

ROUNDED NASAL VOWELS IN THE FREISING FRAGMENTS*

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

Twenty years ago I argued that the reflexes of jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments reflect the Proto-Slavic accentual system existing before the operation of the progressive accent shift which is characteristic of all Slovenian dialects (1975, cf. also 1996). This view was opposed by Holzer, who argues that in I and II (but not in III) the rounded nasal vowel yielded **u(n)** in final syllables of polysyllabic words (unless the following word began with a nasal consonant) and **o(n)** elsewhere (1986). The latter view is now endorsed by Woodhouse, who claims that in III the rounded nasal vowel is reflected as **o** after hard and **u** after soft consonants (1996). As I have not been convinced by these proposals, there may be reason to clarify my position here.

The hypothesis that the Proto-Slavic accentual system is reflected in the Freising Fragments is based primarily on the preservation of weak jers under the stress. Thus, we find initial stress in III 21 **Kibogu**, I 27 **zenebeze**, II 22 **pulti**, II 26 **mirze**, as opposed to II 83 **ctomu**, I 32 **ztemi**, II 5 **flzna**, III 58 **mrtuim**. Similarly, the rounded nasal vowel is stressed **o** in II 13 **(boi)do**, 25 **(pre)ftopam**, 81 **bodi**, 112 **bo(dete)**, and posttonic **u** in II 8 **zavuiztiu**, 9 **(ne)priazninu**, 20 **trebu**, 104 **nafu praudnu vuerun ipraudnv izbovuediu**. A crucial point in the argumentation is that the choice between the inflectional endings **-o** and **-u** is lexically conditioned. Thus, we find 1st sg. **-u** nine times with five verbs and **-o** four times with three other verbs, but never both **-u** and **-o** with the same verb. Similarly, in the *a*-stems we find **-u** nine times with five nouns and **-o** twice with two other nouns. Even the exceptions to the accent rule show a regularity which requires an explanation: the contracted nasal vowel is written **-o** in **mo** (3x), **tuo**, **to**, whereas the uncontracted ending of the possessive pronoun is written **-u** in I 11 **moiv izpovued**, III 66 **moiu dufu**, III 51 **tuuoiu milozt**, never **-o**, which suggests that the ending

of the pronoun was unstressed before the initial stress of the following noun.

According to Holzer (1986: 32), my theory predicts 52 reflexes of the rounded nasal vowel correctly, yields 10 contrary examples, and allows no conclusion for 21 instances. The latter are largely the result of his disregard of the accentological evidence. In the following I shall first discuss the allegedly contrary instances and then proceed to a discussion of the allegedly inconclusive cases.

(1) II 49 **bózzekacho**, II 98 **ftradacho**, III 42 **bodo**. The word-final **-o** in these forms is indeed unexpected in my theory and can be compared with the occurrence of **-o** for **-u** in II 60 **vuirsch|nemo**, as I pointed out already (1975: 410).

(2) I 11 **moiv (izpovued)**, III 51 **tuuoiu (milozt)**, III 66 **moiu (dufu)**. In these instances I assume that the stress of the possessive pronoun was lost before the initial accent of the following noun (see above).

(3) II 88 **iufe**. Here I also assumed weak stress (1975: 411). I now think that the nasal vowel was pretonic in this word (1996: 143, 149).

(4) II 104 **nafu**. Here I assume a short nasal vowel. Note that after the loss of intervocalic ***j** vowels in posttonic syllables were contracted before the operation of Dybo's law, which can be dated at least 200 years before the Freising Fragments (cf. Kortlandt 1975a: 39). Later uncontracted forms are partly the result of back-formations which took place when the conditioning factor was lost as a result of the retraction of the stress from final jers, Dybo's accent shift, and the loss of the acute tone.

(5) III 38 **ptiuuo | bogu** beside I 19 **protiubogu iprotiu me|mu creztu**. Here I assume retraction of the stress of **bogu** to the preceding nasal vowel in the first instance (1996: 142, 151).

(6) II 19 **sunt**. This is clearly Latin orthography (cf. already Kolarič 1968: 54).

(7) I 29 **poronfo**, III 61 **porufo**, III 54 **(na)zudinem**, III 57 **zodit**, and II 88 **iufe** have a nasal vowel in pretonic position. Holzer does not explain why different reflexes in the same root are only found in pretonic syllables.

(8) I 7 **choku**, III 48 **chocu**, I 13 **pomngu (2x)**, I 22 and 24 **tuoriv** have initial stress because they belong to the mobile accent paradigm (c), as is clear from modern Slovene 3rd pl. *hoté* and from the comparative Slavic evidence (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 409, with refer-

ences).¹ Holzer ignores the comparative evidence and pretends that the choice is arbitrary in these instances. One can only wonder how much longer some colleagues will go on disregarding the work done by Stang, Dybo, Illič-Svityč, Ebeling, Garde and the present author and ignoring what has been achieved in the field of Slavic accentology in the last forty years (cf. Kortlandt 1978 for an introduction).

(9) I 29 **poronfo**, III 61 **porufo**, III 11 **izco**, III 1 **zaglagolo** have final stress because they belong to accent paradigm (b) according to the comparative evidence.

(10) I 14 **vuolu** (2x), I 32 **vueliu**, II 8 **ne|priiazninu**, II 34 **bofiu**, II 104 **na|fu prau|ðnu vuerun ipraudnv | izbovuediu** all have the short case ending, which is hardly remarkable in such an old text. Here again, Holzer maintains his agnostic view.

(11) III 22 (**Dabim**) **cifto (iz|pouued ztuoril)** “that I may make a clean confession”. Here I admit that one should rather expect an uncontracted ending, yielding **-u** after the stress.

(12) II 87 **izio prio**, III 10 **Iz|emlo** have final stress as a result of Dybo’s law. The final accentuation in the latter example is very archaic and attested in Kajkavian and Old Russian (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 410, with references). In view of the comparative evidence I now think that **zio** was disyllabic (1996: 149, against Kolarič 1968: 213, Kortlandt 1975: 409, Logar 1993: 76).

Thus, I conclude that my theory predicts 73 out of Holzer’s 83 instances correctly and allows for the doublets in the 5 pretonic reflexes (which Holzer does not explain). There is an unexpected lowering of final **-u** to **-o** in 4 instances, as there is in II 60 **vuirch|nemo** (which Holzer does not discuss). The form **funt** is Latin orthography. Holzer does not count I 5 **mufenicom**, which is a counter-example to his theory and which may be a loanword.

In order to compare Holzer’s theory with mine, it seems useful to list those instances where the rounded nasal vowel is reflected as **o(n)** in final syllables of polysyllabic words and **u(n)** elsewhere because these constitute counter-evidence to his principal rule:²

I 29	poronfo	I 5	mufenicom
II 12	boi do	II 19	funt
II 49	bozzekacho	II 88	iufe
II 87	zio	III 54	gudinem
II 87	prio	III 61	porufo
II 98	ftradacho		

II 107	vue lico
III 1	zaglagolo
III 10	z emlo
III 11	izco
III 22	cifto
III 38	ptiuuo
III 42	bodo
III 61	porufo

It turns out that unexpected **-o** for **-u** is Holzer's major problem. Note that I 5 **mufenicom**, III 54 **zudinem**, III 61 **porufo** are matched by III 16 **mofe|nic**, III 57 **zodit**, I 29 **poronfo** (see above).

In order to accommodate the counter-evidence, Holzer modifies his rule in two respects. Firstly, he assumes that the word-final reflex of the rounded nasal vowel **-u** was lowered to **-o** before an initial nasal consonant of the following word. This is an unnatural condition because one would rather expect raising before a nasal consonant. Moreover, the additional rule only applies to 4 out of the 14 contrary examples, and all of them have a syntactic boundary after the nasal vowel: I 29 (**Miloztivui bofe**) **tebe poronfo me telo** "(Merciful God,) I commend to thee my body", II 12 **strazti Ipetzali boi|do neimoki** "came pain and sorrow, sickness", II 48 **malo mogoncka | uime bofie bozzekacho | mrzna zigreahu** "visited the infirm in the name of God, warmed the cold", II 97 **preife naffi zefztoco | stradacho nebo ie te|pechu** "our predecessors suffered cruelly, for they beat them" (Stone's translations, 1993). There is neither lowering in II 46 **bozza | obuiachu naga ode|achu malo mogoncka** "shod the barefooted, clothed the naked, [...] the infirm", nor in II 98 **nebo ie te|pechu metlami** "for they beat them with birches", III 50 (**Daimi | bofe gozpodii**) **tuuoiu | milozt** "(Give me, Lord God,) thy grace", in spite of the close syntactic connection in the last two examples. It follows that we can safely discard the alleged influence of the following word-initial nasal consonant.

Secondly, Holzer happily removes FF III from his corpus, in spite of the fact that II and III are written in the same hand, as opposed to FF I. This eliminates 7 of the 14 counter-examples of **-o** for **-u** and 2 of the 5 instances of **-u-** for **-o-**. He is left with 6 counter-examples against 23 correct predictions of **-u** and with 2 contrary instances against 9 correct predictions of **-o-** for FF II. Though this is better than his score of 9 counter-examples against 11 correct

predictions for FF III, it is not impressive. The main objection to Holzer's methodology, however, is that there is no reason to suppose that it should lead to a meaningful result in the first place.

In a recent article, Woodhouse has proposed to modify Holzer's rule by means of an additional series of ad hoc assumptions (1996):

(1) Far from rejecting the lowering of final **-u** to **-o** before an initial nasal consonant, he observes that the reflex of the rounded nasal vowel is **-u** if the vowel of the preceding syllable is the same as the vowel which follows the initial nasal consonant of the following word, while the reflex is **-o** if the vowel of the preceding syllable is different from the vowel which follows the initial nasal consonant of the following word: II 46 **bozza | obuiachu naga ode|achu malo mognocka** and II 98 **te|pechu metlami** versus I 29 **poronfo me telo**, II 12 **boi|do neimoki**, II 49 **bozzekacho | mrzna zigreahu**, II 98 **stradachcho nebo ie te|pechu**. On the basis of this bizarre rule Woodhouse rejects the usual emendation of II 13 **neimoki** to **inemoki** because this eliminates his explanation of the final **-o** in **boido**. He evidently does not feel the need to discuss III 51 **tuouiu | milozt**, which would constitute another counter-example.

(2) Woodhouse attributes the **-u-** in II 19 **funt** to the fact that it is the only closed monosyllable with a rounded nasal vowel in the corpus.

(3) He adduces the **-o** of II 107 **vuelico** as "precious evidence that the assimilation of adjectival to pronominal desinences, which was to become such a prominent feature of South (and East) Slavonic, though not necessarily of Slovenian, began, as is to be expected, with adjacent items in concord in the same noun phrase" (1996: 53f) and maintains that this "precious harbinger of a future important morphological change appears to have been sadly overlooked" and that it is one of the two "hitherto unsuspected Serbo-Croatisms" which he has detected in the FF (1996: 57).

(4) Woodhouse interprets **-i-** before **-o** in II 87 **prio** as a sign of palatalization so that the **-r-** is nonsyllabic, in spite of the comparative evidence.

(5) He suggests that the **-u-** of II 88 **iufe** is "due to the paradoxical fact of a morphologically final nasal being located nevertheless medially within a phonetic disyllable" (1996: 54).

It seems to me that all of these considerations are quite useless. For FF III Woodhouse submits another series of additional hypotheses. According to his main rule, the rounded nasal vowel is reflected as **o** after hard and **u** after soft consonants. This rule accounts for 14 out of 20 instances and yields 5 contrary examples: III 1 **zaglagolo**, 10 **Izlemlo**, 54 **(na)zudinem**, 61 **porufo** (root vowel), and either 61 **porufo** (desinence) or 66 **dufu**. In order to eliminate the counter-evidence, Woodhouse assumes that *l* in **zaglagolo** and **zemlo** and *č* in **porufo** are hard while *š* in **dufu** is soft, adducing the alleged depalatalization of *č* as the second of his "hitherto unsuspected Serbo-Croatisms" in the FF. He attributes the **-r-** in **porufo** to the preceding **-r-** and the **-u-** in **zudinem** to the jer in the following syllable. It remains unclear how his article has been accepted for publication in a scholarly journal.

The two articles under review have not given me reason to change my opinion that the reflexes of the jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments reflect a very archaic system of accentuation. The archaic character of this accentual system is no surprise because we are dealing with a very old text. The remarkable fact is that the attested forms fit our expectations so nicely and thereby confirm our reconstructions.³ It turns out that the Freising Fragments provide the oldest documentary evidence for the Proto-Slavic accentual system.

University of Leiden

NOTES

* A Slovene translation of this article has appeared in *Slavistična revija* 44/4 (1996), 393-398.

¹ The accent marks in line 2 of Kortlandt 1975: 409 are clearly the result of a printer's error.

² The unfortunate interchange of III 1 **zaglagolo** with 5 **uze molgoki**, 10 **Izlemlo**, 11 **izco** in Kortlandt 1975: 409 (which Holzer mistakenly interprets as my attribution of the latter forms to FF II) is clearly the result of a printer's error.

³ The full preservation of the nasal vowels in the FF can be inferred from the accent marks on I 7 **chokú**, 8 **vueruiú**, 17 **zpe** (2x), 22 **tuoriv'**, 23 **ze'**, 24 **tuoriv'**,

28 otél, 30 mó (2x), 30 dufú, 32 tuó, which originally marked tautosyllabic nasality (cf. Kortlandt 1994 = 1996a).

REFERENCES

- Holzer, Georg
1986 "Die Reflexe des hinteren Nasalvokals *ǫ in den Freisinger Denkmälern", *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 32, 29-35.
- Kolarič, Rudolf
1968 "Sprachliche Analyse", *Freisinger Denkmäler: Brižinski spomeniki* (ed. J. Pogačnik), 18-120. München: Rudolf Trofenik.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
1975 "Jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments", *Slavistična revija* 23, 405-412.
1975a *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
1978 "On the history of Slavic accentuation", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 92, 269-281.
1994 "O naglasnih znamenjih v Brižinskem spomeniku I", *Slavistična revija* 42, 579-581.
1996 "The accentual system of the Freising Manuscripts", *Zbornik: Brižinski spomeniki*, 141-151. Ljubljana: SAZU.
1996a "On the accent marks in the First Freising Fragment", *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 23, 167-171.
- Logar, Tine
1993 "Fonetični prepis", *Brižinski spomeniki: Znanstvenokritična izdaja*, 65-81. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Stone, Gerald
1993 "Angleški prevod", *Brižinski spomeniki: Znanstvenokritična izdaja*, 120-129. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Woodhouse, Robert
1996 "Notes on the reflexes of the Proto-Slavonic back nasal vowel in the Freising Fragments", *Australian Slavonic and East European studies* 10, 51-58.