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THE NOM.ACC.SG.FEM. AND THE NOM.ACC.PL. OF THE ANGLO-FRISIAN HI-PRONOUN

The English forms in this paper are mostly taken from the standard dissertations; for the Lindisfarne Gospels Mr. D. E. Chadwick’s (unpublished) *Index Verborum* has been used; Dr. G. L. Brook (Manchester) has kindly supplied me with the necessary information for Harleian 2253, Mr. R. M. Wilson with that for the Lambeth Homilies and Dr. M. Serjeantson with that for one or two other ME. texts. The Frisian forms are mostly from W. L. van Helten, *Altostfriesische Grammatik* and Th. Siebs, *Geschichte der friesischen Sprache* (Pauls Grundriss, 1st ed., i, 723-79). The Modern Frisian forms from the latter have been corrected from information from Dr. E. Löfstedt.

**NOTATION.** Numbers after forms indicate statistics of occurrence (from the above sources). In some cases names of texts are printed before their forms, in others the reverse procedure is adopted (and in this case the form is in general not repeated before each text). A notation such as _heo_ n, _ho_ indicates that _heo_ is the normal form in the text, but that _ho_ also occurs; _heo ho_ n, _he_ that _heo_ and _ho_ are both normal but that _he_ also occurs; _heo (n : ha)_ that _heo_ is normal but that _ha_ also occurs; _heo ( : ha)_ that both _heo_ and _ha_ occur, that no comment on the relative frequency of occurrence is intended, but that _heo_ is, at the moment, the principal object of discussion. In general forms placed in brackets are either etymologically distinct or else show a fundamental difference in phonology from those immediately preceding them outside the bracket.

References preceded by v. are by line, those of type 225/15 by page and line, of the edition cited below. Note that the citation

---

I should like to express my thanks to Professor H. C. Wyld (Oxford) and Dr. M. Serjeantson (London) for advice on the English forms and to Dr. E. Löfstedt (Lund) for advice on the Frisian forms. Dr. B. Gericke (Berlin) has kindly sent me a copy of his dissertation *Die Flexion des Personalpronomens der 3. Person im Spätals.* (Palaestra 193) but unfortunately it arrived too late for detailed mention here. It affords a most valuable collection of material, but I am not able to agree with many of the conclusions as to the history and development of the forms.
Note in conclusion, first, that MKent. statistics are not given (owing to the complexity of the different spellings) and, secondly, that the list of forms given in this article, though large, is not intended as exhaustive (except, of course, in cases in which statistics are given).

Two special factors have affected the regular development of the forms of this pronoun:

(A) As in the case of the majority of pronouns special stress-
Conditions have led to abnormal phonological development; in particular:

1. Lengthening tends to take place; thus nom.sg.masc. PrE. *hi > OE. hè > hè (> MnE. he). The stem of the pronoun in the two forms under discussion here was probably long by reason of this special lengthening; this is attested by the late WS. spelling nom.acc.sg.fem.nom.acc.pl. hig, by ME. spellings such as nom.pl. hii hij (e.g. in Dav GuyW PepysGH PPl Rob.Gl SpecGW), and by rhymes such as nom.sg.fem. heo*: beo (Rob. Gl v. 9550).

2. 'Accent-shift' tends to take place in this word; it is probably due to a diminution in stress. Thus, nom.sg.fem. Orb ʒho < OE. hīo; MnWFris. ju < OFris. hiu, hio. Sometimes this accent-shift has caused the loss of the first element of a diphthong, as in nom.sg.fem. ME. ho < OE. hēo.

3. The second element of the OE. diphthongs io, eo tends to be unrounded by reason of a diminution in stress; hence, North. gen.pl. hīara < hīora.

(B) The paradigm of the definite article tends to influence that of the hi-pronoun and vice versa; thus, acc.sg.fem.nom. acc.pl. North. hīa OFris. hia by analogy with OE. ḫā OFris. tha. Cf. similarly MDu. nom.sg.fem. soe3 (= Goth. so) 'she.' For analogy in the reverse direction cf. VPs nom.sg.fem. sē by analogy with hīe.4

Nom.sg.fem. PrGmc. *χi-ō > nom.sg.fem. OE. hīu Lind (13 : hio 6) Ru1 (7 : hio 8 heo 2), > hīo Lind Ru2 Ru1 eWS Kent.Gl (16 : hi 3); > WS. hēo, with the usual change of io to ēo. Hence the following ME. types:—


2 'Akzentumsprung.'
3 J. Franck, Mittelniederländische Grammatik §212.
4 As another peculiarity in connection with the history of this word we may mention (C) a tendency towards the preservation of anomalous and archaic forms; thus, acc.sg.fem.nom.acc.pl. hīa Ru1 Ru2; nom.sg.fem. hūe Prov.Alf [MS. T], heo Jac&Jos (see p. 18).
Jac\&Jos\(^6\) West.Ch—also elsewhere e.g. K.Tars v. 76; Lay heo n, ho MS. C v. 4990 Owl\&N\(^6\) heo ho he\(^7\) Lamb.Homs. heo 57 ho 8 (: ha 3) Trev heo hue (n : she etc. 4, a 8) Harl.2253 heo he n, hue K.Horn [MS. L] heo hue he (: hy), [MS. C] heo he Rob.Gl heo n, he (: 30, 3e, sso, sse) SEL heo n, he Bible heo he Trin.Homs heo hie he VV heo 99/26, he hie\(^9\) n PPL [MS. Phill. 8231] hue n\(^9\) Prov.Alf [MS. T] he hue\(^10\) (n : hie)—(hue also elsewhere e.g. Alex\&Dind v. 562)—K.Horn [MS. O] he (: hy(e, sche) StEd he (: hi)—(hê also elsewhere e.g. Pol.R\&L p. 256 (foot) hey).

(b) With accent-shift (A2 above) > [hjo], [jo]\(^11\):—Orm 3ho n Lay [MS. O] 3eo (: 3e) Rob.Gl 30 (: heo n, he, 3e, sso, sse) F&P 3ho 2, 3o 2 (: 3e i, sso i) PPL [MS. Laud 656] 3o n—also Otuel [Auchinleck MS.] v. 1001.

(c) With loss of the first element of the diphthong (A2 above) > ho. H. Lindkvist (Anglia xlv, 48) says:—"... Bishop Erkenwald ... has only ho; this holds good also ... of the Fairfax MS. of the Cursor Mundi. In the so-called Early English Alliterative Poems (Pearl, Cleanness and

---

\(^5\) The form is anomalous in this text for OE. ēo regularly appears as e (3 x as u)—see A. S. Napier, Iacob and Josep, p. xvii.

\(^6\) For the distribution of the three forms in the different parts of the two MSS. see J. E. Wells, Anglia xxxiii, 258-9.

\(^7\) OE. ēo appears only very rarely as e in either MS. (W. Breier, Eule und Nachtigall p. 15) and the comparatively frequent occurrence of the nom.sg.fem. he (CJ 3 x, C 5 x, J 3 x) therefore raises the question whether OE. nom.sg.fem. hie may not sometimes have given hē with an accent-shift similar to that found in the nom.sg.fem. ho < hē. There is certainly some evidence for this development in the case of the nom.pl. hē (see note 28). If this development were postulated, there would be an alternative explanation for some of the examples of a nom.sg.fem. hē given above from ME. texts in which OE. ēo regularly appears as ë—such as he in the Register of Godstow Nunnery (cf. W. Segelhorst, Die Sprache des "English Register of Godstow Nunnery" (ca. 1450) in ihrem Verhältnis zu Oxford und London p. 27). But the evidence for the assumption of a change nom.sg.fem. hīe > hē could only be regarded as certain if a consistent nom.sg.fem. he were to be found in a text where OE. ēo never appeared as ë.

\(^8\) The writing ie can correspond to OE. ēo in Trin.Homs and VV; see O. Strauss, Die Sprache der me. Predigtsammlung in der HS. B.14.52 des Trinity College, Cambridge p. 49; G. Schmidt, Ueber die Sprache und Heimat der "Vices and Virtues" §33.

\(^9\) H. Lindkvist, Anglia xlv, 17.

\(^10\) This form is anomalous in this text for OE. ēo regularly appears as ë (E. Borgström, The Proverbs of Alfred §29).

\(^11\) See H. Lindkvist, Anglia xlv, 10 ff.
Patience) and in the pieces of the well-known Ireland MS. (Anturs of Arther, Sir Amadace, Avowynge of King Arther) *ho* prevails almost without exception, apart from two or three isolated instances of *scho*. In Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight *ho* by far prevails, but there are several instances of *scho*. The Gest Hystoriale of the Destruction of Troy has *ho* as the regular form; besides *scho* (*scho*) is frequently found, and in not a few places *she.* ME. *hō* > MnE.dial. *ū*, *u* in parts of West Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire, Flint, Denbighshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Worcestershire.\(^{12}\)

(d) With loss of the first element of the diphthong (*A₂* above) and unrounding of *o* to *a* (*A₃* above):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Form</th>
<th>Old English Form</th>
<th>Modern English Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ha</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
<td><em>heo</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Acc.sg.fem. OE. *hīa* Rit 15 Lind 74 *hea* 5 Ru\(^{2}\) (23 : *hīa* 18)\(^{14}\) OFris. *hīa*\(^{15}\) are due to analogy with acc.sg.fem. OE. *pā* OFris. *tha* (*B* above).

---


\(^{13}\) *ha* occurs relatively more frequently in CI than in N.

\(^{14}\) But a few examples of *hīa* in OECh cannot be relied on (R. Girvan, *Angelsaksisch Handboek* §350-3).

\(^{15}\) The phonologically regular Frisian development is seen in acc.sg. *jeve* < PrGmc. *χeβōn*.
In English the distinction nom.sg.fem. *hīo : acc.sg.fem. *hīe *hīy *hī, *hīa tended to be lost, probably because a form identical with the acc.sg.fem. *hīe, *hīa could be used in the plural for both nom. and acc.

Thus, on the one hand:—nom.sg.fem. VPs *hīe WS. *hīe *hīy *hī; further nom.sg.fem. ME. *hi Lamb.Homs (: *heo *hoe *he) Prov.Alf [MS T] *hie (: *hie *he n), [MS. J] *hi (: *heo n) K.Horn [MS. O] *hy(e (: *he, *sche ) Fl&Bl *hi(i (: *she n, *sche) StEd *hi (: *he)—(also elsewhere e.g. Launfal v. 352 *hy, LIF v. 120 *hye);\(^{16}\) with accent-shift (A2 above)\(^{17}\) > [hje:], [je:]\(^{18}\):—Best *ge n Gen&Ex *ghe n, *ge r (: *sche 2, *sge 2) Fl&Bl *zhie (n : *hi, *sche) F&P 3e r (: *hie 2, 3o 2, *sso r) Lay [MS. O] 3e (: *zhoe n, *he, 3o, *sse, *sso) Will.P *zhie (: *sche n, *che) — also in two late fourteenth century deeds (Lindkvist, loc.cit.).\(^{19}\)

On the other hand:—acc.sg.fem. WS. *hēo Ru\(^{1}\) *heo 3 *hio r (: *hīe 7 *hie 2); further, with normal development of OE. *eō:—acc.sg.fem. ME. *heo Lamb.Homs Lay SEL, Owl&N *heo CJ vv. 1232, 1530 C v. 939 *ho J v. 939 Pass v. 435 *heo S&B §E v. 5 *heo Trin.Homs *heo r *hie r VV *hie 35/32 PM MS. D stanza 6r *hoe H.Ch v. 44r *he\(^{20}\); with loss of the first element of the diphthong (A2 above) and unrounding of o to a (A3 above):—acc.sg.fem. *ha Lay MS. C v. 3186 PM MS.L v. 215 Seinte Marherete 15/31.

\(^{16}\) The explanation of the MKent. forms is rendered difficult by the fact that the phonologically regular development of PrE. īu in MKent. is ī. It is therefore very difficult to decide whether nom.acc.sg.fem. *hi Ayen Kent.Gosp Kent.Homs PM [MS. D] Will.Sh corresponds to OE. *hīo or to OE. *hīe (the latter > ī already in OKent., in some cases at least—cf. Kent.Gl nom.sg.fem. *hi (3 : *hio 16) < *hie, with irregular loss of the final vowel due to diminution of stress, as in North. dat.sg.fem. *hir < *híre?). But forms such as Kent.Gosp nom.sg.fem. *hīo *hīo (as well as Will.Sh nom.sg.fem. *he?) show that some at least of the forms descend from OE. *hīo.

\(^{17}\) This explanation is more probable than Lindkvist's (analogy between [hjo:] and [he:]), both from OE. *hīo *hēo); for the identical accent-shift is proved in the nom.pl. for one dialect at least by Ru\(^{1}\) nom.pl. ī < īe (see note 28).

\(^{18}\) H. Lindkvist, Anglia xlv, 26 ff.

\(^{19}\) The nom.sg.fem. *ja in some dialects of MnWFris. is to be similarly explained; i.e., it descends from an OFris. nom.sg.fem. *hīa with the form of the acc.sg.fem. *hīa or *hīe?; see note 7.
### Nom.acc.pl.

Corresponding to a PrGmc. paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.pl.</td>
<td><em>χi-ai</em></td>
<td><em>χi-öz</em></td>
<td><em>χi-ó</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.pl.</td>
<td><em>χi-anz</em></td>
<td><em>χi-ónz</em></td>
<td><em>χi-ó</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Pr.Anglo-Frisian we should expect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.pl.</td>
<td><em>hīae</em></td>
<td><em>hīa</em></td>
<td><em>hīu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.pl.</td>
<td>?²²</td>
<td><em>hīa</em></td>
<td><em>hīu</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there was no distinction in the majority of declensions between nom. and acc.pl., there was naturally a tendency to eliminate the distinction in this pronominal paradigm also. Under these circumstances a form *hīae* was generalised for nom.acc.pl., masc. and fem.; this process is intelligible whatever the form we assume for the difficult acc.pl.masc. For some reason this form *hīae* was extended to the nom.acc.pl.neut. also;²³ consequently, all distinction between the six cases was lost and we may imagine a state of affairs in which either *hīae* or *hīu* could be used in any of them. Then one or other of these forms was generalised.

The first process (generalisation of *hīae*) accounts for:

- OE. nom.acc.pl. 'hīae' RC FC, hīae Ru² (r67 : hīa 54, hīe 7) Ru¹ (r04 : hīe 64, hēo 11, hīo 2, hī 7, hē 5, hy 2, hye 1);²⁴ OE. hīe hīy (—hence Trev nom.pl. hūy²⁵) hī; hence ME. nom.pl. hi hīi hīj hīy Dav Fl&Bl (: āt etc. n, he) GuyW (: he) Harl. 2253 (: heo he hue n) Jac&Jos (56 : āt i) K.Horn (n : āt) Kild (n : āt) Lamb.Homs (: heo ho, he) Lay (: heo ho, ha) Owl&N (n : heo ho) PepysGH (: āt etc. :: 6.5 : 1) PChron n

---

²¹ See H. M. Flasdieck, Indogermanische Forschungen xlvi, 66.
²² It is doubtful what this form would have been; possibly *hīæ* < WGmc. *hīa* (cf. OHG. nom.acc.pl. *taga* = Goth. acc.pl. *dagans* ?).
²³ If it could be assumed that beside *χi-ó* a form *χi-ai* was present in the nom.acc.pl.neut. of the Germanic paradigm (cf. Latin nom.acc.pl.neut. *qua*—see K. Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen §507.2), this extension would be readily intelligible.
²⁴ With irregular preservation of the final *a* (C above) in Ru² Ru¹ as in the acc.sg. fem. (note 19).
²⁵ The spelling *uy* regularly represents OE. long *y* in this text (B. Pfeffer, Die Sprache des 'Polychronicons' John Trevisa's in der Hs. Cotton Tiberius D.VII §74).
The second process (generalisation of *hiu*) accounts for:—


²⁶ As in the case of the nom.acc.sg.fem. (see note 16), the position in MKent. is not clear; nom.acc.pl. hi Ayen Kent.Gosp Kent.Homs Kent.Serms PM [MS.D] Will. Sh < OE. hīo or hīe (the latter > Kent.Gl nom.pl. hi); Kent.Gosp nom.acc.pl. hīo heo Kent.Homs nom.pl. hīo 223/26 are certainly from OE. hīo.

²⁷ Also spelt āey.

²⁸ nom.pl. he 5 in Ru¹ must be derived from hīe by a development similar to that whereby nom.sg.fem. OE. hēo > ME. kē (see p. 18). It is thus possible that some of the examples of ME. nom.pl. kē given above from texts where OE. ēo regularly appears as ē—such as Best (E. S. Hallbeck, The Language of the Middle English Bestiary §18) may descend from OE. hēo, not from OE. hēo; cf. note 7.

²⁹ The form ha is relatively more frequent in Cl than in N.

³⁰ Also acc.pl. 4.
ROSS—THE HI-PRONOUN.

Meid (n : heo) Lay C vv. 3320, 5365, 5601—(also elsewhere e.g. EdII stanza 44); a Trev (hy n, he, huy, pey) MeidMar 12c, 57d Vern.

Nom.acc.pl. OE. hīa Rit (67 : hie 3) Lind (447 : hea 25, hie 6 hīe 4) Ru² (54: hīe 167 hie 7) OFris. hīa and nom. pl. MnFris. jā (Wangeroog) jō (Saterland) ja (Sild, Moringer and WFris.)—with accent-shift (A2 above)—are due to analogy with nom. acc.pl. OE. ðā OFris. tha (B above).³¹

ALAN S. C. ROSS.

³¹ In OE. the forms hēo, hio occur sporadically in all the six cases in texts in which hie is normal; thus, CP H 87/4, C 270/20; Or 66/31, 92/30, 102/29, 130/11, 220/23 VPs xvii, 39 OECh No. 45 (452/32, 36, 44, 52). Cf. also OFris. hīo Emsigo 245/8, Fivelgo 86/104. Unless these forms are erroneous they probably reflect the earlier state of affairs before one or other of the forms *hīe, *hīu had been generalised in all six cases.