

**[1443] Anglo-Frisian ‘here’, ‘there’, ‘where’**

Frederik Kortlandt

0. The etymology of Old Frisian *hir* [hīr] ‘here’ offers a problem because the form appears to be at variance with the expected reflex attested in Gothic *her* [hēr], Old Norse *hér*, Old English *hēr*, Old High German *hiar* (Boutkan & Siebinga 2005: 174). Moreover, the front vowel in Old Frisian *ther* [thēr] ‘there’ and *hwer* [hwēr] ‘where’ is at variance with the back vowel in Gothic *þar*, *hvar*, Old Norse *þar*, *hvar*, Old Saxon and Old High German *thār*, *hwār*. The apparent raising and fronting in Old Frisian call for an explanation.

1. Elsewhere I have proposed the following relative chronology (2008: 270f. = 2010: 279f.):<sup>1</sup>

- WG 0. Centralization of unaccented vowels before nasals in final syllables and subsequent loss of the nasalization in these endings.
- AF 1. Centralization of stressed vowels before nasals.
- AF 2. Loss of nasalization before *f, þ, s, h*.
- AF 3. Retraction of \**ǣ* to *ō*.
- AF 4. Monophthongization of \**ai* to *ā*.
- AF 5. Retraction of \**ǣ* to *ā* before *w* and before *g* plus back vowel.
- AF 6. Fronting of \**a* to *æ*, which was blocked by a following *l, r, h* plus consonant and in open syllables by a back vowel in the following syllable.
- AF 7. Palatalization of \**k* and \**g* before front vowels, also \**g* after front vowels.
- AF 8. Analogical restoration of the back vowel in 2sg. \**farist*, 3sg. \**farip* ‘go’, 2sg. \**slahist*, 3sg. \**slahip* ‘slay’, also OE *sc(e)acan* ‘shake’, *sc(e)afan* ‘shave’ (cf. Campbell 1959: 315f., Kortlandt 1999: 49f.).
- WS 9. Breaking of \**ǣ* to \**ǣa* and of \**ī* to \**īa* before \**h* and raising of \**ea* to \**ēa*, which was simplified to \**ē* in \**hēit*, \**lēæt*, \**fēah*, \**hlēup*, \**hrēop*, \**sēau*, later *hēt*, *lēt*, *fēng*, *hlēop*, *hrēop*, *sēow*, but not in

---

1. WG = West Germanic, AF = Anglo-Frisian, WS = West Saxon, A = Anglian, K = Kentish, E = English, F = Frisian.

- \*fēall, \*hēald, \*spēann, \*gēang*, where *\*ēa* later (at stage E 13) developed into *-ēo-*.
- WS 10. Development of the West Germanic diphthongs *\*eu, \*iu* into *\*ēu, \*īu*, later *ēo, īo*.
- WS 11. Fronting and breaking of *\*a* to short *\*æa* before antecorsonantal *l, r, h, u* and simplification of *\*æau* to *\*æu*.
- WS 12. Breaking of *\*e* to *\*eā* and of *\*i* to *\*iā* before antecorsonantal *l, r, h*.
- AF 9. Monophthongization of *\*ea* to *ē*, e.g. North. *fēll, fēng*, also *\*eā* to *ēa* in *cnēaw, sēaw*.
- AF 10. Raising of *\*ē* to *ē* (this development did not reach Insular North Frisian, cf. Hofmann 1964).
- A 11. Fronting of *\*a* to *æ* before antecorsonantal *r, h, u* with breaking to *\*eā* before *r* plus non-velar consonant and breaking of *\*e* to *\*eā* and of *\*i* to *\*iā* before *r* plus non-velar consonant, e.g. North. *eorm*, WS *earm* ‘arm’ (cf. Campbell 1959: 117).
- A 12. Development of the diphthongs *\*æu, \*eu, \*iu* into *\*æu, \*ēu, \*īu* and monophthongization to *æ, ē, ī* before velar consonants.
- K 11. Raising of *\*æ* to *e* and of *\*eu* to *\*iu* and breaking of *\*e* and *\*i* to *\*iā* before *r* plus consonant.
- K 12. Adjustment to developments WS 9-12.
- E 13. Merger of *\*æa, \*ēa, \*iā* with *\*æu, \*ēu, \*īu* into *ēa, ēo, īo* and development of *\*æa, \*eā, \*iā* into *ea, eo, io*.
- E 14. Palatalization of *\*k* and *\*g* before front vowels.
- E 15. Palatal diphthongization.
- E 16. Umlaut (*i*-mutation).
- F 11. Fronting of *\*ā* to *æ*, which was blocked by a back vowel in the following syllable.
- F 12. Monophthongization of *\*au* to *ā*.
- F 13. Umlaut (*i*-mutation).
- F 14. Breaking of *\*e* yielding *iu* (cf. Boutkan 1998).

In this chronology, West Saxon separated from Anglo-Frisian as a result of the “Saxon” migration to Britain in the 5th century and the break-up of Anglo-Frisian resulted from the “Anglian” migration in the 6th century. The stages AF 1-10 can appropriately be called Anglo-Frisian. Kentish sides with Anglian in this chronology.

2. I have argued that Proto-Germanic  $*\bar{e}_2$  was actually a diphthong  $*ea$  (e.g. 1991, 1994, 2006, 2010: 190, 209f., 290). In the class VII preterits of strong verbs,  $*\bar{e}_2$  represents original  $*ea$ , which was preserved in Old High German *geang* ‘went’, *feang* ‘seized’, *feal* ‘fell’. The model for the development of this formation was provided by the preterits  $*eauk$  ‘increased’,  $*eaus$  ‘poured’,  $*eaud$  ‘granted’,  $*ear$  ‘ploughed’,  $*ealp$ , ‘grew old’,  $*eaik$  ‘claimed’, and especially  $*eaj$  ‘went’. The spread of  $*ea$  as a preterit marker yielded  $*hleap$  ‘leaped’,  $*heald$ , ‘held’,  $*heait$  ‘called’, also  $*beauw$  ‘dwelt’,  $*feāh$  ‘seized’,  $*leāht$  ‘let’, plural  $*hleup-$ ,  $*held-$ ,  $*heit-$ ,  $*beuw-$ ,  $*feng-$ ,  $*let-$ , Old Norse *hlióp*, *helt*, *hét*, *bió*, *biogg-*, *fekk*, *fing-*, *lét*, *lit-* (cf. Noreen 1970: 338-340).

In Old English, breaking (WS 9-12, A 11, K 11) preceded *i*-mutation (E 16) while the conditioning factor apparently blocked the fronting of  $*a$  to  $\bar{a}$  at an earlier stage (AF 6). This chronology suffices to show that the Old English breaking cannot be identified with the Scandinavian breaking. Moreover, the conditions of the two were quite different. Since the Old Frisian breaking “took place only before *ht* and *hs*, and not before intervocalic *h*, such forms as *siucht* (‘sees’) show that it must have taken place later than *i*-mutation, for the *i* of the 3rd pers. sg. pres. indic. was not syncopated till after it had caused mutation” (Campbell 1959: 105). Thus, we find similar, yet quite different developments in the three languages.

Fourquet has pointed out that in Old English “les produits de la fracture des voyelles brèves sont venus occuper dans le système des brèves la même place que les diphtongues d’origine ancienne occupaient dans le système des longues” (1959: 151), which is in accordance with Krupatkin’s observation that “every time the initial shifts in the field of the long vowels raised similar transformations in the field of the short vowels” (1970: 63). This explains the fact that the “fractured reflexes of *i* and *e* have rounded second elements in OE, in early OE *-u*”, and possibly “the second element of the broken reflex of  $\bar{a}$  was also *-u* at first” (Nielsen 1984: 76). Thus, *io*, *eo*, *ea* were the short counterparts of  $\bar{i}o$ ,  $\bar{e}o$ ,  $\bar{e}a$  from the time when these were still *u*-diphthongs. Nielsen can now explain the fact that the reflex of  $*a$  is not broken in Old Frisian: “Gmc. *au* was monophthongized to  $\bar{a}$  in OFris., and consequently there was no systematic pressure in terms of creating another short diphthong in the way that *iu* (*io*) was phonemicized as a short counterpart of Gmc. *eu/iu*” (1984: 77f.).

The identification of  $*\bar{e}_2$  as  $*ea$  now explains the Scandinavian breaking of  $*e$  to  $*\bar{e}\bar{a}$  in accordance with these considerations. It is remarkable that there is no evidence for breaking before a front vowel in the following

syllable, where the model *\*ea* was lacking, and that breaking is less frequent in light than in heavy syllables. Even more strikingly, breaking was blocked by a preceding *\*w*, e.g. *verpa* ‘to throw’, *huelpr* ‘whelp’, while the preterit *sueip*, pl. *suip-* ‘swept’ shows absence of *\*ea* after *\*w*, which is a natural restriction because the form contains a triphthong already. The broken vowel *\*ěǎ* either developed into *ja* by “coinciding in its onset with the non-syllabic allophone of /i/” (Steblin-Kamenskij 1957: 91) or lost its diphthongal character and merged with the reflex of umlauted *\*a*. The latter development may have been conditioned by the monophthongization of *\*ea* to *ē*, which probably took place under the pressure of the rise of *ǣ* from umlauted *\*ā*. It is probably no accident that *\*ea* is best preserved in Old High German, where the umlaut of *\*ā* was late.

3. The Proto-Germanic adverbs ‘here’, ‘there’ and ‘where’ can be reconstructed on the basis of Gothic *her*, *þar*, *hvar* and Old Norse *hér*, *þar*, *hvar* as *\*hiar*, *\*þar*, *\*h<sup>w</sup>ar* and compared with Lithuanian *šia-*, *ta-*, *ka-* from Indo-European *\*ki-o-*, *\*to-*, *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-*. This explains the difference between the long vowel in ‘here’ and the short vowel in ‘there’ and ‘where’. In West Germanic, the latter was lengthened so as to yield High German and Saxon *-ār*, Frisian and Anglian *-ēr*, and West Saxon *-ǣr*. As a result, the West Germanic forms are the following (cf. Stiles 2004: 388):

	‘here’	‘there’	‘where’
West Saxon	<i>Hēr</i>	<i>þēr</i>	<i>hwēr</i>
Anglian	<i>Hēr</i>	<i>þēr</i>	<i>hwēr</i>
Old Frisian	<i>Hīr</i>	<i>thēr</i>	<i>hwēr</i>
Old Saxon	<i>hēr/hier/hīr</i>	<i>thār</i>	<i>hwār</i>
Old High German	<i>hear/hiar/hier</i>	<i>thār/dār</i>	<i>(h)wār</i>

Stiles now reconstructs Proto-West-Germanic *\*þār* and *\*h<sup>w</sup>ār* and concludes that *\*ē<sub>1</sub>* had been retracted to *\*ā* at the time of the lengthening and was fronted to *\*ǣ* in North Sea Germanic and raised to *\*ē* in Anglian and Frisian (2004: 389). As a matter of fact, the lengthening in *\*þar* and *\*h<sup>w</sup>ar* could take place at any time before the Anglo-Frisian monophthongization of *\*ai* to *ā* because there was no other long vowel than *\*ē<sub>1</sub>* [*ǣ*, *ā*] corresponding to short *\*a* [*a*, *ǣ*] in early West Germanic. The rise of *\*þēr* and *\*h<sup>w</sup>ēr* evidently preceded breaking and *i*-mutation, which belong to the period after the early migrations.

In fact, things are more complicated: “The explanation of the Old Frisian and Old Saxon <hir>-forms is unclear, whether they represent an earlier

state or have developed from \*[hē<sub>2</sub>r]. [...] It is uncertain whether a pre-form \*hē<sub>2</sub>r is needed at all for Frisian. The Old Frisian texts, which represent the West and East Frisian branches, show spellings consistent with *hīr*, with the exception of a few instances in late West Frisian texts that are subject to Dutch influence. [...] Old Saxon *hir* is found both in the Bible Poetry and the Minor Texts, whereas *her* occurs only in Bible Poetry manuscripts (cf. von Unwerth 1915). Modern Low German dialect evidence points to a pre-form \*hīr [...]” (Stiles 2004: 388). While the vowel of Old English and Old Saxon *hēr* and of Old High German *hear/hiar/hier* can be identified with \*ē<sub>2</sub> < \*ea, with lowering of \*i to e before a in \*hiar (cf. Kortlandt 1994: 16), the high vowel in Old Frisian and Old Saxon *hīr* points to restoration of \*hi- on the basis of cognate forms, cf. OF *hiu-dega*, OS *hiu-diga*, *hiu-du*, OHG *hiu-tu* ‘today’, *hī-naht* ‘tonight’, OE *hēo-dæg*, *heonan* beside *hine*, *hi(o)nan* ‘from here’, *hider* ‘hither’. The restoration of \*hi- in the form \*hēr was probably an innovation of Old Saxon that spread from the Low German area to Frisia after the Anglo-Saxon migrations, following the innovations that spread from the same area to Anglo-Frisian but did not reach West Saxon (cf. Kortlandt 2010: 259-263).<sup>2</sup>

Thus, we arrive at the following scenario. After \*ā merged with \*ō in Proto-Germanic, symmetry could be restored by lowering \*ē<sub>1</sub> to ā, and this is what happened in High German and Scandinavian. This development was forestalled by the monophthongization of \*ai to ā in Anglo-Frisian, where short \*a was fronted to æ instead unless it was followed by a blocking environment. These developments preceded the Anglo-Saxon migrations. Symmetry in the vowel system was again restored in North and West Germanic by the monophthongization of \*ea to \*ē<sub>2</sub> except in High German, where \*ō was diphthongized instead. I conclude that there is no reason to assume a general retraction of \*ē<sub>1</sub> to ā in North-West Germanic and that Stiles pays insufficient attention to the structural aspects of the developments. After the late Proto-Germanic raising of \*ā to ō but before the monophthongization of \*ai to ā in Anglo-Saxon, lengthening of the short vowel in \*par and \*h<sup>w</sup>ar could only lead to a merger with \*ē<sub>1</sub> [ǣ] because there was no other low vowel. Besides, the following retraction of \*ē̄ to ā and fronting of \*a to æ under special conditions show that the distinction between the two vowels was a quantitative one only. After the Anglo-Saxon migrations, the form *hēr* < \*hear < \*hiar was replaced by *hīr* in Old Saxon

2. “As expected, the *hēr* variant frequently occurs in the ‘Frankish spelling’ <hier>” (Stiles 2004: 388) in the Old Saxon Bible Poetry manuscripts, but not in the Minor Texts, which exhibit the genuine Low German form *hīr* only.

on the basis of cognate forms with \*hi-, and the new form spread to Old Frisian.

4. In a recent article (2017), Eugen Hill argues that the long vowel of West Germanic \*pār and \*h<sup>w</sup>ār resulted from Proto-Germanic monosyllabic lengthening and that the form hēr represents \*kīr with Proto-Germanic lowering of \*i before \*-r followed by monosyllabic lengthening.<sup>3</sup> He acknowledges that the alleged lengthening is contradicted by the Scandinavian data in view of Old Norse hér, þar, hvar and Old Swedish hēr, þar, hvar but does not regard these forms as conclusive evidence. He also rejects Gothic her [hēr], þar, hvar as evidence because the letter <a> could also represent a long ā in the Gothic alphabet. However, Gothic \*ā originated from the denasalization of long \*ā̄, e.g. in brahta, þahta, which was not a common development of East and West Germanic because it was more recent than the centralization and rounding of the nasal vowel in Old English brōhte, þōhte. Hill's rendering of my view is not correct. Of course, I do not claim that "the Proto-Germanic pronoun for 'this here' was not the traditionally assumed i-stem PGmc \*hi- but rather an io-stem PGmc \*hia-" (thus Hill 2017: 140) but that Proto-Germanic \*hiar took -ar from \*þar and \*h<sup>w</sup>ar < PIE \*to-, \*k<sup>w</sup>o-, just as \*kī- is being replaced by \*kī-o- in the Baltic languages (cf. Kortlandt 2009: 140f.). Hill finds this development "implausible" (*ibidem*, fn. 6) in spite of the fact that it is actually taking place before our eyes in Baltic.

Leiden University  
www.kortlandt.nl

## REFERENCES

- Boutkan, Dirk. 1998. On labial mutation and breaking in Old Frisian. *Approaches to Old Frisian Philology = Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 49, 77-88.
- Boutkan, Dirk, & Siebinga, Sjoerd M. 2005. *Old Frisian etymological dictionary* (Leiden: Brill).
- Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English grammar* (Oxford: University Press).

---

3. I am indebted to the editors of *Us Wurk* for having drawn my attention to this publication.

- Fourquet, Jean. 1959. Le système des éléments vocaliques longs en vieil-anglais. *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie: Fernand Mossé in memoriam* (Paris: Didier), 148-160.
- Hill, Eugen. 2017. West Germanic monosyllabic lengthening and Gothic breaking as partially Proto-Germanic developments. *North-Western European Language Evolution* 70/2, 135-170.
- Hofmann, Dietrich. 1964. "Germanisch"  $\bar{e}_2$  im Friesischen. *Festschrift für Jost Trier zum 70. Geburtstag* (Köln: Böhlau), 160-185.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1991. The Germanic seventh class of strong verbs. *North-Western European Language Evolution* 18, 97-100.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1994. On breaking. *North-Western European Language Evolution* 24, 15-19.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1999. The origin of the Old English dialects revisited. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 51, 45-51.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2006. Germanic  $*\bar{e}_1$  and  $*\bar{e}_2$ . *North-Western European Language Evolution* 49, 51-54.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2008. Anglo-Frisian. *North-Western European Language Evolution* 54/55, 265-278.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2009. *Baltica & Balto-Slavica* [=Leiden Studies in Indo-European 16] (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2010. *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic* [=Leiden Studies in Indo-European 17] (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
- Krupatkin, Y.B. 1970. From Germanic to English and Frisian. *Us Wurk* 19/3, 49-71.
- Nielsen, Hans F. 1984. A note on the origin of Old English breaking and back mutation. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 22, 73-81.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1970. *Altnordische Grammatik I: Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut- und Flexionslehre) unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen* (5. Auflage, Tübingen: Niemeyer).
- Steblin-Kamenskij, Mixail. 1957. Scandinavian breaking from a phonemic point of view. *Studia Linguistica* 11, 84-91.
- Stiles, Patrick V. 2004. Place-adverbs and the development of Proto-Germanic long  $*\bar{e}_1$  in early West Germanic. *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen* [Fs. Koivulehto] (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique), 385-396.
- von Unwerth, Wolf. 1915. Altsächsisch *hīr*. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 40, 156-159.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages* (Leiden: Brill).