FROM MODERN FRISIAN TO OLD FRISIAN:
ON CLITICISATION OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Willem Visser

In this article I want to analyse one example of cliticisation in Old Frisian, viz. that of the definite article. Before being able to do so, however, I will have to set up a synchronic theory of cliticisation on the basis of Modern Frisian. For this purpose I will base myself upon Visser (1988b), an article written within the general framework of generative grammar. After having sketched the synchronic theory I will take a look at some Old Frisian data and try to explain these within the theoretical framework adopted. Some notes on the possible source of the Modern Frisian clitic allomorph e beside the definite article clitic de will conclude this article.

1. Studying Old Frisian

Old Frisian is a language which has been transmitted to us in texts, i.e. written documents. No one of us has innate grammatical intuitions about the language which must be somehow "represented" in these texts. If we want to study a linguistic phenomenon in this language, the best way to do so is first to set up a synchronic theory on this phenomenon, based on Modern Frisian. It should be kept in mind that in this particular case this is possible since the phenomena under investigation bear a great similarity.

It is generally assumed in generative grammar nowadays that a separate theory of language change is not necessary: what constitutes a good theory for the present-day language a priori also constitutes a good theory for earlier stages. This claim may turn out to be too strong actually, but it is wise to use it as a heuristic principle. Moreover, it is assumed that languages do not change fast and radically. Seemingly drastic (surface) changes can be ascribed to a simple resetting of a parameter, which may have far-reaching consequences for surface phenomena.2

---

1. I would like to express my gratitude to Geert Booij, Tony Feitsma, Jarich Hoekstra, Ans van Kemenade, and an anonymous referee for this volume for their comments on earlier versions.

2. At least, as far as syntactic changes are concerned. In phonological changes processes like reinterpretation and rule loss are likely to play a role as well.
Before studying cliticisation of the definite article in Old Frisian, a theory has to be construed for this phenomenon in Modern Frisian in order to obtain a heuristic tool. This phenomenon should be couched within a general theory of cliticisation. I assume this general framework to be valid for Old Frisian as well, since, as mentioned before, the data are highly comparable. Therefore, what constitutes a valid theory on cliticisation for Modern Frisian, must constitute a valid one for Old Frisian as well.

2. Cliticisation in Modern Frisian
2.1 A synchronic theory

In Visser (1988b) I have sketched a view of cliticisation in Modern Frisian within the general framework of lexical phonology.

Universally, clitics are "weak", reduced, mostly monosyllabic forms of non-content words. One salient inherent property is their un-stressability. In the Germanic languages they often contain a reduced vowel, a schwa.

In my view a clitic in Modern Frisian is an independent unit syntactically (it can occupy an argument position when belonging to the appropriate lexical category), semantically (it is not a dummy element), and lexically (it constitutes an entry in its own right). Only phonologically does it behave dependently: it cannot be an utterance on its own, but needs a host word to "lean on", as it were.

In his famous 1977 article Zwicky distinguishes three types of clitics: "special" clitics, "simple" clitics, and dependent words. I assume Modern Frisian to have only "simple" clitics, which are characterised by the following: a) they occupy the same syntactic positions as their "strong" counterparts; b) they behave as separate words with respect to conjunction reduction; c) they reduce in weakly stressed or unstressed positions in the sentence. Needless to say that "special" clitics have just the opposite properties. With regard to point c) I disagree with Zwicky for a number of reasons, but assume instead that "full/strong" and "reduced/clitic" forms are both stored in the lexicon when they differ, cf. Berendsen (1986) for arguments to the same effect concerning Modern Dutch. I do not think, though, that point c) is very crucial in Zwicky's argument.

---

3. Object clitics, governed by V, are in all likelihood an exception to this.
4. Cf. Zwicky/Pullum (1983:505, fn. 3): "In line both with Kaisse's analysis and with criticisms by Klavans [...] of the conceptual framework of Zwicky (1977), we do not require that simple clitics derive synchronically from full forms by processes associated with casual or fast speech".
I take cliticisation in Modern Frisian to be the amalgamation of the clitic and the host word to a single phonological entity, i.e. cliticisation is in my opinion a matter of a phonological relation of dependency between host word and clitic. Following Berendsen (1986) I assume that a clitic enters syntax without any prosodic information above the syllable level, so that it needs incorporation into a higher level prosodic constituent in order to be able to be realised phonetically. In Visser (1988b) I assumed this constituent to be the phonological word, but further investigation might reveal that higher constituents also play a role. Cliticisation may have to be considered as a quite different process in other languages, viz. a syntactic one, but I will not dwell on this matter here.5

A Modern Frisian clitic may constitute a syntactic unit with a word to its right, while at the same time being phonologically dependent upon a host word to its left, which may become clear on the basis of phonological evidence, e.g. syllabification, rule application, stress. In other words, one often finds the characteristic mismatch between syntax and phonology as to constituency, see e.g. Klavans (1985) for ample illustration of this phenomenon.

After having sketched the general theoretical assumptions concerning cliticisation in Modern Frisian, I will now turn to a particular instance of it.

2.2 Cliticisation of the definite article in Modern Frisian

The definite articles in Modern Frisian are de and it, corresponding with the gender of the noun.6 Both of them often appear in cliticisation, which is only to be expected because: a) they are non-content words; b) they are monosyllabic; c) they contain a schwa. In establishing a criterion for deciding whether a non-content word behaves clitically (in the phonological sense) or not, Gussenhoven (1985:180) states:

5. Ans van Kemenade suggested to me the following clitic typology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>syntactic</th>
<th>phonological</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>object clitics in the Romance languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Old English personal pronoun clitics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>the case at hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be the case that an object clitic in Modern Frisian is both a syntactic and a phonological clitic, but the majority are in my opinion only phonological clitics.

6. de denotes common gender, it neuter.
Funktiewoorden gedragen zich vaak clitisch. We zullen van "cliticum" spreken zodra aan het criterium wordt voldaan dat de gereduceerde vorm van het funktiewoord samen met zijn gastwoord een eenheid vormt waarin fonologische condities gelden die niet gelden voor combinaties van twee niet-funktiewoorden.

Consider now the forms in (1):

(1) a. *dat de [dɔtə] *[dɔdə] man net goed wie
   'that the man not good was'
   b. *mei'k de [majktə] *[majgdə] süker eefkes hawwe
   'may-I the sugar for a while have'

In these combinations we find that de is realised with a [t] - after which a process of degemination operates - indicating that it makes up a single phonological word with the preceding word, because within a phonological word clusters of plosives ~re voiceless. Normally, words ending in /t/ and /k/ undergo regressive voicing assimilation when followed by a word beginning with /d/, for example:

(2) a. *dat domme [dɔdomə] *[dɔtoma] lju soks dogge
   'that stupid people such a thing do'
   b. *mei'k Durk [majgdörk] *[majktörk] eefkes hawwe
   'may-I Durk for a while have'

As regards the article it, syllabification is indicative of cliticisation, see (3):

(3) a. op it (o)₉ (pət)₉ dak
   'on the roof'
   b. yn it (i)₉ (nat)₉ wetter
   'in the water'

We consider the phonological word to be the domain of syllabification. The forms in (3) indicate that it makes up a single phonological word with the word preceding it, i.e. cliticises onto it, since the final segment of the host word appears in the onset of the syllable also containing it. It may be the case that the segments [p] and [n] are in fact ambisyllabic in order to avoid a syllable terminating in

---

7. See further Visser (1988a) with respect to Modern Frisian, and for similar phenomena in Modern Dutch Zonneveld (1983) and Gussenhoven and Bremmer (1983).
a short vowel, but we will not consider this matter here. 8

The definite article *de* has an allomorph *e* which is a clitic by its very form. It mostly appears after monosyllabic prepositions. It can be observed that monosyllabiclicity usually holds true for both the clitic and the host word. How *e* is used, may become clear from the examples in (4): 9

(4) *om de* or *om e* 'around the'
    *yn de* or *yn e* 'in the'
    *oan de* or *oan e* 'on the'
    *op de* or *op e* 'upon the'

One expects that the "full" form *de* may replace *e* everywhere. This expectation is not completely borne out:

(5) *op e/*de tiid* 'in time'
    *op e/*de doele* 'astray; confused'
    *om e/*de nocht* 'for nothing'

All the expressions in (5) are fixed and they have a non-compositional meaning. When using *de* only a compositional meaning is possible. Consequently, these are not counterexamples to the above mentioned claim that *de* may replace *e* in every case.

The clitic *e* needs a host word. In principle it could "lean" either to the right or to the left. But in this case nothing need be said on this matter. There is a general prohibition in Modern Frisian against phonological words initiating in schwa, 10 so *e* can only cliticise to the left.

---

8. The definite articles can also appear sentence initially, where there is no host word to the left to amalgamate with. Consider also a form like *oan de* [oāndə] 'on the' in which there is no segmental phonological indication of cliticisation. One might adopt as the zero hypothesis that monosyllabic non-content words containing a schwa always cliticise in the prosodic sense, i.e. need incorporation into a higher level prosodic unit, but that their segmental reactivity with their segmental phonological environment is a variable process and/or is constrained by segmental phonological factors. We might call them "inherent" clitics. As to monosyllabic non-content words containing a full vowel, the process of prosodic incorporation might be regarded as variable, i.e. they may enter syntax with or without prosodic information above the syllable level, while their segmental reactivity might be constrained by phonological and morphological factors, cf. Gussenhoven (1985) for examples from Dutch. We might call them "non-inherent" clitics.

9. For some speakers forms like *ûnder e* 'under the', *tusken e* 'between the', *bûten e* 'outside of the' are also possible.

10. The words *it* [ɑt] 'the' and *in* [ɑn] 'a(n)' are an exception to this. Observe that these are non-content words.
The mismatch between syntax and phonology characteristic of phonological cliticisation can be clearly demonstrated with e. We might schematise it as in (6):

(6) syntactic structure

\[
\text{preposition} \quad e \quad \text{N}
\]

phonological structure

Actually, confining the category of the host word to that of preposition is too rigid. Consider the following examples:

(7) a. it is it doel om e hiele wike fuort
   'it is the aim for the whole week away'

b. it dak fan it hûs en e skuorre
   'the roof of the house and the barn'

c. Durk en e frou
   'Durk and the (=his) wife'

d. ik rin e hiele dei al
   'I walk the whole day already'

e. dat ik e iennichste wie
   'that I the only one was'

We should not be too surprised to find this pattern. The article is connected to a noun and consequently to an NP and an NP position. Since NP's can appear in many structural configurations, we may expect e to cliticise onto elements belonging to different categories. In other words, e appears to have a low degree of selectivity with respect to the category of its host. This is an indication of its clitic status, cf. Zwicky and Pullum (1983).

The combination of a monosyllabic preposition with e is the most salient one. There may be a twofold reason for this: a) de/e and monosyllabic prepositions are both highly frequent; b) e and the preposition belong to the same syntactic constituent, viz. PP, while for example in (7) the monosyllabic words and e do not. One can apply the argument of frequency only with caution, so that b) seems the most important reason to me.
We have seen that *de* can show up wherever *e* can. The reverse is not the case, witness the examples in (8):

(8) a. fan allinnich *de/*e Frânse taal
   'of only the French language'
   b. mei krapoan *de/*e helt
   'with just the half'
   c. mei inkel *de/*e lofter hân
   'with only the left hand'

It appears that *e* has phonological requirements regarding the phonological shape of its host word - in this respect it shows a high degree of selectivity - which must be monosyllabic and end in a non-continuant (but see footnote 9). Therefore, in (6) "preposition" must be replaced by the variable "X" and the phonological conditions must be mentioned.

In (9) some examples follow which show that the clitic *e* can only show up when there is an appropriate host word to the left of it:

(9) a. oan *e* ... muorre
   'on the wall'
   *oan ... e* muorre (... denotes a pause)
   b. yn e mûle, de eagen, it hier
   'in the mouth, the eyes, the hair'
   *yn e mûle, e* eagen, it hier
   c. oan *e* muorre hinget in foto
   'at the wall hangs a picture'
   de muorre hinget in foto oan
   *e* muorre hinget in foto oan

In this section I have presented some facts concerning cliticisation of the definite article in Modern Frisian and placed them within a theoretical framework. It appeared throughout that the clitics concerned are monosyllabic and that cliticisation is onto a monosyllabic element. I will now try to extend this analysis to Old Frisian.

3. Cliticisation of the definite article in Old Frisian

In "classical" Old Frisian the definite article/demonstrative pronoun

---

11. In what follows I will use <...> to denote the graphemic level.
begins with <th>, see e.g. Van Helten (1890:191). Yet, forms with <d> or <t> may occur "in der anlehnung". In late texts the customary spelling is <d>.\footnote{The phoneme or 'sound' <th> represents is a matter that will not concern us here too much. Van Helten (1890:95 and following) asserts that <th> represents the interdental spirant and that "der laut sich in einen harten und weichen gespalten hatte und letzterer im inlaut bei weicher nachbarschaft eingetreten war." Sjölin (1969:25) says: "\(p\) wurde im Inlaut als [\(\delta\)] realisiert, in übrigen Fällen als [\(p\)]."}

In his discussion of "Zusammenfall (Synkretismus) von Syngraph-emen" Sjölin (1969:26) asserts that <d>/\<t>\ vacillate with <th>: <d> inside the word, <t> at the beginning of the word. Buma (1957:29) observes:

\begin{quote}
Hie in wurd minder klam, dan brükten somlike åldeastfryske hss. hjir-en-dêr en de Westerlauwerske boarnen hast oeral in d foar germ. \(th\).
\end{quote}

He furthermore claims that the change from <th> to <d> inside the word is the rule in the so-called West Lauwers manuscripts. Van Helten (1890:98-9) points out that in "Old East Frisian" <d> for <th> is found only word-internally, while word-finally <t> or <d> is found; according to him such internal <d>'s denote "unurspr. explosiva".

Sjölin (1970:106-7) thinks that quite early in the Old Frisian period \(b\) and \(\delta\) were interpreted as allophones of /t/ and /d/. Yet, initial <th> is found quite persistently. Nevertheless, Sjölin believes <th> to designate the same phoneme or "sound" as <t>, because hyper-correct spellings of <th> instead of <t> are also met with, such as, for example, \(thach\) pret. of \(tia, thar\), 'tear', \(thegede\), 'tenth', \(tho\) 'to, at, in', and because <t> instead of <th> occurs sporadically at the beginning of a word even in the oldest manuscripts. The persistent separation between <t> and <th> at the beginning of words should according to him be ascribed to the orthographic tradition - a point also emphasised by Van Helten - in which the beginning of a word is quite stable.

It is important for our purpose to note that the transition from <th> to <d> began to take place inside the word and that it may have had to do with weak stress.\footnote{In Van Heltens view this is a kind of lenition, see above, and Sjölin (1970:107) says: "Im Schwachton konnte [\(b\)] anscheinend als ein Allophon von /d/ interpretiert werden". It is a well-known phonological fact that the initial position of the syllable is a "strong", sometimes a "strengthening" position, see Hooper (1976). We adopt this strength hierarchy (cf. Hooper (1976:206)):
As we have only Old Frisian texts at our disposal and no intuitions about Old Frisian phonology, we have to establish a criterion on the basis of which we can determine whether we are dealing with cliticisation or not. Feitsma (1974:187), when dealing with what she terms "pseudo-suffixes" in the texts of the Frisian poet Gysbert Japiks (1603-1666), asserts that some monosyllabic words, i.e. words containing one autographeme, should be counted as suffixes, for one thing because several of them can be joined to the preceding word so as to form one single word in the text. As to the manifestation of their form, they behave like suffixes, while their meaning is the same as that of separate words, and this is exactly how I would like to characterise a clitic in Modern Frisian. To quote some examples from Feitsma (1974: 204/205): enne (e variant of de) 'of the', azme (me variant of men) 'if one', asse (se variant of Jae) 'as she'. Therefore, as the first criterion with which to determine the clitichood of non-content word, I propose:

We will call a non-content word a clitic if it is joined to the preceding word so as to form one single word in the text.

I feel that this is a relatively safe and reliable criterion, the more so because in Old Frisian texts many compounds, which we would write as one word today, are written as separate words. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>glides</th>
<th>liquids</th>
<th>nasals</th>
<th>voiced cont.</th>
<th>voiceless cont.</th>
<th>voiceless stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-- &gt;</td>
<td>-- &gt;</td>
<td>-- &gt;</td>
<td>-- &gt;</td>
<td>-- &gt;</td>
<td>-- &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Sjölin is right in claiming that /p/ inside the word was realised as [δ], and if we assume that <d> stands for approximately [d], then we may view the transition from [δ] to [d] as a strengthening process. As it is, we simply do not know exactly which 'sounds' and phonemes <th> and <d> are intended to represent.

14. Cf., however, Koopman (1989:37) for the opposite view. If the spellings here are at all reliable we could take instances as these [cwistu, etc.] as the first step towards reduction. The pronoun in this position cliticises onto the verb and writing verb and ditic as one word may indicate this. It must be emphasised, however, that as it is common practice in Old English to separate words which we would regard as one (compound words), not too much should be made of the presence or absence of a word division. To be honest, I do not see the point Koopman is making here. If two words are written as one when it is common practice to separate words, this according to me should be viewed as a strong indication that these words constitute a unit at some level of linguistic description. Note that Koopman is primarily concerned with syntactic evidence as to cliticisation, while in my view cliticisation is a mainly phonological phenomenon. The only access we have to the phonology of Old Frisian is via the level of graphemics, viz. spelling, so we cannot but take that level seriously.
Yet, because the orthography (in the widest sense) is much less regularised and normalised in Old Frisian texts than it is today, we might feel the need for another criterion on the basis of which we can decide about the clitichood of a word. Transposing Gussenhoven's above-mentioned phonological criterion to the level of graphemics, we propose the following, second, criterion:

We will call a non-content word a clitic as soon as it meets the condition that it constitutes a graphemic unit with its host, a unit in which one finds graphemic phenomena that one does not find when two content words are juxtaposed.

These two criteria are, of course, not mutually exclusive, but could and should supplement and reinforce one another. In what follows I will indicate for each case which of the two I would argue for.

Sjölin (1969:26) asserts: "in enklitischen und vereinzelten sonstigen unbetonten Formen steht auch <d> am Wortanfang: des, da, der, usw.". Within our theory of cliticisation it is not necessary to mark these words as exceptional to the pattern that the change from <th> to <d> started inside the word, because within that theory host and clitic constitute one single word. On the basis of the above-mentioned criteria da, etc., count as clitics: a) with their host they are written as a single word in the text; and b) we find a graphemic phenomenon, viz. the use of <d> for <th>, that we do not encounter when two content words meet. Just as we have seen with cliticisation in Modern Frisian, monosyllabicity is a key word, with respect to both the host and the clitic.

We might represent the cliticisation in this way:

(10) (fan)ₗ (tha)ₗ --> (fantha)ₗ --> (fanda)ₗ

σ and w denote phonological entities and not graphemic ones. It seems likely that the level of phonology underlies the level of graphemics, but I know of no theory which explains the way in which this connection should be established. Since we have primary access to the phonology of Old Frisian via the level of graphemics, we had better represent (10) as in (11):

(11) <fan> <tha> --> <fantha> --> <fanda>

On the basis of our synchronic theory we expect to find in Old Frisian texts the combination of any monosyllabic word + the definite article to be written as one word. We also expect graphemic
phenomena to occur that are not found when two independent words occur side by side.

I have investigated the Old Frisian manuscript known as $R_1$ (edition Buma (1961) in OTR) and found a.o. the following relevant forms: \textit{anthere, anda, antha, andere} (an, preposition); \textit{anta, antes, antha, anthere, anti} (and, conjunction); \textit{thete, theter, thetes, thetet, theti, thetter, thetterme, thettet} (thet, conjunction). It is remarkable that no single word combinations in $R_1$ occur with the preposition \textit{fon} (once \textit{fon da}) nor combinations with \textit{mith, twisk, ur, with}. These might be accidental gaps, due to the small size of the manuscript. In other Old Frisian manuscripts forms such as \textit{mitta} are recorded.

Many prepositions which are monosyllabic in late Old Frisian texts and Modern Frisian are bisyllabic in $R_1$: \textit{ana, anna, fori, inna, opa, umbe}. Therefore, many potential clitic hosts are not available here, cf. the frequent form \textit{inda} in later manuscripts.

All of the cases in which we find amalgamation have non-combinatorial counterparts, e.g. \textit{an tha, an there}. This is only to be expected within our framework where cliticisation of non-content words containing a full vowel (autographeme) is viewed as a variable process. There is no need for characterising these cases as forms "mit etymologischer schreibung" (Van Helten (1890:101)). For example, combinations of the preposition \textit{an} + \textit{tha, there}, etc., are written as one word 36 times (8 times with <th>, 28 times with <d>) and as two separate words 23 times (all of them with <th>).

I have the impression that in late Old Frisian manuscripts the frequency of amalgamation is higher, especially for \textit{fanda} and \textit{inda}. One would expect the frequency to become higher, because in the course of time the endings of these usually weakly stressed or unstressed words get more and more reduced, a pervasive tendency in all Germanic dialects, by which they gradually become more eligible candidates for cliticisation. Because the text of $R_1$ is known to represent the oldest, "purest", most "classical" variant of Old Frisian, it should not cause too great a surprise when we discover that cliticisation there is not as frequent as in later texts. But there is cliticisation all the same, and I think our theory, based on Modern Frisian, is able to account for it in this particular case.

In $R_1$ words with etymologically initial <th> are consistently spelled that way. The same holds for the manuscripts of B ($B_1$ and $B_2$). But in the other Old Frisian manuscripts one often finds <d> and <t> where <th> would be expected etymologically and, conversely, <th> where <d> or <t> might be expected, see for example Sjölin (1970: Kap. III, § 10.106 (p. 83/4); Kap. III, § 10.122 (p. 86)). This points to the fact that the scribes of the manuscripts were getting uncertain as to what pronunciation their orthography was
supposed to represent. In other words, the orthographic tradition was beginning to take over the actual pronunciation.

In the latest manuscripts one does not find <th> any more or only sporadically so. This implies that in late Old Frisian texts the definite article was consistently spelled with initial <d>. Consequently, our second criterion on which we could base the occurrence of cliticisation becomes increasingly less applicable, only to such cases as datter (< dat der). The most important criterion then becomes whether host and article are written as one word in the text. In late Old Frisian manuscripts one often finds forms such as inda, fanda, oenda, omda, neyda, toda, bida. But forms such as in da also occur. The <a> may be due to the orthographic tradition, the actual pronunciation may very well have comprised a reduced variant, as in the infinitival ending <a>, which was probably rather a mark of "Frisianess" than an intention to represent the current pronunciation.

4. How the Modern Frisian allomorph e might have come into being

Now that we have established a theory of cliticisation in Old Frisian texts, we want to see if we can find an explanation for the form of the clitic e in Modern Frisian.

It is clear that the existence of a clitic allomorph e of the definite article de is a synchronic fact of Modern Frisian. A child learning this language cannot be assumed to have access to the origins of the allomorph. But it might be interesting to know how it has come into being. In the following I will investigate how the change from de to e, which must have taken place at a certain point in time, may have come about and whether we can connect this change to another one that has occurred in the transition from Old Frisian to Middle Frisian.

All monosyllabic Old Frisian words ending in <nd> show up with <n(n)> in Middle Frisian and in Modern Frisian; to give just a few examples: bli<nd> - bly<n> 'blind', la<nd> - là<n> 'land', po<nd> - pû<n> 'pound', frio<nd> - freo<n> 'friend'.

Even in the earliest manuscripts one finds -<n>- for
etymological -<nd>-e, e.g. a<n> < a<nd>, ho<n>brede < ho<nd>brede, mu<n>sket < mu<nd>sket, balumo<n> < balumo<nd>, (h)wa<nn>e < (h)wa<nd>e (see Van Helten (1890:94)), cf. also the ending of the gerund to VERB<nd>e which becomes to VERB<n(n)>e in the course of the Old Frisian period. Yet, these are incidental cases, not to be confused with the rule that has caused <nd> to be turned into <n(n)>e, operative in the transitional period between Old Frisian and Middle Frisian, from which very few texts have survived.

How the underlying phonological change has to be formulated exactly as a newly added phonological rule is not clear to me. It is accompanied by certain vowel changes, for example, that which turns probable /I/ into /i/: blind - blyn, and in some cases seemingly by compensatory lengthening: land - län [lɔ:n]. These changes should be accounted for in separate rules in order to keep the rule of d-loss as simple as possible. What exactly happened: a) was /d/ dropped after any /n/; or b) was /d/ dropped after /n/ with which it is tautosyllabic? We might state the rule as a word level rule which deletes /d/ after stem-final /n/, or, in phonological terms: syllable-final /n/, since this seems to accommodate most of the cases:

(12) /d/ --> φ / n--)ₖ

Once again, since σ denotes a phonological entity and since the only access we have to Old Frisian is via the level of graphemics, the only thing we can observe is this:

(13) <d> --> φ /<n>--#

A rule like (12) can only be inferred from correspondences expressed by (13). An explanation for this deletion might be that universally a syllable must end as sonorously as possible (i.e. the least consonant-like) and begin as little sonorous as possible (i.e. the most consonant-like), hence the universal CV syllable, cf. Hooper (1976:201): "The loss of

17. It is likely that the vowel in land was lengthened before d was lost, so that vowel lengthening was the cause rather than the result of d-loss. It should be kept in mind that [lɔ:n] is the Modern Frisian pronunciation.

18. It may well be the case that a d which had a clear morphological function was not deleted, for example the d of the suffix -end of the present participle. This d could be deleted only when the present participle got a meaning which was no longer a compositional function of the meaning of the verb stem + end, for example mijen (<mijend) 'careful', hoeden (<hoedend) 'careful', rimpen (<(w)rimpend) 'wild', gysten (<gystend) 'wild', opljeppen (<opljeppend) 'short-tempered'.

(12) /d/ --> φ / n--}_{ₖ

(13) <d> --> φ /<n>--#
consonants in syllable-final position is extremely common". This, however, is not a compelling argument, for why were not all syllable-final consonants lost then? It is no more than a tendency, which can only make the present change a little more intelligible.¹⁹

At first sight, it seems to be clear that the change from Old Frisian *fanda/e* to Middle Frisian *fenne/finne* and from Old Frisian *inda* to Middle Frisian *ynne* cannot be directly ascribed to the rule at hand. We do not want to stipulate a rule which simply states that the *d* of the definite article was lost after a monosyllabic preposition terminating in *<n>*, but we will try to improve it. It is worth noticing that forms like *ynne* and *fenne/finne* show up at the same time when e.g. Gysbert Japiks consistently writes the strong verbs of the third declension - of which in Old Frisian the stem, both for the present and the past tense, ended in *<nd>* - with *<n>* (Brandsma 1936:12). There is every reason, therefore, to try and connect these two phenomena.

It should be mentioned that in late Old Frisian texts and in the works of Middle Frisian authors the combination of a monosyllabic preposition and the definite article is frequently written as one word. This indicates in all likelihood that they may be considered as one word (in whatever sense) on some level of linguistic description.

Although at first sight rule (12) operated on monosyllabic words only, its effects were also perceivable in disyllabic words of the form ((...)ₗ(dₘ)ₗ)ₗ, e.g. in the Modern Frisian forms *spine, rûne, stûne, wiîne, moanne*. These forms will pose no problem for our rule when we follow Kager & Zonneveld (1986) and take a final schwa in underived words to be a syllabic appendix at the underlying level. Old Frisian *wonde* would then be syllabified phonologically as ((wond)ₗ(eₗ)ₗ, a form to which (12) could apply.²⁰

The bearing of the preceding cases on the present ones, viz. those of *inda/e* and *fanda/e*, may be as follows: these combinations probably functioned as one word at a certain linguistic level. That a

---

¹⁹. Perhaps there is a connection with the loss of *d* after a long vowel or a diphthong, as in *dea* (*< dead*) 'dead', *hie* (*< hied*) 'had', *brea* (*< bread*) 'bread', a change which may have become operative in the same period. Note, however, that for a subset of words this *d* must be assumed to be still present at the underlying level, since it shows up in inflected and derived forms, e.g. *deade* (inflected form), *deadzje* /deade+je/ 'to kill', and for some speakers also in underived forms, see Tiersma (1985: 34/35). For all other forms no underlying /d/ has to be posited, since it never shows up in whatever form.

²⁰. Although syllabification in Old Frisian has not been investigated, I use this analysis, since it allows me to treat words such as *land* and *wonde* on a par. This may, however, be a first indication that my analysis is on the right track.
syntactically derived host-clitic combination might fit into a word level pattern is not so strange as it might seem. A host-clitic combination is one word phonologically, so it can as a whole undergo phonological word level rules or be subjected to word level constraints. Such combinations may even undergo lexical rules, when they become more or less fixed, e.g. because of frequent usage. A point in case is presented by the third person singular present tense of the verb gean 'to go' which in Modern Frisian may be pronounced as either [giət] or, with so-called "breaking", [gjIt]. Breaking is said to be conditioned originally by a following syllable attached to the stem, particularly in the case of nouns in plural and diminutive forms. But, as no suffix could be attached to the form /giət/, whence do we get the broken form? Probably because of the frequent host-clitic combination giet er 'goes he'. Compare the numeral ienentritich ([IEnEntRiTê] 'one-and-thirty' which must have arisen out of ien[iEn]en tritich. Hof (1933:72-75) mentions the preposition oan [wan] which was (is?) also pronounced as [wan], with breaking. He mentions the following:

Dêr stiet in hûske woán 'e dyk.
'There stands a little house on the road'.

(The initial w in woán will not concern us here). Regrettably, Hof does not say whether oan [wan] only occurs with de/e to its right. But it seems clear that oan de/e has been treated as one word for the breaking rule. Although such cases are not "the rule", they may occur. Notice that the combination of a monosyllabic preposition with a definite article is highly frequent.

Once indа/e and fanda/e had appeared as ynne and fenne, speakers could connect the full form de of yn de/fen de and the dependent form -e of ynne/fenne and could then use e after other (monosyllabic) prepositions and later on after words belonging to other categories, which gave rise to the present system. Though the conditions under which e, as soon as it had become a clitic, could attach to its host may have changed somewhat in the course of time and/or dialectally, this process of cliticisation must have been stable for quite a few centuries.

5. Conclusion

In this article I hope to have shown that one cannot study cliticisation

---

21. Observe that yn has /i/ in Modern Frisian, while it probably had /I/ in Old Frisian. It must have undergone the same change as we may posit for the pair blind - blyn, an indication that our analysis may be correct.
in Old Frisian without a synchronic theory. This is not a matter of coincidence, but one of principle. Old Frisian must have been a learnable language, just as Modern Frisian is. That it has been transmitted to us in written form only, so that we have no direct access to matters of phonetics and phonology, does not alter this fact. The less we know about the phonetics of Old Frisian, the more we are in need of a theory of phonology, viz. of cliticisation. Not all problems will have been solved then, but we then at least have a framework in which to ask the relevant questions. I take this approach to have proven itself fruitful in this particular small case.
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