me with assistance to punish and correct such ugly matters and that, for the sake of God's honour, these churchwardens will give assistance lest the church lands are sold and spent in this way, which I trust firmly your honour will not refuse).

3.3 The relative clause can be introduced by an adverbial word, either a straight adverb or a pronominal one.

<sup>8</sup>. According to Stoett, § 72, this type of construction is quite common in Middle Dutch already.

The adverb *deer* as a relative marker<sup>9</sup> is used four times, all of them in the fourth letter; *dier* occurs three times as such, each one of them in letter thirtysix. They refer to an inanimate antecedent denoting a location. *Deer* introduces a restrictive relative clause (4.11) or a non-restrictive one (4.6, 4.8, 4.17); *dier* does the same in 36.147, 36.152 and 36.8 respectively.

A pronominal adverb used as a relative marker occurs more often, twenty-six times in all. The adverbial part is *deer*, also spelled *der*, *dier*; or *hweer*, *hwer*, *weer*, *wier*, *vier*. By and large we can say that in the combinations with *deer* etc. the first part is separated from the second by minimally one word, and that *hweer* etc. is followed immediately by its complement. In the second category there is one exception:

25.8-10: ... ende ick hie aeck meend scriftlick anduort (*vier* jck my *neij* stelle solde mochte) ontfinen to hebben (and I had also thought to have received [a] written answer by which I could be guided [lit. after which I would be able to adjust myself]).

In the *deer-group* there is one combination that, according to form, does not follow the rule:

37.1-3: ick foegije joe toe viten dat mod nijft ion breuen hat ont fensen *der vt* forstet dat ij sount ende machtich sint... (I let you know that cousin Mod has received your letters from which [she] understands that you are hale and hearty ... ).

The subject of the clause *der vt forstet* ('she') is left unexpressed; this may be an oversight, but probably is not. If this subject were to be added, it might just possibly be entered between *der* and *vt* (compare *deer .... wt* in 2.2).

More than half (16) of these markers refer to a preceding clause; the rest to a masculine, feminine or neuter noun. It is only once that a pronominal adverb as a relative marker refers to an antecedent denoting a person or persons:

36.118-9: Trije ontron mej gewalt *Wier van dat* dae aersrwtters dae twae krijchgen ... (three [= soldiers suspected of rape] escaped by force, two of whom the troopers got hold of).

In this passage the pronominal adverb is followed by the conjunction *dat*. This phenomenon (pron. adverb followed by *dat*) occurs in two, and possibly three, more passages:

---

<sup>9</sup>. The relative particle *ther* may originally well go back to the same root that the adverb *ther* developed from, but it is impossible to find an unequivocal answer to the question of the origin of the relative particle *ther* (see for this problem, for example, Holger Johansen, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der altgermanischen Relativsatzkonstruktionen*. Copenhagen, 1935, p. 116). It is for this reason that I have distinguished between the particle *ther* and the adverb *ther* as relative markers, just as I did in similar articles that appeared in *Us Wurk* 35 (1986), pp. 57-74; 36 (1987), pp. 21-54 and 71-90.



36.94-5: ...alsoe datse weer weij tijaen ende naet weer komme etc. *wier toe dattir* dat gildt hadde most... (... in such a way that they [= a band of mercenaries] would withdraw and not come back etc. why [= for what reason] he had to have the money ... ). And similarly 36.63.

The dubious passage, for which see also towards the end of section 3.2, is:

44.20-4: ... twelck dae van dyeperde naet consenterye wille dattet die sted ontfangt hoe wol die schilden om tverlaet opleid graeter zent *weer om* indient joe guedt tynckt *dat* wy interloquerie ende kenne dat die sted by prouisie dae vorscreuen tachtich golnen scel moeghe ontfaen ... (... which [= a sum of money] those of Dieperde are unwilling to permit the city [= Bolsward] to receive although the debts advanced for the lock are greater wherefore [= for what reason], if you think it suitable, we pass an interlocutory judgement that the city will be allowed to receive the required eighty guilders by anticipation ... ).

This is a possible, and in my opinion probably correct, interpretation. However, it is also possible not to consider the clause *indient joe guedt tynckt* to be a parenthetic one, but as the clause upon which the following *dat*-clause depends; in other words that from *weer om* the scribe begins to lose track of his intended construction and produces what now appears to be an anacoluthic sentence.

In a few passages the status of *hweer om* is doubtful. Take e.g.

11.37-40: ... ende habba deer naet aen wold mer hia confideria in hiara boeffhefftige ordinancie ende statuten deer to jenst god ende dae heliga tzerka sent *Hweer om byjerrye jck aeck* wrmits dio graeta inobediencie ende en summige aeck mey to ban sent *Dat jck dae gastelicke personen mey citerie to liowerd* (... and [they = certain clerics] have been unwilling to accept this [offer] but they rely on their knavish regulation and statutes, which are contrary to God and holy church wherefore [= for what reason] I desire also on account of the great disobedience and some are still excommunicated that I may summon the clerics to appear in court at Leeuwarden).

The word order in the clause *Hweer om ..... inobediencie*, in which finite verb and subject are contiguous constituents, is that of a main clause. If it is a main clause *Hweer om* would introduce a new sentence, but then we would expect it to introduce a question, which is not the case. This passage may therefore be an example of anacoluthon, a phenomenon that is by no means rare in these letters. A similar example of the use of *hweer om* referring back to the contents of the preceding statement, but followed by a clause that is not formally a relative one because it does not have the word order of a subordinate clause is

3.12-3: ... hwa my dat wr seit dy dattet by auentuer om ws thoe thwisten dat naet schaen sel *hweer om soe sterkie ws fryonden* ... (... who imputes that to me he does this, I presume, to stir up discord between us, which will not happen, wherefore [= for what reason] reassure our friends ... ).

The following combinations occur: *deer(dier)...fan, van* (2), *der..in* (1), *deer (dier)...mey* (2), *deer(dier)...oen* (2), *deer(der)...op* (3), *deer(dier)...troch, truch* (2),

*deer(der) ...wt,vt (2); vier ..ney (1), hweer(hwer, weer, wier) om (9), wier toe (1), wier van (1).*

The majority of these relative markers have an adverbial function in its relative clause. Six of them serve as prepositional object, e.g.

18.8-10: *deer mochte by auentwr rebellicheed ryse troch dit oerloegh jnt sticht deert troch forteyn mochte worde deer ick dan naet mej to freed scolde wesse (there might just be a rebellion because of this war in [the diocese of] Utrecht through which it [= a certain payment] might be delayed with which I would not be satisfied then).*

Similarly 8.3, 15.9, 25.9, 37.2 and 37.3. In 36.19 the pronominal adverb is part of the direct object in its clause (*wier van ... dae twa*).

4. The phenomenon of the non-expressed relative marker is very rare but does occur. This statement does not refer to an incomplete clause, as in e.g.

3.4: ... *hoe dat ick foerstinzen (hab) dat brieff oen Joe sant fan worp wnya ...* (... how I have taken note of the letter sent to you by Worp Unia ..);

or to a clause that lacks a relative marker as a result of deletion, as in

10.4-6: ... *en seta landis deer zillige douwa hesslingha op plyge to wannien ende ↓dat wyff nu mit aesgha peers zen her aefte man op wannit...* (a farm on which the late Douwa Hesslingha used to live and ↓the wife [= his widow] lives now with Aesgha Peers son, her wedded man [= her second husband]).

The only genuine example of a non-introduced relative clause occurs in

42.6-8: ... *want ick vormoedt dy seck genoegh schaet toe wessen troch vuirsecken ick Joen lyaeften alsdan breder wal schil vorclaerije ...* (for I suppose the affair to have been sifted out sufficiently for reasons [that] I shall explain further to your honour then...).

The non-introduced relative clause in this passage is a restrictive one in which the non-expressed marker would have served as the direct object. Another instance seems to occur in

8.12: *kenne god joe moet sparye jn doeghden* (acknowledge God [who] may spare you in all decency).

Note 12 on FrBr page 30 states that the relative particle *dier* 'seems to have been forgotten'. This may well be true, seeing that this particle occurs in a similar text in 24.13 (and also in the Dutch text 32.16-7).

5. In two or more coordinated relative clauses the marker that introduces the first may be deleted in the following one(s). Although this phenomenon is usually limited to the relative marker, other clause constituents may be deleted as well. In the large majority of the relevant passages the deletion is identical: the non-

expressed relative marker in the second (etc.) of the coordinated clauses has the same function as the one in the first. A few examples are:

8.5-7: Oengaende *dan dyckhuustera zyl dier* jn fortyden op drijon is ende ↓ een kostelyken gueden zylroed hat ende ↓ dae fyower delen berth weer to meytien ... (concerning the sluice at D., which was swept away in former times and [which] has an extremely good drainage canal and [which] falls to the four districts to repair ... ).

41.3-5: ... *dat fen goed to gennum* ..... *der y ontwa leyd haebbet* ende ↓↓ nu wer ontwa ledzet welle (the Fen farm at Genum ..... which you have divided into two and [which you] intend to divide again).

Also 10.4-6, for which see section 4 of this article.

Another example might be:

36.150-2: soe waesser *een guedt eerlick borgher van Dort dier* mey ws uwer kaem ..... ende ↓ wennet aen dijo porte ..... *dierme neij Aelden bosch faert* (so was there a good, honest citizen of Dordrecht who crossed with us .... and [who] lives near the gate ..... where one goes to Oudenbosch).

An example of non-identical deletion<sup>10</sup> occurs in passage

36.24-5: ... het geenninge *dier* (1) *ws*(3) toe antwirdt ijown waes ofte ↓(4) ↓(1) foerfaern hiedden (that which had been given us for an answer or [which we] had found).

Another passage to illustrate this phenomenon is 36.36-9.

A passage to be noted in the context of deletion is

4.18-21: ende wy deykis grate beclag here moeten fan wse borghes dat hira nering owrmits duske bilettinge staff is ende ↓ wse sted aeck grate scaed ende hinder *fan* hat ende ↓ wy aeck naet verschielde mugget ney wtwysinge des verbondis... (and daily we have to listen to serious complaints on the part of our citizens that their livelihood because of such interference is going down and of [which] our city also suffers great harm and hindrance and [which] we may not perpetrate either in accordance with the contents of the alliance).

At the places indicated by means of an arrow the particle *deer* seems to have been deleted, the first time as part of the pronominal adverb *deer... fan*, the second time as the relative particle *deer*. However, *deer* in a similar function does not occur in a relevant preceding clause. The scribe seems to have lost track of his structure and consequently have mixed up two types of sentence.

6. Sometimes a clause which is the semantic equivalent of a relative clause, is formally coordinated to a preceding one (by means of the coordinating con-

<sup>10</sup>. Compare for this non-identical deletion what is said in section 5 of my article *Relative Markers ... in Us Wurk* 36 (1987), p. 78 ff.

junction *ende*). For an illustration of this phenomenon see 4.18-21 (in section 5 above), in which two consecutive relevant *ende*-clauses occur. See also:

- 1.8-9: ... so dwe dach so wal ende schryw en bref ende bruck myn oen schild aldir mey in (... so be then so kind as to write a letter and use my innocence therewith in [= in which you also excuse me]).
- 49.1-2: Dijn brieff ..... hab ick ontfinsen ..... ende dier wt verstien, dat ... (your letter ..... I have received ..... and learned from it that [= from which I have learned ....])

*Als* is used as a conjunction in an adverbial clause of comparison. A number of these clauses are the semantic equivalents of a non-restrictive relative clause. A few examples are:

- 5.14-7: soe wil ic dath schot ..... reke ende jaen deer nochtans seer to jenst dae reden is *als yenna eerbaarheid beth versteeth dan jck yenna scriue kan* ... (so I shall hand over and give the tax ..... which is, however, very much against reason as your honour understands better than I can write to you...).

The clauses *als* ..... *kan* qualify the statement made in the preceding clause.

- 49.15-6: ... ende bid her aeck datset hem voeral naet ijout, *als ick aeck op her wol betrou* (... and also ask her not to give it [= the testament] to him by any means, which I also trust she will not do).
- 4.22-3: hyr jn so ramet dat beste *als wy wp joe betrouwet to scaen* (in this so devise the best as we trust you will do).

In these passages the *als*-clauses qualify a statement made in the preceding clause, which is the characteristic of a (non-restrictive) relative clause. Similarly in 6.11, 10.14, 20.4, 50.4. In 10.9 the statement made in the *als*-clause refers to a noun group in the preceding clause; this noun group (the antecedent) contains an adjectival word stressing comparison.

In two passages a similar clause is introduced by *is*, e.g. in

- 11.26-8: ... helpa hyr mey to alducke onreedelicke stoecken to straeffien deer god ende syn liaeuwa helgen joen laen fan wessa schilla *is ick my ganselick vp joe betrowe* (help to punish such improper deeds for which God and his dear saints will reward you as I fully trust you to do). The other passage occurs in 11.33-4.

A similar function has the *soe*-clause in e.g.

- 22.14-5: ende angaende alle ore artyckelen *soe dae blyoun sinte op sybren roerda ende seerp odynghe* ... (and concerning all other articles as they have been referred to Sybren Roerda and Seerp Odynghe ...).

7. In a number of subordinate clauses the opening word serves as both antecedent and relative marker. Such independent relatives do not introduce relative clauses, but mostly subject or object clauses. The function of the independent relative in its clause is predominantly that of subject or object. As such independent relatives occur: the particle *deer*, the (originally demonstrative)

pronoun *dat*, the (originally interrogative) pronouns *hwa* and *hat* ('what'), and the adverb *hweer*.

7.1 The independent relative particle *deer* ('who, the one who') occurs twice, in two very similar passages:

4.5-6: ... men *deer* dio seck aen gheet to amsterdam heert ende wennet (... but whom the affair concerns belongs and lives in Amsterdam).

The other passage occurs in 4.16-7. In both *deer* serves as indirect object.

7.2 The only demonstrative pronoun used as an independent relative is *dat* ('what, that which'). It occurs in one passage only, in which it serves as the subject in its clause:

4.8: ... *dat* meer is ... (... [and] what is more ...).

7.3 *Hwa* ('he who') is an independent relative in two passages, in each of which it serves as the subject in its clause:

3.9: *hwa* dat seit die lyucht dat fulck ende quaelck (he who says that he lies in a foul and evil way). Also 3.12.

7.4 The originally interrogative pronoun *hat* ('what, that which') is used as an independent relative in nine passages. Spelling variations are *haet*, *bath* and *hoth*. In one passage it occurs in its genitive form *wes*. Its usual function in its clause is that of direct object, but it also serves as subject, nominal part of the predicate and object in the genitive. Some examples are:

20.14: nochtans *hat* ick om jon wille hyr in dwaen mej ben ick altyt beraet (yet what I, for your sake, can do in this I am always ready [to do]).

2.3-5: Maer *hoth* dae eerbera heren ende dae mena stemma by gripet dat schel ws wtstra twa fieirdeel wal noeghia (but what the honourable gentlemen and the estates agree upon that will please our remotest two quarters).

4.23-5: ende *wes* joe hyr jn beliauet to dwaen jeffta to leten jwn guetlick bescreuen andert by brenger dissis breuis (and what it pleases you to do in this or refrain from doing we hope to receive your favourable written answer via bearer of this letter).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>. *Wes* is the genitive singular form of the neuter pronoun *hwet*. This genitive form occurs with the impersonal verb *biliavia* (to please).

7.5 There is only one example of an independent relative adverb. This adverb *hweer* ('where, there where') occurs in

10.12-3: wil to alle tyde mit gelyck off mara tienst to jenst joe forjelda *hweer* ick kan ([I am always ready to return equal or greater service to you where I can).

8. When comparing the occurrence of relative clauses and their markers in the language of *Friese Brieven...* and that of JUS we find:

1. The number of non-restrictive relative clauses in FrBr is proportionally much higher; the reason for this has been discussed in section 3; this fact does not make any difference for the choice of the relative marker since, here as well as in JUS, restrictive and non-restrictive clauses are syntactically indistinguishable.
2. Proportionally speaking a pronoun used as a relative marker is much more frequent in FrBr; this is entirely due to the use of 'welcke' in this function. A particle used as a relative marker is less frequent, and an adverbial word used as such is more frequent in FrBr; however, these are no more than tendencies and to be viewed with circumspection, particularly when we remember that the evidence is based on very limited material.
3. In both texts the grammatical function of the relative marker in its clause is, with slight variations, very similar.
4. For the first time so far in Old West Frisian, as well as in Old East Frisian, we have come across the occurrence of what genuinely looks like an unintroduced relative clause (FrBr 42.7).

9. Compared with that of JUS, the language of FrBr is wordy and characterized by long, easily flowing sentences in which the writer does not always adhere to the pattern with which he has started. He pursues his train of thought steadily, sometimes to the detriment of what is now considered correct grammar, while all the time he aims at clothing his thoughts in what appears to be the formal language of his day.

From what has been said so far it is clear that there are notable differences between the language of JUS and FrBr. These differences apply clearly to relative clauses in one aspect only (the predominance of non-restrictive relative clauses in FrBr), whereas the choice of relative markers, with one exception (the use of 'welcke' in FrBr), is hardly different in the two texts.

*Beatrixlaan 7  
6713 PR Ede*

## SUPPLEMENT

The total number of relative clauses in the Dutch letters in FrBr (all those marked N + nrs. 46.1-31 and 51) is fifty-four, thirty-six of which are nonrestrictive ones. The overall pattern as regards the nature of their antecedents, the mutual position of relative marker and antecedent, and the grammatical function of the markers in their clauses is largely the same as in the Frisian letters. There is one notable difference though: in the Dutch letters by far the most frequently used relative marker is a pronoun (35 = 65%), whereas the particle (*deer, daer, der*) is used as such in no more than 9% of the total number of clauses; the use of an adverbial marker in relative function is proportionally about the same as in the Frisian letters.

The word *als* occurs a number of times at the head of a clause that is the semantic equivalent of a relative clause, as in e.g.

31.26-7: Die deputierden sullen w doen eijschen to huijs commen als ghy bij hore scriften verstaen sullen (the provincial executive will demand you to come home as [= which] you will learn from their written instructions).

There is one passage to illustrate the phenomenon mentioned towards the end of section 3.2 of this article:

30.17-8: ... dat ghy w villet lyden ende behelpen als myn heer meent dat ghy val doen sult sonder noet (... that you are willing to suffer and do the best you can for yourself as my lord thinks that you will manage to do without distress).

In one passage the relative clause refers to the non-nucleus part of a noun group, a phenomenon not represented in the Frisian letters; this non-nucleus part is in the genitive:

31.15-7: ... dan bifelen tselue ..... *des keijzers* genade die den landden geloeft heft ..... die landen to biscutten ende to biscermen (... but we commend the same ..... to the grace of the emperor who has promised the states ..... to shield and protect the states).

	N.	129	= 100%
P1	---	---	
P2	DEER DIER DER DIR DYR DYER	28 36 7 1 3 1	76 = 59%
P R O N O U N	DIE DAT HAT WELCKE	1 3 1 15	20 = 15%
A D V E R B I A L	DEER [LOC.] DIER [LOC.] PRON. ADVERB	4 3 26	33 = 26%
REL. CLAUSE FOLLOWS ANTECEDENT	IMMEDIATELY NOT IMMEDIATELY	100 29	= 78% = 22%
FUNCTION IN RELATIVE CLAUSE	SUBJ. DIR. OBJ. INDIR. OBJ. PREP. OBJ.  ADVERBIAL	54 40 1 6  28	= 41% = 31% = 1% = 5%  = 22%
	RESTRICTIVE REL. CL. NON-RESTRICTIVE REL. CL.	52 77	= 40% = 60%