

[0626] ON CASE-FORM ENDINGS IN RUNIC FRISIAN

At the time when I wrote my contribution for *Miscellanea Frisica* (1984). I was unaware of the existence of Gysseling's list of runic inscriptions included in his monumental *Corpus van Middelnederlandse Teksten* (1980:5-18), cf. also Philippa 1981:85. Professor Miedema, Dr. Gysseling and a few other scholars have subsequently directed my attention to this oversight on my part, and I should like now to take the opportunity of drawing Gysseling's corporal list into my discussion of case-form endings and unaccented vowels in runic Frisian.

For reasons already stated (Nielsen 1984:11-12), I choose to ignore the Wijnaldum, Britsum, Hantum, Ferwerd and Westeremden B inscriptions, all of which are dealt with by Gysseling. The clearest indication of the different views taken by Gysseling and myself of the unaccented vowels in the (remaining) runic inscriptions is the way each of us interpret the nominal case-endings:

Runic form	Gysseling 1980/	Nielsen 1984
<i>skanomodu solidus</i>	ism. <i>a</i> -st	nsm. <i>a</i> -st
<i>hada</i> [Harlingen]	nsm. <i>an</i> -st	nsm. <i>an</i> -st
<i>weladu</i> [Schweindorf]	ism. <i>a</i> -st	nsm. <i>a</i> -st
<i>edæ:boda</i> (Arum)	dsm. <i>a</i> -st & nsm <i>an</i> -st (two words)	nsm. <i>an</i> -st (one word)
<i>eda</i> (Amay)	dsm. <i>a</i> -st Franconian?)	nsm. <i>an</i> -st
<i>adugislu</i> (Westeremden A)	ism. <i>a</i> -st	nsm. <i>a</i> -st
<i>gisuhldu</i> (Westeremden B)	dsf. <i>ō</i> -st.	dsf. <i>ō</i> -st.
<i>kobu</i> (Toornwerd)	ism. <i>a</i> -st.	(n/) asm. <i>a</i> -st.
<i>kabu</i> (Oostum)	ism. <i>a</i> -st.	asm. <i>a</i> -st.
<i>habuku</i> (Oostum)	dsf. <i>ō</i> -st.	nsm. <i>a</i> -st.

If we leave out of account *eda* (Amay), Gysseling's list exhibits 5 instrumentals, 3 datives and 2 nominatives, while I have a 6 nominatives 2 accusatives and 1 dative (the difference in total number is due to our divergent interpretations of *edæ:boda* as 2 nouns and 1 noun respectively). Analyzed more closely, it is interesting that both Gysseling's nominatives are *an*-stems, and that his instrumentals all belong to the *a*-declension, while only his datives are distributed on more than one stem, viz. one form belonging to the *a*-declension and two to the *ō*-declension. It almost looks as if there is a division of labour involved in connection with Gysseling's nominal case forms: his *a*-stems are instrumentals (or in the dative, cf. also the *ō*-stems), and his *an*-stems are nominatives, – which would seem all the more improbable in view of the fact that personal names are represented here

in the *a-*, *ō-* as well as the *an*-declension (cf. *skanomodu*, *gisuhldu*, *hada*).

Gysseling (1980:9) himself sees the presence of personal names in both the nominative and the instrumental on the *skanomodu* (ism.), Harlingen (nsm.) and Schweindorf (ism.) solidi as a parallel to the Frankish-Merovingian coins with Latin legends and moneyers' names in either the nominative or the ablative ("made by ...").

But even if we ignore the coins, the proportion of instrumentals and datives in relation to nominative(s) among Gysseling's forms would still be extraordinary, to say the least. A quick glance in Krause's runic grammar (1971:128-32) leaves no doubt that the nominative is frequently used in an absolute sense in early Runic, and that this case is used more often than any other case-form. And I do not know of any early Runic inscription whose only form is a dative, let alone an instrumental dative. In their "Grammatische Übersicht" of the continental runic inscriptions, Arntz & Zeiss (1939:486-7) list 27 nsm. and 14 nsf. forms, but only 5 dsm. and 3 dsf. forms. Nominatives thus outnumber datives by 5 to 1, and it should be noted that 4 of their 5 dsm. forms are "Frisian" (Ferwerd, Westeremden A (*adugislu*) & B. whose status as datives I think are, at best, dubious). The fifth dsm. form (*wōdanī*) derives from the inscription on the Kärlich fibula which was later shown to be spurious, cf. e.g. Düwel 1968:115. Despite the shortcomings of Arntz & Zeiss (1939) in the light of later finds and recent runic scholarship, there can be no question of the fact that the nominative case was used much more frequently than the dative in the continental inscriptions.

My main objection to Gysseling's interpretation of the case-endings is, however, that he ignores the internal evidence and thereby misses what to me is a decisive point, viz. that *-u(-)* may derive from *-a(-)* as well as *-u(-)* (< *u/ō(n)*), cf. *adugislu*, *gisuhldu* and *habuku* (Nielsen 1984:13-15). If this is granted (which in fact it is unwittingly by Gysseling, cf. 1980:17, 14-15), there is absolutely no reason why the *-u* of *kobu*, *weladu*, *skanomodu*, etc. could not be derived from *-a(-)* and designate the nom. or the acc. sg.

Finally, I should like to comment on Gysseling's view of the origin of final *-a* in *deda* "did" (Oostum). Gysseling takes it that in OFris. the 3rd person preterite ending was replaced by the 1st person ending as it was in Old Saxon and Old High German, and that this was also the case in runic Frisian. Consequently, Gysseling assumes that *-a* ultimately derives from *-ōm*. I cannot deny that Gysseling could be right about runic Frisian (and Old Saxon and Old High German), but in Old Frisian the regular reflex of *-ō* +nasal is *-e* (as it is in Old English), cf. e.g. Old Frisian nsf. *tunge* (*ōn*-st.), and it therefore looks as if the Old Frisian 1st and 3rd preterite endings merged in result of regular sound change (as was the case in Old

English). However that may be, the *-a* of *deda* remains a problem as compared with the other runic Frisian forms ending in *a* (< IE *-ō*, cf. OS/OHG *-o*, OE/OFris. *-a* < IE *-ō* vs. OS/OHG *-a*, OE/OFris. *-e* < Gmc. (IE) *-ōm*).

Odense (Denmark)

Hans F. Nielsen

References

- Arnts, H. & H. Zeiss. *Die einheimischen Runendenkmäler des Festlandes*. Leipzig, 1939.
 Düwel, K. *Runenkunde*. Stuttgart, 1968.
 Gysseling, M. *Corpus van Middelnederlandse Teksten II. Literaire handschriften, deel 1, fragmenten*. 's-Gravenhage, 1980.
 Krause, W. *Die Sprache der urnordischen Runeninschriften*. Heidelberg, 1971.
 Nielsen, H.F., "Unaccented Vowels in the Frisian Runic Inscriptions". In: *Miscellanea Frisica*. Eds. N. Århammar i.a. Assen, 1984. Pp. 11-19.
 Philippa, M. "De meervoudsvorming op *-s* in het Nederlands vóór 1300". *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, 97 (1981), 81-103.