

[0471] THE IMPERATIVUS PRO INFINITIVO RECONSIDERED

Jeg har her ligesom tidligere villet advare mod en tilbøjelighed til ved sproglige forklaringer at holde sig til ett princip. (Jespersen 1932:208)

I n t r o d u c t i o n

In this article I will again discuss the so-called Imperatives pro Infinitivo construction in Frisian, which over the last few years has received a good deal of attention. After De Waart (1972) I will also follow Hoekema's lead and propose to stick to the name Imperatives pro Infinitivo,¹ this being the most elegant name for the construction under discussion.

From the most recent literature it can be concluded that at present there are two theories about this construction (which is not as typically Frisian as one may be led to think²). In 1971 De Waart put forward a new theory which I will try to summarise as briefly and as accurately as possible. In his 1971 article he rejected the view that the *en* opening the IpI could only be taken as a kind of subordinating particle, with no longer the 'normal' meaning *en* mostly has. In his theory *en* could sometimes have subordinating function, but in other cases it could simply have its old coordinating function, even when opening the IpI. This implies for him that he does not believe in the final function that has often been ascribed to the IpI. Though he would admit that the IpI is often interpreted as final, this final interpretation - according to him incorrect - need not presuppose a structure that automatically leads to such an interpretation. For him this interpretation is quite understandable, but nevertheless wrong.

The use of coordinating *en* opening the IpI was possible only, if - in his own words - 'de conjunctie als geheel ondergeschikt is aan iets anders, en als het werkwoord van het eerste lid een infinitief is' (De Waart 1971:17). This 'iets anders' may be a modal auxiliary or something different (p. 16). I could here remark that for me it sounds a bit odd to say that the (main) verb is subordinate to an auxiliary; it might be better to consider what have traditionally been called auxiliaries main verbs with idiosyncratic formal and collocational properties. Moreover, the first half of the conjunction need not even be an infinitive, as (8), (13) prove (below); in fact, there may be even no verb at all as (21) proves - unless this verb is believed to be present in deep structure. De Waart's main contention that the IpI was never (structurally) final was attacked by Hoekema (1972), who also criticised him on other points. Hoekema received

support from Van der Meer (1972), who interpreted the IpI in essentially the same way as Hoekema, but who moreover gave an explicit (deep) structural description of the IpI. He postulated that the IpI could always be given the same deep structure, no matter whether it functioned as subject, object, or as adverbial adjunct of purpose.

De Waart replied with De Waart (1972). Here he was obliged by Hoekema's criticisms to refine his description somewhat, but he maintained that on the whole his views had not been proved to be incorrect. He also complained that his discussion with Hoekema was rather fruitless, as apparently they were working on different wave-lengths.

In an appendix De Waart³ then replied to my own 1972 article. After remarking that my examples could be adequately described by his theory as well as by mine, he went on to say quite rightly that we should look for examples that are unambiguous and can only be explained by one of the two theories. He gave two such sentences, namely (19) below, and (1) below. According to him (19) and (1) could only be adequately described with his own theory. (19) is indeed a valid counterexample to my theory, but I do not think (1) absolutely clinches the matter, as I will show. De Waart gave no source for his example (19), however, and I thought it wise to look for more genuine counterexamples to my theory, before deciding that my theory was incorrect. I did in fact find a sufficient number of them, which will be listed below, (2)-(20). Though some of these examples could perhaps be fitted into my descriptive framework, most of them cannot, but are perfectly in accord with De Waart's theory, and therefore at the beginning of this paper my first conclusion must be that the *en* opening the IpI can be both subordinating and coordinating, and that therefore De Waart was right.

I will now first list (1)-(20) in part A, then I will discuss (1) in B, where I will show that De Waart's arguments for rejecting my description of this sentence are not pertinent, and in C I will put forward a hypothesis concerning the origin of the IpI; in D something will be said about the semantic value of this construction in contradistinction to other ways of saying 'the same'; in E, finally, we will return to the question whether the IpI may be an adjunct of purpose or not.

A.

- (1) *It die jin goed dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen koe, e n lit de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije* (De Waart 1972: (75a); VdMeer 1972: (39), but without the comma, and with an exclamation mark).
- (2) *Hy liket wûnder syn slinger to hawwen, dat Peke sels sil him wol to wacht nimme e n rep der net oer, dat er sa yn ein is as in maits...* PD15

- (3) ... wol Peke him in deugd dwaen e n lês him, jitris Hedzer en dy's brief foar? PD 69
- (4) Oars bliuwt Eke dêrnêst wei jouns nei iten wolris efkes, om de saek hwat op to rêdden e n set in pantsjefol thé, drinkt wolris ien mei op en stekt dan ôf. PD92
- (5) ... Peke kin likegoed by harren ite en drinke e n jow kostjild. PD99
- (6) Hwat bilet him e n reizgje hjoed of moarn nei Teaklema's folk e n freegje, oft se net in ûngetider brûke kinne? PD130
- (7) Nou yn 'e goedichheit, kin men yn Fryslân net in minske syn gong gean litte e n jow him de kâns? PD269
- (8) Hja kinne net oars dwaen as jow har fortrouwen e n win dat fan oaren. PD282
- (9) It gie ek yn him om e n lit alles mar farre, de widdou mei har kream moai guod en de oantins oan de glimkjende deugdsome Sandra, stou by de treppen del e n jei mei de nije auto de wegen lâns nei in oar oarde ta... FFF82
- (10) Hja stiet der op oan, dat hja nou anstouns mar opbrekke sille e n jei nei hûs ta. FFF90
- (11) Easge achte himsels to heech om nei it lokaal to gean e n rieplachtsje dêr mei oaren, frjemden, oer de bilangen fan it Simmerwiid. IA10
- (12) En dy't oan it Simmerwiid komme doarst e n forinnewear it, ... IA31
- (13) As it hynder hjir komt e n meitsje de haedwei frij, den wirdt it al hwat noedlik for him. IA46 (cf. de W. 1970:17).
- (14) Hja koe sokke jounen in reis ef hwet om hûs dangelje e n nim in mennich toanen op fen 'e hymjende feestmuzyk, ... IA75
- (15) Wol moast hjir de roppigens driuwe e n stjûr de foarste snuten de úttrape daem troch... IA80
- (16) De lytse boeren, dy't de reize nou al wol oan woene e n siikje om in eigen stik fé... IA85
- (17) Dy moast den syn eigen paed mar rinne e n helje út 'e tsjusterens, hwet fen sines wie. IA85
- (18) It wie noflik hjir to sitten by it wetter e n jow de wurge lea rêst. SHH47
- (19) ...hy koe him nije as it moast e n smyt it ark der hinne... SHH61
- (20) In momint hie er oanstriid om oerein, om der út, om de doar ticht to slaen e n lit har hjir sitte mei dat naesje. SHH84
- (21) Soest opslach wol nei it Eastermarder tsjerkhôf doare e n sjoch dêr ris by Sipke grêf? WRR93⁴

As far as I am concerned, all or at least most of these examples admit of n o final interpretation - if they could conceivably have this interpretation they cannot readily be fitted into the modal categories that I listed in Van der Meer 1972:164.

S o m e r e m a r k s: the IPI in (2) must be the second part of the conjunction after *sil*, because of the presence of the word *net*; had *net* been absent, we could have postulated deletion of *der ... foar*:

sil him der wol foar to wacht nimme en rep der oer ...

If (4) is a case of the IpI, we see here an example of an IpI that is the second part of a conjunction that is a s a w h o l e subordinate to the preposition *om*, the 'iets anders' of De Waart (1971:17).

In (5) we see something very similar: here the conjunction consists of three parts (*ite, drinke, jow*), in fact three verbal forms, of which o n l y t h e t h i r d one is formally an imperative! The final interpretation is out of the question and the underlined *en* can only have its ordinary conjunctive meaning. If *kin* is considered a main verb, *ite en drinke en jow kostjild* is its object, consisting of three coordinated m e m b e r s (cf. for this term and its implications Dik 1968:205-206).

The same applies to (7), where *jow* etc. is the second member of a conjunction. (8) is interesting because it appears that a conjunction of two or more members may also be subordinated to *as*.

The most interesting example is (9): here *it* is the provisional subject, and everything after and including the first *en* the 'real' subject, which consists of three members (*lit* etc., *stou* etc., and *jei* etc.). The first *en* is clearly subordinate, so that there is only one coordinating *en*, occurring before the last of the three coordinated members, in accordance with the principle that 'an almost universal rule puts the coordinator before or after the last member of the series' (Dik:1968:41-42). As apparently the *en* in the IpI here behaves as a coordinator p u r s a n g, and is subject to its general rules of behaviour, I think this is a very cogent argument in favour of De Waart's proposal.

(10), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20) and (21) are all examples in which an IpI is the second member of a conjunction.

(13) is exceptional in that the first member of the conjunction is not as to form either an imperative or an infinitive, but a f i n i t e form (3rd sg. pres. indic.). This sentence strikes me as very unusual.⁵ Its meaning I would paraphrase as: *As it hynder hjir komt en de haedwei frijmakket ...*

(19) was quoted by De Waart (1972:26), without, however, indicating where it was to be found. He moreover added the two commas, which are nowhere to be found in the original. De Waart also added the comma in (1), which is also his own responsibility. Indeed, these commas are not in accordance with his own theory concerning the semantic value of the IpI.

B.

De Waart (1972:25 ff) adduced two counterexamples to my theory. I have already indicated that I accept (19) as a valid counterexample.

His second counterexample is (1), which is also to be found in Van der Meer 1972:159, where it was supposed to have been derived from the conjunction of two sentences:

(22) *It die jin goed dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen koe*
and

(23) *It die jin goed en lit de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije.*

I there reduced (22) and (23) by conjunction reduction to (1). This procedure may have been incorrect, as the result should have been not (1) but (24):

(24) *It die jin goed dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen koe e n e n lit de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije.*

(24) constitutes a difficulty in so far as there should be only one *en* immediately before *lit*, but this could be solved by introducing a later rule deleting one *en*.

Now De Waart said that in (1) *en lit de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije* also depended on *koe*. This is likely, and in that case the meaning of (1) would be:

(25) *It die jin goed dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen en de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije litte k o e.*

If (1) is really derived from (22) and (23), (25) would be an incorrect paraphrase. The question we should ask ourselves is then: is in the case of (1) an interpretation possible in which *en lit etc.* is *n o t* the second member of the object of *koe* (the first member being: *de skonken wer ris útslaen*), but the second member of the 'real' subject (the first member being *dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen koe*)? The somewhat hesitating answer I would give is: yes, but then a clear break between the first and second member is necessary, in writing indicated by a comma. As De Waart does not accept this possibility, he should not have added the comma in (1).

De Waart's second argument for rejecting my analysis of (1) is vitiated by the fact that he still believes his sentence (29a) to be grammatical. This sentence is according to Hoekema and me ungrammatical, and is not found as such in Van Houten 1961:52. What we do find in Van Houten is.

(26) *Dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen koe en lit de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije!*

This is quite different from De Waart's (29a).

De Waart's third argument has to do with what he calls 'saamhorigheid'. My analysis of (1) was at that time based on the assumption that all conjunction was *d e r i v e d* conjunction., i.e. that all cases of conjunction derive from deep structure *s e n t e n c e* conjunction. I now think that the evidence against this hypothesis is overwhelming (cf. Dik (1968) and others). Consequently I agree with De Waart when he says that in the IpI the two members show a certain degree of 'saamhorigheid', but this is not the same as proving that (1) cannot conceivably have an interpretation in which *en lit* etc. not 'within the scope' of *koe*. As I have indicated, I do believe that (1) can have a meaning which may be paraphrased as

(27) *It die jin goed dat men de skonken wer ris útslaen koe en om de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije to litten.*

Incidentally, when we generate (1) directly by *p h r a s a l*, and not by *d e r i v e d* conjunction, we also remove the need for the extra rule referred to above to delete one *en* in (24).

To summarise: in my opinion only (19) is an unambiguous counterexample to the theory that I put forward in 1972, because it admits of only one (non-final) interpretation.

C.

In this section I will put forward a hypothesis about the origin of the IpI. When I considered sentences like (4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20) and also (13) I saw in all cases an imperative form functioning as the *s e c o n d* member (or third) of a conjunction that is as a whole the 'object' of a preceding verb, preposition (*om*), or conjunction (*as*), and that moreover the word-order in those second (or third) members was the 'normal' order as found in main clauses. Similarly, when looking more closely at the Old and Middle Frisian examples quoted in Hoekema (1958) I discovered that in all these examples the second halves of the conjunctions had normal word-order as well, that is: verb - object, or verb - Prep. Phrase, for example (cf. also Hoekema 1971: 62). To make clear what I mean, I here quote some of Hoekema's Old and Middle Frisian examples:

- (28) *ende Jan hat oen nymen by vrow toe commen ... ende recknya mej her ende stellense toe vreden.*
- (29) *opden dei vors. ist ... consenteret datse dae kynden mogen toe hyara nijma ende brengense deerse bewaard syn ende deerse haffna wirdet.*
- (30) *hij woldet oen hem nyma ende gaen toe een prester ende spyliet wr dae tredda hand.*

- (31) *weyten seyndt dat hij comma schel ... ende forandria dat ferdban ende ayndom.*
- (32) *ende dan schel Jan syn broer ende sister al deer mey brenge ende dwaen Jurame(n)tum de calumpnia.*
- (33) *deer van schel hyo comma ende reckenya mey Eden ende stellen hem toe freden.*
- (34) *Reijner Jelys zin hat oen nijmen toe reysyen In mennertsgae ende maken boet tapster soe guet ... dat.*
- (35) *datter ... hier ... scolde commen ende brengen syn need schyn.*
- (36) *marcus orgelmaker hat oen nymen ... toe reysien toe scoterbwren ende meykia dat orgel aldeer.*
- (37) *bocka peter ... hat oen nymen ... hier Jn snits ... toe commen ende recknya mey sywrd goltsmit.*
- (38) *my tinckt wy mogge hinne gæn in seyne Waatze neye Sted in litte fen ien tijge Dockter ien Geerbrieff ofte Putlicatie schrieuwe.*
- (39) *so wol ick din hinne gæn in sisse ous Pistor dat...*

We see e.g. in (32) that the object of *brenge* precedes, whereas the object of *dwaen* follows the verb; this is also the situation that invariably holds for Modern Frisian in the IpI. The only difference between these examples, and those in A is that Old and Middle Frisian do not yet have unequivocal imperative forms in the second conjuncts. Apparently even in Old Frisian the rule held that after an auxiliary the word-order was: object (...) verb (=infinitive). But if the auxiliary governs two coordinated verbs, it seems as if the power of the auxiliary to impose this particular word-order is exhausted after the first verb, and that the normal word-order reasserts itself: e.g. in (32) verb-object.

As appears from the examples in A, in Modern Frisian the words *om* and *as* - cf. (13)-(20) - have the same property: they also impose the word-order object-verb, but if they govern two or more members of a conjunction this power is liable to be exhausted after the first member, and the normal word-order can be found again: verb-object. In Modern Frisian a concomitant phenomenon is that the verb has the form of an imperative, whereas in Old and Middle Frisian this was not the case. If we symbolise the marked (non-normal) word-order as *a*, and the first and second members of the conjunction in (32) as *x* and *y*, we could characterise the state of affairs in (32) as follows: *dan schel Jan (x and y)*. in other words: the word-order indicating subordination to *schel* is found only once. This is an example of the economy of language. To me this phenomenon is comparable to what we find in Latin *opera virorum omnium bonorum veterum* versus English *all good old men's works*: in Latin the genitive is indicated four times, in English only once (Jespersen 1922:351). We therefore observe in my interpretation the following phenomenon in these Old and Middle Frisian sentences: a formal property (word-order) to indicate subordination is,

in two or more conjuncts that are members of a subordinate structure, found only once, the last member(s) having 'unmarked' word-order.

When he discussed the above quoted Latin and English constructions, Jespersen spoke of 'parenthesising', as if $(ax + bx + cx + dx)$ had become $(a+b+c+d)x$. For example, the 's does not serve as the genitive of *men* only, but is the genitive of the whole group (all *good old men*)'s! I propose to borrow this term and change the provisional schematic representation $(\mathcal{A} + y)$ into $a(x + y)$. Such a representation should be read as follows: formal property a is to be interpreted as modifying x and y , as a whole, though it can only be actually observed as such in the first element following it, i.e. x . It is clear that concepts like *f o l l o w* and *o r d e r* should not be interpreted in a strictly literal sense.

What emerges from all this is the suggestion that in (1) through (21), and of course in the examples from Old and Middle Frisian, we have exemplifications of the abstract formula $a(x+y)$, such that formal element a is only to be observed in x , but not in y . We say then that x is *m a r k e d*, and that y is *u n - m a r k e d*. In the case of Modern Frisian moreover, a is a complex symbol, standing for both 'marked word-order' and 'infinitive form' of the verb (if a verb is present, which is mostly the case). It would be consistent to hypothesise that the infinitive is more marked than the imperative form and that the latter is relatively 'unmarked'. This last point is impossible to prove, and can only be made acceptable when it can be shown that the same phenomenon, namely $a(x+y)$ (= parenthesising) also exists, or has existed, in other languages.⁶ Therefore I will now proceed to give a summary of the relevant passages in an article by Kiparsky. In this admirably lucid and comprehensive study (Kiparsky 1968:30-57), the author discusses first the so-called historic present in e.g. Greek, Old Irish and Old Norse. He emphasises the fact that in these languages the historic present behaves *s y n t a c t i c a l l y* as a *p a s t* tense, whereas in the modern languages the historic present is syntactically not different from any normal present tense. In the second place we can observe a propensity of the (historic) present to appear in *c o n j u n c t i o n s* after a *t r u e* past tense, frequently in *c l o s e l y p a r a l l e l* structures (Old Icelandic, Lithuanian, Salamis Albanian). In the third place the historic present appears in Greek in *c o n j o i n e d* structures after a future tense. And fourthly we have alternation of aorist and present in Greek, again in conjoined structures: aorist subjunctive followed by *p r e s e n t* subjunctive; aorist optative followed by present optative; and aorist imperative followed by present imperative.

Surveying what he has said about the present tense so far, Kiparsky concludes (1968:33-34) 'Everything points to its being an underlying past tense, and its conversion

into the present tense in the surface structure must be governed by a syntactic rule, evidently some form of conjunction reduction, which optionally reduces repeated occurrences of the same tense to the present'. He then adds that *m o o d* is also subject to conjunction reduction (Old Irish, Homeric Greek), for which he gives the formula: subjunctive + subjunctive \rightarrow subjunctive + \emptyset (= indicative). He then goes on (1968:34): 'The reason that conjunction reduction yields presents and indicatives is evidently that they are the *z e r o* or unmarked tense and mood in the sense of Prague School 'Linguistic theory'.

'It is perfectly possible that a language should have a form whose unique function is that of unmarked, zero exponent of a category... The Indo-European counterpart to these forms which at once suggests itself is the so-called injunctive ... expressing only person, number and voice' (1968:36). Kiparsky then suggests that the historic present is the reflex of an earlier injunctive. That we do in fact have an instance of *a(x+y)* here is also stressed by Kiparsky: 'It is the fact ... that a large proportion of the Vedic injunctives are conjoined to non-injunctive forms' (1968:37).

In the transition from injunctive to historic present Kiparsky distinguishes three stages:

- (a) the oldest system (Vedic Sanskrit, and traces in Homeric Greek and Celtic) in which conjunction reduction of tense and mood yielded injunctive forms.
- (b) a new system (Greek, Old Irish, early Latin, Old Icelandic and some modern languages) in which the injunctive is lost, and the present and indicative now become the unmarked tense and mood.
- (c) newest system in which only conjunction reduction of *w o r d s*, not of inflectional categories etc. is possible (most modern languages).

'The infinitive also figures in conjunction reduction of these categories (tense and mood, VdM), though in a more marginal way. For example, while it is true that repeated subjunctives can be reduced to indicatives in Homeric Greek, this never holds true of repeated imperatives and optatives. Here we instead encounter the infinitive fulfilling much the same zero function (1968:52)....

'This analysis would make the prediction that the infinitive of command typically should appear in sentence conjunction after fully specified imperative forms. But this is indeed the case ...' (1968:53). 'Following up a hint of Meillet and Vendryes ... we might further consider the possibility that the historical infinitive of Latin and Welsh is also the result of conjunction reduction. The fact that in both languages it is frequently conjoined to true past tenses gives support to this hypothesis' (1968:54). Kiparsky finally gives examples from Old Irish, Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit to prove that there is also evidence that

c a s e was subject to conjunction reduction in Indo-European, with the nominative serving as the unmarked case.

My proposal to represent the conjoined structures after the 'auxiliaries', *om* and *as* in (1) through (21) as $a(x+y)$ is after this summary not as wild a guess as it may at first have seemed, I hope. Kiparsky has given definite proof that conjunction reduction is not confined to words, it may also affect inflectional categories, and (in Frisian) w o r d - o r d e r.

From all this it must follow that the imperative form in the IpI in examples (1) through (21) is the result of conjunction reduction, and that therefore the imperative form is less marked than the infinitive (cf. what I already hinted at above). But in what way is this imperative form less marked? And why did we have the shift from the infinitive to the imperative in conjunction reduction from Modern Frisian times onwards?⁷ The explanation might be quite simple:

- (a) as far as I know the infinitive (in Old, Middle and Modern Frisian) has mostly marked word-order, i.e. the object e.g. p r e c e d e s the verb (inf.).
- (b) the infinitive in the second part of the conjunction under consideration was f o l l o w e d by its object, so had unmarked word-order (Hoekema 1971:62).
- (c) because of (a), (b) must therefore have been felt to have been 'against the rules'.

And:

- (I) the r e a l imperative has unmarked word-order, i.e. its object follows.
- (II) now it happens to be the case that already in Old Frisian the imperative and the infinitive forms of the large class of *-ia* verbs had fallen together (Hoekema 1971:62), and that in later developments of Frisian another important group of verbs *gean*, *stean*, etc.) were affected by the same development.

(c), (I) and (II) then explain:

- (III) the imperative f o r m is substituted for the infinitive form.

The only thing still to be explained is the IpI in sentences like

(40) *It wie noflik en jow de wurge lea rêst*
and

(41) *Hy koe net oars dwaen as skriuw dat artikel.*

I think that just as the injunctive in Indo-European need not always be in the second (or third) member of a conjunction, but had already in Vedic Sanskrit begun to live a life of its own, the IpI emancipated itself and began, in the same way to lead an independent existence. The fact that the IpI was f o r m a l l y different from the preceding member(s) of the conjunction must have been

instrumental in this particular event of emancipation. This theory predicts that further investigation will show that sentences like (40) and (41) are only the latest development. The examples I have seen so far all point in this direction. No need to say that after this the word *en* acquired a different meaning, namely that of *s u b o r d i n a t i n g* conjunction. Apparently, it had even to disappear after *as* (41).

How are we to explain this particular case of emancipation? At first sight it might seem illogical that the second of two conjuncts, which shares but does not itself formally indicate the same function, and which therefore for its functional interpretation depends on the first conjunct, should nevertheless have loosened its ties with that first conjunct. But perhaps this is not as illogical as it seems. Let us accept the theory that

- (A) two or more conjuncts should not only be equivalent as to grammatical function (Dik 1968:25), but should also have the same *f o r m a l p r o p e r t i e s* to signal that particular function. Then
- (B) given the state of affairs as symbolised in *a(x and y)*,
- (C) the second conjunct, *y*, because of this lack of functional signals, may loosen its ties with the first conjunct *x*, and may ultimately begin to lead a life of its own.

For the second half of theory (A) I have not found any corroborative evidence in the literature I know of, but this principle probably accounts for the ungrammaticality of

(42) *Omt Jan siik wie en Pyt wie op fakânsje, gyng it kaertjountsje net troch.*

Of course the second conjunct should have had the same word-order as the first:

(43) *Omt Jan siik wie en Pyt op fakânsje wie,...*

Though I won't go into this problem here, I will yet add that the truth of theory A is an empirical matter, and is therefore testable, for instance in the manner I indicated by means of sentences (42) and (43).

Finally, it should be emphasised that the causal explanations given above do not have predictive value in the sense that (c) and (III) *m u s t* follow, given that the theories - (a); and (I) are true, and the antecedent conditions - (b); and (c), (II) - hold. Perhaps we should prefer a statement like the following: if e.g. (a) is true, and (b) holds, then (c) *m a y*, but need not, follow.

To summarise: conjunction reduction in Kiparsky's sense brings about a state of affairs that may be symbolised as *a(x+y)*; the result of this conjunction reduction however, is in conflict with another rule, my theory (A). The

outcome of this conflict is the second conjunct separating itself off from the first conjunct, so much so that in course of time it may also be found by itself, without the first conjunct actually being there. In that case the linking device *en* loses its original value, and becomes a mark of subordination. To what extent this linking device *en* has in reality become subordinate will be discussed in E.

D.

De Waart (1972:11) says 'een "nevengeschikte" *en* + "imperatiefzin"-constructie is alleen mogelijk als de beide nevengeschikte zinnen semantisch zodanig bij elkaar horen, dat ze één handeling of toestand verwoorden'. The rule that "If constituents are conjoined, they necessarily have a semantic relation" (Stockwell, Schachter, Partee 1973: 315) is well-known, and no examples are needed to prove it. My only criticism here is that it might be better to say *n o t* that the two conjuncts "één handeling of toestand verwoorden," but that the two (or more) conjuncts refer to two (or more) actions or states of affairs that are connected in such a way that they are in fact inseparable: in other words, what e.g. in (2) Peke intends to do ('sil') is *t w o* things, but he intends *n o t t w i c e*, but only *o n c e*. This last sentence is of doubtful grammaticality, but I know no other way to express what I mean here. It follows that I think it intuitively more satisfying to derive (2) directly, so with *p h r a s a l c o n j u n c - t i o n*, and *n o t* by means of *d e r i v e d c o n j u n c t i o n* from two underlying sentences like

(44) ... *Peke sels s i l him wol to wacht nimme*
and

(45) ... *Peke sels s i l der net oer reppe dat ...*

If according to the theory the semantic interpretation depends on the underlying sentences, then we have two occurrences of 'sil', so Peke 'sil' twice, not once. But this is not in accordance with the feeling that Peke 'sil' in fact only *o n c e*, though what he 'sil' is two things. We could no doubt add a rule to the effect that in such cases the partly incorrect semantic interpretation based on the underlying structures must be 'corrected' somewhat after the surface structure has been reached, but this would be one more rule than is needed if we derive (2) directly, by phrasal conjunction and not by derived conjunction. This problem of 'referential identity' - if I may use that term here - of 'sil' in (44) and (45) is a direct consequence of the derived conjunction hypothesis, and is avoided if we reject this hypothesis. The same problem is noted by Dik (1968:81 etc.), who also rejects derived conjunction. It should be stressed that in the light of

these remarks the words 'conjunction reduction' as used in section C should not be taken literally.

The last problem to be discussed here is how (2) differs from

(46) *Hy liket wûnder syn slinger to hawwen, dat Peke sels sil him wol to wacht nimme en der net oer reppe, dat er sa ynein is as in maits ...*

(46) differs of course from (2) in that its second conjunct has the same formal properties as the first. As we have seen, two or more conjuncts must have the same function. Now if the second conjunct lacks the formal indications of this function, and if the first one does have them, this second conjunct presupposes the first, and is in this sense dependent on it. This explains the strong semantic relation holding between the conjuncts in an IpI, as e.g. in (2), and also the fact that the conjuncts in a sentence like (46) are somewhat more loosely connected semantically.⁸

E.

It is clear that in

(47) *It is in lust en sjoch dernei*

en is no longer an coordinating conjunction, but is here subordinating.

According to De Waart *en* in the IpI can never have final function. The examples in A proved that he was right to the extent that they fitted his model but could not be described by mine. But is it really true that the IpI can n e v e r have final function? If we accept the hypothesis concerning the origin of this construction, it must be conceded that such a final function can only be a later development. This last point is borne out by the fact that I have not been able to find examples in Frisian fiction that provide definitive proof of the existence of this final function. It is nevertheless often asserted that the IpI is interpreted as final. How do we reconcile these facts? Is it perhaps possible for this construction to have been reinterpreted f u n c t i o n a l l y because of persistent s e m a n t i c reinterpretation? Formally this would be quite possible, because *en* in the IpI need not always be coordinating as (47) proves. So why could not this same *en* sometimes be used to introduce adjuncts of purpose?

At the moment we have examples admitting final interpretation, and others that certainly do not (those in section A). If the IpI c o n s t r u c t i o n is indeed ambiguous it should be possible to have sentences with an IpI where o n l y the final interpretation is possible. I made up two such sentences, and then asked Hoekema and Tamminga what they thought of it:

(48) *De polysje is grif kommen e n h e l j e h i m o p.*

(49) *Hy is grif nei hûs ta gien e n d r i n k i n p a n t s j e t h é.*

Both Tamminga and Hoekema accepted these sentences, though Tamminga made the restriction that (48) was a bit awkward. They also asserted quite unequivocally that the IpIs here are final, and cannot be paraphrased as:

(50) *De polysie is grif kommen en h a t him grif ophelle*

or

(51) *It is grif sa dat de polysje kommen is en him ophelle h a t.*

and

(52) *Hy is grif nei hûs ta gien en h a t grif in pantsje thé dronken*

or

(53) *It is grif sa dat er nei hûs ta gien is en in pantsje thé dronken h a t.*

Their views are in accordance with my own intuition, so that I advance the tentative hypothesis that the IpI may have final function, and may hence be subordinate. The weakness of this hypothesis is caused by the fact that I had to make up these sentences and could not find them in any texts, but at the same time this weakness may be explained by what I said above concerning the theoretically late development of the final (subordinate) function of the IpI. To summarise: I consider sentences like (47) as historically derived from sentences like (2). In (47) the first conjunct is 'lacking' - in a vague, not too literal sense - so that the second conjunct is left stranded, and reinterpretation of *en* takes place. Sentences like (48) and (49) also show reinterpretation of the IpI, even though this time the first conjunct is still there. The reinterpretation of the IpI as found in (47) paved the way for the reinterpretation as found in (48) and (49).

S o m e f i n a l r e m a r k s

The reader will no doubt have noticed that in the foregoing pages I begged a number of important questions. To mention just one example: our knowledge of Old and Middle Frisian syntax would hardly permit the sweeping statements about word-order I have been making. Though this be granted I maintain however that most of the hypotheses in this paper are based on facts, and it is only to be hoped that these facts have been correctly interpreted. Further evidence will decide whether I was right. I wish to conclude this paper with an even more general hypothesis. It seems

to me that the particular kind of conjunction reduction described above is really only a manifestation of a much more general tendency. This tendency could quite appropriately receive the name of 'economy of language'. It could be put like this: **if a certain element of a sentence presupposes, and depends on, another element in that sentence, in another sentence, or even something in the extralinguistic context, then such an element need not be fully specified syntactically and/or semantically; what is lacking, is filled in by what it presupposes.**

I believe that the IpI is a case in point, and that also e.g. pronominalisation is the result of this tendency. In other words: the same information - of whatever nature - need not be 'repeated' under certain specified conditions. I hope that future studies will confirm the essential correctness of this view.

A p p e n d i x

I will here list a number of sentences that may throw some more light on the IpI, though they are as yet unexplained.

(54) *In inkelde kear bart it, dat Peke thús ien en oar to forhakstûkjen hat en Eke komt by him.* PD 100.

(? unmarked word-order seems to be restored here; but cf. my remarks on ex. (42)).

(55) *"Hwat moatstû hjir en brek samar yn 'e hûs?"* PD 221.

(56) *Syn ûnderfinings binne net fan dyn aerd en wês dêr daelk tige eigen mei.* PD 284.

(57) *Hat Hja, Hiske, wol witen hwat se die, doe't hja sei fan ja en tsjen mei, werom nei har âlde wrald?* PD 313.

(58) *Mar hwer hat hy, Peke, de rêst wei en bisjocht (misprint?) dit allegearre hjoed sa kalm op in ôfstân?* PD 316.

(59) *... wel dy fleach it suver oan en bigjinne dermei.* FFF 177.

Annen, sept.-dec. 1973

G. van der Meer

NOTES:

1. Henceforth abbreviated as: IpI.
2. Cf. Jespersen (1932). Among the great number of examples I found this German sentence: *Fräulein Emma, wenn ich Ihnen meine gedichte vorlesen darf, so bin ich im stande und - heirathe Sie.* (p. 177). And from Bulgarian: *badéte tai dobrí i mi storéte mjesto; 'vaer så god og gør plads for mig'* (p. 177).
3. The title-page mentions as year of publication 1972, but this article did not appear until well into 1973.
4. PD stands for: Peke Donia; FFF: Folk fan Fryslân; IA: It Anker; SHH: De Sûnde fan Haitze Holwerda, WRR: Wite en Reade Roazen. Cf. the references.
5. When I asked Tamminga about it he found it a quite acceptable sentence.

6. In that case this phenomenon could be made part of the general theory of language, and my description would then have reached the level of explanatory adequacy as well.
7. An early example is to be found in Posthumus 1958:33. 'Ik tink, dat hij dit eilan yn syn boesse nei hoes drage sil, in jouw it syn soon for in apel'. Hoekema (1971:62) considers *in jouw* etc. to mean: 'om it syn soon for in apel to jaan'. That, however, *in jouw* etc. is simply the second conjunct and *n o t* an adverbial adjunct of purpose is made likely by two things: (a) according to the editors Posthumus originally wrote 'in it for in / apel oon syn soon sil jaan'; (b) Shakespeare himself wrote (here in modern English spelling) 'I think he will carry this island home in his pocket and give it his son for an apple'.
8. Note the paradox: semantically the IpI conjunct is inseparable from the preceding conjunct, syntactically - cf. what I said in C - it tends to loosen itself from this preceding conjunct. This imbalance accords well with my own intuition.

REFERENCES:

- Brolsma, Reinder (1952): Folk Fan Fryslân; Laverman, Drachten.
- Dik, Simon C. (1968): Coordination. Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics; North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Folkertsma, Eeltsje B. (1967): Wite en Reade Roazen; Laverman, Drachten.
- Haisma, Nyckle J. (1952): Peke Donia, Osinga, Boalsert.
- Hoekema, Teake (1958): In spesifyk Frysk syntagme, in: *Us Wurk* 1958: 17-23; idem (1959): In spesifyk Frysk syntagme II; in: *Us Wurk*, 1959: 85-88; idem (1971): Sentences with imperativus pro infinitivo; in: *Us Work*, 1971: 61-74.
- Houten, Ulbe van (1961): De Sûnde fan Haitze Holwerda; Laverman, Drachten.
- Jespersen, Otto (1922): *Language*; George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London. idem (1932): *Sammenfaldet: og = at*; in: *Tanker og Studier*; København.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1968): Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax; in: *Foundations of Language* 4: 30-57.
- Meer, Geart van der (1972): Is it de muoite wurdich en lêz dit? (a description of the so-called 'en + imperative construction' in Frisian); in: *Us Wurk*, 1972-1973: 151-166.
- Posthumus, Rinse (1958): De Storm, in toneelstik uut it ingels fen William Shakespeare; útjown fan J. Ras en P. Gerbenzon mei in vnlieding fan K. Dykstra. Estrikken, nûmer XXV, Grins.
- Stockwell, Robert P., Schachter, Paul and Barbara Hall Partee (1973): *The Major Syntactic Structures of English*; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Sybesma, Rintsje P. (1932): *It Anker*; Brandenburgh & Co., Snits.
- Waart, A.A.J. de (1971): Constructies met *e n* + 'imperatiefzin' in het moderne Westerlauwerse Fries; in: *Stúdzjekonferinsje Frysk, Ljouwert*. Idem (1972): 'Twee aspecten van de Friese imperativus pro infinitivo: 'Saamhorigheid' en 'Content Phrases', naar aanleiding van: Hoekema's 'Sentences with imperativus pro infinitivo', met een aanhangsel naar aanleiding van Van der Meer's 'Is it de muoite wurdich en lêz dit?'; Ljouwert.