

[0408] Sentences with imperativus pro infinitivo¹**1. INTRODUCTION**

A. In Old Frisian, and in other Germanic dialects, sentences of this type are found²:

(a) *dan schel Jan syn broer ende syn sister al deer mey brenge / ende dwaen juramentum de calumpnia* (Snitser Recesboeken 1490-1517, ed. M. Oosterhout, Assen 1960; no. 4421 30-6-1507);

(b) *opden dei vors. ist /. . / consenteret datse dae kynden mogen toe hyara nijma / ende brengense deerse bewaerd syn* (op. cit. no. 4245 24-3-1507).

Both in the principal and in the subordinate clause objects and infinitives form a chiasmus. For the sake of brevity we will call the part up to the oblique dash part I and the rest part II, even if in later texts the imperative form occurs instead of the infinitive (imperativus pro infinitivo). Although both the examples cited above have objects in part II, sentences occur without an object in that part, and in that case some other element is present. In Modern Frisian sometimes neither an object nor another element is used:

se moasten mar hinnegean / en birêst.

However it was the type of sentence which did contain an object or other element which was to cause the development of this specifically Frisian phenomenon, viz. imperative form without imperative function³.

Taking examples like (a) and (b) we may assume that the chiasmus has a rather negative influence on the co-ordinating function of *ende*⁴. Even dissimilar units can be connected by *ende* as probably is the case in:

Marcus orgelmaker hat oen nymen /... / toe reysien toe Scoterbwren / ende meykia dat orgel aldeer (op. cit. no. 2655 1511).

In the following Middle Frisian sentence, translated from Low German, it might appear that an essential element, viz. the infinitive, has been omitted from part I. This was probably possible because the idea of movement, here as in many other examples expressed in part I, is implied by other words:

Soon, soo mooste neye sted / in litte yn wtickati schriewe fin in tijge dooctoor (Estrikken VII, Grins 1955, p. 20).

B. The use of the imperativus pro infinitivo is becoming apparent in the case of verbs whose infinitive and imperative differ in form⁵, as is shown on p. 33 of Rinse Posthumus's translation (1852) of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (ed. J. Ras, P. Gerbenzon & K. Dykstra as *Estrikken XXV*, Grins 1958, p. 33):

(c 1) *Ik tink, dat hij dit eilan yn syn boesse nei hoes drage sil, / in jouw it syn soon for in apel.*

How was the infinitive in part II subsequently replaced by an imperative form? It seems to us that the following two factors are very important:

- a. the infinitive and the imperative occupied the same position in the word order, viz. between *en(de)* and the other elements;
- b. the infinitive form and the imperative form of the large class of *ia*-verbs had already fallen together by the Old Frisian period.

The structure of part II tends to be rather fixed. Part I however can have various structures, though these are, as we know from experience, not variable ad libitum. The conditions under which imperativus pro infinitivo can and can not occur have never been delineated, but we hope to reveal some of them in the following pages.

C. First we must consider the change from the compound sentence with its one (contracted) subject to the sentence with one subject in part I and a different subject, not expressed, in part II. Under what circumstances could this change of subject take place? We believe that synonymous sentences have played an important rôle. We know that a sentence like (c 1) is synonymous with

(c2) *Ik tink, dat hij dit eilan yn syn boesse nei hoes drage sil om it syn soon for in apel to jaan* (orthography of Posthumus).

The *om*-phrase occurs with a non-final function in many other sentences:

(d2) *It is in lust om der nei to sjen.*

For the native speaker resemblance in form has probably been more important than difference in function, so why should he not, on analogy with (c2): (c 1) create (d2): (d1), so we get a new structure as found in the *Leeuwarder Courant* of 24-8-1955:

(d 1) *It is in lust / en sjoch der nei.*

Now let us consider another possibility. L. Brolsma, in *Stoarm oer Fryslân* (De Haech 1944) p. 33, uses the sentence

(e 1) *den moatte hja al tûke sylfers wêze / en ûntwyn dy mannen.*

This sentence can be changed into synonymous sentences like
 (e2) *den moatte hja al tûke sylfers wêze om dy mannen to ûntwinnen*
 and
 (f2) *den moatte it al tûke sylfers wêze om dy mannen to ûntwinnen.*

Then it is but a short step from the latter sentence to

(f 1) *den moatte it al tûke sylfers wêze / en ûntwyn dy mannen.*

One could consider sentence (e 1) theoretically derived from
 (e) *den moatte hja al tûke sylfers wêze / en dy mannen ûntwine.*

But this does not apply in the same way to (f 1):

* *den moatte it al tûke sylfers wêze en (den moatte it) dy mannen ûntwine.*

One could still say that *it* in (f 1) and in (f2) functions as the subject, in fact the only subject in the sentence, even if one objects to the form of the pronoun. But it is quite impossible to assume any relation between the expressed subject *it* of part I and the unexpressed subject of the *om*-phrase in a sentence like

(g2) *it is moai wurk om sa folle nijs to finen.*

However it is hardly surprising if the native speaker on analogy with (f2): (f 1) creates (g2): (g1), so the following structure comes into being:

(g 1) *it is moai wurk / en fyn sa folle nije dingen.*

Here again the formal resemblance between the sentences probably had a greater influence than the functional difference: in (f2) the *om*-phrase can be considered synonymous with a conditional clause; in (g2) *om* is rather superfluous and is used purely copulatively. Doubtless one could posit other theories which might account for the change from sentences with one subject to sentences with two subjects, but let us restrict ourselves to the two mentioned above.

D. For the sake of brevity we will introduce two terms for the different kinds of sentences we dealt with in the preceding paragraph, viz. 'C-type' (C < co-ordination) and 'S-type' (S < subordination). We will call a sentence with an imperativus pro infinitivo a C-type, if it theoretically can be derived from the type of compound sentences exemplified by (h). As regards type sentence (h) can be considered a variant of (a) or (b), but with a 'normal' word order. We will call the sentence an S-type, if such a derivation is quite impossible.

E. After what was written about the *imperativus pro infinitivo* some years ago⁶ we recently became acquainted with Mr. A.A.J. de Waart's transformational-generative approach to the Constructies met *en* + 'imperatiefzin' in het moderne Westerlauwerse Fries (Amsterdam, 1971), a forty page study, that was distributed by the author in order to renew the discussion about this specifically Frisian phrase. Mr. De Waart's study is divided into six paragraphs (see note 13):

- (1) Literatuur;
- (2) Overeenkomsten en verschillen van het tweede lid en de imperatiefzin;
- (3) Constructies met *en* + "imperatiefzin" van tweeërlei syntactische structuur;
- (4) De relatie met *om to* + infinitief-constructie;
- (5) Restricties;
- (6) De toepasbaarheid van de transformationeel-generatieve grammatica.

Paragraphs (2)-(5) are the most essential ones for the discussion. In our review we deal with the topics in the same order as does Mr. De Waart; our paragraphs also retain his numbering.

2a. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN PART II AND THE IMPERATIVE SENTENCE (De Waart p. 7-9)

The similarities in form and word order between part II (without *en*) and the imperative sentence are well-known from earlier publications. As a third similarity the author considers 'Het ontbreken van het subject in de uiterlijke vorm van de zin', but he says in the same breath 'Gebiedende wijzen kunnen in het Fries een uitgedrukt subject hebben, maar in de regel ontbreekt het' (p. 7). It is quite untrue to say the subject of part II is never expressed. Imagine, for instance, that A and B are each planning to give a present to C. In discussing the matter, A could well say to B

it bêste is en jow dou him in boek (, dan jow ik him in kistje segaren)

A fourth similarity is supposed to be 'dat sommige modale hulpwerkwoorden in geen van beide als persoonsvorm kunnen optreden' (p. 9). The author mentions two examples: *moatte* and *wolle*. These verbs, at any rate, can both be used in the imperative clause and in part II:

- (*moatte*) A: *Dou silst wol tsjin de operaesje oansjen tink?*
 B: *Ja, mar moat mar ris opereard wurde!*
 C: *Ja, it is yn sa'n gefal faeks ek mar it bêste / en moat.*
- (*wolle*) *Wol my de útslach sa gau mooglik to witten dwaen*
 (epistolary style).
 As se sa fier komme koenen / en wol my skewiele, dan bin 'k moai klear.

2b. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PART II AND THE IMPERATIVE SENTENCE (De Waart p. 9-11)

The author notes three differences:

a. 'Wederkerende voornaamwoorden corefereren naar getal en persoon met het subject van de zin. In imperatieve zinnen zijn alleen wederkerende voornaamwoorden van de tweede persoon mogelijk' (p. 9). The latter assertion is untrue, at least in that precise wording. In note 10 the author cites two examples from P. Sipma's *Phonology and Grammar* (Oxford 1913, reprint Ljouwert 1966): *Wêz hy mar stil* (p. 69) and *Doch Heit dat effen* (p. 18). What is true of non-reflexive verbs, is true also of the reflexive ones, e.g.:

jow hy him mar moai del, jonkje!

and

jow der jin net to djip yn (, dat 's de baes).

In the first example *hy* is formally a pronoun of the third person, but functionally it is used as if it were second person. The pronoun *men-jins-jin* refers more or less to all persons. We therefore believe that the author is making a mistake in saying the example with *jin* would be impossible.

b. 'Stative⁷ werkwoorden [kunnen niet] optreden in imperatiefzinnen, maar wel in het tweede lid van de constructie' (p. 11). The wording of this assertion is wrong: it is not the verb as such, but its function that can be either stative or non-stative. This can be proved beyond a shadow of doubt by using the author's own examples. He presents *hearre* and *sjen* as statives and *sjen nei* and *harkje/hearre nei* as nonstatives. In the following examples however *hearre* and *sjen* have a non-stative function:

hear dy bernestimmen ris!

sjoch ris, sa'n fûgels fleane dêr!

Or consider whether *harkje nei* really is non-stative in the following sentence:
ik moat thús gauris harkje nei mesyk dy't my net leit.

If what the author says is true, it should be impossible to use *stroffelje* in an imperative sentence. This is untrue. Imagine A stumbling over B's legs. Quite likely B would react by exclaiming in exasperation - we use the author's own example -:

stroffelje (dou) oer dyn eigen skonken!,

an order that can easily be obeyed, as every clown knows.

This second difference mentioned by the author cannot be used in order to distinguish a part II from an imperative sentence. Rather, the situation is quite the reverse. Not until we know by other means whether we are dealing with a part II or with an imperative sentence, can we determine whether the verb used in it has a stative or a non-stative function.

c. 'Een laatste argument waarom het tweede lid van de constructie geen imperatiefzin is, is dat in het algemeen een imperatiefzin door *en* slechts kan worden verbonden met een andere imperatiefzin' (p. 11). This thesis is invalidated by the words 'in het algemeen' and consequently cannot be used as a criterion in distinguishing a part II from an imperative sentence. It is easy to construct ambiguous cases by loosening C-types from their context, as in:

dou moastst de sted mar yngean en helje ek even in pakje sigaretten.

If *ek* is used to join the second clause as a whole to the first, *helje* is a real imperative. If *ek* refers to anything else, *helje* must be interpreted as an imperativus pro infinitivo⁸.

3. C-TYPES AND S-TYPES (De Waart p. 12-15)

The difference between 'nevengeschikte' and 'ondergeschikte constructie' in De Waart's study does not coincide with our division in C-types and S-types, as will be demonstrated in § 4. As the author says, many subordinate constructions with an imperativus pro infinitivo are distinguished by a word in part I which indicates that there is a part II to follow; in the next example this word is *der*:

Jelle tocht der net oan / en knip syn hier [der]ôf (p. 13).

Dealing with the example

It is better en demonstrearje by 't winter net (p. 13)

the author strangely enough does not mention among the characteristics of this subordinate type that of having different subjects in the two parts of the sentence. A further review of De Waart's § 3 will follow in our § 4. First we should explain how a theoretical derivation of a sentence with imperativus pro infinitivo can be worked out. Let us take an example from Miedema's contribution to the problem, a quotation from the Acts of the Apostles IX. 38:

/... / to freegjen, dat er net toevje scoe / en kom ta hjarren oer.

This could theoretically be derived from

/... / to freegjen, dat er net toevje en ta hjarren oerkomme scoe,

in which sentence *net* refers only to *toevje*. The quotation then is to be considered a C-type.

Sometimes part I seems to be defective and it must be completed, before we can identify the particular type. This is the case in another of Miedema's quotations:

Hja wierne by steat / en bliuw stil wei (U. van Houten, *De sûnde fen Haitze Holwerda*, Ljouwert 1938, p. 19).

The expression *by steat wêze* cannot be used without a prepositional object, so we have to complete the sentence making it:

Hja wierne derta by steat / en bliuw stil wei.

The element *der-* indicates that there is a part II to follow, so the example is quite obviously an S-type.

The author however used other methods in order to identify sentences with an imperativus pro infinitivo, as we will learn from the next paragraph.

4. THE RELATION BETWEEN PART II AND THE OM-PHRASE (De Waart p. 16-22)

A. Let us look at the following three sentences:

(h) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean en mij in bôle helje?*

(h 1) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean / en helje mij in bôle?*

(h2) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean om mij in bôle to heljen?*

As in the examples in 1 A the first principal verb in these sentences denotes movement. The final function of *om* in (h2) is obvious. This final function is also present in (h) and in (h 1), even if we cannot point to special words marking that function. But other characteristics can prove the synonymity of both (h) and (h 1) with (h2). Not only would one get a rather silly sentence in permuting the two parts either in (h) or in (h 1), but as the sentences stand, intonation and rhythm point towards the second part, this being the more important as regards content. We may conclude that we have in (h) a special compound sentence and it is there the principal mistake of the author lies, because he is lumping all compound sentences with a contracted subject together. It was Overdiep who observed the same special characteristics in the Low Saxon counterparts of (b)⁹. As mentioned above sentence (h) can be considered a variant of types like (a) or (b), but with a 'normal' word order. It is both the unchangeable sequence of the parts and the intonation and rhythm that distinguish sentences like (h) from a type like

(i) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean en dyn fyts by de smit weihelje?*

This can be proved by demonstrating that it is impossible to change (i) either to

* *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean / en helje dyn fyts by de smit wei?*

or to

* *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean om dyn fyts by de smit wei to heljen?*

It would of course be possible to say

wolstou effen nei de bakker om d ê r n e i dyn fyts by de smit wei to heljen?

This alteration however is not a case of merely adding a word. It also involves changing the meaning of *om*, from final to continuative function.

In Frisian one also encounters the ironical use of the *om*-phrase:

(j2) *Gerben soe in pô't ferve keapje kinne om lykwols syn tafel net to fervjen.*

It seems that the author did not know of the existence of sentences like (j 2) in his mother-tongue, let alone in Frisian. And again we must give the honour to Overdiep as the first scholar who mentions examples of this from Dutch in his grammar^o. It might be evident that (j2) can be changed into synonymous sentences like

(j) *Gerben soe in pô't ferve keapje kinne en lykwols syn tafel net fervje*

and

(j1) *Gerben soe in pô't ferve keapje kinne / en fervje lykwols syn tafel net.*

For the author however, the sentence (j 2) was nonsense (p. 12).

B. Overlooking the difference between sentences like (h) and those like (i) the author produces a bad example:

(k 1) *men koe de skonken wer ris útslaen / en lit de keamerlucht fan jin ôfwaeije.*

In a sentence like this with different objects in the two parts there is no direct relation between the actions mentioned in part I and in part II. Moreover, it is impossible to enunciate (k 1) with the same intonation and rhythm as (h 1). Sentence (k 1) is incorrectly derived from a sentence of the same type as (i):

(k) *men koe de skonken wer ris útslaen en de keamerlucht fan fin ôfwaeije litte.*

The author unwittingly proves that (k) is just such a sentence as (i), because he considers it possible to add words like *ek*, *boppedat* etc. after *en*. This is only possible if the sentence is enumerating two actions without a direct relation to each other.

A second principal mistake of the author is his supposition that only S-types have what he calls a complement and that it is only those which can be rewritten as a sentence with an *om*-phrase (p. 16 ff.). A complement sentence is a sentence in which a part II is necessary. But because of the intonation and rhythm one knows that part II is equally a necessary complement in C-types like (h 1) and both a C-type and an S-type can be changed to a synonymous sentence with the *om*-phrase. The author is therefore drawing a wrong conclusion if he says 'dat "nevengeschikte" *en* + "imperatiefzin"-constructies n o o i t kunnen worden "omgezet" in *om to* + infinitivf-constructies' (p. 21). The author's way of thinking may be illustrated by the following example. On p. 19 ff. he turns a deaf ear to the intonation and rhythm of

(l) *de polysje soe by him komme kinne / en helje him op,*

saying that part II does not have a final function in the sentence and can be detached, so the rest is

de polysje soe by him komme kinne.

We may refer again to Overdiep's § 372 (p. 611). The author overlooks the relation between the two actions mentioned in (1). There is a rather fine balance between the two principal verbs in sentences like this: semantically *helje ... op* is more important than *komme*, but grammatically *komme* functions more independently and can take more forms than merely the infinitive.

C. On p. 16 the author discusses the sentence

(m2) *Piter die it him net oan tiid om it boek to lêzen.*

Though it might be evident that this sentence can have no other meaning than that Piter is too busy to read the book - *it* in part I heralds part II -, the author considers a second meaning possible, viz. that Piter is busy with something else, expressed by *it* in part I, and therefore does not have time to read the book. A sentence with the latter meaning would have not only a different intonation and rhythm, but certainly also a different punctuation, and this is the case both in Frisian and in his mother-tongue. Such a sentence as this would appear as follows:

(n2) *Piter die it him net oan tiid: om it boek to lêzen,*

or preferably with this wording:

Piter die it him net oan tiid: om it boek lêze to kinnen.

Sentence (m2) can be changed into what is clearly an S-type:

(m1) *Piter die it him net oan tiid / en lêst it boek.*

Sentence (n2) having a first part with an object different from that in the second part is to be considered as an (i)-type:

(n) *Piter woe it him net oan tiid dwaen en it boek lêze.*

D. On p. 20 the author broaches a new question in connection with the *om*-phrase. He says that the *om*-phrase in

(p2) *de polysje soe mei dit doel by him komme kinne, om him op to heljen*

has the same character as the *om*-phrase in (n2). That this is a mistake is proved by the fact that it is impossible to change (p2) into a synonymous sentence like

**de polysje soe mei dit doel by him komme kinne en him ophelje. ..*

The latter sentence would be grammatically correct only if *mei dit doel* refers to something other than *him ophelje*. In (p2) there is a clear connection between the pause before *om* and the force of the demonstrative pronoun *dit*. If one substitutes *dit* by *it*, the pause is not there:

de polysje soe mei it doel by him komme kinne om him op to heljen,

or better

(q2) *de polysje soe by him komme kinne mei it doel om him op to heljen.*

These sentences do not have a formal relation with sentence (1), as the author assumes (p. 20), but with a sentence of this structure:

(p 1) *de polysje soe mei dit doel by him komme kinne / en helje him op.*

Sentence (I) is a C-type, sentence (p 1) is an S-type, whereas part II is a content phrase connected with *doel*, just like the *om*-phrases in (p2) and in (q2). We believe that the author's mistake in the analysis of these sentences is rooted in the fact that he groups together extensions like *mei (d)it doel*, which from a strictly logical point of view are not necessary, with necessary words whose function is to herald part II, such as we have in

hy hat deroer prakkesearre / en forfar nei Fryslân.

If the phrase *mei (d)it doel* was a necessary prelude, we could use it somehow in a simple sentence as indeed we can with *-oer*:

hy hat prakkesearre oer forfarren nei Fryslân.

The author was forced to say that (p 1) in Frisian was an impossible sentence, because his (wrong) way of thinking led step by step to that conclusion.

5. RESTRICTIONS

A. Though we always consider a sentence with a compound verb as the prototype of the C-types, these types in Modern Frisian do often occur with a simple verb in part I. This fact does not prevent the author from saying: 'Een "nevenschikkende" constructie is inderdaad niet mogelijk na een "enkelvoudig gezegde" in het eerste lid' (p. 24). On p. 25 he gives exceptions, only making his argument even more complicated. At any rate, we do not see why one could not say

hij komt wol ris by dy / en nim myn pepieren wer mei (Us Wurk 1958 p. 18),

if it is possible to say

(r 1) *de polysje komt grif by him / en helje him op* (Us Wurk 1959 p. 87; De Waart p. 24)

or

(s 1) *giestou even hinne / en nim in spoarkaertsje foar my?* (Us Wurk 1958 p. 18; De Waart note 23).

The exceptions built into the author's rule force him to very abstruse explanations. For instance, in (s 1) *nim* is undeniably more important than *giest-* from a semantic point of view, but this circumstance does not allow us to demote *giest-* to an ordinary auxiliary verb and to neglect the category to which this sentence belongs, the C-types. The author is on the same, wrong, track by saying that in

hy sil wol ris by dy komme / en nim myn pepieren wer mei

we do not have 'een samengesteld gezegde in het eerste lid, maar /.../ een modaal hulpwerkwoord waaraan twee werkwoorden ondergeschikt zijn: één infinitief (*komme*) en één "imperatief" (*nim*)' (p. 24). First as regards the auxiliary verb, 'what is the difference between 'een samengesteld gezegde' and 'een /.../ hulpwerkwoord waaraan /.../ werkwoorden ondergeschikt zijn'? But the whole thesis is

untrue. Since the verb in part II could change its form from an infinitive to an imperative, it no longer depends on an auxiliary verb in part I. As for the latter there is a relation only with the principal verb in part I. This auxiliary verb may have a modal character, but the question is to what extent that quality is due to the presence of the modal words *wol ris*; cf. the presence of *grif* in (r 1). The author's conclusion 'Alleen als de hele conjunctie [viz. the principal verbs in part I and in part II] ondergeschikt is aan het modale hulpwerkwoord, is in het tweede lid ervan een imperatiefvorm mogelijk' (p. 24) is as far as we can see based on a fiction.

B. Neither can we agree with the author's analysis of the sentence, corrected in accordance with the author's remarks on the use of *om* in note 19:

it wie noflik om hjir to sitten en jow de wurge lea rêst (p. 24).

The author is mistaken if he believes that *sitten* belongs to part I. Part I consists of *it wie noflik*. Part II has a compound character, consisting of both *om hjir to sitten* and *en jow de wurge lea rêst*. The sentence could be rewritten as

it wie noflik / en sit hjir en jow de wurge lea rêst.

The relation between the two elements of part II is the same as that between the two parts of a C-type, but the sentence as a whole is an S-type: the subject *it* heralds part II.

C. The use of a rather special S-type, such as

it idé en liz de Lauwerssé droech is net alhiel nij (p. 28)

can be explained by assuming either that this is a case of prolepsis and a development from

it idé is net alhiel nij / en liz de Lauwerssé droech

or that the preceding stage was an *om*-phrase (content phrase). Similar examples include (p. 1) and two of the author's sentences:

Harmen hie de moed / en laitsje Sytse út (p. 29)

and

haw it hert net / en blies it Coulonhûs op (De Waart note 23).

Strangely enough the author mentions the last example together with a C-type like (s 1).

CODA

Like Mr. A.A.J. de Waart I hoped that his investigations of an aspect of Frisian syntax would turn out as well as did the studies in Dutch syntax by A. Kraak and W.G. Klooster, who so splendidly introduced transformational-generative methods to the Netherlands. That his attempt was unsuccessful is largely due to his Frisian supervisor, who as such is responsible both for his bad examples and for his frequent rejection or misinterpretation of the good ones, not to mention his failure to apply the new methods¹¹. In connection with the last point it is rather sad to recall that it was this same supervisor who some years ago wrote a not unpretentious article casting doubt on the competence of other Frisian linguists in using 'the new' methods in their field¹². The results of Mr. De Waart's study¹³ admit that new methods help little if language sense is lacking.

I hope that with the preceding pages I have satisfied the author's expressed wishes concerning a renewed discussion of this specifically Frisian syntagma. As for the future I trust that he will manage to get some competent help with his Frisian studies, or better still, that he will be able to stand on his own two feet.

Teake B. Hoekema

Notes

1. The term 'imperativus pro infinitivo' might replace the terms I used in earlier publications. - Normally I write my contributions to Us Wurk in Frisian. Whereas this article is primarily intended for Mr. A.A.J. de Waart of Amsterdam, by his own testimony not very fluent in Frisian, it is published in the sister-language of Frisian that rose to the rank of a universal language. My thanks go to Miss Heather Wood M.A. of Edinburgh for her translation.
2. Where it was useful, examples have been numbered. Examples in which the principal verb in both parts of the sentence has an infinitive form are indicated by a single letter. For cases with an imperativus pro infinitivo a number 1 is added to the letter. Examples with an *om*-phrase are indicated by a letter with a number 2.
3. An imperativus pro infinitivo never has an imperative meaning. Either one is dealing with an imperative or with an imperativus pro infinitivo. In written form a sentence can therefore have two interpretations, e.g. *kom hjir ris en jow my de krante* can be interpreted as a sentence with two imperatives: *kom (dou) hjir ris en jow (dou) my de krante*, or as: *kom (dou) hjir ris en jow my de krante*, the latter being a sentence consisting of a part I with imperative connected with a part II. In both cases we assume one subject per sentence. In view of this the too simple presentation of the question both in my article in Us Wurk 1958 p. 17-18 and in De Waart's study p. 36 should be corrected.
4. We restrict the discussion in this article to examples with the conjunction *en(de)*. Other less frequent conjunctions are *as* and *mar*, e.g. *sy kin neat better dwaen as hâld har stil* and *it bêste is: freonlik tsjin him wêze mar jow him net to folle bod*.
5. In Modern Frisian the imperative and the 1st pers. sing. present tense of all verbs except *wêze* have the same form. In the case of verbs with an infinitive in *-e* that stage had already been reached in Old Frisian. In order to get the same result with the verbs with an infinitive in *-je*, the singular form of the imperative had to be lost. With the *je*-verbs the forms of the 1st pers. sing. present tense, the imperative and the infinitive have by now fallen together.

6. Literature: G.S. Overdiep, *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch* (Zwolle, 1949²). - H.T.J. Miedema, It bynwurd *en* mei in ymperatyf of ynfinityf, in: *De Pompebledden* 1957, p. 232-236. - Teake Hoekema, In spesifyk Frysk syntagme I-II, in: *Us Wurk* 1958 p. 17-23, id. 1959 p. 85-88. - D.A. Tamminga, Fan sinnen en bysinnen, in: *De Pompebledden* 1959 p. 126-131.
7. With statively used verbs the acting person's will in the action is not involved, but in the non-statively used verbs the action is voluntary.
5. Cf. the author's note 17 and note 3 of this review.
6. Op. cit. § 372, p. 611.
10. Op. cit. § 215.
11. A great part in this discussion has been played by 'juff. drs. A. Feitsma, dosinte Frysk oan 'e Vrije Universiteit [at Amsterdam]. /... / Oan juff. Feitsma wyt ik boppedat gâns forbetterings hwer't myn Fryske [r. Frysk] taelgefoel net tarikkend wie' [= I blame [sic] Miss Feitsma moreover for many corrections in cases where my sense for the Frisian language was insufficient] (*De Waart* p. 1).
12. A. Feitsma, Frisistyk freget modernere oanpak; kin Fryske Akademy romte en klimaet skeppe foar't nije? in: *Friese Koerier* 3-5-1969. The reply by the president of the Fryske Akademy, Mr. Freark Bergstra, was published in: *Ut de smidte fan de Fryske Akademy* of June 1969. - My thanks are due to the financial director of the Fryske Akademy, Mr. Keimpe Sikkema, for drawing my attention to the two articles.
13. Just before this number of *Us Wurk* went to press I heard that Mr. De Waart's article is to be reprinted in a practically unaltered form, but almost certainly with different page-numbering. The sequence of the paragraphs however remains unchanged.

SENTENCES WITH IMPERATIVUS PRO INFINITIVO II

A

Some time ago Mr. Geart van der Meer - to whom I am indebted for the English translation of the following pages – and I discussed *Sentences with imperativus pro infinitivo* [I] (U.W. 1971 p. 61-74). The result of this discussion is that I have to delete lines 7 through 10 on page 63 of my remarks on example

(e1) *den moatte hja al tûke sylfers wêze / en ûntwyn dy mannen*

from L. Brolsma, *Stoarm oer Fryslân* (The Hague 1944). As happens more often there is in this example no heralding particle. It would even sound a bit awkward if we were to insert it:

den moatte it der al tûke sylfers foar wêze / en ûntwyn dy mannen.

But a sentence like

om dy mannen to ûntwinen, nou, dêr moat men in tûk sylfer foar wêze

makes it clear that *d e r* is as it were an 'underlying' particle in the sentence under discussion. We had the same in the example *Hja wierne (derta) by steat / en bliuw stil wei* (*Sentences I*, p. 67). In other words, example (e1) is an S-type.

B

In reply to *Sentences I* Mr. A.A.J. de Waart published *Twee aspecten van de Friese imperativus pro infinitivo: "saamhorigheid" en "content phrases"* (1972). My overall impression is that the author maintains the absolute validity of his theses - criticised in *Sentences I* - concerning the properties of imperative sentences and sentences with an imperativus pro infinitivo, no matter what kind of and how many exceptions I there pointed out. The author has made extensive use of the saying that the exception proves the rule ... Though this article by De Waart cannot lead me to change the essentials of my point of view as expressed in *Sentences I*, and more discussion from my part is therefore uncalled for, it might yet be in order to make some marginal notes on the separate sections of this publication, whose numbering I for convenience' sake shall adopt.

1.1. De Waart's thesis that imperative sentences and sentences with an imperativus pro infinitivo do not have overt subjects has been refuted by me in *Sentences I*, p. 64 with the following example:

it bêste is en jow dou him in boek(, dan jow ik him in kistje segaren),

to which may be added an example of an imperative sentence:

jow dou him in boek (, dan jow ik him in kistje segaren).

Contrast is responsible for the overt subjects in these examples, though the sentence with the contrasting subject need not be expressed. No contrast is needed, however, for overt subjects in imperative sentences if such sentences are functionally equivalent to requests, for example

Jouke, gean dou even nei de bakker om in bôle, ju.

Nor is contrast required if in sentences with an imperative the command is given emphasis by means of an adverbial adjunct:

Jouke, gean dou as de blikstien nei de bakker om in bôle!

Apart from the fact that these examples in themselves disprove the author's thesis, they are also clearly different from sentences with imperativus pro infinitivo, for in such sentences this use of overt subjects is of course lacking.

1.2.1-2 As far as I know A. Kraak and W.G. Klooster have written nothing in their books to cause me to rank an imperative sentence like

stroffelje (dou) oer dyn eigen skonken (Sentences I, p.65)

among ungrammatical sentences. The same holds for the other examples given in these sections.

1.3. In this section also the author had better first have acquired a more adequate overview of the subject before jumping to any conclusions. In describing sentences with an imperativus pro infinitivo in connection with imperative sentences we base ourselves on formal criteria, and we do not exclude from that description any groups of sentences because of their function. Many thousands of imperative sentences really constitute pieces of advice, for some or all people - just read the advertisement columns! - and there are naturally also sentences with an imperativus pro infinitivo with this function. Therefore, in describing the Frisian examples there is no avoiding an example like

jow der jin net to djip yn(, dat's de baes), (Sent. I, p.65)

no matter what the context of this imperative sentence is, though in a full and adequate description this context cannot be left out. As a matter of course we also have a

sentence with an imperativus pro infinitivo, which owing to the formal difference had better not be called a variant:

it is de baes en jow jin der net to djip yn (*Twee asp.*, p. 6).

1.4. One and the same word may have various functions; therefore I prefer saying e.g. '*hearre* with stative function' and '*hearre* with non-stative function'. Expressions like 'the stative verb *hearre*' or 'the non-stative verb *hearre*' are apt to be misinterpreted.

1.5. When the author says that imperative sentences are generally only conjoined with other imperative sentences (by means of *en*) I take him to be referring to sentences with a f o r m a l imperative. In that case it is relatively easy to find counterexamples. In a sentence like

dou moastst mar ris in eintsje kuijerje en helje dan ek even in pakje sigeretten

the second part is a sentence with a formal imperative, the first not being an imperative sentence formally. As long as we do not know the intonation of a sentence like

dou moastst de stêd mar yngean en helje ek even in pakje sigeretten (*Sentences I*, p. 66)

this sentence may quite well be interpreted in Dutch as

je moet de stad maar eens ingaan(,) en haal ook even een pakje sigaretten (*Twee aspecten*, p. 8).

2. The author maintains that his division into coordinate and subordinate constructions runs parallel to mine into C- and S-types, but as long as he denies the final character of my C-type examples he will go on putting forward ungrammatical sentences he considers examples of the coordinate construction.

3.1. I do not give up the view that in all of the three following examples (to be found in *Sentences I*, p. 67) meaning, word-order, intonation and rhythm point to there being a final relation:

(h) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean en mij in bôle helje?*

(h1) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean/en helje mij in bôle?*

(h2) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean/om mij in bôle to heljen?*

When the author says that 'De onverwisselbaarheid der leden is evenwel niet in strijd met een "nevenschikkende" interpretatie' he is beating on an open door. Have I ever said the opposite? For about the type we are concerned with here - (h1) - I said that it was a C-type, so hwat? If I may also have applied the 'onverwisselbaarheid der leden' to (h2), then this only holds because we here have an interrogative sentence. In cases like

dou moastst effen nei de bakker gean om mij in bôle to heljen

the *om*-phrase may also be fronted, and yet we do not get a meaningless sentence. After this operation the meaning is of course slightly different.

3.2.1-2. In 3.1 we saw that (h) was an example of coordination (with a special relation between the coordinate parts), and that (h1) was a C-type, because it is from a historical point of view a case like (h) with only a somewhat different word-order. Both in (h) and (h1) we have what the author calls 'saamhorigheid' (cohesion). But contrary to what the author wants to make the reader believe I have n o w h e r e said that an added *dêrnei* brings about the required cohesion in a purely continuative sentence like

(i) *wolstou effen nei de bakker gean en dyn fyts by de smit weihelje?* (*Sentences I*, p. 68).

The same holds for

wolstou effen nei de bakker gean om dêrnei dyn fyts by de smit wei to heljen?

The author finally constructs a sentence like

wolstou effen nei de bakker gean en helje dêrnei dyn fyts by de smit wei?

But is it grammatical? The author does not realise that not every continuative *om*-phrase can alternate with *en* + the second part of sentences with imperativus pro infinitivo. Alternation seems to be possible only if there is real cohesion between the two parts of the sentence. So it will perhaps be possible to say

wol Doeke earst wol effen nei de bakker gean en helje dêrnei syn fyts by de smit wei?

if it originally was Doeke's intention to go first to the blacksmith. The required cohesion is brought about by the c o r r e s p o n d i n g adverbs *earst* en *dêrnei*.

The author came to his example because he thought that in a sentence like

Gerben soe in pô't ferve keapje kinne om (lykwols) syn tafel net to fervjen (*Sentences I*, p. 68)

we also have a purely continuative *om*-phrase, which is not the case however. In such ironical sentences we may observe a pseudo-final relation. The adverb *lykwols* is not required but intensifies the cohesion between two parts one would not expect next to one another. We have the same relation in the alternating sentences.

Gerben soe in pôt ferve keapje kinne en lykwols syn tafel net fervje
and

Gerben soe in pôt ferve keapje kinne en fervje lykwols syn tafel net.

4.2. I refer the reader to what was said in 3.1. concerning whether we here do or do not have final relations in the examples. Towards the end the author says that intonation is dependent on sentence structure and not the other way round. I do not think that I have said that the structure of a sentence is dependent on its intonation, only that *d i f f e r e n c e s* of intonation are relevant. I do not believe that intonation is dependent on sentence structure, for that matter. A declarative sentence may easily be made into an interrogative sentence by altering its intonation and yet be structurally the same: one and the same sentence structure may admit two different intonation contours.

5. (m2) *Piter die it him net oan tiid om it boek to lêzen* (*Sentences I*, p. 69).

W i t h o u t a comma after *tiid* this sentence has according to me only one interpretation: that Piter does not allow himself any time to read the book, because he is too busy doing other things. Not until we add a comma after *tiid* could (m2) have the author's second interpretation: that Piter does not allow himself any time but for reading the book. I have to admit that I misrepresented this reading. That this was a slip of the pen appears from the fact that in spite of this I correctly re-formulated this reading by saying that the sentence in such a case has 'a first part with an object different from that in the second part' and (is to be considered as /.../:

(n) *Piter woe it him net oan tiid dwaen en it boek lêze* (*Sentences I*, p. 70).

The same meaning could be expressed by:

Piter woe it (= hwat oars) him net oan tiid dwaen, hwant hy woe it boek lêze.

However that may be, it does not invalidate my thesis at all that this second interpretation is quite impossible in (m2), there is in this interpretation no final but only a causal relation, so that cohesion as in the examples in 3.1. is out of the question. Examples interpreted in that way are in point of fact outside the scope of the present subject.

6.1. If the author mistook the slant line I used to separate the first parts of sentences with an imperative pro infinitivo from the rest for a punctuation mark I am sorry for that, but it should be stressed that in a sentence like

(p1) *de polysje soe mei dit doel by him komme kinne/en helje him op*
(*Sentences I*, p. 70)

there ought to be no punctuation mark. The author's Dutch translation of
de polysje soe by him komme kinne om him op to heljen
into

de politie zou bij hem kunnen komen, om hem op te halen

is simple a falsification. There is no break in the Frisian example, and any suggestion that two e q u i v a l e n t actions are taking place here, 'komme' and 'ophelje', is misleading. It is exactly because there is nowhere such a break that the last-mentioned Frisian example is a variant of sentences like

de polysje soe by him komme kinne en him ophelje

and

de polysje soe by him komme kinne en helje him op.

Therefore we can speak of a final relation (of 'cohesion') as in 3.1., in all three examples.

6.5.4. Instead of *hjirom* the author had better use *hjirom* in his example (72a) and in

(72b) *Nixon sil hjirom wol de sawnde float nei de Tonkinbaei stjûrd hawwe, en set McGovern in pyk,*

which is ungrammatical. *Hjirom* ('*hjirom*') may herald an *om*-phrase, but not an *en* + imperativus pro infinitivo construction. This also holds when we replace *hjirom* by *om dizze reden*. An *en* + imperativus pro infinitivo is possible, though, in sentences like

Wie der foar Jo eigentlik wol r e d e n en wurd sa lil?

and

Jo ha gjin r e d e n en wurd sa lil.

8. In this section the author comments on my *Coda* (*Sent. I*, p. 73). For those who still do not understand: I there discussed who were in a c t u a l fact responsible for his mistakes, because this kind of responsibility was relevant here, and not the f o r m a l responsibility. It is in itself laudable for the author to want to put new theories and methods to the test in the description of a specifically Frisian syntactic development. This is only possible if he stays critical of every theory and method, and carefully checks his material, which he must know through and through. As regards his further remarks on theory and methodology in linguistics, I cannot help being under the impression that quite a lot of contemporary contributions on linguistics bristle with theoretical terms but betray at the same time the authors' insufficient knowledge of the language being studied. If the author's approach, and mine, are correct, our findings should be mutually translatable. It is my sincere wish that my marginal notes may have been a contribution to that goal.

Ad note 5 (*Twée aspecten* p. 32): It is out of the question that

ik bin it fan doel en kom net wer

should be of d o u b t f u l grammatically, for this sentence is completely ungrammatical.

Ad note 21a (*Twée aspecten*, p. 34-35): I gladly accept the author's opinion that *it hert hawwe* is an idiomatic expression. But *de moed hawwe* may occur without *hawwe*, e.g.:

de moed om troch to gean is der net mear,

which does not characterise the present discussion, I hope.

C

Under it skriuwen fan it foargeande rekke Geart van der Meer klear mei *The Imperativus pro Infinitivo Reconsidered* en wy praetten togearre ôf dat ik mines dêr yn itselde nû. fan UW noch fan sizze soe, hwat ik hjirby dan doch.

De skriuwer foeget de sinnen mei IpI - ik nim dy tige praktyske forkoarting jerne oer - yn it greate skift fan sinnen (út allerhanne Yndogermaenske talen) mei op syn minst twa njonkenskikte ferbale ienheden, dy't ynsafier forskille dat biskate bisûndere eigenskippen fan de earste net trochsette by de twadde. Foar de Fryske IpI-sinnen bitsjut dat, dat in sin dy't fan rjochten wêze moat

- (a) *hy sil moarn wol by dy komme en syn boek meinimme*
 dus SVfAV-en-AV, wurde kin ta SVfAV-en-VA:
- (b) *hy sil moarn wol by dy komme en nimme syn boek mei,*
 dy't dêrnei troch ûnderskate oarsaken, earder al neamd, waerd ta
- (c) *hy sil moarn wol by dy komme en nim syn boek mei.*

It eintsjebislút mei dan net earlik sa 'spesifyk' wêze as wy earst tochten, it hat syn eigen Fryske skiednis en it wreidet foaral op syn eigen wize. Wy hawwe yndertiid net bot socht om âlde fbb. mei in regelmjittige wurdfolge, mar likefolle as se der binne of net, ik leau net dat de skr. dy nedich hat om de oannimlikens fan syn ûnderstelling to skoarjen. Nije fbb. mei in regelmjittige wurdfolge binne der yn alle gefallen wol.

By ús petear die bliken dat it sin hie en ûnderstreekje jitris dat ik de termen *f o a r m* en *f u n k s j e* brûk sa't Overdiep en Van Es dat diene. It wit dat Van der Meer in oar taelwittenskiplik idioom praet, mar ik mien noch altyd net dat dat in biswier wêze hoecht om de IpI-sinnen yn 'e mande to ûndersykjen mei in ridlike kâns op in goed risseltaet.

Al nei't der mear fbb. bybrocht wurde, is it nedich dat it forskaet fan IpI-sinnen ek forskillend bineamd wurdt. Eigentlik hawwe wy allinnich yn gefallen lykas (c) in echt fb. fan in ymperativus dy't yn 't plak krongen is fan in ynfinityf, dy't ik tonei IpI1 neame wol. It is ek sa klear as hwat dat dy allinnich mar ûntstean koenen yn sinnen mei njonkenskikte parten I en II, yn C-fbb. dus. In biskate sin is dus hwat dizze ûnderskiedingen oanbilanget folslein karakterisearre, as we sizze dat it in C-fb. is, hwant dan is it òf in sin dy't forfongen wurde kin troch ien mei in IpII, òf ien dy't al in IpII hat. Neame we in sin tonei in IpI1-sin, dan kin dat dus allinnich mar in C-fb. wêze en spesiael in C-fb. dêr't de wiksel fan ynfinityf ta ymperatyf stalgrypt hat. - It is al net mear hielendal krekt, as we ta de C-fbb., of ta de IpI1-sinnen, hwat men mar wol, ek noch rekkenje dy fbb. dêr't yn part I it predikaet syn eigen gong gien is, sa't we dat hawwe yn

- (d) *hy komt moarn wol by dy en nim syn eigen boek wer mei*
 en
- (e) *hy is grif by dy komd en nim syn eigen boek wer mei?*

hwant dy binne yn dy foarm net mear tobek to bringen ta tipe (a). Mar se binne der neijer oan bisibbe as hokfoar oar tipe en it mei, liket ús ta, tonearsten gjin kwea en rekkenje se ta ien skift.

Net ta de IpII-sinnen rekkenje ik al dy gefallen dêr't yn de fierste fierte net to tinken is oan in ûntstean út in sin as (a). De ymperatyf forfangt dêr nearne in suvere ynfinityf en eigentlik is de namme IpI dus forkeard. Ik soe him allinnich hanthavenje wolle om de boel byinoar to hâlden en der in 2 oan tafoegje wolle: IpI2-sinnen binne sinnen mei in "twadderangs" IpI. Mar se binne dêrom net minder nijsgjirrich as de IpII-sinnen.

Ta de IpI2-sinnen hearre û.o. de S-fbb. Dy binne mei dat simboal folslein karakterisearre, wylst oan dat IpI2 in S tafoege wurde moat om dat skift to ûnderskieden fan IpI2-fbb. dêr't Van der Meer ien fan jowt yn:

(55) *Hwat moatstû hjir en brek samar yn 'e hûs?*

Dat fb. falt alhiel bûten de kritearia dy't liede koene ta in fordieling yn C- en S-gefallen en salang't wy gjin nije to ûnderskieden kategoryen tsjinkomme, kinne gefallen as (55) ta mei IpI2 sûnder mear.

De kritearia foar de S-gefallen haw ik yn *UW 1971* s. 63 allinnich negatyf formulearre: wy soenen to krijen hawwe mei in S-fb., as it net ûntstien wêze koe út in sin lykas (a). Nou't der in nij skift IpI2-sinnen bykomt fan it boppeneamde tipe (55), sille dy kritearia ek posityf formulearre wurde moatte. As ik it goed sjoch, dan is in IpI2-sin in IpI2S-sin, as part II yn part I oankundige is of by in krefter taelgebrûk oankundige wêze moatten hie, en fierders, as part II it direkte objekt is by part I. Dy oankundiging kin barre troch persoanlike en oanwizende omnamwurden, omnamwurdlike en oare bywurden, soms ek troch biskate lidwurden. Fan dy oare bywurden in foarbyld:

(f) *dou moatst net sa dwaes wêze en bianderje dy briif.*

Yn it foargeande hawwe wy skiften ûnderskaet op groun fan f o r m e l e kritearia. Slimmer wurdt it, as wy begjinne to freegjen nei de f u n k s j e (en de lêzer wit nou hwat dêr hjir mei bidoeld is) fan biskate gefallen of nei de bidingsten foar de geweldige opgong dy't de IpI's makke hawwe - ek dêrsanne hwer't se mei skoalmasterseagen bisjoen perfoarst net thúshearden. Om mei dat lêste to begjinnen, ek folslein "nije" gefallen as (55) hawwe my bisterke yn myn bitinken dat de parten II fan a l l e IpI-sinnen alternearje mei om-sinnen; dat om kin finael wêze, it kin sûnder hokfoar bitsjutting wêze en is dan faeks in lettere útwreiding fan to + bûgde ynfinityf, it docht der allegearre neat ta. Yn alle gefallen moatte de brûkers gjin forskillen field ha yn al dy konstruksjes mei (om) to + ynfinityf, hwant de parten II waerden op it lêst identifisearre mei dy konstruksjes en oarspronklik hie it mar in d i e l derfan west dêr't se mei wikselje koenen. It hat leau ik net yn 't lêste plak de wiksel mei dizze om-sinnen west dy't ús it idé jown hat dat der yn de C-fbb. tusken part I en II in biskate relaasje, in forbân

(De Waart: 'saamhorigheid', Van der Meer: 'cohesion') bistiet en as ik it goed bigryp rinne ús wegen dêr wol it meast út elkoar. Foar my is it gjin biswier om in part II fan in biskaet C-fb. in *f i n a l e f u n k s j e* ta to skriuwen, foar Van der Meer wol. Hy mient dat krekt it koördinaesjekarakter him dêrtsjin forset, mar dat is in *f o r m e l* kritearium en foarm en funksje dekke elkoar net yn dy sin dat ien foarm of struktuer mar ien funksje hawwe kin en gjin oaren of dat ien funksje mar troch ien foarm útdrukt wurde kin en troch gjin oaren.

As lêste moat ik dan Van der Meer syn ffb. bylâns omdat biskate dingen har dan it bêste sizze litte. Koart krieme kin ik as it giet om it C-fb. (5), dêr't de IpII my net sa tige needsaeklik taliket en dêr't grif gjin oare relaesje bistiet tusken part I en II as in kontinuativen ien. In finale relaesje sjoch ik yn de C-fbb. (7), (12)-(15), (17) en (21); (14) en (15) binne gjin sterke fbb. Yn (54) stiet yn part I gjin tiidwurd, mar dat is sa't wy sjoen ha yn it Midfryske fb. ûnderoan op s. 61 fan *UW 1971* gjin nijs. De oare fbb. neffens nûmer:

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

Yn *UW 1971* s. 68-69 haw ik hjir mines al fan sein. De wurden *It die jin goed* binne in tafoeging fan Van der Meer. Dy kinne net it part I wêze dat korrespondearje moat mei de IpII, om't der in *dat*-sin tusken stiet. De parafraze fan (1) ta (27) liket my net grammatikael ta, om't ik net leau dat de *dat*-sin, en de *om*-sin sa koördinearre wurde kinne.

(2) */.../ Peke sels sil him wol to wacht nimme en rep der net oer, dat /.../*

Soe Haisma yn part I útgien wêze fan *jin to wacht nimme*, dan is (2) in C-fb., dat noch opfette wurde kin as finael. Leaver nim ik oan dat er eigentlik de langere útdrukking *jin earne foar to wacht nimme* yn 'e holle hawn hat. Yn dat gefal is *net* yn part II - mei "skoalmasterseagen" bisjoen - oerstallich en wy soenen (2) dan "forbetterje" moatte ta

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

en dêrmei in dúdlik S-fb. foar ús hawwe.

(3) *wol P. him in deugd dwaen en lês him jitris /.../ foar?*

Hie der stien *d e deugd*, dan hienen wy dúdlik in gefal fan oankundiging hawn en dus in S-fb. Nou konkretisearret, spesifisearret part II hwat yn part *in deugd* neamd wurdt en wy hawwe hjir dus in fb. fan in IpII sa't we net earder hawn hawwe. Men soe ek sizze kinne dat part II oanjowt h o e 't part I forwêzentlike wurde kin; of wer oars, men soe sizze kinne dat part II in kondysjonele funksje hat.

(6) *Hwat bilet him en reizgje/./nei T/./ en freegje /./*

Alles hwat folget nei *Hwat bilet him* is objekt, mar yn dat objekt bistiet der wer in finale relaesje tusken *reizgje /./* en *freegje /./*. Yn it greaterre S-fb. sit dus in C-fb. Of: de IpI1 *freegje* stiet yn C-relaesje ta de IpI2 *reizgje*.

(8) *Hja kinne net oars dwaen as jow har fortrouwen en win dat fan oaren*

is in fb. fan de oant nou ta hwat bûten de diskusje bleaune gefallen mei *as* + IpI2S. Part II is it troch *net oars dwaen* oankundige objekt. Men soe twifelje kinne oft der tusken *jow har fortrouwen* en *win dat fan oaren* in finael forbân bistiet. Leaver leau ik dat beide sjoen wurde moatte as op harsels steande IpI2S-konstruksjes en dat it forbinende *en* hjir normaël brûkt is en net it tige spesiale IpI-ynliedende *en* is. It is foaral de negaesje + komparatyf + *as* dy't (8) ta in S-fb. makket. Hie der stien

Hja kinne hwat oars dwaen en jow har fortrouwen en win/./

dan hie it fb. to forlykjen west mei (3) en hie part II dus de neijere spesifikaesje west fan part I.

(9) *It gie ek yn him om en lit alles mar farre /.../, stou by de treppen del en jei /./ nei in oar oarde ta /./*

It kundicht dus in gearstald ûnderwerp oan mei *lit* en *stou* as IpI2S-foarmen, wylst men by *jei* faeks twifelje koe oft it gjin IpII is dy't yn finale relaesje stiet ta *stou*, mar earder leau ik dat it lêste *en* it normale bynwurd is dat de twa lêste foarmen fan in IpI2S-trijekaert forbynt.

(10) *Hja stiet der op oan, dat hja nou aenstouns mar opbrekke sille en jei nei hûs ta.*

De IpI1 *jei* stiet yn in finale of kontinuative relaesje ta it earste part fan de *dat*-sin, dy't op syn bar wer it preposysjonele objekt is by *Hja stiet der op oan*.

(11) *Easge achte himsels to heech om nei it lokaal to gean en rieplachtsje dêr mei oaren/./oer/./it Simmerwiid*

hat yn it twadde part fan de *om*-sin in IpII. De relaesje is finael. De *om*-sin is preposysjoneel objekt by hwat ta *Easge achte der himsels to heech ta* oanfolle wurde moat.

(16) *De /./boeren, dy't de reizje/./oan woene en siikje/./*

In C-fb. mei finale relaesje. Dat it tiidwurd fan biweging weilitten wurde kin wisten we al út Midfryske fbb.: forl. UW 1958 s. 22 en it *FriW* op *jilding*. My sels is dit idioom net eigen en ik soe it leaver hawwe oer *in reis oangean*.

(18) *It wie noflik hjir to sitten by it wetter en jow de wurge lea rêst*

soe ik leaver oanfolje resp. wizigje wolle ta

It wie noflik om hjir by it wetter to sitten en jow /.../.

Ik kom hjir werom fan hwat ik sein haw yn UW 1971 s. 72 en sjoch de IpI1 hjir yn in finale relaesje ta part I fan de *om*-sin, it troch *It* oankundige ûnderwerp yn (18).

(19) *hy koe him mijne as it moast en smyt it ark derhinne*

is hwat komplisearre troch *as it moast*, dat dochs tinkelik net it part I fan in S-fb. foarmet, mar slacht op it gehiel, sadat de sin fariearret mei

as it moast koe er him mijne en smyt it ark derhinne,

dêr't wy in IpII hawwe, to forlykjen mei dy yn (3).

(20) *In momint hie er oanstriid om oerein, om derút, om de doar ticht to slaen en lit har hjir sitte /.../*

Ek hjir leau ik dat de IpI1 part II is fan de *om*-sin, dy't op syn bar preposysjoneel objekt is by de útdrukking *oanstriid hawwe*. Ik leau m.o.w. net dat de IpI-sin sjoen wurde moat as it *f j i r d e* preposysjonele objekt nei trije oaren dy't mei *om* begjinne, omdat sa'n sin tocht ik sa'n lange distânsje ta syn part I net forneare kin.

(55) *Hwat moatstû hjir en brek samar yn 'e hûs?*

In foarbyld om tige wiis mei to wêzen, om't wy lykas sein dêrmei ta in nije kategory IpI-sinnen komme. It aparte fan dit foarbyld docht fuort al bliken oan de farianten dy't mooglik binne:

(55a) *Hwat moatst' hjir, datst' samar yn 'e hûs brekst?*

en

(55b) *Hwat moatst' hjir, (om) samar yn 'e hûs to brekken?*

Hwat ûnwis is, it doel, de reden fan hwat neffens part II bard is, komt foarop, yn part I. It stellen fan de frage (of by oare fbb.: de mooglikheit) yn part I komt fuort út de hanling of de sitewaasje dy't werjown is yn part II. It hat fuort al klearrichheit dat soksoarte fbb. har net liene foar in "biwurking" dy't harren bringe koe ûnder it skift C. De IpI neame wy dêrom in IpI2. Ek mei de S-fbb. hawwe se neat gemien dat wy litte dêrom dat simboal hjir wei. Wol is it ûnderwerp fan part I en part II itselde en ik ha oant nou ta ek gjin fbb. fine kind dêr't dat oars is.

(55a) en (55b) kinne ek sûnder ûnderbrekking yn de sin sêin wurde. De *dat*-sin resp. (*om*)-sin forliest dan alle forhef yn de yntonaesje en stiet praktysk ûnder it aksint fan *Hwat moatst' hjir*. By (55) binne beide yntonaesjes yn part II mooglik sûnder dat der yn it gehiel in rêst stean hoecht. Overdiep bihannelt de hjir neamde *dat*-sin yn syn *Stilistische Grammatica* yn par 385 5°, yn syn *Zeventiende-eeuwsche Syntaxis* yn par.54.

As lêste noch in pear fbb. fan dizze IpI2-sinnen, dy't der neffens my op troch kinne:

Woest' hjir meskien sliepe en brek samar yn 'e hûs? -

Se moat grif nedich ris wer yn 't nijs komme en meitsje sa folle spul.-

Hy hat seker wol oan rêst ta west en stap samar ynienen in jier út syn wurk.-

Dy bakken sille wol to lang damp stien ha en wurd sa slof.

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

is in S-fb. Part II wurdt oankundige troch it oanwizende omnamwurd *dyn* yn part I.

(57) */.../, doe 't hja sei fan ja en tsjen mei /.../ ?*

In C-fb. mei kontinuatyf forbân. De gearhing sit him hjir foaral ek yn it feit dat it *mei-tsjen* in gefolch is fan it *ja-sizzen*. De foarm *tsjen* as IpII is hwat âldfrinzich. Sj. ek by (59).

(58) *Mar hwer hat hy, Peke, de rêst wei en bisjoch dit /.../ ?*

Der stiet *bisjocht*, sûnder mis in printflater. De IpI2S-sin kin sjoen wurde as in soarte fan content phrase by *de rêst* yn part I. It lidwurd *de* hat hjir oankundigjende funksje.

(59) */.../ dy fleach it suver oan en bigjinne dermei.*

Frjemd yn dizze sin is de ynfinityf-foarm *bigjinne*, dy't nei't ik mien yn de njoggentjinde ieu noch wol skreaun is, hwat net seit dat er ek sein waard. Formeel hawwe wy hjir dus in gefal dat bûten de diskusje stiet, mar soenen wy ta *bigjin* forbetterje, dan is it in IpI2S-sin, dy't, oankundige troch *it*, ûnderwerpsin is by part I.

(Noat 7) Ek yn Shakespeare syn tekst en yn Posthumus syn earste oersetting soe ik wol in fïnael forbân oannimme doare. Mar ek as biwiisd wurde koe dat dat in forsin wêze soe, hoegde dat in finale ynterpretaesje fan in lettere oersetting fan Posthumus net yn de wei to stean, tocht ik.

Súdhorn

Teake B. Hoekema