

[0655] RELATIVE MARKERS IN OLD EAST FRISIAN¹

A. Bor

1. *Relative clauses* are a type of subordinate clause, and as such usually to be recognized in Old Frisian via normal characteristics, the main one being that the finite verb form does not usually occupy the first or the second slot in the clause. Such a clause can never be complete in itself, but refers to a noun(phrase) in a (commonly: the) preceding clause (its antecedent), and in exceptional cases to the preceding clause in its entirety. Among relative clauses we can distinguish two different types: *restrictive* relative clauses and *non-restrictive* ones. In a spoken modern West Germanic language they can be recognized by their different intonation pattern and junction; in writing these differences are often expressed by means of punctuation marks. These characteristics are of no help for the analysis of e.g. Old Frisian texts. We know nothing about its intonation pattern, and its system of punctuation (if there is one) is very limited, and inconsistent according to our notion. Since neither the phonetic nor the graphic criterion is of any value to us², there is only the semantic one left to guide us in distinguishing between these two types of relative clause.

A relative clause makes some kind of statement about its antecedent. This statement either modifies its antecedent and is essential to the precise delineation of its group of referents (the relative clause is a restrictive one); or it gives some additional information about it, of greater or lesser interest, but never essential to its correct understanding (the relative clause is a non-restrictive one).

The large majority of relative clauses in the Old Frisian texts are restrictive ones, which is according to expectation in law-texts: there should be no misunderstanding about the referents to which the articles of law apply and consequently they should be narrowly defined. An example of a restrictive relative clause is:

E₃ I. 262-3 : Huasa bi fiucht ieftha bi rawie..... en fone *ther bi iewen se fon ther rualde...* (who fights or robs an unmarried girl who has taken the veil...).

This relative clause makes it clear that the young woman referred to belongs to a certain class; in other words the relative clause limits the number of referents to whom this article applies.

An example of a non-restrictive relative clause occurs in

H₂ IV-1: Thet sprec thi wisa salemon *ther was allere ertherskera monna wisest...* (that spoke the wise Solomon, who was the wisest of all men on earth...).

‘Solomon’ is a proper noun, referring to one particular person. The relative clause gives some additional information, functional in its context, because it adds to the clarity of the picture of the person concerned; but it does not add anything to his identity.

Jacobsen (1965) suggests that restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses are not always mutually exclusive, but should be seen as two extremes on a continuous scale³; this implies that some relative clauses are restrictive or non-restrictive to a greater or a lesser degree than others.

Behaghel (1897) makes the same distinction for relative clauses in Old Saxon⁴. In both categories he makes a considerable number of subdistinctions. Mitchell (1985) also makes a number of subdivisions, especially in the non-restrictive category⁵. In Old East Frisian, too, it would be possible to subcategorize the group of non-restrictive relative clauses. Compare for example:

R₂ III. 2-4 : ...and hi nelle..... *thre warua ouir sitte ther him fon thes kininges haluon ebeden send.* (... and he fails to attend the three sessions of the people’s court, which have been ordered him in the king’s name), and

E₁ V. 72 : Thi prestere heth *soghen* wielsa. *ther althus gheheten send An there boc.* (the priest has seven ordinations, which are called thus in the book).

In the R₂ passage the relative clause stresses the fact that the man’s non-attendance is all the worse since he knows (like everybody else does) or should know that the meetings have been decreed by the king himself. The relative clause in the E₁ passage gives information which could just as well have been given in a main clause coordinated to the first by means of the conjunction *and*. Different from either of these two is the relative clause in e.g.

R₁ XX. 109-10 : Thet ur ief us thi kinig kerl..... bi sante willehadus tidon. *ther wi under kersten wrthon.* (that granted us king Charles..... in the days of saint Willehad, under whom we became christians).

It is clear that this relative clause is not a restrictive one, as it does not limit the reference of its antecedent in any way. But it adds nothing to our knowledge of saint Willehad, either, and it could not be easily coordinated to the preceding clause. Its function is to give some information about the time at which a certain historical event took place.

Does the distinction between these types of relative clause affect their syntactic appearance? Andrew (1966) found that for Old English this distinction is relevant, indeed: the relative marker to introduce a restrictive relative clause is *þe*, in a non-restrictive one it is *se*⁶. Sprockel (1973) found something similar for the language of the *Parker Chronicle*⁷. Although Mitchell (1985) has his suspicions about ‘clear-cut distinctions’ between the two categories, he has no doubt that this ‘distinction made by Andrew often works’⁸.

Analysis of the Old East Frisian texts has made it clear that 1. each of them has at least a few non-restrictive relative clauses, but never more than ten percent of the total; 2. the non-restrictive relative clauses are introduced by *ther* usually as a relative particle, occasionally in adverbial function; and 3. the large majority of the restrictive relative clauses are also introduced by *ther*. Evaluation of these facts leads to the conclusion that for Old East Frisian there is no point in sharply distinguishing between the two main categories of relative clauses, not to speak of subdividing one of them. Old East Frisian is obviously included among those languages in which (with very few exceptions) restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses are syntactically indistinguishable⁹. This is in accordance with what Behaghel found for the Old Saxon of the *Heliand*¹⁰.

2. In Old East Frisian there occur a number of clauses that have the function of relative clauses, but without the corresponding word order. It appears that if there is a conflict between form and function, the latter is determinant in the majority of the relevant passages. The relative marker in most (not all) of these clauses is *ther*, which invariably serves as the subject in its clause. The finite verb form in these clauses is usually in the *wesa* paradigm. See e.g.

E₃ V.50-2 : Alle frouwes noma scel heb be thenne berna ieff then kerna anda thi
 ther is aller sibbest fon ther feiders sida thi scel wise hire formunder
 (every woman shall have the born [guardian = a relative] or the
 chosen [guardian = the husband] and the one who is nearest related on
 the father's side he shall be her guardian).

Similarly R₂ VIII. 30-2, 41; B₁ p. 103 lines 2-3; E₂ I. 11-2, VIII. 36-7; H₂ IV. 1-2, XIV. 99-101; F XI. 281-2, XXII. 152-3.

A few of these clauses are not introduced by the relative marker *ther*, but by a pronoun (once) or a pronominal adverb (once):

H₂ II 45-7 : ief hit his lond raf sa scelen suera fiwer ethele men. end fiwer fri men
 tha se ein erua. end fiwer letslaga ther er unge bern vere and fri helse
 iwen ethele were (if it is about theft of land then shall swear four
 noble men and four free men who possess inherited land and four
 half-free men, who were born unfree before and were equally free
 when given their freedom).

B₁ p. 105 lines 15-7: thi prestere nemot nenra wraldeskera lena plegia wara sines eynis
 ombechtes *ther to is hi wied.* (the priest must not hold any worldly
 functions, but only his own office to which he has been ordained).

The parallel version (B₂ p. 106 lines 12-4) has this relative clause in the word order of a subordinate clause¹¹.

Occasionally the finite verb form is not in the *wesa* paradigm; the relative marker is *ther* and serves as the subject of its clause:

R₂ VI. 15-6 : Werth ther enich mon eslein sunder thesse haga fretha *ther falle to ene ielde*. sa skil ma tha bona barna... (is a man killed without violation of this particular state of legal security, which homicide results in one wergeld, so shall (the houses of] the killers be burnt down).

E₁ III. 26-8 : Thet hi tian merca scheldich se..... thi *ther fare an otheres wera. and otheres wald...* (that he owes ten marks who moves onto someone else's property or what is in someone else's custody).

There are three more passages that might fit this category, but probably do not. They are:

F XVI. 12-5 : ...also se starf. sa lefde se thet goud. ther se vnt fen hede fonta arra bernum also fir vppa tha letera bern. ther fremde weren. sa se to tham. ther thet goud fon e kemen was *thet weren arra bern*. (...when she died she left the property that she had received from the earlier children in equal proportion to the latter children, who were unrelated, as she did to those from whom the property had come ;/, those/ who were earlier children).

This passage occurs in an article of law referring to the inheritance of property that a woman has acquired on the death of one of her children from a first marriage. When she dies after a second marriage, in which she also had children, the property mentioned just now has to be divided equally among the children, both from the first and the second marriage. The clause (*thet weren arra bern*) has the formal appearance of a main clause. But is it? In theory there are three possibilities: 1. it is a main clause. The subject is the demonstrative pronoun (used substantively) *thet*; the finite verb form does not match the subject in number, but corresponds in this respect with the nominal part of the predicate, which phenomenon also occurs in Modern Frisian and Dutch¹².

2. it is a relative clause. *Thet* is a relative pronoun referring to the plural pronoun *tham*, and the plural finite verb is in accordance with the rule of concord of number between subject and finite verb.

3. it is a relative clause. *Thet* as a relative pronoun refers to the combination *tham* + following relative clause (*ther..... was*); the relative clause (*thet..... bern*) is a non-restrictive one.

Which of these is correct? According to his glossary to F (p. 90) Sjölin considers *thet* to be a demonstrative pronoun, but his translation of this passage (p. 347) suggests it is a relative pronoun. BuEb (p. 155) is not explicit, but seems to imply the first possibility. If 2 were the correct analysis, we would have two relative clauses referring to the same antecedent (*tham*), but without any formal sign of coordination, without deletion and with entirely different relative markers. The third possibility looks a bit far-fetched (see also my comment on the next passage below). The only conclusion left is that the clause under discussion is not a relative one, but there is no certainty.

Another dubious, very similar passage occurs in

F I. 52-3 : Thet is falsche riucht. ther there werde mith thiugum vn fiucht. *thet blindat siande aghene*. (that is false justice that fights truth with witnesses;/, that/which blinds seeing eyes).

This clauses (*thet.....aghene*) has the formal appearance of a main clause, and could well be one, loosely fitting the passage that has just been quoted, acting as a pithy summary of what has been stated before¹³. However, the possibility that it should be analysed as a relative clause referring to *falsche riucht* in line 52 is not entirely to be excluded. If this is the correct interpretation, it is coordinated with the preceding relative clause without a formal coordinator. Besides the two relative clauses would have a different relative marker and show no deletion. Another, semantically plausible, analysis is to see the *thet*-clause as a relative one referring to the preceding clause as its antecedent (making a law null and void by swearing false oaths is what blinds seeing eyes). The only thing against this interpretation is that this would be the only non-restrictive relative clause in Old East Frisian; apart from the one in F XVI. 14-5, not introduced by *ther*.

Finally there is

H₁ IX. 8-9 : and god ief moysi tua stenene tevla *ther was on al thet riucht* ther tha irsahelesca liude heden tha se andere westenese weren. (and God gave Moses two stone tablets;/, on them/which were all the laws that the people of Israel had when they were in the desert).

There is nothing to guide us in deciding what the status of the clause (*ther.....riucht*) is. Of the four very similar passages only one gives this clause as a clearly relative one (R₁ I. 10-1: ..twa stenena tefla *ther hi on eskriuin hede tha tian bodo.*).

In the other three (R₁ II. 7-8; E₁ II. 10-1; F II. 6-7) the corresponding clauses are main clauses, as is the case in a parallel Low German version (Borchling p. 7 lines 6-8): Got vnse here gaff Moyses twee stenen tafelen vp den berch Synay, *daer was*

ynne screuen seentrecht vnde lantrecht... . This fact makes it likely that in H₁, too, the clause under discussion is a main clause. Another indication in the same direction might be that the clause serves as a main clause containing the antecedent to a following compounded subclause. But none of this gives absolute certainty.

3. The large majority of relative clauses in Old East Frisian refer to an antecedent which is a noun(group), both animate and inanimate, of each gender and number, or to a pronoun, in particular masculine singular and plural, and neuter singular ones. The antecedent can also be an adjective used substantively or a numeral; the non-expressed noun can be supplied from the context.

The antecedent can be the non-nucleus part of a word group; this non-nucleus part is usually in the genitive. The relative marker is the particle *ther* as a rule, but can also be the pronoun *thet* (once) or an adverbial word. An example of each is:

E₂ VI. 51-3 : Thervmbe sa agen *thes monnes* holda And tha erwa *ther hi er effalled hede*. sin ield in to nimane...(therefore the relatives and the heirs of the man [= the one who was killed before by the man killed in a battle] whom he [= the one killed in a battle] had killed before, shall receive his wergeld...).

F IV. 10-2:.. ...hit ne se. *thet thi other biade. thera fior nedschinena hwelic. thet ti freia fresa. fon riuchta ach to duane.* (unless the other one may offer one of the four emergency cases which the free Frisian has to do according to the law).

E₂ VIII. 41-3: Hwasa otherem ene blod rennande dede deth vppe howe sa sikerath hi hine mith tha selwa tsiurckfoghetem and mith niughenten *tsurspeles monnem alder hit sken is* (when a man inflicts a bleeding wound upon somebody in the churchyard, so shall he exculpate himself with the same churchwardens and with nineteen men from the parish where it has happened).

A passage to be included in this section, but about which there is some difference of opinion as regards its meaning is:

H₂ VII. 74: ...*enes walebera raf ther mith berde se* ...

If the text is correct, the sense is clear (robbery of a pilgrim who carries his luggage). This is the way BuEb sees it, following in this Von Richthofen (p. 628 of his dictionary). Van Helten (1890, p. 35 note 1) rejects this interpretation, which he calls impermissible (,unstatthaft'). According to him, and to the editor of the H text, Hoekstra, the clause *ther mith berde se* should be put

farther back in the sentence so that it refers to *enre femna* with the obvious meaning ‘robbery of a woman who is with child’. Is this emendation necessary? In other words: can *berde* mean luggage, load to be carried? The answer to the second question is an unqualified yes, witness Holthausen - Hofmann, p. 7, and the various etymological dictionaries of the Germanic dialects. On the basis of all this material it seems to be unnecessary to emend the text in the way Hoekstra has done. However, this H₂ passage is the only one in the entire Old East Frisian material in wich *berde* can have the meaning ‘load, burden’, and this makes the interpretation as BuEb gives it less than fully convincing

In an exceptional passage a relative clause refers to the first element of a compound noun:

B₂ p. 54 line 4: *Lond wixle ther be seten is ier and dei.* (exchange of land that has been in his possession for a year and a day).

The antecedent can be a preceding clause; with one exception the relative clause is introduced by a pronominal adverb; the exception is *ther* in R₂ VI. 15.

An example is:

E₂ VIII.53-4: *ruogiat hia ac ange monne ther thi official se to monat vmbe aenge seke ther se nene werde fon wite...* (do they accuse anyone on account of anything of which they do not know the truth, to which the official urges them...).

It appears that the clause to which the relative clause refers, partly precedes and partly follows it. This gives the relative clause *ther..... monat* the character of a parenthetical one, which prevents confusion with the second relative *ther*-clause in the same context.

4. The usual marker to introduce a relative clause in Old East Frisian is a particle, either *the* or *ther*.

4.1 In addition to its thirteen occurrences in R₁ as a relative marker, the original particle *the* is found as such in R₂ and E₂. It may or may not follow its animate or inanimate antecedent, and it serves as the subject or direct object in its clause. The relevant passages are:

R₂ I. 126-7: *Alle dede the ma deth binetha lemithon. thet send al tian reil merk tho fretha.* (all offences liable to punishment that stay below the level of paralysis, are in all ten marks’ worth of cloth as a compensation for a breach of the peace).

E₂ III. 281-2: *Hwasa bi fiucht iefta berauwet ene frouwe the hia bi iewen heth fon thire rualde...* (whoever assaults or robs a woman who has renounced the world [= who has taken the veil] ...).

A difficult passage is:

E₂ III. 158-9: Thiu sol dede eden ther ne meij ma nene sol dede dua *the* ne se thi hagesta dath swina den

BuEb (1967), p. 118. 117, translates this passage as: ‘man kann keine Sudeltat begehen, wo nicht (zugleich) der Tatbestand der tiefsten Bewußtlosigkeit erfüllt wird’. This is undoubtedly the correct interpretation. The corresponding passages in E₁ VII. 103-4 and E₃ I. 417-8 both stress the fact that one of the aftereffects of a ‘soldede’ is a state of unconsciousness. Munske (1973, § 210) describes a ‘soldede’ as the affliction of a grievous bodily harm resulting in a fainting fit accompanied by vomiting.

In note 107 on p.118 BuEb states that *the* is a weakened form of *tha*, which is taken to be a conjunction, as appears from the way this passage is translated. For the passage to make sense this conjunction must express condition (a crime cannot be considered a ‘soldede’, if not the highest degree of unconsciousness is inflicted). So far, so good; but what unsettles this theory is the fact that *the* (<*tha*). according to the dictionaries and relevant vocabularies does not occur in Old East Frisian as a conjunction introducing an adverbial clause of condition.

Fokkema (E₂, p. 121) calls this *the* a relative particle. He suggests (E₂ p. 24, note 159) the emendation *swina den* -> *swima*. This indeed would solve the problem of how to avoid a certain distortion in the sense, but what justification is there for leaving out (the past participle?) *den*?

Yet I believe that essentially his analysis is the correct one. It is remarkable that the information given in the main clause in E₁ and E₃ is contained in the subclause in E₂, and the other way round. Paraphrasing the Old Frisian text, one could say that E₁ and E₃ stress the fact that the main characteristic of a ‘soldede’ is the victim’s state of unconsciousness, whereas the E₂ passage emphasizes that an action which passes off without a fainting fit cannot be registered as a ‘soldede’. The factual contents are the same, the emphasis is different. The subclause (*the* *den*) is to be regarded as a relative one opening with the marker *the*, and I suggest the following translation for E₂ III. 158-9: Having committed ill-treatment resulting in vomiting and diarrhoea; there one cannot commit a ‘soldede’ which is not done (as) the deepest unconsciousness (= which is not at the same time a deed that causes a state of unconsciousness as if the victim were dead). The relative clause is the semantic equivalent of an adverbial clause expressing condition (see in 4.2 below).

4.2 A high percentage of the relative clauses in Old East Frisian are introduced by the secondary particle *ther*, as appears from the general survey. These *ther*-

clauses can refer to each of the antecedents listed in section 3. *Ther* can have various functions in its clause, as will be discussed farther on in this article. An unusual passage that deserves special attention is:

H₂ XXIII 109-10: ...and hokne sa hi sziase *ther him thinszie theret aller best duan muge*. Thet skel stede wesa. (... and whomever he chooses who it seems to him who can do it best of all [= who is best of all in his opinion], that shall be decisive).

This passage contains two paratactic relative clauses back to the antecedent *hokne*, an (accusative singular) indefinite pronoun referring to a (masculine) person. The semantic relationship between the two *ther*-clauses is that of main clause and subordinate (object) clause ('he thinks he can do it best of all'). And so it appears that a relative clause could be used in Old Frisian where Modern Frisian would probably have a *dat*clause.

This is the only example of this phenomenon in Old East Frisian. It also occurs in Old West Frisian, as is demonstrated by e.g. Fr. Br. p. 36, lines 30-2 and CoRo XLV. 15. For the same phenomenon in Middle Dutch see Stoett (1923), p. 41 § 65.

The finite verb in the first of these clauses is an optative form of the impersonal verb *thinza*. This verb is complemented by a *that*-clause, according to Rolf H. Bremner Jr. (The so-called 'Impersonal verb' construction in Old Frisian, in NOWELE, vol. 8, September 1986, p. 77). It appears from this passage that in particular circumstances the complement can be a *ther*-clause.

Sometimes a relative *ther*-clause is the semantic equivalent of an adverbial clause, often expressing a reason or condition. An example is:

F IV. 7-9 : Gef hi werne thria riuchtes thingis. and hi tha thria liudthing bi vr mode. and bi dulla stride vr sitte. *ther him fontes keninges halm beden send to haldene...* (if he refuses to attend three legitimate court sessions and he neglects the three people's sessions because of presumption and foolish quarrel, which he has been ordered to observe on the part of the king...).

The relative clause, besides qualifying certain duties a Frisian has to observe, also gives the reason why these cannot be neglected: it is on the authority of the king that he has been called upon to perform them.

The opposite phenomenon, an adverbial clause that is the semantic equivalent of a relative clause, occurs as well. The coordinating conjunction *and*, either by itself or in combination with a personal pronoun, may be used in a relative function, as appears from passages like:

E₁ IV. 196-7: Alder se en wif on efuchten. *And hiu se mith berde. And hiu hire den nebbe blodelsa...* (when a woman is attacked, and she is with child, and she on her part has not inflicted a bleeding wound...).

Formally this is a set of three coordinated subordinate clauses. Semantically, however, the second and the third qualify the wif mentioned in the first, and in this context the second and third clauses are the semantic equivalents of a relative clause. The conjunction *and* together with the subject *hiu* could be replaced by a relative marker serving as the subject of its clause.

H₂ III. 49-51: Sa en mon sie blenda sinne friund *andere him binna tha thredda knisues se.* end hi fiuchte thruch sin soth. dat ieftha dolch ieftha bethe... (if a man sees his relative being blinded, and he is related to him within the third degree, and he commits manslaughter or injury or both by fighting because of this relative's claim. . .) .

The italicized clause gives a qualification of the degree of kinship, in other words is the semantic equivalent of a relative clause. ('his relative who is related to him within the third degree'). In both the E₁ (IV. 91) and F (IV. 85) versions of the ninth Statute the relationship between the members of the family concerned is expressed by means of a (relative) *ther*-clause.

Something similar, to mention just one more example, occurs in:

B₂ p. 100 line 9 : ...and fenszen lond. *and sex ier bi seten se.* (...and land reclaimed from the common pasture which has been held for six years).

The subject (expressed or implied) of these adverbial clauses is the object (grammatical or logical) of the clause that is qualified by the *and*-clause. The *and*-clauses used in this function invariably have the character of a restrictive relative clause. For this phenomenon in Old Frisian see especially Van Helten (1907), p. 16. The phenomenon also occurs in Old English, as is illustrated in Bosworth-Toller, *Supplement* (1955 reprint), p. 38, *and*, III. For Middle Dutch see Stoett (1923), § 68.

That an adverbial clause and a relative clause sometimes border on each other semantically can be inferred from the comparison of, for example, the following two passages:

B₂ p. 18 lines 12-3: ...sa skelma hine on spreca thes selwa deis *ther hi ret anda warwe* (...so a complaint shall be lodged against him on the very day on which he gives his verdict in the court);

B₂ p. 20 lines 14-6: ...hi nebbene fon e skirad thes selwa deis *tha thi other bi wernad wart.* (...unless he has detached himself from the verdict of the others on the very day when a security was given against the other).

It is clear that both passages are very similar. Yet the first is a relative clause opening with the (adverbial) relative marker *ther*, whereas the second is an adverbial clause opening with a conjunction.

5. A relative clause can be introduced by a pronoun; these pronouns were originally demonstrative or interrogative ones. As such occur *thi*, *thet*, *tha*, *thera*; and *hwet*.

5.1. *Thi* refers to a masculine singular noun or pronoun; it serves as the subject in its clause. An example of each is:

- E₁ IV. 146-8: ... Sa istet riucht Allera fresena. Thet tet god. And thi fiamanda mith riuchte and mith triuwem gader stonde. *thi ther mit triuwem gadere set se* (... so it is the right of all Frisians that the possession and the common property which has been brought together there according to an agreement, will stand together with justice and as agreed upon).
- R₂ I. 107-8: alsa hit thruch thet lif ekimin is sin kere *thi thene skatha heth*. (when it [= the weapon] has pierced the body, his choice who has the damage).

In this second passage the relative clause refers to the person implied by the possessive pronoun in the noun phrase, which serves as its antecedent. Originally the possessive pronoun of the third person singular was the genitive of the personal pronoun. This means that here we have come across another example of the phenomenon mentioned in section 3, to wit that a relative clause can refer to the non-nucleus part (in the genitive) of a noun phrase, a phenomenon that is familiar in this stage of the language. The same phenomenon occurs in Old English (Mitchell, 1985, § 296), and in Middle Dutch (Stoett, 1923, § 58).

5.2. *Thet* is by far the most frequently used relative pronoun. It usually refers to a neuter singular pronoun (*al, alle, ol*) or pronominal combination. In one passage it refers to a non-neuter singular noun and in two passages to a plural noun or a combination of nouns. It serves as the subject or direct object of the clause in which it occurs. The passages in which *thet* refers to a non-neuter or plural noun are:

- F V. 47-8: and magnus spreket hit mitha munde vt ther stena teula. *thet god her Moyses ief vp tha birge to synai*. (and Magnus spoke it with the mouth in accordance with the stone table which God gave the lord Moses on mount Sinai).
- F IV. 10-2: ...hit ne se. thet thi other biade. thera fior nedschinena hwellic. *thet ti freia fresa. fon riuchta ach to duane*. (...unless the other one may offer one of the four emergency cases which the free Frisian has to do in accordance with the law).
- F XIX, 5-6: Sa ach (h)i him to yr bonnane thingslitene. dernsone. sunderacht. an vn hlest. *thetter en mon dwe bi halua iuwe orleue*. (so you have to forbid him to interrupt the lawsuit through premature departure, clandestine reconciliation, underhand consultation and disturbance of the peace, which a man may cause without your permission).

5.3 *Tha* as a relative pronoun occurs only once; it refers to a masculine plural noun, and serves as the subject of its clause:

H₂ II. 45-6: ...sa scelen suera fiwer ethele men. end fiwer fri men *tha se ein erua...*
(...so shall swear four noble men, and four free men who are the owners of hereditary property...).

5.4 *Thera* may occur as a relative pronoun, but only once; if so it refers to a masculine plural noun, and in a genitival plural form is part of the subject in its clause:

E₁ II. 44-5 : Thit [= thisse] fiuwer and fiuwerthech kenenga and othere moneghe. *thera send alle soghentech* hebbet to rume kenengar ewesen (these forty-four kings and many others, of whom there are seventy in all, have been kings at Rome).

Sipma, (E₁, Vocabulary, p.123), registers this *thera* as the genitive plural of the demonstrative pronoun *thi*. This implies that the clause *thera..... soghentech* is taken to be independent, a parenthetic one. This is not impossible, although one would have expected this clause to begin with the nominative plural *tha* or *thisse*. Another and more natural possibility is to regard it as a relative clause opening with the genitive plural form of the relative pronoun *thi*. None of the corresponding passages in other texts (R₁, H₁, F) has a comparable construction.

5.5 The originally interrogative pronoun *hwet* (*huet*) is used in a relative function, but only rarely so, and always in combination with *sa*; it refers to a neuter singular pronoun, and serves as the subject or direct object of the clause which it opens. An example is:

B₂ p. 78 line 18 - p. 80 line 1: sa skel hi thes wachtia *hwetsa hi deth* (so shall he be responsible for that which he [= the foreigner] commits).

5.6 Summarizing we can say that pronouns are not prominent at all as relative markers in Old East Frisian; that they introduce restrictive relative clauses only; and that they function as either subject (or part of it) or direct object. *Thet* is by far the most frequently used relative pronoun; its reference is not limited to neuter singular antecedents.

6. A relative clause can be introduced by an adverb or an adverbial combination. As such adverbs occur *ther* (*alder*, *aldeer*, *older*), *thana* and *sa*. Adverbial combinations in this function are pronominal adverbs the first element of which is *ther*, exceptionally *alder*.

6.1 The adverb *ther* used as a relative marker (in E₂ it is *alder*, *aldeer*, *older*) can have a local denotation: it refers back to an antecedent which indicates a location, directly and sometimes indirectly.

An example is:

H2 XXII. 9-11: Etta warue *ther alle hunesgena redgeuan hiara warf ledzie* fon there sunna up tocht. thet etmel al vmbe to tha warue to farane, ther te wesane. and wither to hus te cumane. thine frethe to haldane. (at the session of the court, where all the magistrates in Hunsingo determine to sit, people shall observe the peace from sunrise and twenty-four hours after it..... in order to travel to court, to be there, and to go back home).

The subclause in this passage is a relative clause on formal grounds. Antecedent + relative clause indicate the location where a certain activity is supposed to take and consequently - together with the preposition in question - serve as an adverbial adjunct. The same is true of two more passages in which the antecedent is not expressed, but used implicitly:

E₂ VIII 58-9: bi lift hi othere sex wikem inna bonne sa bi slaijt ma tha tsiurca *alder hi vnat*. (does he remain excommunicated for another six weeks, the church where he lives should be laid under an interdict).

R₂ V. 66-8 : sa skillath him alle tha riuchtera..... umbe alrek honda seka eta warue *ther thi fiuchtere eseten is* elle skeldich hlia. (so shall all the judges declare him fully guilty because of whatever case in the court of which the fighter is a resident).

It is obvious that in these passages the relative clause does not refer to the church or the court, but to the village or town in which this church is located or the session of the court is held.

In the passages quoted so far in this section there is a formal justification for regarding the relevant subclauses as relative ones. This justification becomes very thin, or disappears altogether, in the following passages:

F VIII. 78-9: ...sa ach hi him efter him to lathiane to thrim tzurkum *alder hi thenne then sind halt* (so he ought to summon him after him to three churches where he holds the church court then).

Formally the clause *alder..... halt* might still be considered a relative one, opening with the adverb *alder* for its marker. Its semantic function, however, is not so much a qualification of the antecedent (*thrim tzurkum*) as an indication of the activity that is to take place in them.

F XXI. 107-8 : Alra monnic sin goud. and sine schira. dam to lene. and tho burge dwe. *alder thet ield rethe se* (everybody can leave his property and his utensils as a loan and on credit to him where the money is available).

The subordinate clause *alder..... se* can be regarded as a relative one referring to *dam* (= him), which indicates a location in an indirect way (= the house, the farm, the owner of sufficient security).

One step farther away from a relative clause proper is *ther..... scriwan* in:

F XI. 653-4: Ist a orna kemen *therma tha wederwonnia ach to scriwan*. sa scemma se ther to scriwa. bi xxiiij scill. (has it [= the burn] come somewhere else where one has to charge a fine because of susceptibility to a change in the weather, so shall one charge the amount of twenty-four shillings for it).

See for the meaning of *a orna* Sjölin, F p. 177. It is clear that the clause *therma..... scriwan* is not a relative one in the proper sense of the term, as it is characteristic of such a clause that it qualifies a nominal or pronominal antecedent or the statement made in a preceding clause (see section 3 of this article), whereas here it refers to an adverbial element of the preceding clause. However, this adverbial component could be easily replaced by a nominal synonym, for example by 'to a position', or 'to that part of the body', in which case the clause (*therma..... scriwan*) is a relative one with the adverb *ther* for its marker.

A comparable passage is:

H₂ VII. 326-7: Uersa en frowe ut ge belt is end hiut nowet bi tiucht. sa ach thet god in til weruane alther *ther hit fonge kemen is*. (where a woman has been given her trousseau and she does not give birth, the property goes in there where it has come from).

If *alther* were to be replaced by an equivalent phrase, e.g. 'that place', the clause *ther..... is* could be considered a relative clause opening with the relative adverb *ther*.

Finally there is the passage

F XI. 667: Slaudolch ne achma nout to to scriwane *ther nen domman a twisc is*.

The translation of the passage causes some difficulty because of lack of agreement between the plural noun *domman* (sing. *dom*), which is the subject, and the finite verb is¹⁴. The English equivalent is: Burns one ought not to register [as separate wounds] between which there is [or:

are] no sound part [or: parts] [of the skin separating them].

According to Sjölin *ther* is a relative adverb (Vocabulary to *F*, p. 88) and *atwisk(a)* an adverb (Voc., p. 11). Does this mean that he sees the clause *ther...is* as an adverbial one beginning with the independent relative adverb *ther*? His translation points to his seeing it as a relative clause. Is it not more natural then to see the combination *ther a twisc* as a pronominal adverb (between which); it is true that *atwisk(a)* as a preposition is rare, but it does occur in Old Frisian (e.g. in charter 259, 1.4. in volume II of P. Sipma, *Oudfriesche Oorkonden*, 's-Gravenhage 1933). In my opinion the subclause in this passage should be regarded as a relative one with the pronominal adverb *ther a twisc* for its marker.

The adverb *ther* used as a relative marker can also have a temporal denotation. It will appear that this relative adverb *ther* denoting time is rendered into English by means of a pronominal adverb. For relative *ther* denoting location translation by means of a pronominal adverb is one of the alternatives. A few examples are:

R₂ VI. 3-4: ...and hof fretho fon tha houï. and to tha houï. alle hachtida *ther ma thes godis hus seke*. (...and peace of the churchyard on the way from and on the way to the churchyard on all the holy days on which one ought to attend church).

H2 XXIII.24-5: Hwasa thes thunres deys *ther redgeuan swerath et ulderna domme etta warue*. Ieftha on there to fere. Ieftha on there fon fere enne mon sle... (who kills a man on the Thursday on which the magistrates swear [their oath of office] at Onderdendam, in court or on the way there or on the way from it ...).

6.2 The relative adverb is *thana*. The only occurrence is in R₁ IX. 36.

6.3 There is only one passage in which the adverb *sa* is used in clearly relative function. This passage is:

F VI. 27-9: ..sa ach thi persona then alter him to bi felane. and tha tzurka. boka. stola. ompel and fona. and alle thet goud. *sa ther binna is to hudan. therma godis thianst mithe framma schol*. (...then the pastor has to delegate to him the altar and the church, books, stole, ample and standard and all the property that has to be guarded in there, with which God's service has to be performed).

This passage contains two relative clauses. The first (*sa... hudan*) qualifies the neuter singular noun *goud*;

the second (*therma..... schol*) qualifies the combination noun + relative clause *goud..... hudan*. The first is a restrictive relative clause, the second a non-restrictive one. Theoretically there is the possibility that both relative clauses qualify the same antecedent (*goud*). In that case there is no formal sign of coordination, there is no deletion, and the relative markers in these clauses are different.

6.4 A pronominal adverb in relative function occurs frequently. The adverbial part is *ther*, with only two exceptions (*alder* in B₂ p. 80 line 2 and E₁ VIII. 93). With only one exception *ther* is separated from the rest of the pronominal adverb by minimally one word. The exception occurs in B₂ p. 44 line 3 (*ther fon*). The following combinations occur: *ther...atwisc* (1), *ther...bi* (2), *ther... binna* (1), *ther...fon* (15), *ther...mithe*, *mithi* (12), *ther(alder)...on*, *one* (6), *ther...oppa*, *oppe*, *up*, *vppa*, *vppe*, *wppa* (7), *ther...to* (3), *ther(alder)...umbe*, *vmbe* (8), *ther...under* (2).

The usual reference is to an inanimate noun. It is in two passages only that the pronominal adverb refers to an animate noun:

B₂ p. 4 lines 8-10: Hwersama sprech vmbe werna. hia se lessa ieftha marra. and se bi iecht to fara sine eyne redieva *ther se vnder stonde inna there herna...* (when a person complains about pledges, be they smaller or greater, and they are conceded [by the accused] in the presence of his own magistrate under whose jurisdiction they fall...).

F XX.6 : Sa thi feder sterft. *ther se fon e kemen sen...* (when the father dies from whom they are descended...).

In a number of passages the reference is indirectly to a person via a pronoun, either a demonstrative or (once) a personal pronoun. They are:

E₂ VIII. 98-9: ... Hwara allena sijn skeldenat ieftha thene *ther hi ene riuchte tele oppa hebbe* (...but only his debtor or the one against whom he has a just complaint).

F XXI.16: Jef hi bi seke *ther thio bare vppe gant*. (if he denies against whom the charge is laid).

Similarly B₂ p. 42 line 7; F VIII. 87-8, XVI. 12-4, and probably also XI. 571.

In one passage the reference is to a personal pronoun indicating a person who is not seen as a particular individual, but as the representative of his line of descent:

E₃ V. 166-7: sa nime thi thet *ther hit bi kniaia muge anda ther hit fon kemen se* (then the one take it who can lay claim to it on the strength of nearer relationship and from whom [= from whose side] it has come).

In a number of passages a relative clause with a pronominal adverb for its marker refers to a preceding clause, as in

E₁ VIII. 78-80: ... hit ne se thet thiū moder gheselt ieftha sette hebbe thruch therā thirā hauued nede huuelic *ther hiu thes liuues mithe behulpe*.
(...unless the mother has sold or mortgaged the property because of one of the three cases of emergency, through which she saved its [= the child's] life).

6.5 Does the phenomenon of the unIntroduced relative clause occur in Old East Frisian? An example in point seems to be:

E₁ IV. 12-3: Thet sint (thre) geldene pennengar *Andere rednathes menta gheslaghen se* (these are three gold pennies struck in Rednath's mint).

This looks like an example of a non-introduced relative clause, but it is practically certain that there is something wrong with the text. Compare the parallel passage H₁ XI. 12-3: thet send thre geldene pennengar ande there rednathes menta islein. By leaving out *se* the clause changes into a participial construction, which occurs regularly in Old East Frisian. Another possible emendation would be the addition of (the relative particle) *ther*, as is suggested by both Sipma (E₁ p. 62 note 13) and BuEb p. 29 note 71). This emendation makes the clause a regular restrictive relative one. Either emendation is all the more plausible as the clause as it stands would be the only illustration of the type of clause under discussion.

7. In a number of 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. As such independent relative markers occur the particle *ther*, the pronouns *thi*, *thet*, *hwa* and *hwet*, and adverbial *ther*.

7.1. The independent relative particle *ther* (once spelled *ter*) has three different meanings: 'he who', 'those who' and 'that which, what'. An example of each:

E₃ V. 162-3: ... sa bi halde thet lond *ther* hit erst e kapad anda vor gulden heth... (so keep the land he who has first bought it and paid for it ...).

F II. 16-7: ...And *ther* efter christus berde weren. (and those who were after Christ's birth).

F VIII. 25-6: Sa ach hi an fulla synd to wrogiane. *ther* him sin prester. and sine buran redath. (so he has to censure in the full churchcourt what his priest and his neighbours mention).

There are a few passages that at first sight seem to qualify for inclusion in this section, but actually do not, e.g.

B₂ p. 30 lines 1-2: sa felle *thit ther* tha dede deth.

B₂ p. 42 lines 14-5: sa felle *thine frethe ther* tha case halad heth.

There is little doubt that in these two passages *thit* and *thine* are the result of contraction, of *thi hit* and *thi thene* respectively; so it appears that each subclause in these passages is a restrictive relative clause having the particle *ther* for its marker and referring to the pronoun *thi*.

Another passage that seems to belong in this section is:

E₂ IX. 109-11: Huersama then brond inna thet hus stat And hir barne fon fe husa iefta fele husa sa skeppeth tha bare *ther* thi brond olrerst on estat is. (when somebody sets the house on fire and because of this few or many houses are burnt down, so determine the charge for compensation he who [se house] has been set on fire first of all).

This is what Fokkema considers the correct interpretation (E₂, Vocabulary, see for *skeppa*, p. 118, and for *ther*, p. 121). However, the verb *skeppa* occurs as a third person singular optative, which requires the form *skeppe*. Therefore the emendation 'skeppeth = skeppe thi', as suggested by BuEb (p. 159 note 362), is most likely correct and *ther* in E₇ IX. 110 is a relative particle referring to *thi* as its antecedent. Compare E₂ IX. 113 (...*thi ther* thi brond olrerst on estat is...).

Finally there is:

F VIII. 120-3: Thit is riucht. thet tha Capella papan thiania schen mitha haudprestere. alder ney *ther* hiara goud to leit. sa schen hia thianst dwan. *ther* nanne decma vnt fatht. and ti nanne decma vn feth. thine thor nanne thianst dwan.

This passage consists of two parts: 1. This is the law: that the priests of the chapel shall serve with the main priest; in accordance with what their office brings in, so shall they do service; 2. and the one who does not receive tithe, he does not need to do service.

In between these two parts, not really belonging to either, we find the clause under discussion (*ther nanne decma vnt fatht*). This must have been added, for example as Sjölin suggests in note 122 on p. 278, as a kind of commentary in the margin, which then was incorporated into the text somehow. This is more plausible than Van Helten's (1907, p. 326) solution; he suggests an emendation on the basis of a comparison with an Old West Frisian parallel text.

7.2 *Thi*, once spelled *ti*, meaning 'he who', occurs only a few times. An example is:

B₂ p. 98 lines 18-20: *Thit* [= *thi* hit] ered and esen heth *thi* nimene fech thes ieres. and *thi* ther *thet* lond ekapad heth ieftha wixlad *thi* nime tha hera. (he who has ploughed and sown it, he take the produce of the year, and he who has bought or exchanged the land, he take the rent).

It appears that the independent relative pronoun is part of a word that is the result of contraction. In the parallel construction in the same passage (*thi ther thet lond ekapad heeth ieftha wixlad*), *thi* serves as the antecedent to a following relative clause.

7.3 *Thet* as an independent relative pronoun means 'what, that which'. An example is:

E₃ V.8: *thet* ik fon *thi* capad hebbe *thet* heb ik *thi* al bi taled (what I have bought from you, that I have paid you fully).

7.4 *Hwa*, also spelled *hua* or *wa*, as an independent relative means 'he who, the one who'. It appears that this independent relative is invariably followed by *sa*, which gives the pronoun a more indefinite connotation. An example is:

F XXII. 98-9: and *hwam* *sa* *thi* abbit *thet* iewe mith *tham* *ther* *hi* *ther* to nime. and *hwam* *sa* *hi* *kiase*. *thi* scol stede *wesa* and *fest*. (and to whom the abbot gives it with those whom he takes for this purpose, and whom he chooses, he shall be uncorrupted and steady).

7.5 *Hwet*, also spelled *huet*, as an independent relative means 'what, that which'. It may be followed by *sa*, but usually is not.

An example is:

E₃ V. 270; *ist* *nawt* *sa* *halder* *monnic* *huet* *hi* hebbe (is nothing there so must everyone keep what he has).

An other passage in point is:

F III. 151-2: An *alra* *monna* *lic* *him* *sellum* *withe* *inna* *tha* *withum* *hwet* *hi* *den* hebbe. (and everyone shall know for himself on the relics what he has done).

A passage that is almost identical to this F passage is:

E₁ III. 130-1: And *allera* *monna* *huelic* *witet* *him* *seluem* *anda* *withem*. *huet* *hi* *eden* hebbe.

The only real difference is that in the E₁ passage the main clause formally contains an antecedent (*t*, added enclitically to the optative verbal form *wite*) to which the clause opening with *huet* refers. However, the enclitic position of the antecedent *t* proves that it has little or no prominence, and was probably no longer felt to be the antecedent to a following clause, which means that the *huet*-clause could be considered an object clause with an independent relative pronoun for its opening word. This phenomenon occurs more often, e.g. in H₂ II. 114-5, and similarly E₂ IX. 153.

A passage that might be relevant in this section is:

R₂ II. 56-7: Sa hach use frana mith vse capmonnon withir an tha stede to farande sin god opa tha heligon to swerande *hwes* sin god werth were (then our magistrate with our merchants shall go back to the site [where the infringement took place], [each] to swear on the relics concerning his merchandise what its value was).

Von Richthofen, in his *Friesische Rechtsquellen* (p. 539 line 8) gives *hwet*, as does Hoekstra (1940, p. 140 line 2). This is incorrect, since *werth* is accompanied by a genitive. See for this e.g. R₁ XIX. 8-9: ... thruch thet. thetet alter is *thera erana wel werth*. The same is true of the equivalent in Old English (*weorþ*, Bosworth-Toller, p. 1199; Mitchell I, p. 202, § 1331); Middle English (*wurþe*, *worthe*, Mustanoja, p. 87); and Middle Dutch (*wert*, *werdich*, Stoett, § 174). Buma (R₂, Vocabulary, p. 108) registers this *hwes* as the genitive singular form of the neuter interrogative pronoun. One might also see it as an independent relative: the merchants had to make a most solemn statement about the value of certain goods; they have to mention something under oath, viz. the amount that (= that which) was their value¹⁵.

7.6 Sometimes the adverb *ther* occurs in an independent relative position; this adverb is usually spelled *der* when it is used in combination with intensifying *al*, which is the case in the majority of the relevant passages. A few examples are:

R₂ VIII. 33-4: Sa hwersa thi hodere firor te. tha thi redieua hlie. tha hi nawet tia nelle *ther* him thi redieua hlie. (when the constable goes further than the magistrate orders, [or] when he does not want to go where [= there were] the magistrate orders him to).

E₁ VIII.11: sa ach thet god in to hueruane *alder* hit ut egeuen is. (so the property ought to fall to where it has been given out).

8. In Old East Frisian the relative marker serves in its clause as subject or, to a lesser degree, object, or it has an adverbial function. Among the objects the direct object is the largest category by far, but there are also indirect and prepositional objects and occasionally objects in the genitive. With one exception (E₁ II. 17-8, see under 8.3) the relative marker to occur as an indirect object or an object in the genitive is the particle *ther*. The only markers to serve as a prepositional object are some pronominal adverbs.

8.1 Two examples of *ther* as an indirect object are:

R₂ II. 35-7: Thet send ethelinga alle fria frisa *ther* thi kining kerl and thi pagus leo and thi bishop liudgere etheldom and fria halse ouir lendon. (those are 'nobles': all free Frisians to whom king Charles and pope Leo and bishop Liudger granted 'nobility' and freedom).

F XIII. 29-30: and lowat tham betringa *ther* thi schada den is. (and promise compensation to him to whom the damage has been done).

And similarly B₂ p. 34 lines 9-10, p. 54 line 3, p. 94 lines 6-8; E₂ IX. 110-1, 113; E₃ V. 143, 243-4; F VII. 46-8.

A passage that resembles E₂ IX. 110-1 (see under 7.1) and 113, and E₃ V. 143 very much is B₂ p. 94 lines 1-2: sa skeppe thi tha bare *ther* him thi brond alra erest on stet is. The essential difference is that in the B₂ passage *ther* is accompanied by the personal pronoun *him*. This pronoun conforms with the person and number of the antecedent, but its case (which it shares with the relative marker) is decided by its function in the relative clause. Compare R₁ IV. 185-6.

8.2 Most pronominal adverbs have an adverbial function in the clauses in which they appear. Sometimes, however, they serve as a prepositional object. This is the case in clauses in which the preposition (i.e. the second part of the pronominal adverb) is closely attached to the verb or verbal phrase. It should be noted, though, that it is not always easy to distinguish a prepositional object from an adverbial adjunct. Some examples are:

E₂ IX.1: Hijr bi ginnath tha domar *ther* alle amsgane *bi* rekeniat (Here begin the statutory regulations with which all the people of Emsingo comply).

F VII. 12-4; ... hit ne se thet hi swera wol. thet hi thisse achte seka eng vn for waret se. *ther* hio him *fon* huda scolde.(...unless he wants to swear that he has not been guarded from one of these eight cases from which she should guard him).

8.3 An example of *ther* as a genitive object is:

E₁ IV. 181-3: and hi ach to betane. And the fellane. ief hi hebba mey sines vnriuchta hera fia. alle tigtega. *therma* him betigath. (and if he can have the money of his wrong doing master, he has to compensate and pay for all the charges which are brought against him [lit. for all the accusations of which he is accused]).

In two passages *ther* combines with a possessive pronoun to indicate that the relative marker is in a genitive relation to its antecedent. The possessive pronoun follows *ther* immediately. They are:

E₂ p. 52 lines 13-5: and thi redieua skel thet wita *ther sin* berielda sprech thetter cap den se. (and that shall declare officially the magistrate whose subject [= a man living in his jurisdiction] asserts that the bargain has been struck).

H₂ VII. 185-6: Sa achma tham thene thredda pennig to rekane. tha knapa *ther sin* feder sa afte dede (then one has to grant the third part to him, the son whose father gave her in marriage).

In one passage the genitive object is the plural form of a relative pronoun:

E₁ II. 17-8: thet hede aller honda smaka. and allerhonda suethma *thera* hira herte gerade. iefta tragdade. (that [= the manna] had all kinds of taste and all kinds of sweetness, which their heart desired and wanted).

9. Two coordinated relative clauses may show deletion. This phenomenon is usually limited to the relative marker, but may include other clause elements. In the large majority of the relevant passages there is identical deletion: the non-expressed relative marker in the second of the coordinated clauses has the same function as the one in the first. With one exception the relative marker is *ther*. The exception occurs in:

E₃ I. 258: Alle *thetma* wiwem deth anda ma mith saxe deth... (all that is caused to women and is done with a knife...). The parallel passage in E₁ (VII.248) runs: Alle *theth therma* frouuen deth and ma mith saxe deth....

Deletion of the relative marker with a different function (non-identical deletion) is basically limited to three passages of which there exist slightly differing versions in the parallel texts. They are:

E₁ III. 55-6: ... mith fiuwer letslachta *ther* er eyn ebern weren. and↓ fri halse ouer ieuen se (... with four serfs who were born unfree before and to whom freedom has been granted).

E₁ IV. 16-8: Thit sint tha fiuwer nedskin. *ther* thi fria fresa hine *mithe* biskirma mey. And↓ thi kening kerl selua sette. (these are the four cases of 'force majeure' with which the free Frisian can protect himself, and which king Charles himself established).

E₁ IV. 51-2: Thet lond *ther thu* mi *umbe* to tinghe lathast And ↓↓ to mi ascast. (that land for which you summon me to court and which you demand from me).

Two coordinated relative clauses do not necessarily show deletion whether identical or non-identical, as appears from the following examples:

E₂ VI. 68-9: sa mugen hia..... nima ana orne rediewa *ther* him nest se *ther* mitha prestere thet bitiuge. (so they can take another magistrate who is closest to them, who proves it with the priest).

These two relative clauses, although contiguous and qualifying the same antecedent, are not formally connected by a conjunction. The first is a restrictive relative clause, second a non-restrictive one. Another interpretation is to see the second *ther*-clause as qualifying the combination noun + relative clause (*rediewa.... se*). A similar example occurs in F XXI. 60-1. The relative markers in these clauses have the same grammatical function.

E₃ V. 166-7: sa nime thi thet *ther* hit bi kniaia muge anda *ther* hit *fon* kemen se (see also 6.4).

The prospective buyer of land must meet two requirements: 1. he must be related to the seller, and after this has been established, 2. he must be the one closest related within this category. The deletion, if it had been there, would have been non-identical. And similarly in

H₂ XXIII, 102-4: ... sa nime thi riuchta elmetha....thene selua..... *theret on* here. *ther* him allere best hacie. (...so the voting members of the community must choose the one whom it [= the office] befits, who pleases them best of all).

10. As was stated in section 6.3 there is only one passage in which the adverb *sa* is used in a clearly relative function. Throughout the Old Frisian texts there are a number of passages in which *sa* (sometimes *alsa*) has somewhat the character of a relative marker in clauses that qualify an antecedent which is also qualified by an adjectival word(group) stressing comparison or degree. An example of each of these combinations figuring in the Old Frisian texts is:

B₂ p. 12 lines 12-4: sa biwerie thi helgenamon thet mith tuelf ethum oppa *hoke* helgum *sama* him tofara brendze. (so the churchwarden confirm that officially with twelve oaths on what relics that are brought before him).

E₁ VII 250-1: al tha botha skelma lasta bi *al sa dene* penninghem *sa* tha liude bigripen. and bilowat hebbat. (all the fines shall be paid in such pennies as the people have determined and undertaken to do).

F XXI. 40-1: thet hi him *alsa thene* deda hebbe den *alsa* hi him schele beta. (that he has caused him such injury as he shall compensate him).

E₁ II. 1-2: Hir is eskriwen thet wi *al sellech* lond riucht halde *sa* god seluua ereste bad.

(here is written that we shall observe all such justice in this land as God himself ordered before).

Among these combinations *alsa dene...sa* is very numerous.

In one passage *sa* is used in the function of a relative adverb:

E₁ II. 12-4: Tha weren hya andere westene fiuwerthech gera. *sa* nauder hira hauled ne serade. hira wede ne saluade. (then they were in the desert for forty years in which their heads were not painful nor their garments faded) [lit. head was etc.]

11. The data recorded so far in the various sections might give the reader the impression that there are many trees, but make him wonder if there is a wood, and if so what does it look like? Therefore I have tried to compose a general survey with exact numbers and percentages so that the overall picture can be taken in more easily. I realize that such a survey is not without its risks: the exact figures of occurrences and accompanying percentages suggest a rigid and easily analysable system. This is by no means the case. Mainly due to uncertainties about the reliability of certain passages it is sometimes necessary to make a choice from a number of alternatives. These dubious cases have been recorded and I have accounted for the result of my analysis. This does not detract, though, from the general usefulness of such a survey for establishing trends.

12. On the basis of this article, and a preceding one dealing with the data in the first *Riustringer Codex*, the following general conclusions can be drawn:

1. About 90% of the relative clauses in Old East Frisian are restrictive ones.
2. Non-restrictive relative clauses in Old East Frisian are syntactically indistinguishable from restrictive ones.
3. In roughly four out of every five relative clauses the relative marker is a particle; in H and F this percentage is even higher.
4. Approximately half of the remaining relative markers are relative pronouns and the other half adverbial elements, with notable exceptions for E₂, H and F, in which introduction by a pronoun is infrequent.
5. The percentage of adverbial elements as markers is roughly constant throughout the texts with the exception of E₂, in which it is higher than in the other texts.
6. The phenomenon of the non-introduced relative clause is non-existent.
7. In roughly two out of every three instances the relative clause follows its antecedent immediately.

	TEXT	R ₁	R ₂	B ₂	E ₁	E ₂	E ₃	H ₂ (1)	F
N	→	116=100%	47 =100%	110=100%	59 =100%	87 =100%	51 =100%	92 =100%	160=100%
P ₁	THE	13 = 11%	1 = 2%			2 = 2%			
P ₂	THER	72 = 62%	35 = 75%	88 = 80%	44 = 75%	65 = 75%	38 = 74%	77 = 84%	131= 82%
PRONOUN	THI THEET THA THERA HWEET	2 12 } =13% 1	1 3 } = 8%	10 } =10% 1	3 4 } = 13% 1	2 2 } = 2%	5 5 } = 14% 2	1 1 } = 2%	5 5 } = 3%
ADVERBIAL	LOC. THER TEMP. THER THANA SA PRON. ADVERB	3 1 1 } =14% 11	1 2 4 } = 15%	3 8 } = 10%	7 7 } = 12%	7 11 } = 21%	1 5 } = 12%	3 2 8 } = 14% 14	6 3 1 } =15% 14
REL. CLAUSE FOLLOWS ANTECE- DENT	IMMEDI- ATELY NOT IMMEDI- ATELY	95 = 82%	33 = 70%	65 = 60%	42 = 71%	63 = 72%	31 = 61%	62 = 67%	109= 68%
FUNCTION IN RELA- TIVE CLAUSE	SUBJECT DIRECT OBJECT INDIRECT OBJECT PREPOSI- TIONAL OBJECT GENITIVE OBJECT ADVERBIAL	71 = 61% 24 = 21% 5 = 4%	24 = 51% 15 = 32% 1 = 2%	83 = 75% 12 = 11% 4 = 4%	27 = 46% 23 = 39%	43 = 50% 24 = 28% 2 = 2%	33 = 64% 10 = 20% 2 = 4%	52 = 56% 27 = 30% 1 = 1%	94 = 59% 39 = 24% 4 = 2%
		16 = 14%	7 = 15%	11 = 10%	7 = 12%	15 = 17%	5 = 10%	12 = 13%	20 =12%

N = NUMBER OF RELATIVE CLAUSES P₁ = ORIGINAL PARTICLE P₂ = SECONDARY PARTICLE

8. The function of the relative marker in its clause is that of subject in almost to considerably more than half of the clauses¹⁶.

6713 PR Ede
Beatrixlaan 7

NOTES:

1. The texts to be analysed for this survey have been taken from the various volumes in the series *Oudfriese Taal- en Rechtsbronnen*: volumes VIII (R₂), V (B₁₊₂), IV (E₁), VII (E₂), X (E₃), VI (H₂₊₁) and XII (F). The text of volume XI (the R₁ codex) has been analysed in an earlier article (*Us Wurk* 35, 1986, pp. 57-74) and has been excluded from the survey.
2. See, however, what Mitchell (1985), § 2285, says about the possibility of our not recognizing a system behind the various data in relative clauses in Old English.
3. S. Jacobsen in his review of M. Rydén (1966), *Relative Constructions in Early 16th Century English*, in *Linguistics*, 45 (1968), pp. 118-127, especially p.123.
4. Behaghel (1897), § 465-468.
5. Mitchell (1985), § 2272.
6. Andrew (1966), p. 35.
7. Sprockel (1973), pp. 112 and 167 ff.
8. Mitchell (1985), §§ 2272 and 2277.
9. Downing (1978), p. 380.
10. Behaghel (1897), especially § 468.
11. It is ultimately impossible to say with certainty whether the clause *ther..... wied* (B₁ p.105 lines 16-7) is a main clause or a subordinate (relative) one. Just as in Old English, in Old Frisian 'there are no infallible criteria for distinguishing principal from subordinate clauses'. None of the criteria mentioned by Mitchell (§ 1885) are workable. It seems that in this particular B₁ passage the clause under discussion is read most naturally in its context as a subordinate clause. See also the translation in B₁₊₂ p.106, § 177, and BuEb p. 99, § 168. A strong indication, perhaps the decisive one, is the parallel passage in B₂.
12. See Tiersma (1985), p. 107, 5.1.5; Stoett (1968), § 204; A.N.S. (1984), p. 835, 21.2.3.1.8.
13. See also JUS II, 50.
14. See also Van Helten (1907), p. 83.
15. The choice between interrogative and independent relative pronoun is hard to make in certain contexts, of which *hwes* in this passage is an example. The fact that in R₂ II.57 the subjunctive verbal form *were* is used may point to the *hwes*-clause being an indirect question opening with an interrogative pronoun. The

same difficulty occurs in Old English. See for this Karlberg (1954), especially chapter 2, and Mitchell § 2049ff.

16. With sincere thanks to Prof. N.R. Århammar, Dr. O. Vries. and particularly to Dr. G. van der Meer for their suggestions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts analysed:

- Buma, W.J. *Die Brokmer Rechtshandschriften*. 's-Gravenhage, 1949. (OTR, V; referred to as B₁ and B₂).
- Buma, W.J. *Het Tweede Rüstringer Handschrift*. 's-Gravenhage, 1954. (OTR, VIII; referred to as R₂).
- Fokkema, K. *De Tweede Emsinger Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1953. (OTR, VII; referred to as E₂).
- Fokkema, K. *De Derde Emsinger Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1959. (OTR, X; referred to as E₃).
- Hoekstra, J. *De Eerste en de Tweede Hunsinger Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1950. (OTR, VI; referred to as H₁ and H₂).
- Sipma, P. *De Eerste Emsinger Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1943. (OTR, IV; referred to as E₁).
- Sjölin, B. *Die 'Fivelgoer' Handschrift*. Den Haag, 1970. (OTR, XII; referred to as F).

Other works:

The parallel texts in the series *Altfriesische Rechtsquellen* (referred to as BuEb), viz.

- Buma, W.J./& W. Ebel *Das Rüstringer Recht*. Göttingen, 1963. (Vol. 1) .
- Buma, W.J./& W. Ebel *Das Brokmer Recht*. Göttingen, 1965. (Vol. 2).
- Buma, W.J./& W. Ebel *Das Emsiger Recht*. Göttingen, 1967. (Vol. 3)
- Buma, W.J./& W. Ebel *Das Hunsingoer Recht*. Göttingen, 1969. (Vol. 4).
- Buma, W.J./& W. Ebel *Das Fivelgoer Recht*. Göttingen, 1972. (Vol. 5) .
- Andrew, S.O. *Syntax and Style in Old English*. (reissue of the 1940 ed.). New York, 1966.
- Behaghel, O. *Die Syntax des Heliand*. Leipzig, 1897.
- Borchling, C. *Die niederdeutschen Rechtquellen Ostfrieslands I*. Aurich, 1908.
- Buma, W.J./& W. Ebel/M. Tragter-Schubert *Westerlauwersches Recht I*, parts 1 and 2. Göttingen, 1977 (Vol. 6, Jus Municipale Frisonum; referred to as JUS).

- Downing, B.T. 'Some Universals of Relative Clause Structure', in *Universals of Human Language*, Vol. IV, Syntax, ed. J.H. Greenberg, (Stanford, 1978), pp. 375-418.
- Geerts, G. et al. *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen, 1984. (referred to as A.N.S.).
- Helten, W. L. van *Altostfriesische Grammatik*. Leeuwarden, 1890.
- Helten, W. L. van *Zur Lexicologie des Altostfriesischen*, Amsterdam, 1907.
- Holthausen, F./ D. Hofmann *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1985.
- Karlberg, G. *The English interrogative Pronouns: A Study of their Syntactic History*. Lund, 1954.
- Mitchell, B. *Old English Syntax*, vols I and II. Oxford, 1985.
- Munske, H.H. *Der germanische Rechtswortschatz im Bereich der Missetaten*, part I. Berlin/New York, 1973.
- Mustanoja, T.F. *A Middle English Syntax*, part I, Parts of Speech. Helsinki, 1960.
- Sprockel, C. *The Language of the Parker Chronicle*, vol. II, Word-Formation and Syntax. The Hague, 1973.
- Stoett, F.A. *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst*, (reprint of the 1923 ed.). 's-Gravenhage, 1968.
- Tiersma, P.M. *Frisian Reference Grammar*. Dordrecht, 1985.