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OLD WEST FRISIAN BI THA SIDA ‘ACCORDING TO THE CUSTOM’: A CASE OF INTERTEXTUALITY

Han Nijdam

1. Introduction: Old Frisian bitha sida ‘both sides’?

While analysing the Old West Frisian composition tariffs – and the Birekna-de Bota (BBr) in particular – I came across a curious clause, which on closer scrutiny turned out to be an example of intertextuality in the Old Frisian corpus of texts. The following instances from BBr as found in the version preserved in Jus Municipale Frisonum (J) may serve to illustrate the problem at hand:

BBr  83 Thio bote this ferra aghe is xiiij pund.
     84 Thet wynstera aghe, thio bote is xiiij pund and bitha syda so senth fif merck sonder wald.
     85 Jef hem thio nose offe js, soe send sex pund, bitha zijda xxxij punda.
     92 Jef thet are is al ofslaghen iesta koren, soe is thio bote iiiij scillingen and bitha zijde viij pund and xiiiij ense.
     95 Jef ti aeghappell all wt tha haude is, thio bote is x pund. Sulch boka haldeth xx punda and bytha zijde xxxij punda.

83 Die Buße (für Verlust) des rechten Auges ist vierzehn Pfund.
84 Die Buße (für Verlust) des linken Auges ist dreizehn Pfund, und (werden) beide Seiten (geblendet), so sind außer der Gewalt(buße) fünff Mark (verwirkt).
85 Wenn einem die Nase (auf der einen Seite) abgehauen ist, so sind sechs Pfund (verwirkt), und auf beide Seiten zweunddreißig Pfund.
92 Wenn das Ohr ganz abgehauen oder abgeschnitten ist, so beträgt die Buße vier Schillinge, und (ist das auf) beide Seiten (geschehen), acht Pfund und Vierzehn Unzen.

I would like to thank Rolf Bremmer for placing question-marks in my translation of BBr, which made me rethink the clause bi tha sida, as well as for his comments on earlier versions of this article. All errors, however, both grammatical and in argumentation, are my own.
Buma and Ebel translate the phrase bitha sida with beide Seiten ‘both sides’. This translation seems appropriate for §§84, 92 and 95, but it becomes problematic when in §85 Jef hem thio nose offe js is translated with ‘Wenn einem die Nase (auf der einen Seite) abgehauen ist’, since Old Frisian nose means ‘nose’ and not ‘one side of the nose’. Note, too, the parenthetic paraphrases which Buma and Ebel use in order to save their interpretation.

2. The alternative: bi tha sida = bi tha sida ‘according to the custom’, and its philological problems

Could it be that bitha sida denotes something different than ‘both sides’? The Old West Frisian composition tariffs BBr, the Leeuwarderadeel Composition Tariff (BLw) and the Ferwerderadeel and Dongeradeel Composition Tariff (BFD) contain several references to alternative compensations for certain injuries. These are usually phrased as: sulk boek halt / hath ‘some books state’, followed by an amount of money. Could it be that bitha sida also refers to some alternative source of information and an alternative compensation? I think that this is indeed the case, and that bitha sida should be read as bi thā sida ‘according to the custom’, i.e. from side ‘custom’ (cf. OE, OS sidu, OHG situ), and not from side ‘side’ (cf. OE sfde, OS sfda, OHG sfta). This reading is not wholly unproblematic, however. I will therefore first deal with the orthographic and linguistic aspects of this alternative interpretation.

Are there any arguments to be gained in favour of or against the proposed interpretation of bi tha sida ‘according to the custom’ by looking at how the phrase is actually spelled in the manuscripts? For the manuscript J, the orthographic aspects of the problem are partly concealed by its critical edition, but Buma’s dictionary on J is more revealing on this point. In the

---

2. J XXVIII; Buma and Ebel, Westerlauwerssches Recht I. Jus Municipale Frisonum, 500–503. In this article, the Roman numerals following the abbreviations (see below) denote the texts in the editions referred to. In the case of D and U, they refer to the numbering of the texts in Gerbenzon, Zeer voorlopige lijst. Arab numerals refer to paragraphs.

3. Examples can be found in: J XXIII,42; J XXIX,31; U XXV,40.

entry bêde ‘both’, the attestations of bi tha sida can be found: all attestations of the subform bithe (i.e. with i instead of e)\(^5\) that are mentioned there turn out to be instances of the problem at hand, and all forms are written as bi tha, by tha, bij da in the manuscript, spellings that suggest two words (bi tha) instead of one (bitha).\(^6\) This also means that if my proposal to read bitha as bi tha ‘according to the’ is accepted, the only example of the subform bithe ‘both’ in J can be found in J XXVIII,251, which reads: Sinekerf and sinespield, allerlich haech ma to betane and bitha onbrinze ‘A cut sinewand a split sinew, each has to be compensated and both are onbrinze’.\(^7\) Furthermore, in the incunabulum Druk (D), which also contains a version of BBr, the phrase is spelled <bida sida>. In the whole of D, the string <bida> occurs 20 times, and this is always to be read as bi da ‘according to the’, and never as bida ‘both’.

As far as the linguistic aspects of the problem are concerned, there are two observations to be made. The first one is that bi tha is sometimes spelled <bidae>\(^8\) or <bij dae>.\(^9\) The spelling <ae> represents ä, and this observation is a strong argument in the case for bi tha sida, since a schwa (in the case of bitha / bithe ‘both’) is never spelled as a long vowel. The second point concerns the spellings <zijdem>, <zijde>, <zijda>, <sijde>\(^13\) for side, which represent i (instead of i). Although this seems to be an argument against the reading side ‘custom’, it can also be explained as the result of lengthening of an original short i in open syllable, as mentioned by a.o. Steller.\(^14\) This sound change made the old phonemic distinction between side ‘side’ and side ‘custom’ disappear.

I suspect it is because of two reasons that Buma and Ebel have interpreted sida as ‘side’. First, there are the spellings <zijdem>, <zijde>, <zijda>, <sijde>, as mentioned above, which seem to point toward side ‘side’ rather than to side ‘custom’. Second, there is the fact that the

---

7. Onbrinze is a legal term. It means that the plaintiff has more rights to bring his case to court than the defendant has to deny the claims made by the plaintiff. It literally means that an injury is ‘bringable (to court)’.
9. U XXV,34.
11. J XXIII,32, 34, 35; J XXVIII,92, 95, 102; J XXIX,34.
preposition *bi* is rarely used in combination with *side* ‘custom’: von Richthofen’s dictionary records only *nei* ‘after, according to’ + *side* ‘custom’.\(^{15}\) Why *bi* is used here will become apparent below.

3. Further clues: *bi tha pliga* and the compensation of 32 pounds

Debatable as the paleographic and linguistic arguments may seem in their own right, combined with the textual evidence in the Old West Frisian corpus, however, a strong case can be made in favour of the interpretation *bitha sida* = *bi tha sida* ‘according to the custom’. In the first place it must be noted that in two of the paragraphs cited above (85 and 95), *bi tha sida* is followed by a compensation of 32 pounds. In both cases, 32 pounds is not a doubling of the ‘singular’ compensations that are mentioned there. This would be what was to be expected if *bitha sida* meant ‘both sides’: 16 pounds as compensation for one side and 32 pounds for both sides. Moreover, the amounts of these ‘singular’ compensations are not the same: 6 pounds and 10 pounds, respectively. Such figures make it unlikely that the amount of 32 pounds is some kind of multiplication of these ‘simple’ compensations.

Furthermore, 32 pounds are a rare compensation in the Old Frisian composition tariffs. This means that the amount of 32 pounds can be used as a lead. Attestations of a compensation of 32 pounds are bound to give information concerning the problem at hand. Following this lead throughout the Old West Frisian composition tariffs yields two instances, which together form the core of the argument that *bitha sida* = *bi tha sida*. The first one is found in BFD:

**BFD 57** *Jef en manne thet wreste lith offe is bi tha neyle, soe send ij pond, thet pund is alhijr xx grata. And bi tha pligha soe send twa and thritich ponda and bi tha othera fingherum also fula.*\(^{16}\)

57 If a man’s upper joint (of a finger) has been cut off at the nail, this is to be compensated with 2 pounds, which in this case must consist of 20 groats each. And according to the custom the compensation is 32 pounds, and the same for the other fingers.

---

\(^{15}\) Von Richthofen, *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch*, 1012.

\(^{16}\) J,XXIII; cf. U XXV,54; J XXIX,55.
Here, a variant formulation *bi tha pliga* (*plige* ‘custom’) instead of *bi tha sida* is used, in combination with the compensation of 32 pounds and in a similar context: cutting off (parts of) limbs.

The second attestation of a compensation of 32 pounds tells us which ‘custom’ is referred to. It can be found in the same BFD, but I will cite from the less corrupted version from BLw:

BLw 81 *Hwam soe werth zijn foeth ofslyyn jn eenre fry kase twiska tha foethwerst and tha tane jefta zijn hand, thio bote is fyl merck bij xij scillingen.*

82 *Thet aghe also fula, jef hij aller syone onmist.*

83 *Aldus ist thi wilkere jn tha landa fan aghum, fan handum and fan fothem; and fan ghersfallich lethum scel ma betha bi landis wilkere, also is hirefier bescriun js.*

84 *Ghersfallich lith bethi ma mith xxxij pundem. Mer alther en manne thet are afslyyn js: viij penningen and xiiij ensa, xvij enghelscha en clena myn.*

81 The compensation for striking off someone’s foot between the ankle and the toe, or his hand, in a skirmish, is 5 marks of 12 shillings each.

82 The eye likewise, if he misses all sight.

83 Thus says the statute of the land concerning eyes, hands and feet; and limbs that have been cut off must be compensated according to the land’s statute as is said below.

84 Limbs that have been cut off must be compensated with 32 pounds. But if a man’s ear has been cut off: 8 pennies and 14 ounces, which is the same as 17 English pennies less one small penny.

In §84 the compensation of 32 pounds is found again. Furthermore, the compensation for cutting off the ear is the same as referred to with *bi tha sida* ‘according to the custom’ in BBr §92 (see the quotation above), except for the fact that BBr §92 has 8 pounds and 14 ounces, and BLw §84 has 8 pennies and 14 ounces. Parallel paragraphs for the BBr-text, however, show that only BBr has pounds instead of pennies, whereas all the other texts have 8 pennies and 14 ounces. It is therefore safe to assume that the

18. J XXIX,35; U XXV,35; J XXIII,36.
compensation for cutting off the ear was 8 pennies and 14 ounces, and that
the reading from BBr should be corrected at this point.

4. Some Old Frisian Statutes (wilkere) as possible sources of bi tha sida

The sequence of §§83 and 84 in the above quotation from BLw seems to
indicate that bi tha sida refers to some kind of wilkere, which is Old Frisian
for a ‘statute’, that is a stipulation that has been put to writing and ratified
by some higher authority. As I will show below, the wilkere in th a landa in
§83 of BLw is not the same as the landis wilkere in the same sentence.19

The wilkere referred to in BLw §§81–83 states that 5 marks are to be
paid as a compensation for the loss of either a hand, a foot or an eye.
Furthermore, it stipulates that this compensation is to be paid if the
mutilation occurred jn eenre fry kase ‘in a skirmish’. The adjective fri ‘free,
open’ emphasizes the fact that the fight took place somewhere out in the
open. The collection of wilkerren which comes closest to this is confusingly
called a composition tariff known as the Interregional Composition Tariff
(BIr). It has been preserved in three versions: in J (XXVII), in Codex Unia
(U XVIII), and in Codex Furmerius (Fs IV). The title of the J-version is:
Alhijr is thi oenbeghin fan tha botem twiscka land20 ‘This is the beginning
of the compensations between the lands’, which explains why the text is
called a composition tariff. The title is also an indication for the relationship
between statutes and composition tariffs, of which I will be saying more
below. The versions in J and Fs contain a paragraph which puts a date to the
text: 5 June 1276.21 The fifth paragraph stipulates:

BIr  5 Hwam so ma jn da hemcase sin aghe wthysyoet iefta wthstath iefta
sinne foth iefta sine hand ofslayth, thet se ghersfallich blijft, soe scel
ma thet beta mith sex merkum.22

19. When I first saw these two phrases, they reminded me of the way the distinction
between dark and light soy sauce was made for those who do not read Chinese
characters on the old labels of a certain Chinese brand: ‘soy superior sauce’ and
‘superior soy sauce’.
21. J XXVII,9; Fs IV,10.
22. J XXVII; cf. U XVIII,5; Fs IV,5.
5 If, in a village skirmish, someone's eye is shot out or poked out, or his foot or his hand is cut off, so that they remain severed, this must be compensated with 6 marks.

Here a compensation of 6 marks (instead of the 5 marks mentioned in BLw and BFD) is set on the same injury as in BLw. The type of fight is specified too: hemkase ‘fight in a village’. Since instances of frikase and hemkase are rare in the Old West Frisian composition tariffs, it is at least remarkable that they are found in both BLw §83 and BIr §5. These correspondences, however, do not imply that BIr is the immediate source of BLw §§81–83, but that this definitely is the direction in which it should be looked for.

Next, there is the landis wilkere that is mentioned in BLw §§83–84, according to which a compensation of 32 pounds is set on ghersfallich lethum ‘severed limbs’. Note that this stipulation partly covers the same injuries as BLw §§81–83, since lith ‘limb’ includes the hands, eyes and feet. This overlap in itself is an indication that in BLw §§81–84 we see a merging of two different traditions. The fact that the first source (i.e. the statute referred to in BLw §§81–83) counts in marks and the second one (i.e. the statute referred to in BLw §§83–84) counts in pounds adds weight to this conclusion.

A wilkere which puts a compensation of 32 pounds on severing limbs is found in the ‘Statutes of the Five Districts’ (Dutch: ‘Willekeuren van de Vijf Delen’), called the ‘Old Statutes of the Opstalsboom’ in J. It is further known from versions in D and U. Although these three versions are far from identical, they all share this stipulation: Gersfallich lya: xxxii ponda. Alle disse ferden selma in Fraenkere byriuchta ende lasta ‘Severed limbs: 32 pounds. All these compensations for breaking the peace must be taken to court and paid in Franeker’.

The ‘Statutes of the Five Districts’ have thus far received little scholarly attention. Algra dates the text to the end of the thirteenth century, while Buma and Ebel prefer the first half of the fourteenth century. In both cases this is mainly based on the types of officials that are mentioned in the text. No attention has, however, been paid to the differences between the three

---

23. J XVII; D XII; U IV; U XXI (fragments).
24. D XII, 7; cf. U IV, 7; J XVII, 7. J has 20 pounds instead of 32. That 32 is the right amount can be inferred from the compensations in D XII, 6–10: 80, 32, 24, 16, 8 pounds respectively, i.e. multiples of 8 pounds.
redactions. I will do so here only inasmuch as it pertains to the present problem.\(^{27}\)

Remarkably, the paragraphs that appear in only one of the three versions of the ‘Statutes of the Five Districts’ often have a parallel in one or other composition tariff. This goes for §§32–39 of the J-version (not in U or D), which as a whole form an exact parallel to the first part of the *West Lauwers Composition Tariff* (BWI) that can be found in Codex Aysma (A IVa)! It also applies to §§25, 36–38 of the D-version, which closely resemble compensation stipulations. The subject of §§25–29 is unlawful entry into someone’s house or damaging it. Parallels are found, for example, in BBr and in the *Hemmen Composition Tariff* (BHm).\(^{28}\) The conclusion of the D-version (§§36–39) also consists of stipulations concerning injuries that are otherwise found only in composition tariffs (e.g. about *faxfang* ‘hair pulling’ and *dustslek* ‘hard blow’).\(^{29}\) Of the unique paragraphs in the U-version, §25 falls into the cluster of stipulations about unlawful entry into someone’s house (mentioned above), which also occurs in the other versions, but which has no parallel in the composition tariffs. These examples show once again how difficult it is to draw a clear boundary between the composition tariffs and other Old Frisian law texts.

5. *Further attestations of* bi tha sida and bi tha / thes landis wilkere in the composition tariffs

Returning to the paragraphs in the composition tariffs which contain the phrase *bi tha sida* or *bi tha pliga* (nr. 5 below), the following stipulations are found:

1) Loss of an eye: 5 marks.\(^{30}\)
2) Loss of an eyeball: 32 pounds.\(^{31}\)

---

27. Some figures: the J-version is the longest with 41 paragraphs, next comes the D-version with 39, and lastly the U-version with 35. The J-version has 9 paragraphs which are not found in the other two, the D-version 4, and the U-version 2.
28. 25 = D XIV,256; 26 = D XIV,254; 27 = J XXV,97; 28 = J XXV,98; 29 = J XXV,99. Note that these stipulations are grouped together in all three texts!
30. J XXVIII,34; J XXVIII,84; D XIV,59; J XXIX,33; U XXV,33.
31. J XXIII,32; J XXVIII,95; D XIV,62; J XXIX,31; U XXV,31.
3) Loss of the nose: 32 pounds.32
4) Loss of an ear: 8 pennies and 14 ounces.33
5) Loss of the upper joint of a finger: 32 pounds.34

A few things should be noted here. In the first place, the compensation for the loss of an ear is not mentioned in the ‘Statutes of the Five Districts’, which again makes it likely that they are not the immediate source for bi tha sida. Second, bi tha sida occurs in only a limited number of composition tariffs: BFD, BBr and BLw, which I have already shown to be a related cluster of registers within the Old West Frisian corpus.35 Third, the variant form bi tha pliga is found only in BLw and BFD. Taken together with the fact that BBr is a compilation, this makes the tradition of bi tha sida one which can be located in the northern region of Oostergo: Ferwerderadeel, Dongeradeel (BFD), and Leeuwarderadeel (BLw).

Now that a relation has been ascertained between bi tha sida and bi thes landis wilker, further attestations of the latter phrase in the Old West Frisian composition tariffs may be revealing:

1) If a bleeding wound (shorter than 2.5 cm.) is visible for 63 days, it must be inspected by a count.36
2) A bleeding wound in the face: 30 marks + 80 pounds peace-money.37
3) Severed limbs: 32 pounds.38
4) A penetrating wound through hand, arm, foot, leg or neck: the entrance of the weapon and the exit each 18 ounces.39
5) A knock-out: 18 ounces and 2 men must testify that the injured man was unconscious.40
6) Hand or foot cut off: 6 marks.41

32. J XXIII,35; J XXVIII,85/102; D XIV,89; J XXIX,34; U XXV,34.
33. J XXIII,36; J XXVIII,92; D XIV,99; J XXIX,35; U XXV,35.
34. J XXIII,57; J XXIX,54; U XXV,57.
35. Nijdam, ‘Het Oudwestfriese boeteregister Bireknade Bota (deel 1)’, 84 (figure 1); 99–105.
37. J XXIII,94.
39. J XXIII,82; J XXIX,86; U XXV,86.
40. J XXIII,84; J XXVIII,8 (5 shillings); J XXIX,88/141; U XXVII,105 (5 shillings); J XXIV,2.
41. U XXVI,75; J XXV,56; U XXVIII,68/69; J XXI,68.
7) Nose cut off *unwerdelik* ‘in a shameful way (causing shame)’: 1 wergild.\(^{42}\)

Trying to find parallels for these stipulations in the *Interregional Composition Tariff* (BIR) and the *Statutes of the Five Districts* yields some results. Some kind of parallel exists for the first stipulation: the *Statutes of the Five Districts* contain a stipulation about a wound that is visible for 63 days, but it is not exactly the same type of wound (*dustslek* ‘hard blow’ instead of the *blodresene* ‘bleeding wound’ in the composition tariffs) and it is not the same official that should inspect the injury (*judges* instead of the count mentioned in the composition tariffs).\(^{43}\) The third stipulation is again the compensation of 32 pounds, but this particular paragraph of BFD ends with: *thet is wilkarad* ‘thus it is fixed in the statute’.

The last two stipulations (numbers six and seven) provide a direct parallel with the *Interregional Composition Tariff* (BIR): they correspond to the fifth and third paragraphs of that text, respectively.\(^{44}\) It is telling that these stipulations do not stem from the cluster BBR / BLD / BFD, but from the *Wymbritseradeel Composition Tariff* (BWB), BHm, and the *Dongeradeel Composition Tariff* (BDg).\(^{45}\) This group of composition tariffs also shows a great mutual dependence and forms the second cluster of interrelated Old West Frisian composition tariffs.\(^{46}\)

6. Conclusion

In this article I have shown that *bitha sida* in the Old West Frisian composition tariffs must be interpreted as *bi tha sida* ‘according to the custom’. This ‘custom’ referred to some collection of statutes that has not been preserved. This new interpretation has made it possible to put *bi tha sida* on a par with *bi thes landis wilkere* ‘according to the statutes of the land’. This parallelism, together with the alternative formulation *bi tha pliga*, might also explain the use of the preposition *bi* besides *nei* in combination with *side* ‘custom’.

\(^{42}\) J XXI,67.
\(^{43}\) J XVII,20; D XII,21; U IV,17.
\(^{44}\) J XXVII,5 and 3; Fs IV,5 and 3; U XVIII,5 and 3.
\(^{45}\) Hofmann already aired the suspicion that this name is probably incorrect, and that BDg should be located somewhere in the south. See: ‘Zu der neuen Ausgabe’, 340.
\(^{46}\) See figure 1 in Nijdam, *Het Oudwestfriese boeteregister Bireknade Bota*, 84.
Most paragraphs containing the phrase *bi thes landis wilkere* are found in BFD: the origin of this textual tradition of referring to statutes must therefore be sought in the northern region of Oostergo. This tradition made use of a collection or collections of statutes which (1) partly resembled the ‘Statutes of the Five Districts’, (2) partly resembled the *Interregional Composition Tariff* (BIr), a collection of statutes dated 1276, and (3) contained stipulations which we only know from the fact that they are referred to in the composition tariffs.

Another, smaller tradition, located in the south of Westergo (BWb, BHm, and BDg) made use of the exact text of the *Interregional Composition Tariff* (BIr).

My observations show once more that the composition tariffs were not at all a closed genre in the Old Frisian corpus: stipulations taken from statutes found their way into them in order to augment the original compensations. Some knowledgeable scribe(s) who had access to a variety of composition tariffs and collections of statutes apparently knew this material well enough – perhaps because he was / they were working with it as legal officials? – to notice the flaws and gaps in the composition tariffs they were copying. Hence they updated them where they saw fit, using those statutes which in their eyes carried the greatest authority: those which had acquired the status of *side* ‘custom’.

*Universiteit Leiden*

*Opleiding Engels*
ABBREVIATIONS

D = Druk or Freeska Landriucht (no modern edition).
Fs = Codex Furmerius, edited in Gerbenzon et al. 1963.
U = Codex Unia. Dirk Boutkan kindly put the text of the modern edition he is preparing at my disposal.

BBr = *Bireknade Bota / Boeteregister van Wonseradeel en de Vijf Delen* (D XIV; J XXVIII) (*Bireknade Bota / Wonseradeel and the Five Districts Composition Tariff*)

BDg = Boeteregister van Dongeradeel (U XXVI) (*Dongeradeel Composition Tariff*)

BFD = Boeteregister van Ferwerderadeel en Dongeradeel (J XXIII) (*Ferwerderadeel and Dongeradeel Composition Tariff*)

BFW = Boeteregister van Franekeradeel en Wonseradeel (U XXVII) (*Franekeradeel and Wonseradeel Composition Tariff*)

BGr = Boeteregister van de grandscriwer (J XIV; J XXIX, 136–171; U XXV, 135–177) (*The grandscriwer’s Composition Tariff*)

BHm = Boeteregister van de Hemmen (J XXV) (*Hemmen Composition Tariff*)

Blr = Interregionaal Boeteregister (J XXVII; U XVIII; FS IV) (*Interregional Composition Tariff*)

Blw = Interregionaal Boeteregister ‘Van Walddethum’ (J XXVI; J XXI, 118–120) (*Interregional Composition Tariff ‘Van Walddethum’*)

BLw = Boeteregister van Leeuwarderadeel (U XXV; J XXIX) (*Leeuwarderadeel Composition Tariff*)

BWb = Boeteregister van Wymbritseradeel (U XXVIII; J XXI) (*Wymbritseradeel Composition Tariff*)

BWI = Westerlauwers Boeteregister (A IV) (*Westerlauwers Composition Tariff*)
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