JERS AND NASAL VOWELS IN THE FREISING FRAGMENTS

Analiza jerov in nosnikov v Brižinskih spomenikih kaže zelo star naglasni sistem.

An analysis of the jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments reveals a very archaic system of accentuation.

Are the Freising Fragments a Slovenian document? The characteristic development common to all Slovenian dialects is the progressive accent shift in words of the type *oko*. In this article I intend to show that the Freising Fragments reflect a linguistic stage which is anterior to the progressive accent shift. From this point of view, the language of the Freising Fragments must be regarded as the pre-Slovenian dialect of Slavic.


Though the large majority of weak jers are not written in the Freising Fragments (cf. Kolarič 1968: 85 f.), there are a considerable number of exceptions. The relevant cases are following:

I 4 uuizem [w(ə)sem]
   5 zelom [səlom]
   16 vzinistue [w səničtwe]
   27 zenebeze [sə nebese]
II 1 neze/gresil [ne səgrešil]
   14 zemirt [səmɔɾt]
   37 zesti [ɕastɪ]
   39 oze{

   pasgenige [o səpasenije]
   50 zigreahu [səgreahɔ]
   72 ze/zopirnicom [sə səpɾnikom]
   83 dini [dɔnɪ]
   92 bozzledine [posledoñe]
III 21 Kibogu [kə bogu]
   34 Uznicistve [w səničastwe]
   39 dine [dɔne]
   41 dodiniz negodine [dɔ do sənɔznego dɔne]
   49 zimizla [səmisla]
   54 nazudinem dine [na sədɔnem dɔne]
The preservation of the weak jer in the preposition [sə] before word-initial [s] in II 72 ze/zopirnicom and in the prefix [sə] before the cluster [gr] in II 1 neze/gresil and II 50 zigreahu is comparable to the same phenomenon in the contemporary language, e.g. in sogreti, sosuti (cf. Kolaric 1968: 26). The [ə] in I 4 uuizem is isolated and must be a slip of the pen. The other instances require an explanation. I think that the majority of cases can be accounted for if we assume that weak jers were preserved under the stress.

Ramovš writes (1936: 55): »Če imamo v brižinskih spomenikih pisano ki bogu, nas ta zapisek še ne sili k branju kə-bogu (= današnjemu dolenjskemu γ-büga), marveč more podajati izgovor kə bógu in predlog kə bi imel sekundarni əx. One can certainly agree with Ramovš that the single occurrence of Kibogu in the Freising Fragments does not force us to assume that the preposition bore the stress. A definite conclusion must be based on the totality of available material. The essential point is that we find III 21 Kibogu next to II 83 ctomu [k tomu], where the comparative Slavic evidence points to final stress, just as we find I 27 zenebeze next to I 32 ztemi [s temi]. The presence of a jer before accentually mobile nouns and its absence in cases where it cannot have attracted the stress is an indication that the preposition was stressed in the former category.

Nonzero weak jers are particularly frequent in the inflected forms of the word den [den]: gen. sg. dine (2 X), dat. sg. dini, loc. sg. dine. All of these forms were stem-stressed before the loss of the jers. The same holds true for the dat. sg. zesti [časti]. The first jer in diniz, which did not bear the stress, must have been taken from the stem-stressed case forms of the word den. There are no examples of weak jers which should bear the stress according to the comparative Slavic evidence and appear as zero in the Freising Fragments. The same distribution is found in the reflexes of the syllabic resonants. We find II 22 pult [gen. sg.), with initial stress, next to II 5 slzna, for which final accentuation must be reconstructed because it is derived from a noun with accentual mobility (cf. Valjavec 1897: 177). Unfortunately, the form I 15 ulsi [w ži] presents no indication of the presence or absence of a jer. The syllabic resonant [r] receives an epenthetic vowel in stressed and posttonic syllables: crezti (2 X), crisken, zemirt, mirzcih, mirze, nuirch/nemo, zopirnicom, priuuae, zridze (Kolaric 1968: 26). Pretonic [r] appears in II 87 prio (see below) and III 58 mrtlui [mertuim] (cf. Kolesov 1972: 209). The accentuation of II 50 mrzna offers a problem. If this word is a relatively recent formation on the basis of the verb mrzniti, we should expect initial stress. If
the word is old, however, we must assume final accentuation because the root is accentually mobile (cf. Pleteršnik 1894: 615). Since all nominal formations signifying 'cold' in the contemporary language are formally derived from the I-participle, I think that the latter assumption is correct and that we have to reconstruct [mɔznà]. The accentuation of II 103 raztrgachu cannot be reconstructed. In Ukrainian we find tórhaty next to teržáty, either of which may correspond to the Slovenian word. If the historical connection with Sanskrit trdhāh is correct (Vasmer 1958: 124), which is questionable, the word cannot have had fixed stress on the root in Slavic.

Though stressed jers appear as vowels in the Freising Fragments, not all nonzero weak jers should be stressed on the basis of the comparative Slavic evidence. Kolarič writes (1968: 26): »Die Verfasser der Urtexte haben wahrscheinlich sa im Anlaut in zelom I 5, zenistue I 16, zemirt II 14 als Präfixe empfunden«. This explanation may be correct for I 16 vžinistue and is certainly plausible for II 39 ozcepasenige [o səpasenije], but it is improbable for II 14 zemirt and III 49 zimizla and simply impossible for I 5 zelom. These three words should have fixed stress on the second syllable as a result of Dybo's law (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 14; for the original formulation of the law see Dybo 1962: 7). The presence of a nonzero jer in the initial syllable can be explained if we assume that these words had passed over to the class of accentual mobilia. The initial stress in the dat. pl. originated in the accentual paradigm of the u-stems (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 15) and was generalized in the Slovenian mobile o-stems before the progressive accent shift. Apart from a few exceptions, accentual mobility has been generalized in the i-stems in the majority of Slavic dialects. The word [səmisel] must have taken its mobility from the cognate [misəl], like elsewhere in the South Slavic area.

The medial jers in II 92 bozzledine and III 54 zudinem had received the stress as a result of Dybo's law. When the weak jers disappeared, the stress was transferred to the preceding vowel. The occurrence of these forms next to zodni (2 X) indicates that this process was underway at the time when the Freising Fragments were written down. The reconstruction of the stress in [sqdənom] is corroborated by the reflex of the nasal vowel (cf. below). Summarizing, we can say that the analysis of the jers, even if it does not compel us to accept all details of the theory put forward here, shows that the material is perfectly compatible with the suggestion that weak jers were preserved under the stress.
2. Nasal vowels.

The reflexes of the nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments show that nasality was probably an optional feature at the time when the documents were written down. The nasal character of the vowel is indicated before [č] in I 23 *vuensih* and I 29 *poronso*, before [ť] in II 48 *mogoncka*, and word-finally in the isolated instance II 105 *vuerun*. Elsewhere we find e for [č] and o or u for [q].

The choice between the reflexes of the rounded nasal vowel is lexically conditioned. In the 1st sg. ending of the present tense we find u in [hoťo] (2 X), [wėrujo] (2 X), [poročo] (2 X), [twofg], [kajšo], and o in [poročo] (2 X), [zaglogol'q], [isko]. This distribution can hardly be accidental. Similarly, in the acc. sg. and inst. sg. endings of the noun we find u in [woľo] (3 X), [wėro] (2 X), [dušo] (2 X), [moko], [trebo], and o in [přjo], [zemlo]. On the basis of these observations I would maintain that the nasal vowel is reflected as o under the stress and as u in posttonic syllables. Pretonic [q] is written either way, cf. I 29 *poronso* next to III 61 *poruso* and III 54 *zudinem* [sodınem] next to III 57 *zodit* [sódít].

Posttonic [q] is reflected as u in the following cases:

I
7 choku [hoťo]
8 vueruiu [wėrujo]
13 pomeriu [pomujo] (2 X)
14 vuołu [woľo] (2 X)
22 tuorio [twofo]
24 miltuorio [mil twofo]
27 omoku [w moko]
30 dusu [dušo]
31 vuelu [wėlo]
32 vueli [wel'o]

II
8 zapuiztiu [zawistjo]
14 ne/pruiazniu [neprijazninjo]
20 trebu [trebo]
34 bosiu [božjo]
45 natrovuechu [natroweho]
46 naboiachu [napojaho]
47 obuiachu [obujaho]
50 zigreahu [sagreaho]
52 uvedechu [uwedeaho]
55 bozcekachu [posefaho]
56 utessahu [utešaho]
98 te/pechu [tepeho]
100 petsacho [pečaho]
101 inachu [tnaho]
102 vuesachu [wešaho]
103 raztrgachu [rastrgaho]
104 nasu [našo]
105 prau/dnu [praw(ə)dno]
106 izbopuediu [ispowedjo]
108 strastiu [strastjo]
110 utho [uto]
111 ode/achu [odeaho]
112 zaviztiu [zawistjo]
113 poročo [poročo]
114 uue/ruiu [wėrujo]
115 praudnO [praw(ə)dno]
116 izbopoediu [ispowedjo]
118 strastiu [strastjo]
The non-final accentuation of these words is evident in all instances with the exception of the 1st sg. verb forms [hoṭ̆], [pom̥n̥], [tvoṭ̆], each of which occurs twice in the text. The latter two words belong to the end-stressed type for which retraction in the 1st sg. form is regular in Old Russian (cf. Stang 1957: 109 and Dybo 1969b: 116). The accentuation of the former word cannot be reconstructed. Though the Old Russian material points to recessive stress, the contemporary 3rd pl. form hote, Russian xotjat would require the retraction which the word-final u in the Freising Fragments seems to indicate.

Stressed [o] is reflected as o in the following cases:

I
9 nazodni [na sǒdni]
27 pmoku [w mǒko]
29 poronso [poročo]
31 nazodni [na sǒdni]

II
3 neprigem/lioki [ne prijemli̲ti]
 6 imoki [imot̆ti]
12 boi/do [pojdo]
24 pre/stopam [prestopam]
48 malo mogonckα [malomogōfa]
73 zopirnicom [sopri̲nikom]
81 bodi [bodzi]
87 izio prijo [i sjv p̢jjo]
112 bo/dete [bōdete]
 5 uze mo/goki [wsemogot̆i]
10 Iz/emlo [i zemlo]
11 izco [isko]

III
1 zaglagolo [zaglagolo]
16 mose/nic [mōčenik]
25 uze mogokemu [wsemogot̆emu]
42 bodo [bōdo]
61 porusō [poryčo]

The final stress in [poročo] and [isko] is secured by the recessive accentuation of these words in Russian and Serbo-Croat. The same accentuation must be assumed for [zaglagolo] because all verbs which belong to the same flexion type as this word have recessive stress. Dybo writes (1969a: 87): »Dvusmyslenno udareiiie glagola 'glagolati', kotoryj piśetsja v pamjatnike vsegda sokraščeno vo vsex formax (nejasny kak voobšče paradigmatičeskaja otnesennost' etogo glagola, tak i mesto uda- renija v 1-m lice ed. čisla prezensa)<. The participial forms in -oki [o]
are stressed on the nasal vowel because they are derived from verbs with recessive accentuation. The nasal vowel received the stress as a result of Dybo’s law and did not lose it because the next syllable contained a full vowel (cf. Ebeling 1967: 592). The final stress in the 3rd pl. aorist form II 12 boi/do is confirmed by the evidence from Bulgarian and Serbo-Croat (cf. Leskien 1899: 5 and Dybo 1961: 36 f.).

The nominal forms [sjo], [přjó], [zeml'oj] have final stress as a result of Dybo’s law. The stress was not retracted in [přjó], as it was in [wol'q], because the word did not contain a medial cluster (cf. Ebeling 1967: 587). The final accentuation of [zeml'oj] is very archaic indeed (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963: 108). It is attested in Kajkavian (Jedvaj 1956: 302) and Old Russian and can be explained if we assume that the word goes back to a Balto-Slavic ũ-stem (Kortlandt 1974: 305). The occurrence in the Freising Fragments now corroborates the antiquity of the end-stressed acc. sg. form.

Contracted [q] is always reflected as o:

I 30 mo [mo] (2 ×)  
21 mo [mo]  
32 tuo [twq]

II 107 to [to]  
vue/lico [welikq]

III 22 cisto [čistq]

The u in the inst. sg. forms I 14 vuolu (2 ×), II 105 vuerun shows that the old Balto-Slavic nominal case ending had been preserved in the dialect of the Freising Fragments.

There are three instances of unexpected word-final o reflecting post-tonic [q]:

II 49 bozechkacho [posefahq]  
98 stradacho [stradahq]

III 42 bodo [bodq]

These cases are comparable to the occurrence of o reflecting post-tonic [u] in II 60 vuirch/nemo.

On the other hand, we find u in the acc. sg. fem. ending of the possessive pronoun (except for the contracted forms):  

I 11 moip [mojo]  
III 51 tuuoiu [wojø]

66 moiu [mojo]
These forms had probably a weak stress on the second syllable or constituted a single accentual group with the following noun. A similar explanation can be put forward for the relative pronoun II 88 iuse [jože]. There is a single instance of unexpected u reflecting stressed [q] in I 5 musenicom. Is it possible that this word is a borrowing, as in the contemporary language, and that we have to transcribe [mučenikom]? The Slovenian form is attested in III 16 mose/nic.

I conclude that the double reflex of the rounded nasal vowel is well explained if we start from the supposition that the choice between o and u is mainly determined by the place of the stress. Conversely, the reflexes of jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments provide valuable information for the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accentual system.

3. Chronology.

If the theory presented in the foregoing sections is correct, we have detected a very archaic system of accentuation. The stage of development reflected in the documents is posterior to Stang's law because of I 14 vuolu (cf. Ebeling 1967: 591 f.), but anterior to the progressive accent shift because of I 22 tuorip etc. Elsewhere I have dated Stang's law in the 9th century (1975: 34) and the progressive shift in the 10th century (forthcoming). This result is in agreement with earlier datings of the manuscript.

REFERENCES


Illic-Svityč V. M. 1963. Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom, Moskva.


Pletersnik M. 1894. Slovensko-nemški slovar I, Ljubljana.

POVZETEK

Sestavek obravnava refleksje reduciranih in nosnih samoglasnikov v Brižinskih spomenikih. Avtor postavlja hipotezo, da so šibki reducirani samoglasniki ohranjeni, če so bili naglašeni; vendar se ne morejo vsi primeri neničtih reduciranih samoglasnikov v šibkem položaju razlagati z mestom naglasa. — Dvojnost v zapisu zaokroženega nosnika se ravna po naslednjem pravilu: ta samoglasnik se pojavlja kot črka o pod naglasom, v ponaglasnih zlogih kot u, medtem ko imamo v prednaglasnih zlogih oba refleksa. — Naglasni sistem, ki se kaže na podlagi prikaza nega reflektiranja tega nosnika, je zelo starinski. Ponuja se sklep, da je stopnja jezikovnega razvoja, izpričanega v Brižinskih spomenikih, iz dobe pred značilnim slovenskim naglasnim premikom z začetnega circumflexiranega zloga v desno. Umetitev spomenika v obdobje med Stangovim zakonom in slovenskim naglasnim premikom v desno se składa s prejšnjim datiranjem rokopisa.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В статье рассматриваются рефлекссы праславянских редуцированных и носовых гласных в Фрейзингенских отрывах. Автор выдвигает гипотезу, что слабые редуцированные сохранились под ударением. Не все случаи ненулевых редуцированных в слабой позиции можно объяснить местом ударения. Двойное отражение округленного носового гласного подчиняется следующему правилу: этот гласный проявляется как о под ударением и как у в заударных слогах. Оба рефлекса выступают в предударном слоге. Выявленная на основании отражения носового гласного акцентуационная система является очень древней. Напрашивается вывод, что этот шаг развития представленный в Фрейзингенских отрывах предшествовал характерному для славенского языка перенесению ударения с начального слога с нисходящей интонацией на последующий слог. Отнесение памятника к периоду между законом Станга и славенским переносом ударения согласуется с прежней датировкой рукописи.