

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 *okô*. 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.

1. *Jers*.

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 to following:

- I 4 *uuizem* [w(ə)sem]
 5 *zelom* [səlom]
 16 *ozinistue* [w səničtwe]
 27 *zenebeze* [sə nebese]
- II 1 *neze/gresil* [ne səgrešil]
 14 *zemirt* [səmr̩t]
 37 *zesti* [čəsti]
 39 *ozcepasgenige* [o səpasenije]
 50 *zigreahu* [səgreahɔ]
 72 *ze/zopirnicom* [sə sɔpɾ̩nikom]
 83 *dini* [dəni]
 92 *bozzledine* [posledəńe]
- III 21 *Kibogu* [kə bogu]
 34 *Uznicistve* [w sničəstwe]
 39 *dine* [dəne]
 41 *dodiniz negodine* [do dənəšńego dəne]
 49 *zimizla* [səmisla]
 54 *nazudinem dine* [na sɔdənem dəne]

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 *səgreti*, *səsuti* (cf. Kolarič 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 *kǎ-bogu* (= današnjemu dolensjkemu *γ-bûgǎ*), marveč more podajati izgovor *kə bôgu* in predlog *kə* bi imel sekundarni ə«. 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* [dǎn]: gen. sg. *dine* (2 ×), 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* [čǎsti]. 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 *pulti* (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 l̥zi] presents no indication of the presence or absence of a jer. The syllabic resonant [r] receives an epenthetic vowel in stressed and posttonic syllables: *creztu* (2 ×), *crisken*, *zemirt*, *mirzcih*, *mirze*, *vuirch/nemo*, *zopirnicom*, *priuuae*, *zridze* (Kolarič 1968: 26). Pretonic [r] appears in II 87 *prio* (see below) and III 58 *mrtuim* (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 *l*-participle, I think that the latter assumption is correct and that we have to reconstruct [mʁznà]. The accentuation of II 105 *raztrgachu* cannot be reconstructed. In Ukrainian we find *tórhaty* next to *terzáty*, either of which may correspond to the Slovenian word. If the historical connection with Sanskrit *trdháh* 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 *sə* im Anlaut in *zelom* I 5, *zenistue* I 16, *zemirt* II 14 als Präfixe empfunden«. This explanation may be correct for I 16 *vzinistue* and is certainly plausible for II 59 *ozcepasgenige* [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 ×) indicates that this process was under way at the time when the Freising Fragments were written down. The reconstruction of the stress in [sɔdànem] 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 [t] in II 48 *mogoncka*, and word-finally in the isolated instance II 105 *ouerun*. Elsewhere we find *e* for [ẽ] and *o* or *u* for [õ].

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 [hofõ] (2 ×), [werujõ] (2 ×), [pomnõ] (2 ×), [twořõ] (2 ×), [kajõ se], and *o* in [poročõ] (2 ×), [zaglagořõ], [iskõ]. This distribution can hardly be accidental. Similarly, in the acc. sg. and inst. sg. endings of the noun we find *u* in [wořõ] (3 ×), [werõ] (2 ×), [dušõ] (2 ×), [mořkõ], [trebõ], and *o* in [přjõ], [zemřõ]. 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 [õ] is written either way, cf. I 29 *poronso* next to III 61 *poruso* and III 54 *zudinem* [sođənem] next to III 57 *zodit* [sođit̃].

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

I	7 <i>choku</i> [hofõ]	50 <i>zigreahu</i> [səgreah̃õ]
	8 <i>oueruiu</i> [werujõ]	52 <i>uvedechu</i> [uwedeh̃õ]
	13 <i>pomngu</i> [pomnõ] (2 ×)	55 <i>bozcekachu</i> [posefah̃õ]
	14 <i>vuolu</i> [wořõ] (2 ×)	56 <i>utessahu</i> [utešah̃õ]
	22 <i>tuoriv</i> [twořõ]	98 <i>te/pechu</i> [tepeh̃õ]
	24 <i>milltuoriv</i> [mil twořõ]	100 <i>petsachv</i> [pečah̃õ]
	27 <i>omoku</i> [w mořkõ]	101 <i>tnachu</i> [tnah̃õ]
	30 <i>dusu</i> [dušõ]	102 <i>vuesachu</i> [wešah̃õ]
	<i>vuoliu</i> [wořõ]	103 <i>raztrgachu</i> [rastrgah̃õ]
	31 <i>oueru</i> [werõ]	104 <i>nasu</i> [naš̃õ]
	32 <i>ueliu</i> [weřõ]	<i>prau/dnu</i> [praw(ə)dñõ]
II	8 <i>zavuižtiu</i> [zawistjõ]	105 <i>ouerun</i> [wer̃õ]
	<i>ne/priiazninu</i> [neprijazniñõ]	<i>praudno</i> [praw(ə)dñõ]
	20 <i>trebu</i> [trebõ]	106 <i>izbovuediu</i> [ispowedjõ]
	34 <i>bosiu</i> [bož̃jõ]	108 <i>strastiu</i> [strastjõ]
	45 <i>natrovuechu</i> [natroweh̃õ]	III
	46 <i>naboiachu</i> [napojah̃õ]	4 <i>uue/ruiu</i> [werujõ]
	47 <i>obuiachu</i> [obujah̃õ]	46 <i>Caiuze</i> [kajõ se]
	<i>ode/achu</i> [odeah̃õ]	48 <i>chocu</i> [hofõ]
		66 <i>dusu</i> [dušõ]

The non-final accentuation of these words is evident in all instances with the exception of the 1st sg. verb forms [hoʃq], [pomnúq], [twořq], 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 *hotě*, Russian *xotját* would require the retraction which the word-final *u* in the Freising Fragments seems to indicate.

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

- I 9 *nazodni* [na sɔdni]
 27 *omoku* [w mɔkq]
 29 *poronso* [porɔčq]
 31 *nazodni* [na sɔdni]
- II 3 *neprigem/lioki* [ne prijemʎqfi]
 6 *imoki* [imɔfi]
 12 *boi/do* [pojɔq]
 24 *pre/stopam* [prestɔpam]
 48 *malo mogoncka* [malomogɔŋa]
 73 *zopirnicom* [sɔpɾnikom]
 81 *bodi* [bɔdi]
 87 *izio prio* [i sjɔ pɾjɔ]
 112 *bo/dete* [bɔdete]
 5 *uze mo/goki* [wsemogɔfi]
 10 *Iz/emlo* [i zemʎq]
 11 *izco* [iskq]
- III 1 *zaglagolo* [zaglagol'q]
 16 *mose/nic* [mɔčɛnik]
 25 *uze mogokemu* [wsemogɔtemu]
 42 *bodo* [bɔɔq]
 61 *poruso* [porɔčq]

The final stress in [porɔčq] and [iskq] is secured by the recessive accentuation of these words in Russian and Serbo-Croat. The same accentuation must be assumed for [zaglagol'q] because all verbs which belong to the same flexion type as this word have recessive stress. Dybo writes (1969a: 87): »Dvusmyslenno udarenie glagola 'glagolati', kotoryj pišetsja v pamjatnike vseгда sokraščeno vo vsex formax (nejasny kak voobšče paradigmatičeskaja otnesenost' ètogo glagola, tak i mesto udarenija v 1-m lice ed. čisla prezensa)«. The participial forms in *-oki* [qfi]

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 [sjǫ], [prǫjǫ], [zeml'ǫ] have final stress as a result of Dybo's law. The stress was not retracted in [prǫjǫ], as it was in [wol'ǫ], because the word did not contain a medial cluster (cf. Ebeling 1967: 587). The final accentuation of [zeml'ǫ] 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 *ē*-stem (Kortlandt 1974: 305). The occurrence in the Freising Fragments now corroborates the antiquity of the end-stressed acc. sg. form.

Contracted [ǫ] is always reflected as *o*:

- I 30 *mo* [mǫ] (2 ×)
 21 *mo* [mǫ]
 32 *tuo* [twǫ]
 II 107 *to* [tǫ]
 vue/lico [welikǫ]
 III 22 *cisto* [čistǫ]

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 posttonic [ǫ]:

- II 49 *bozzekacho* [posefahǫ]
 98 *stradacho* [stradahǫ]
 III 42 *bodo* [bǫdǫ]

These cases are comparable to the occurrence of *o* reflecting posttonic [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 *moiv* [mojǫ]
 III 51 *tuuoiu* [twojǫ]
 66 *moiu* [mojǫ]

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* [jōže]. There is a single instance of unexpected *u* reflecting stressed [o] in I 5 *musenicom*. Is it possible that this word is a borrowing, as in the contemporary language, and that we have to transcribe [mučënikom]? 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 *tuoriv* 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

- Dybo V. A. 1961. Udarenie slavjanskogo glagola i formy staroslavjanskogo aorista, *Kratkie soobščënija Instituta slavjanovedenija* 30, 35—38.
- Idem 1962. O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole, *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 6, 5—27.
- Idem 1969a. Srednebolgarskie teksty kak istočnik dlja rekonstrukcii praslavjanskogo udarenija, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 18/3, 82—101.
- Idem 1969b. Drevnerusskie teksty kak istočnik dlja rekonstrukcii praslavjanskogo udarenija, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 18/6, 114—122.
- Ebeling C. L. 1967. Historical laws of Slavic accentuation, *To honor Roman Jakobson, The Hague*, 577—593.
- Illič-Svityč V. M. 1963. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*, Moskva.
- Jedvaj J. 1956. Bednjanski govor, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* I, Zagreb, 279—330.
- Kolarič R. 1968. Sprachliche Analyse, *Freisinger Denkmäler*, ed. by J. Pogačnik, München, 18—120.
- Kolesov V. V. 1972. *Istorija russkogo udarenija* I, Leningrad.
- Kortlandt F. H. H. 1974. Old Prussian accentuation, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88/2, 299—306.
- Idem 1975. *Slavic accentuation*, Lisse.

Idem forthcoming. The Slovenian neo-circumflex, *The Slavonic and East European review* 53.

Leskien A. 1899. Die Betonungstypen des Verbuns im Bulgarischen, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 21, 1—10.

Pleteršnik M. 1894. *Slovensko-nemški slovar* I, Ljubljana.

Ramovš F. 1936. *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika* I, Ljubljana.

Stang C. S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo.

Valjavec M. 1897. Glavne točke o naglasu književne slovenštine, *Rad* 132, 116—213.

Vasmer M. 1958. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* III, Heidelberg.

POVZETEK

Sestavek obravnava reflekse 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 neničitih 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 prikazane refleksiranja 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 cirkumflektiranega zloga v desno. Umestitev spomenika v obdobje med Stangovim zakonom in slovenskim naglasnim premikom v desno se sklada s prejšnjim datiranjem rokopisa.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В статье рассматриваются рефлексы праславянских редуцированных и носовых гласных в Фрейзингенских отрывках. 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 *o* под ударением и как *u* в заударных слогах. Оба рефлекса выступают в предударном слоге. Выявленная на основании отражения носового гласного акцентуационная система является очень древней. Напрашивается вывод, что этап языкового развития представленный в Фрейзингенских отрывках предшествовал характерному для словенского языка перенесению ударения с начального слога с нисходящей интонацией на последующий слог. Отнесение памятника к периоду между законом Станга и словенским переносом ударения согласуется с прежней датировкой рукописи.