

[0647]

RELATIVE MARKERS IN OLD FRISIAN*

Introduction

While reading Frisian I, a non-Frisian, was struck and gradually intrigued by the appearance of the *'t* in the relative marker *dy't*. This *'t*, we are told in some Frisian grammars, is a remnant of the conjunction *dat*. See for example Fokkema (1948), section 64 (*dy* and *hwa* are often followed by *t*, a remnant of the conjunction *dat*); Sipma (1949), p. 46.6 (*dy't* = *dy dat*), and (1966), section 230 ('The *'t* is the relic of the conjunction *det...*'); Anglade (1966), p. 33 ('Le *'t* qui apparaît dans ces formes est la contraction de *dat*, en fonction de mot subordonnant'). Tiersma (1985) does not express himself explicitly on this point, but he is probably of the same opinion, since he states in his section 5.3.4.1 '... the relative pronoun (and subordinating conjunction) *dy't...*'

At first sight this seems to be an obvious and irrefutable statement, particularly because there are a number of parallels among conjunctions that introduce adverbial clauses (*doe't*, *ear't* etc.). This assumption may well be true. However, one disturbing doubt remains: if this supposition is correct, one would expect a transitional period in which the full form *dat* and the shortened form *'t*, which was added enclitically to the relative pronoun, were used side by side in the same or roughly contemporary texts. In fact, one would expect to encounter Frisian texts of bygone periods in which the full form *dat* is the rule, seeing that written texts tend to give a formal rendering of the language that is used among people for communicative purposes.

This expectation is not borne out, however. Apart from a few very rare examples from the beginning of the nineteenth century the combination *dy dat* as a relative marker does not occur in writing. Van Coetsem (1960) writes in his article on this Frisian phenomenon (p. 331) that the modern Frisian principle of forming a relative marker by combining a relative (pronoun) and a conjunction ending in *t* tends to find its roots in the Old Frisian period, but that somewhere between Old and Modern Frisian the continuity was interrupted. At the end of his article he suggests that a thorough study of this matter should be made on the basis of a large number of Frisian texts, including comparison with the results of similar studies of the same phenomenon in cognate languages.

This is sound advice. The first thing to do, it seems

* I wish to express my sincere thanks to prof. N. R. Århammar, dr. G. van der Meer and drs. O. Vries of the Frisian Institute (University Groningen) for their generosity in giving me advice at various stages of the preparation of this article.

to me, is to find out what (combinations of) words were used in the function of relative markers in the Frisian that has come down to us through the centuries. Some of the preparatory work has been done, and the data collected are being processed or are awaiting processing in the pertinent institutes. It is my intention to start with the work that is most urgently needed: mapping out the situation for Old Frisian. I intend to analyze first the Old East Frisian texts, and after that the Old West Frisian ones, law-texts as well as charters and letters. Comparison with other Germanic languages will likely suggest itself and might prove rewarding.

In order to give a concrete idea of what I have in mind, I offer a specimen based on one text, with occasional references to other Old Frisian texts, if this seems appropriate. This text is the *First Rüstringer Manuscript*, edited by W. J. Buma as volume XI in the series *Oudfríese Taal- en Rechtsbronnen*, 's-Gravenhage, 1961.

1. *Relative clauses* are a type of subordinate clause, and as such to be recognized via formal characteristics, the main one being that the finite verb form does not occupy the first or the second slot in the clause. A few examples in R_1 are:

I. 4-5: ... romulo and remo that weron tha tvene brother *ther rume erost stifton*. (... Romulus and Remus those were the two brothers who first founded Rome):

XX. 101-2: An alle thi *the mith unriuchte to breue cumi*. thi skil of sunder panningon. (And everyone who be excommunicated unjustly, he shall go off without paying a fine; literally: And all he who with injustice to letter announcing a clerical ban come. he shall off without pennies).

The function of a relative clause is to give some kind of qualification of its antecedent, which is a noun(group) in a (usually: the) preceding clause. However, in our text-material there occur a number of clauses that have the function of relative clauses, but without the corresponding word order. Thus we read in R_1 for example:

XI. 10-11: Thes fiarda dis sa somniat se alle fiskar *ther send an tha wetiron* to semine... (On the fourth day assemble all the fishes that are in the waters...)

VII. 2-3 : Tha nam hi of fif wenda. *ther send alle frison fremo and fere*. (Then he excepted five cases that are of use and importance to all Frisians).

In both clauses *ther* can only be the subject of the clause of which it is the opening word. According to Holthausen-Hofmann (1985), p. 110, *ther* can occur in an adverbial function, as a conjunction, or as a relative particle. Of these three only a relative particle could serve as the subject of a clause. Therefore the *ther*-clauses just men-

tioned are subordinate (relative) clauses. Besides in the XI. 10-11 passage the *ther*-clause is embedded in its main clause, which is a very strong indication of its being a subordinate clause. It appears that if there is a conflict between form and function, the latter is determinant in the majority of the relevant passages. The phenomenon of a clause resembling a main clause in form, but a subordinate clause in function, occurs in almost all the Old Frisian texts, both East and West Frisian. The finite verb form in these clauses is in the *wesa* paradigm, almost without exception, but not quite; see e.g. R₂ VI. 15-6; JUS 374. 20; CoRo 87.7; SnRec 3982.8.

If the clause under discussion is introduced not by a relative particle, but by a pronoun (denonstrative?, relative?), the question whether this is a main clause or a subordinate (relative) one cannot be settled decisively. This is the case in passages like:

- JUS 588.1 : Dje aerste grewa jn Holland *thi hiet Dirch...* (The first governor in Holland he/who was called Derrick...);
 JUS 566.13 : Die fria Fresa haed en wth Fyullinghalande, *di heed een yrssen flayle jn siner hand...* (The free Frisians had one from Fivelgo, he /who had an iron flail in his hand...);
 JUS 562.1 : Thi Saxo thi mackath thet land to Saxonia, *thet coem fan sin name...* (Saxo he makes the land to Saxony that/ which came from his name, ...).

As is well-known our modern criterion of punctuation is irrelevant as an indication of the status of a clause. The same is true of the intonation pattern, of which we know next to nothing with certainty; we read an Old Frisian text with a particular intonation *after* we have decided what the function of the various clauses is. See for the same difficulty in Old English Mitchell (1985), vol. II, sections 2109-21.

2. *The total number of relative clauses* in R₁ is 116. They are introduced by a relative particle (85), a pronoun (15), or an adverbial word (16). It appears that the relative clause without a formal relative marker is unknown in R₁, as it is in most of the Old Frisian texts. This statement needs some qualification. At first sight there are some relative clauses in R₁ without a relative marker for its opening word. An example is XX. 20-1: *thet bad sante willehad. ther erost biscop was to brema. and wi under kersten wrdon...* (that ordered Saint Willehad, who was first bishop at Bremen, and under whom we became christians...). It is clear that the second of the two coordinated relative clauses does not have a relative marker as a result of progressive contraction. A similar passage is IV. 186-7: *Thet erue. ther thu mi umbe to sext. and mi umbe to thinge lathast...* (The land for which you take legal proceedings against me and summon me to court...), with this difference, however, that the two

coordinated clauses show contraction in relative marker plus subject.

In all there are 14 relative clauses in which the relative marker is used implicitly. This marker is invariably *ther*: 10 times it is a relative particle, once a relative adverb, and 3 times it is part of a pronominal adverb in relative function. Most of these clauses show identical contraction (9); with the other 5 the contraction is nonidentical, which means that the coordinated, non-expressed marker in the second (and the third) clause has a different function from that in the first. An example occurs in XX. 20-1 (quoted above). The other instances occur in IV.17-9: *Thit sint tha fiuwer ned skininga. ther hine thi fria frisa mith bi skirma skil. and him thi kinig kerl selua sette and ur ief alle frison.* (These are the four legitimate impediments with which the free Frisian shall protect himself, and king Charles himself decreed him and granted all Frisians); and in IV. 43-4: *thet lond ther thu mi to askath and to thinge umbe lathast. and un rivchte to sprekest ...* (the land that you claim from me and for which you summon me to court, and unjustly take legal proceedings against me...). I have not included these contracted relative clauses in my survey.

As antecedents serve: noun(group)s, or words used as such (adjectives, numerals), and pronouns. The phenomenon of a clause serving as the antecedent to a relative clause does not occur in this manuscript.

Worth mentioning in this section is VIII. 24-5: *Sa hwersa twa sinhigen se. and kinda tein hebbath. and hiara other fori falle...* (Where there are two spouses and they have begotten children and one of them dies...). Formally this is a set of three coordinated subordinate clauses. As far as meaning is concerned, however, the second qualifies the married couple (the *twa sinhigen*) introduced in the opening clause, which, a subordinate clause itself, serves as the main clause to the *and*-clause following it. A similar passage is IV. 204-5: *Alther en wif se on efuchten. and hiu se mith berne...* (If a woman is attacked, and she is with child...). Less pronounced, but still present is this qualifying element in VIII.5, 24, 70 and XV. 15-6. In all these *and*-clauses a possible relative marker would serve as the subject in its clause. See for a similar phenomenon in Middle Dutch Stoett (1923), section 68.

3. About the original particle *the* little is known with certainty except the fact that it is very old: its occurrence as a relative marker is limited to West Germanic (Old English, Old Saxon, Old High German and Old Frisian), which makes it very likely that it has its roots in the days before the Germanic tribes wandered off in a westerly direction. See for example Johansen (1935), particularly p. 139. In Old Frisian its use as a relative marker is very much limited to the easternmost areas. It occurs

fifteen or sixteen times in all, of which thirteen times in R_1 , once in R_2 and once or twice in E_2 .

In R_1 *the* refers to a noun group (7 times) or to a singular or plural pronoun (6 times). Of the nouns only one is animate (with *tha prestere* in XX. 41). *The* as a relative particle can refer to the genitive singular form of a noun (e.g. *thes erves* in XX. 37) or a pronoun (*thes* in VI. 94). In two passages the relative particle *the* and the following definite article combine to form one word; they are X. 26: *Sa brekth hi thene* (= *the thene*) *fona andere hond ferth...* (Then forfeits he who carries the banner in his hand...), and VI. 94-5: *... alsa hit thruch that lif ekimin is. sin kere thes thene* (= *the thene*) *skatha heth...* (... if it [= a weapon] has pierced the body, the choice is his who has the damage). The particle *the* is of such rare occurrence that it is impossible to form an idea of its weight in the clause, but it seems unlikely that *the* in the R_1 -passages was said with any stress. The same is true of the definite article. Seeing that *thene* is a two-syllable word, it seems at least possible that in the two relevant passages in R_1 (X. 26; VI. 94) the first syllable of the article is the weightiest element soundwise, and consequently attracts the relative particle into the proclitic combination *thene*. In the final analysis it has to remain a moot point, though.

The function of *the* in its clause is that of subject (10 times) and direct object (3 times). The relative clauses in which it serves as the relative marker are all restrictive ones.

Comparison of certain syntactic phenomena in the language of this manuscript is all but impossible, owing to the fact that there is a great deal of uncertainty about its date, even more so about the origin and date of composition the separate parts; see for this Buma (1961), p. 28ff., and Buma-Ebel (1963), p. 13ff. What is obvious to us is that as far as the use of relative markers is concerned, there seems to have been considerable freedom in apparently very similar contexts.

For *the* and *ther* compare for example:

- X.26-8 : *Sa brekth hi ...thritich merk. and alle tha the him folgiath. en and twintich skillinga...*(Then he forfeits... thirty marks, and all those who follow him twenty-one shillings...); and very similarly X. 32-4.
- X. 19: *... alle tha ther him folgiath...*; see also VIII. 59-60.
- XX. 114-5: *Thes send fre to tha iungosta di alle tha the thit riucht haldath...* (Of this are free on the Day of Judgment all those who keep this law...).
- I. 45-6 . *Alsa lat vse hera god alle tha to tha himulrike ther tha rivchte folgiath.* (Thus God, our Lord, guides all those to the kingdom of Heaven who obey the law); and similarly I. 47; II. 12-3; also III. 32-3, 90-1.

All these relative clauses have the same antecedent and their relative markers have the same grammatical function (they serve as subject in their clause). The only difference is that the *the*-clause follows its antecedent immediately, which is not always true of the *ther*-clause.

The other passages in which a *the*-clause refers to a pronoun-antecedent are:

- X.26: Sa brekth *hi the*ne (= the thene) fona andere hond ferth...
- XX. 101-2 : An alle *thi the* mith unriuchte to breue cumi. *thi* skil of ...
- VI. 94-5 : alsa hit thruch thet lif ekimin is. sin kere *thes the*ne (= the thene) skatha heth...;
- but compare
- XV. 74-5 : Wili *hi* thenne bi seka *ther* thet raf and thet unriucht eden heth... (Will *he* then deny *who* has committed the robbery and the injustice...);
- VIII. 68-9: Sa hwet sa *thi* were *ther* tha riuchta erua thet god under wnne... (Whatever he were who deprived the rightful heir of the property...);
- XX. 104-6 : Sa ne mima ther umbe bi cumbria feder ne moder ...buta *thene ther*ma anda breue fint. (Then one may not put an embargo on the goods of father or mother for this..., but only of him whom one finds in the letter announcing the clerical ban).

Again the *the*-clause follows its antecedent immediately and *the* serves as its subject, but neither statement is exclusively true of the *ther*-clauses.

The remaining six *the*-clauses, each of which has a noun group for its antecedent, do not always follow their antecedent immediately (three times they do: XII.12, XV. 21, XX.41; three times they do not; XX. 35, 37, 85), and besides being the subject, *the* can also be the direct object of its clause:

- XX. 34-6: Sa hwelek prestere sa thene progost and feth. sunder tha fiuwer ga stherekon. and *thet riucht* brekth. *the* god use hera us ur ief... (Whatever priest receives the provost, except those of the four district churches, and breaks the law that God, our Lord, granted us ...); also XV. 21.

4. The large majority of relative clauses in R₁ (as in all Old Frisian texts) are introduced by the secondary relative particle *ther*, seventy-two in all. *Ther* refers to nouns of each gender and number, and to pronouns. A few examples are:

- I. 13-4: Thin god thet is *thi ena ther* skippere is himulrikes and irthrikes (Your God that is the only one who is creator of heaven and earth);

- XIII. 10-1: Sa hwersa *en iung kind* to tha godis huse brocht werth. *therma depa skil...* (Where a young child is brought to the church that will be baptized...);
- IV. 126-7: ... Sa is *thet* al twi bete. *therma* him ther efter in deth... (...so is that all a double fine which is inflicted upon him after that).

Most of the relative clauses in R_1 are restrictive ones. This is as to be expected in a law-text, in which perceptions and quantities should be unambiguously clear, and where there is little need for non-essential, complementary information. However, there are non-restrictive relative clauses in R_1 (10%), among the highest percentage in the Old East Frisian texts. (It is for example much higher in the *Friese Brieven...* and the *Snitser Recesboeken*, in accordance with the particular character of these texts). This higher than average occurrence in R_1 can be attributed to the mentioning in the first chapter of many historical persons with some qualifications that are not essential to their identification.

The usual function of *ther* in its clause is that of subject, but it also occurs as direct object. In three 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 or is separated from it by the subject of the relative clause. These passages are:

- IX. 33-4: ... thes bondedoga del tham anda hond. *ther sin mon is eliue*. (... the homicide's share in the hand of him whose man is lifeless);
- IV. 98-9: ... and hi thenne wili bi seka *ther thi nat sin is*. (...and he then wants to deny whose the animal is);
- VIII. 46-7: ...and thet ur ield tha friendon *ther thi mon hiara was*. (...and the extra wergeld to the relatives whose the man was).

This syntactic phenomenon occurs in a number of other Old Frisian texts, for example in B_1 (51.15), H_2 (VII.186), JUS (46.72, 116.66d, 156.9), CoRo (62.7, 79.1), SnRec (197.1-2). See for the three R_1 passages Buma (1961), p. 103 note 99, and p. 245; also Van Helten 1907), pp. 325 and 354. It also occurs in Middle English (Mustanoja, p. 202f.), and in Middle Dutch (Stoett, section 54 note II).

In one passage *ther* is accompanied by a personal pronoun in the relative clause. This personal 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. The only passage to illustrate this phenomenon occurs in

- IV. 185-6: Sa ondarde thi. *ther mat him to askie...* (So should he answer on whom it is claimed...).

See for this phenomenon in Old English Sprockel (1973), vol. II, p. 171, section 10.2.4; and Mitchell, vol. II, section 2180ff. Also because this phenomenon occurs in a cognate language there is no reason to accept Van Helten's suggestion to cross out *him* in this passage (1907, p. 12).

There is one clause left in which the function of *ther* is controversial; the clause occurs in the twentieth Statute (R₁IV, section 20). This Statute describes the plight of the man who was captured by Northmen during a raid, and who was forced by his captor(s) to commit all kinds of atrocious crimes. If this man, in whatever way, manages to regain his liberty and to come back, and if he can prove that he is the rightful heir to certain property, he is allowed to take possession of it. If anybody wants to challenge him on account of his crimes, he can swear an oath on the relics that he had no power of body and limbs then, because he had to commit whatever he was ordered to do by his lord, against whom he was powerless. The pertinent part of the R₁-passage runs as follows:

IV.177-80: Sa mire thenne afare thene warf gunga. and iechta mire tella. enne eth hach hi thenne opa tha heligon to swerande. thet hit al dede bi there nede. alsa him sin hera bad. *ther hi was liues. and lethana en vn weldich mon.* (So may he then go before the assembly of the people, and he may make a confession of guilt; an oath has he then to swear on the relics that he did it all under compulsion, as his lord ordered him, to whom?/when? he was a man unable to have body and limbs at his disposal).

Van Helten considers *ther* in IV. 179 a conjunction introducing a temporal clause (p. 324), as obviously does Von Richthofen, as appears from the translation of this passage in his dictionary (see p.1107, under *unweldich*). Buma counts *ther* in this clause among the relative particles (p. 245). Whose opinion is correct?

N. E. Algra, in an article in *Us Wurk* (1959, 4, pp. 73-82), entitled *De Riustringer Tekst fan 'e 17 Kêsten en 24 Lânrijochten*, points out that the R₁-version of the twentieth Statute gives deeper, more explanatory, background information than do the corresponding versions in H₁, H₂, E₁, F and JUS (p. 81). It is R₁ that refers particularly to the Viking-raids as the likely cause of the man's captivity; that tells us that the captors bring him with them on their (next) raid(s) and force him to commit crimes ('and hini ther to thwingath thet hi hus barne...'); that gives the detail about the 'frana' not being able to protect him, as he should have been ('thi frana ne machte him thes fretha waria') as a mitigating circumstance. R₁ is also the only version that contains a clause as worded in IV. 179-80. Therefore direct comparison is impossible.

In all the versions of this Statute the former captive is not held responsible for his crimes: he was a 'skalk', a slave, and 'thi skalk skolde dwa alsa him sin hera bad. thruch thes liues willa'. In all of them, with the exception of R₁, this appeal to *f o r c e m a j e u r* is made via an adverbial clause opening with the conjunction *tha* (H₁, H₂, E₁), *dae* (JUS) or *tha hwile* (F), and consequently in clauses referring to time or circumstances. *Ther* is used as a conjunction denoting time or circumstances in Old Frisian, but not in R₁. This is not proof that the *ther*-clause in R₁IV. 179-180 is not an adverbial clause; but the fact that it would be the only *ther*-clause of its kind makes it unlikely. Besides, *tha* occurs twelve times in R₁ as the opening of an adverbial clause denoting time, so one would expect a *tha*-clause, if such an adverbial clause had been intended. On the other hand, if *ther* is seen as the opening word of a relative clause with '*sin hera*' for its antecedent, this fits in well with Algra's observations on the character of the language of R₁ in these Statutes. In the other manuscripts the man is a slave, and as such not fully responsible, but in an impersonal way. The R₁-passage gives a more direct picture of the '*hera*' and the slave. The latter is a man with no longer any power of his body, particularly his limbs, because these are all for the benefit of the master. Therefore I consider it highly probable that *ther* in R₁IV. 179 has the function of an indirect object, which means that Buma's interpretation is the correct one.

A *ther*-clause qualifying an antecedent which is the non-nucleus, genitive part of a word group, is a familiar syntactic construction in Old East and West Frisian texts. Examples in R₁ are III. 24-5: ...thruch *thes ethes* willa. *ther hi to fara tha keysere fon rume esweren heth*... (...because of the oath that he has sworn before the emperor of Rome...); also IV. 9-10, XX. 109-10, VIII.60-1.

5. *Ther* is used as an adverb with a relative function, both as a straight adverb and as part of a pronominal adverb.

As a straight adverb *ther* is used with a local denotation (three times), or a temporal one (once). See

XI. 7-8 : Thes otheres dis. sa werthath se lik there selua skipnese. *ther se bi fara weron*. (On the second day they come to the same state in which they were before); also XI. 23-4;

IV. 143-5: ...sa dele se tha friond under hiam. al with thiv *ther hia sibbe se*. and *knia mugi*. (... so must the relations divide it [= the inheritance] among themselves according as they are related and can prove the degree of kinship).

Modern Frisian and English would use a pronominal adverb instead of this straight adverb in these passages.

The adverb *ther* with a temporal denotation occurs in

- IV. 146-8: Sa hwersa en mon tha otheron sin god to haldande deth. sa is thet riucht. thet hit him ondwarde. thes selua dis *ther hit hebba wili*. (Wherever a man deposits his property with somebody else so is that the law that he give it back to him on the very day when he wants to have it).

These are all restrictive relative clauses.

Ther in a relative function occurs as part of a pronominal adverb in the following combinations: *ther ... binna* (XII. 27a, *ther...et* (XX. 32), *ther...mith*, *mithi* (IV. 18, XX. 86-7), *ther...on* (I. 11), *ther...ova* (XIX. 7, XX. 66), *ther...to* (X. 44), *ther...umbe* (IV. 186), *ther...under* (XX. 110). Twice the combination is *alder ... efter* (III. 4,120). In some clauses *ther* is used implicitly as a result of progressive contraction, as in IV. 43, 186-7 (*ther...umbe*) and in XX.21 (*ther...under*). They usually refer to an inanimate noun for their antecedent, but twice the reference is to a person, as appears from

- XX.109-10: ...bi sante willehadus tidon. *ther wi under kersten wrthon*. (...at the times of Saint Willehad, under whom we became christians); also, with implicit *ther*, from

- XX. 20-1 : thet bad sante willehad. *ther erost bishop* was to brema. and wi *under kersten wrdon*... (... that ordered Saint Willehad, who was first bishop of Bremen, and under whom we became Christians...).

In all these clauses the adverb *ther* is separated from the rest of the pronominal adverb by minimally one word. Most of these clauses are restrictive ones, but not exclusively so, as appears from e.g. XX. 109-110.

6. *Thana* occurs as a local adverb with a relative function, in

- IX. 35-6 : ...tha haua skilun withir anda hond. *thana se ut egengen send*. (...the goods shall go back into the hand from which they have gone out).

7. The originally demonstrative pronouns *thi*, *tha* and *thet* can be used as relative markers. *Thi* (twice) refers to a masculine singular pronoun in the preceding clause, *tha* to a feminine plural noun, and *thet* to a neuter singular pronoun, with one exception (the neuter singular noun *lond* in I. 44). They occur in restrictive relative clauses only. *Thi* and *tha* serve as subjects, *thet* as both subject (7 times) and direct object (5 times).

8. There are a few clauses in which 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 in R₁; *ther*, e.g. in

IV. 83-4 : Sa is thera twira niar tha withon. *ther* tha otheron ehulpen heth. (So is of the two nearer to swearing on the relics *he who* has helped the other one)
thet in

IV. 103-5 : Sa hwersa en tichta lat werth fon harses houe. tha fon ritheres horne. tha fon hundes tothe. tha fon hona itsile. tha fon swines tuske. ief *thet* en ungeroch kind deth... (Wherever a charge is brought against a horse's hoof, or a cow's horn, or a dog's tooth, or a cock's spur, or a swine's tusk, or against *that which* a child under age does...).

Buma considers *ief* in 105 a subordinate conjunction introducing a conditional clause (see his p. 203). This makes no sense, and the corresponding passages in H₁, H₂, E₁, F and JUS all have *ieft(h)a*, the coordinating conjunction, which also occurs as *ief*, according to Holthausen-Hofmann. This meaning of *ief* makes excellent sense in an enumeration of injuries that fall into a special category.

hwet in

III. 147-8: ...*thet* hit him allera monna ek witi him selua antha withon *hwet* hi eden hebbe (...that everyone himself know for himself on the relics *that which* he has done).

A possibly further example is

thi in

IX. 16-9: Falt hi ac anna en hus. and ma hini ther ut sunder hus breke ne mugi nawet winna. ief tha sunder bronde. *Thi* ther brekth ief tha barnt. thene skatha and thet laster. mith enfaldere bote to betande... (In case he penetrates into a house and they cannot get him out without pulling down or burning the house, *he who* breaks or burns there shall compensate for the damage and the harm with a single fine ...). See for this passage further section 10 below.

hwet in

IV. 199-200: sa *hwet* sa hi ther fiucht inur hof. and inur hus. thet skilma mith twifaldere bote beta (*all that* he brings about there by fighting in the house and yard that shall be compensated for with a double fine).

This is a well-known type of construction in which a preceding statement is summed up in one word, which is the opening word of the following clause. According to Mitchell, vol.II, section 2201, this construction involves what by 'modern speakers' is seen as 'tautologic postce-

dent', by which he means that the relative clause precedes its main clause, the opening word of which is the 'postcedent' to which the relative marker refers in advance. Mitchell has found that this construction is very common in Old English prose.

Ther in

XV. 39-40: Sa hwelek aldirmon sa ther hlige *ther* hi nenne eth nebbe sa brekth hi wed... (What alderman makes an official statement *where* he has not sworn an oath, he forfeits a fine...), might be called an independent relative adverb, although it formally refers to the *ther* in the preceding clause.

9. Relative markers belong to three categories: particles, pronouns and adverbs. As far as can be concluded from the available texts, the relative frequency of each group is more or less constant throughout the Old Frisian period, allowing for some fluctuation here and there. It seems likely that the percentage of adverbials in relative position has remained pretty much the same in the course of the history of Frisian, although this will have to be verified via statistical data. What has changed drastically after the Old Frisian period is the mutual relationship between relative particles and pronouns used as relative markers, so much so in fact that relative particles have practically disappeared in present-day Frisian. According to Fokkema (1948, p. 54) a remnant might still be heard in the middle of the twentieth century, but Tiersma (1985, p. 68) makes no mention of it.

If we limit ourselves now to a comparison of the relative markers in R_1 excluding the adverbial ones, we find that there must have been some struggle between the original and secondary particles, and between particles and pronouns. Seeing that *the* as a relative particle occurs in R_1 , and to a much smaller extent in R_2 and E_2 , and in no other Old Frisian text, whereas *ther* in that function is very strong throughout the Old Frisian period, the thought forces itself upon us that in the beginning of the Old Frisian period of which we have records *ther* has practically succeeded in ousting *the*. There might be some traces of this process in R_1 .

For *the*, *ther* and *thi* compare

X. 26: Sa brekth *hi* thene (= the thene) fona andere hond ferth...(Then breaks he who carries the banner in his hand...);

XV. 74-5: Wili *hi* thenne bi seka *ther* thet raf and thet unriucht eden heth... (If he wants to deny then who has done the robbery and the injustice...);

- IV.8: Sa mot *hi* hebba *tha* onferd *thi* ther er utana on sprek. (Then may he have the right of occupancy who laid claim to the delivery there before);
- X. 32-3: ... Sa brekth *hi. thi* thes werkes mastere is. allera distik. en and twintich skillinga. (...then forfeits he who is the master of the work daily twenty-one shillings).
- For *tha* and *ther* compare
- XIX. 16-7 Hwasa anna ena godis huse fiucht. and *tha helega wiena* to brekth. *tha* ther on eleid send ... (Whoever fights in a house of God, and violates the holy ordinations which have been adjudged to them...);
- XVIII.19-20: Werther en prestere to dada slein. sa hach hi fori *tha sigun wiena. ther* hi und fangen heth fon thes wera godis haluon... (If a priest is killed, he is entitled to have for the seven ordinations which he has received on behalf of the true God...); also XII. 32-3.
- For *ther* and *thet* compare
- IV. 42-3: Sa ondwarde *thi* haldere mith rivchtere tele. and quethe. *thet lond ther* thu mi to askast... (Then the defendant should answer with a legitimate plea and say: the land that you claim from me ...);
- I. 44-5: ...and lattese an *thet lond thet* flat fon melokon and fon hunige. (... and took them to the land that flowed with milk and honey).

10. Are there any traces in R_1 of *the combination pronoun + particle* to serve as a relative marker? This question is a pertinent one seeing that in other Germanic dialects especially Gothic and Old Norse (see Holger Johansen, p. 57ff.), but also in the oldest stages of English which of all the Germanic dialects is the one to which Frisian is most closely allied, this phenomenon is familiar to a larger or smaller extent. See for Old English for example Sprockel, p. 167ff., and Mitchell, p. 140ff.

First some facts from R_1 . It is clear that *thi ther* in IV. 8: Sa mot hi hebba *tha* onferd *thi ther* er utana on sprek..., does not apply, because *ther* is part of the pronominal adverb *ther...on*. The same is true for *tha. ther* in XIX. 17 (see above in 9).

More serious consideration deserves a passage like I. 47: And *alle tha ther* thet rivht ieftha enich rivht brekth..., and similarly VIII.59-60 and X.19-20. The translation that comes to mind first is: And all those (= *alle tha*) who (= *ther*) violate the law or some law...; but: And all (= *alle*) who (= *tha ther*) violate the law..., is not entirely impossible. A passage that is only slightly different occurs in the preceding sentence I. 45-6: Alsa latvse hera god *alle tha* to tha himulrike *ther* tha rivchte

folgiath. (Thus our Lord God leads all those to the kingdom of Heaven who observe the law). There is no doubt that *ther ... folgiath* is a relative clause qualifying its antecedent *alle tha* in the main clause, and having the particle *ther* for its relative marker. See also II. 12-3. It is on the analogy of passages like these that we can almost be certain that *they* in I. 47 by itself is the relative marker and not part of a relative combination pronoun + particle. However, there is another strong indication that *ther* in a similar combination is an independent relative marker. Take for example III. 32-3: *hia skilun helpa alle tham ther hiam seluon nauwet helpa ne mugu*, in which *tham* forms part of the main clause, where it serves as the indirect object with the corresponding dative form; if it were part of the relative clause it would require the nominative case form, as it would be its subject. A similar passage is III. 87-91: *Fretho alle widuon. and... alle tham ther ur sweren hebbath wich and wepin. thruch fretho. and thruch natha. and thruch godis natha. bi tian liod merkon* (Safety to all widows...and all those who have renounced strife and weapon, for the sake of peace and quiet and the grace of God, to the amount of ten people's marks). See for a comparable construction in Old English Sprockel, p. 169, where the relative particle is *þe*, not *ther*, but where, as in the passages just quoted, the demonstrative pronoun functions as a determinative pronoun, to which the particle refers as its antecedent.

Two more passages that should be looked into in this context are

- XV. 42-4: *Thit is ak. frisesk Riucht. Theti prestere hach to wetande ur sthereka and ur stherek hof. and alle thetter binna there withuma sketh.* (This is also Frisian law that the priest has to testify under oath concerning the church and the churchyard, and all that (?) happens within the area consecrated to the church)
- XV. 55-6: *Thet is ak frisesk Riucht. Thet thi aldirmon ak hach to wetande. alle theter sketh anna ena wrpena warue...* (That is also Frisian law that the alderman also has to testify under oath concerning all that (?) happens in the convened assembly of the people...).

There are three possibilities:

1. *thet* is a determinative pronoun, which is part of the antecedent (*alle thet*), to which *ther* refers as a relative marker;
2. *all* is the antecedent, *thet* is the relative pronoun followed by enclitic *ther* with a vaguely adverbial meaning;
3. the combination *thet(t)er* (= *thet* + *ther*) serves as a relative marker referring to the antecedent *alle*.

In these combinations (*th*)*er*, *ter* cannot have had any stress, seeing its enclitic combination with the preceding

thet. Although we know very little about the intonation and stress patterns in Old Frisian, we may safely assume that this enclitic (*th*)*er ter*, had it been intended to serve as a relative marker, with consequently a prominent function in its clause (the subject), should be given some accent at least in such a context. Besides there would have been a (slight) break between the stressed determinative pronoun *thet* (main part of the antecedent) and the following *ther* (relative particle), which was obviously not there seeing the enclitic combination. Therefore we can be certain that *thet* is the relative marker (or at least part of it) in these two passages. This means that we will have to choose between the second and third possibilities mentioned above. It appears that in Old Frisian the verb *skia* is often accompanied by adverbial *ther*, sometimes in enclitic combination with the preceding word, e.g. in B₁ p. 29.6 (Hwetsare), B₁ p. 41.15 (Hwersar), B₂ p. 104.3 (alsar); without enclisis e.g. R₁IV. 72, F XXI.48, JUS p. 486.10. This makes it very likely that (*th*)*er, ter* in these passages has some adverbial meaning; in other words that the second supposition is the correct one, but combination *thet(t)er* serving as the relative marker in these passages remains a possibility.

The same conclusion applies to the following two passages:

- XX. 55-7: Sa hach thi prestere to wetande ur sthereka. and ur stherek hof. and
 alle thete binna there withume sketh. (compare XV. 42-4);
 XX. 85-6: And *alle thete* buta godis huse fuchten werth ... (And all that (?) is
 fought outside the church...).

In these passages the enclitic form is unaccented *tha*, according to Van Helten (1890, section 125) and Buma (R₁, p. 133, note 85). The possibility that *thete* has developed *thet the* cannot be excluded for one hundred per cent, seeing that in Old English the combination demonstrative pronoun + *þe* as a relative marker is not unknown; but the fact that this possibility is practically limited to these passages makes it very unlikely to be true.

11. *Sa* occurs frequently in R₁, usually as an adverb, or as a conjunction to introduce an adverbial clause. In some passages, however, it has a quasi relative function, as Nummenmaa ascertained for (*al*)*so* in Early Middle English (see Nummenmaa, 1973, pp. 85-7). The same is true for Old English (see Mitchell, vol. II. p. 211ff.).

Some illustrations in R₁ are:

- XX. 18-9: ...sa skilma hini fonda liodon liaflike and fa. mith *alsa denere kost*.
 sa hir anda londe best is. (... then he [= the bishop shall be re-

ceived kindly by the people with such food as is the best here in the land)

XX. 1: Hir is eskriuin *alsaden riucht sa* us god selua sette... (Here is written such law as God Himself laid down for us...)

XI. 21-2: Thes niugunda dis. *sa* werth *alsa grat irth biuinge. sa* ther fon on bi iennene there wralde er nen *sa* den nas. (On the ninth day there is such a great earthquake as there has not been such a one before from the beginning of the world).

The combination (*sa*)...*sa* is also used to give an independent relative a more general denotation, as is illustrated by:

XIX. 12-4: *Sa* hwersama thet godis hus brekth our willa and our wald. sex bete thera helegana laster and skatha. and sex stunda sextich skillinga. umbe thes godis huses bote. *sa hwas*a thet brekth to thes biscopos bonne. (Wherever one breaks the house of God against the will and without permission [of the priest] six times indemnification for the harm and the damage to the church and six times sixty shillings in compensation for the church, whoever violates it, to the jurisdiction of the bishop);

IX. 6-7: *Sa hwas*a fiucht. *thi* skil fiuchta opa sinne einene hals... (Whoever fights, he shall fight on his own neck...);

XX. 103: *Hwas*a mith riuchte to breue cumi. *thi* reke sina riuchta wed... (Who is justly excommunicated, he pay his legally set fines...);

IV. 199-200: *sa hwet sa* hi ther fiucht inur hof. and inur hus. *thet* skilma mith twifaldere bote beta... (whatever he fights there in yard and in house, that shall be atoned for with a double fine...).

The final three passages are a few more examples of what Mitchell calls the construction with a 'precedent': the demonstrative pronouns opening the main clauses might be considered the 'precedent' to which the independent relative combinations in the preceding subordinate clauses refer. This seems a rather artificial way of analyzing language; it is more natural to see the demonstrative pronoun in these main clauses as the summing up of the person or thing described in the preceding subordinate clause.

12. As this article is based on very limited material and intentionally analytic in nature, there is hardly any room for well-founded conclusions. Summarizing, I

can say that in R₁ the majority of the relative markers are *particles* (three out of four), whereas the remainder of them are equally divided between *relative pronouns* and *relative adverbs*. Further conclusions based on more extensive text-material are to be published in due course.

6713 PR Ede
Beatrixlaan 7

A. Bor

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALGRA, N.E. 'De Riustringer Tekst fan 'e 17 Kêsten en 24 Lânrijochten', *Us Wurk*, 8 (1959), pp. 73-82.
- ALGRA, N.E. *Ein. Enkele Rechtshistorische Aspecten van de Grondeigendom in Westerlauwers Friesland*. Groningen, n.d.
- ANGLADE, J. *Petit Manuel de Frison moderne de l'Ouest*. Groningen, 1966.
- 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).
- BUMA, W. J. *De Eerste Riustringer Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1961. (OTR, XI; referred to as R₁).
- BUMA, W.J., EBEL, W. and TRAGTER-SCHUBERT, M. *Westerlauwerssches Recht I*, parts 1 and 2. Göttingen, 1977. (Jus Municipale Frisonum; referred to as JUS).
- COETSEM, Fr. van 'De Friese Relativa en Conjuncties met *t'*', *Fryske Stúdzjes*, oanbean oan Prof. Dr. J. H. Brouwer. Assen, 1960, pp. 327-34.
- FOKKEMA, K. *Beknopte Friese Spraakkunst*. Groningen, 1948.
- 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).
- GERBENZON, P. (ed.) *Jurisprudentia Frisica (Codex Roorda)*, Special copy for use at lectures. Groningen, 1981 (referred to as CoRo).
- HELTEN, W.L. van *Altostfriesische Grammatik*. Leeuwarden, 1890.
- HELTEN, W.L. van *Zur Lexicologie des Altostfriesischen*. Amsterdam, 1907.
- HOEKSTRA, J. *De Eerste en de Tweede Hunsinger Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1950 (OTR, VI; referred to as H₁ and H₂).
- HOLTHAUSEN, F. and HOFMANN, D. *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1985.
- JOHANSEN, H. *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der altgermanischen Relativsatzkonstruktionen*. Kopenhagen, 1935.
- MITCHELL, B. *Old English Syntax*, vol. I and II. Oxford, 1985.
- MUSTANOJA, T. F. *A Middle English Syntax*, part I, Parts of Speech. Helsinki, 1960.
- NUMMENMAA, L. *The Uses of 'So', 'Also' and 'As' in Early Middle English*. Mémoires de la Société néophilologique de Helsinki (39). Helsinki, 1973.
- OOSTERHOUT, M. (ed.) *Snitser Recesboeken 1490-1517*. Assen, 1960. (referred to as SnRec).
- RICHTHOFEN, K. von *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch*, reprint of 1840 ed. Aalen, 1961.
- SIPMA, P. *De eerste Emsinger Codex*. 's-Gravenhage, 1943. (OTR, IV; referred to as E₁).
- SIPMA, P. *Ta it Frysk*, II. Ljouwert, 1949.
- SIPMA, P. *Phonology and Grammar of Modern West Frisian*, reprint of the 1913 ed. Ljouwert, 1966.
- 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.