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Nasal Vowels in the Cyrillo-Methodian Language and in Dialects of Southeast Macedonia

Introduction. In the Glagolitic alphabet, the three letters for nasal vowels are digraphs. They share the same second part, viz. the sign ĕ, transliterated as n, which obviously indicates nasality. Their first parts consist of either a sign for an oral vowel (e, o) or, in the case of the “third nasal”, the sign ĉ = Ĉ, which is not used as an independent letter in the extant manuscripts. In what follows I shall assume that ĉ is a symbol for a vowel sound (cf. Trubetzkoy 1954: 62; Lindstedt 1986), and that the independent use of n as a sign for the nasal e is a later development.¹ The “fourth nasal vowel” that is written before i in certain participle forms of Zogr. and Mar. will not be dealt with in this study.

The Cyrillic nasal vowels, transliterated as ĕ, ĝ, and jğ, contain no separate symbol for nasality. It is the Glagolitic n that poses a problem. How did St. Cyril have the idea of marking nasality with a special symbol, if nasality was only a distinctive feature of the vowel? If, on the other hand, nasality was realized as a separate segment, why did he not make use of the letters n and m? What was the original system of nasal vowels in OCS actually like?

1. Trubetzkoy’s analysis and the problems in it. In his grammar of OCS (1954), Trubetzkoy argues that the grapheme n was a sign for

¹ Cf. e.g. Mareš (1971). Marti (1984) has recently argued for a quite different solution. But although he presents the relevant evidence with clarity and erudition, I do not find his conclusions convincing. Unfortunately I cannot here discuss his interesting article in greater detail.
a nasal consonantal phoneme /N/ which had no definite place of articulation but, nevertheless, was a phoneme distinct from /m/, /n/, and /ŋ/. He assumes that its actual realizations were strongly dependent on the following sound. The important passage on /N/ reads as follows (pp. 81–82):

Über das im Konsonantensystem ganz isolierte Phonem N läßt sich nur sagen, daß es zu keiner bestimmten Lokalisationklasse gehörte. Es ist möglich (und sogar sehr wahrscheinlich), daß es sich hinsichtlich der Lokalisation des Mundverschlusses an den folgenden Konsonanten anpaßte, d. h. z. B. vor Labial als m, vor Dental als n, vor Guttural als η usw. gesprochen wurde; dabei mußte es vor Engelaugen und oralen Sonorlauten einen lockeren oder sogar unvollständigen Mundverschluß, vor Verschlüfslauten dagegen einen vollständigen Mundverschluß bilden; vor Vokalen und im absoluten Auslauten war N vielleicht nur ein unsilbischer nasalerer Vokal. Alle diese vermutlichen Variationen der Aussprache des N (wenn sie wirklich existierten, was sehr wahrscheinlich, aber durchaus nicht sicher ist) waren jedenfalls äußerlich durch die Lautumgebung bedingt und für das phonologische Wesen des N vollkommen [!] irrelevant. Relevant für dieses Phonem war nur akustisch das nasale Timbre und artikulatorisch die Senkung des Gaumensegels.

Trubetzkoy then produces evidence for his hypothesis of different allophones of /N/: in loans from Greek, a nasal consonant before a stop is rendered by η, e.g. septembrā ‘September’ < Σεπτέμβριον, aleksandrā ‘Alexander’ < Ἄλεξανδρος. The Greek nasal can also be retained, at least graphically, as in aleksandrā, klimentā ‘Clement’ < Κλήμεντος: Κλήμεντος; ἀγελὼ ‘angel< ἀγγέλος. The most interesting case is the form ἀγέλ-, which is found six times in the Psalterium Sinaiticum; the combination ἀN is otherwise unknown in OCS manuscripts.

2 Traditional transliterations are septembrā and aleksandrā (for typographical reasons, the OCS jers are rendered by ā and ū in this article, as is customary in Indo-European philology). As concerns the latter word, Trubetzkoy actually quotes the form from Mar. (Mk 15:21) as “aleks(a)Ndrouv”; but in Mar., N without a preceding vowel of course stands for ē / eN, and there is no reason for postulating an a in this word. Note, incidentally, that the 13th-century Banitsa Gospel still has the obviously popular form aleksadriska in its calendar part (f. 189v, 27), but in Mark 15:21 it has aleksandrōv.

3 See Velčeva (1980: 42), Marti (1984: 144), and the sources quoted there.
Soon after the posthumous publication of Trubetzkoy’s grammar, E. Koschmieder (1958)\(^4\) showed the fundamental problem in his analysis: in original Slavic words, we do not find such spellings as \textit{**mondru} or \textit{**žentva} (for \textit{mondru} ‘wise’, \textit{žentva} ‘harvest’). This shows that even before stops, there was no free orthographic variation between \textit{N} and the nasal consonants \textit{n} and \textit{m}. Moreover, had the actual pronunciation really been [mondru] and [žentva], St. Cyril would of course have made use of the grapheme \textit{n} in these words. There is no reason for presuming that some kind of abstract phonological analysis would have led him to assign the sound [n] to different phonemes (i.e., graphemes) depending on its position. Obviously, such a solution would not be possible in classical phonological analysis, either, unless \textit{N} is interpreted as an archiphoneme; and Trubetzkoy does not suggest anything to that effect.\(^5\)

As to the Greek loans, the assumption cannot be accepted that the types \textit{aleksendru} and \textit{aleksandr} are only orthographic variants representing one and the same pronunciation. The \textit{aleksendru} type rather shows the popular pronunciation, while \textit{aleksandr} is a literary form, following the Greek model at least orthographically — and perhaps in the prestige pronunciation as well (cf. Gălăbov 1980: 34).\(^6\) The Slavic attempt to imitate the Greek model must have resulted in pronunciations like [aleksanədr]. This often shows in the writing, too, as in the forms \textit{kli}men[C]t-, \textit{an}d[ə]re- < \textit{Κλήμεντ}-, \textit{Ἀνδρέ}- (cf. Jovićević 1985). In the name \textit{kon(ə)stan(ə)tinu} < \textit{Κωνσταντῖνος}, the abundance of nasal consonants hampered the pronunciation to such an extent that of the eight OCS tokens of this word, collected by Jovićević (1985: 80), not a single one contains both of the two first \textit{n}'s.

\(^4\) Cf. also Diels (1963/1932: 31). Koschmieder’s article is dedicated to Diels.

\(^5\) Contrary to several other Slavists, Trubetzkoy was well aware of the fact that in certain positions, \textit{N} was really opposed to \textit{n} and \textit{m}. Cf. Trubetzkoy (1954: 83–84) and below.

\(^6\) Consequently, -\textit{n} and -\textit{m} are never written in Greek loans, either, if they receive no support from standard Greek. This is shown by the word \textit{sonbota} ‘Sabbath’; cf. Greek \textit{σαββατον}. No such form as \textit{**sombota} is found in OCS MSS. (to my knowledge; unfortunately the material of SJSS s.v. \textit{sobota} has not been at my disposal when writing this note). The word is a loan either from dialectal Greek \textit{*σαμβατον} or (less likely?) Balkan Latin \textit{*SAMBATA} (Vasmer s.v. \textit{subbota}). Even if it was a Latin loan, it was certainly felt to be related to the Greek \textit{σαββατον}.
The use of the back *jer* /ũ/ as a fill vowel in foreign words can be observed in the word *olūtarī* ‘altar’ < Lat. ALTAIRE. The correspondence short *a* = Slavic *o* clearly shows that this is a popular, pre-literary loan, while the rarer form *altarī* — with an *a* and without the fill vowel — must be a later literary formation. There can be no doubt that just as */lt/* was not a permitted cluster in OCS, and had to be broken up with an epenthetic */ũ/," so */nt/*, */nd/*, etc. were prohibited in the native phonological system, and needed a fill vowel. Thus, the letter *n* cannot possibly have had the sound value [n] or [m] before stops.

There are, however, such forms as *talan*-*, andrē-, sandali-, k'ins-* in Zogr., among others. But they represent a later stage of development, when weak *jers* had already been lost, and new consonant clusters had become possible in Slavic words, too, as in *dondēže*<sup>9</sup> < *donỳdeže* ‘until’. Moreover, we always have to reckon with the possibility of conscious imitation of Greek orthography. The spelling *ponn’tiskumu* ‘Pontius (dat.sg.)’ in Zogr. (Mt 27:2) looks like an unsuccessful correction of an earlier *pon’tisk*-

Earlier we noted that Trubetzkoy did not suggest that *n* was an archiphoneme. Such an assumption would, however, seem to be obvious if the standard formulation is accepted that the OCS (and Common Slavic) nasal vowels were only positional variants of combinations of an oral vowel and a nasal consonant (Shevelov 1964: 330; Kortlandt 1979: 264–265). The nasal vowels are said to have only occurred before consonants and word-finally, while the nasal consonants required a vowel after them. Had this really been the case, an inquiry into the precise pronunciation of *n* would hardly make sense.

However, there did exist a position where nasal vowels and nasal consonants were in opposition, viz. before liquids. Nasal vowels could freely appear in this position, while for the nasal consonants Trubetzkoy (1954: 83) formulated the rule thus: “Als erstes Glied einer

---

<sup>7</sup> The material of *SJSS* (s.v.) shows that in the OCS canon (excluding Zogr.<sup>b</sup>), *olūtarī* is written with ū in only half of the instances; in other cases we find either an apostrophe or, more often, no fill vowel at all. But I still think that the ū instances (twice in Sin., 13 times in Euch.) are sufficient for positing an original *jer*.

<sup>8</sup> But cf. *k'entùriona* ‘centurion’ (gen.sg.) in Zogr. (Mk 15:45). This could represent an older layer.

Konsonantenverbundung wurde n gar nicht,\(^{10}\) n nur vor r und m nur vor r, l, l zugelassen." Cf., on the one hand, words like zeml'a 'earth', umrěti 'to die', sūmlěti 'to grind', zūlonravině 'immoral' and, on the other hand, začelo (začenlo) 'beginning', rinčlů (rinčnělů) 'push (past res. pcpl. act.)', člů (čnlů) 'take (past res. pcpl. act.)'. I do not know if perfect minimal pairs can be found, but the forms prieml'i 'take (imperfective impv. sg.2)' vs. priělů 'take (perfective res. pcpl. act. masc. nom. pl.)' constitute a subminimal pair proving that before liquids, nasal vowels (or the sound N, if it was an independent segment) entered into an opposition with respect to nasal consonants. Thus, we are still left with the problem: what was the actual pronunciation of N like?

Borjana Velčeva (1980: 42) has found a hypothesis in Trubetzkoy's published correspondence that N was actually a velar nasal consonant /ŋ/.\(^{11}\) In that case, it would really have had an articulation different from the other nasal consonantal phonemes; and the spelling angelů would receive a plausible explanation – as is well-known, the Greek ἀγγελος was pronounced [ángelos] or [áng'elos]. Velčeva also points out that the combination Vŋ (where V is an oral vowel) is a normal intermediate stage in the rise of nasal vowels proper.

Unfortunately Velčeva's hypothesis, as it stands, is not fully satisfactory. For the moment, we can set aside the problem of whether the Glagolitic OCS eN, oN, ðN really represent a stage PRECEDING the Common Slavic rise of nasal vowels. But even then, the theory does not explain why the spelling angelů (or angelů) is by far the commonest in OCS sources, and why we only find evangelie or evanđelie, but never **evanđelie. If Old Bulgarian had known the same velar nasal [ŋ] which was heard in the Greek pronunciation, and if the Glagolitic alphabet had contained a separate letter for it, how could the spellings with -n- have arisen for which there was no model in the Greek orthography? It is only the occasional forms of the type agg'elů, aggčelů that imitate the Greek spellings.

\(^{10}\) Trubetzkoy's ř = n. Note that in dondežě, Zogr. never marks the etymological palatality of ř.

\(^{11}\) The suggestion is found in T's letter to Roman Jakobson in 1929. Notice that T. seems to have abandoned this hypothesis later on; the above quotation from his OCS grammar, written in the thirties, is not commensurable with the /ŋ/-hypothesis. In Trubetzkoy (1927/28: 675), [ŋ] is mentioned only as one of the possible sound values of N.
Another problem is that in certain positions, the hypothesis would presume rather odd consonant clusters. Forms such as /mũŋdrũ/ or /ženťva/ are unlikely in a language whose phonotactics had been thoroughly shaped by the open-syllable drift.

Nevertheless, I do think Velčeva’s hypothesis is along the right lines, and the spelling anţelũ should be considered to be very old, possibly Cyrillo-Methodian. But instead of a distinct phoneme /ŋ/, something else must be proposed.

2. The decomposition of nasal vowels in the Thessalonian dialect. In southern Macedonia, in the environments of Thessaloniki (Slav. Solun) and Kastoria (Kostur), there are Slavic dialects in which the nasality of the former nasal vowels has been preserved as a distinct nasal consonant, most often when a stop or an affricate follows, e.g. dămp¹² ‘oak’ < dobũ, žentfă ‘harvest’ < žetva. The different types of this decomposed nasality and their geographical distribution have been analyzed by Illič-Svityč (1962) — mainly in the south-western (Kastorian) dialects, though. In the present context we are more interested in the state of affairs in the dialects of the Thessalonian region (Solunsko). The basic field work was carried out in the thirties by Mieczyslaw Malecki (1934; 1936), who surveyed the Slavic language spoken in the villages of Sukho (Suzó, Gr. Σωχός) and Visoka (Visóka [w'i-], Gr. "Οσσα). Malecki’s material was later analyzed linguistically by Golab (1960/61; 1962/63). Lastly, the dialect of Visoka was subjected to a phonological analysis in the Yugoslav volume containing descriptions for the Obšćešlavjanski lingvističeskij atlas (FO pp. 801–810).

Malecki’s vocabulary from Sukho and Visoka contains over 60 roots with a decomposed nasality of the type dămp (see the Appendix below). There are also some instances of secondary nasality, reminiscent of Polish,¹³ e.g. p’int’ěl ‘rooster’ < pětel’i; st ’âŋglu ‘glass’ < stíklo.

¹² For typographical reasons, I have not been able to follow the transcription standard of OLA. The middle vowel phoneme is transcribed as ź, not as the upside-down e. The stress sign is placed above the stressed vowel, but before ź and ź = IPA [œ] ( ‘ă ’ā; this stress sign should not be confused with the palatalization sign ’).

Malecki’s material has been phonemized according to the solution in FO (pp. 801–810). In unstressed syllables, /â/ corresponds to the three distinct phonemes /a/, /ĕ/, and /a/ of stressed syllables.

¹³ Cf., e.g., Rospond (1973: 87).
They may partly be due to interdialectal hypercorrection, as suggested by Golab (1962/63: 232). At any rate, the phenomenon is old; Koneski (1983: 389) quotes lažq ‘a lie, acc. sg.’ (< *lqöße instead of lůqo) from the 12th-century Šafařík’s Triodion — a form to be compared with the Sukho and Visoka word länžá.

Instances of decomposed nasality are mainly found before stops and affricates, though not in all instances of etymological nasal vowels (Golab 1962/63: 229-230; this kind of irregularity can also be observed in other dialects with decomposed nasality). Moreover, nasality can be observed before the sibilants z and š which, in such cases, have been changed into the corresponding affricates ẓ = ȷz and ʃ = ȷʃ, e.g. inžík ‘tongue; language’ < jëzyků; v’änži ‘rope’ < qže. The affrication of z and š occurs even when nasality is secondary, as in the above-mentioned länžá ‘a lie’.

For the chronology of the phenomenon, it is important to notice that decomposed nasality has not arisen, or has not been preserved, before voiceless sibilants. This is seen in m’ȃsu, m’ėsu ‘meat’, k ’ȃštą ‘house’ (cf. kûnt ‘hearth’, from the same root), l’ȅštą ‘lentil’, čést(ą) ‘dense’, g ’ȃską ‘goose’, and also kús ‘low, short’, with an irregular reflex of *q (cf. BER s.v. kás2). The words mánč ‘man; husband’ and bânc ‘elder tree’ (< *búzů, with secondary nasality), are not real counterexamples: they have been formed according to the definite and plural forms (def. mänžo(t), bänžo(t)), or perhaps show a trace of the old voicedness of the word-final consonant before the loss of weak jers.

After the loss of weak jers, combinations of a nasal consonant and s or š became possible, as in sf’ïnsku adj. ‘pork’, kamšík ‘whip’ (a Turkic loan). Moreover, the second elements of the decomposed nasal vowels could now be readily identified with the phonemes /n/ or /m/. Had there still been a distinct nasal element present in mešo, for instance, its reflex would now be **m’玟nsu or perhaps **m’玟ncu, and not the actual m’玟su, m’ėsu. Therefore, the decomposition of nasal vowels must have started well before the loss of weak jers.14

The adjectives m ’ȃská ‘male, man’s’ (or, with a secondary labial-

---

14 The form m’玟nsu has been reported from certain other dialects, to be sure, even from the nearby village of Zarovo (Zároβα; see Oblak 1894: 519-520). But it does not disprove the chronology proposed here, it is merely indeterminate as regards chronology.
ization, můšká) and t'ěšká¹⁵ ‘heavy’ make an even more exact relative dating possible (cf. mānžó(t) ‘the man’, tānží- ‘to be heavy’). Since the sibilants following the nasal vowel in these words did not become voiceless before the loss of weak jers, we must conclude that the rule governing the distribution of the decomposed variants was still in force; therefore, the decomposition of nasal vowels and the later loss of jers partially overlapped in time. But when the jer loss was already a completed process, the thoroughly reformed phonotactic system could certainly not have supported such distribution restrictions of nasality any longer.

It is interesting to note that although the details of the decomposition are different in the south-western Macedonian dialects, Illič-Svityč (1962: 84–85) arrives at a nearly similar conclusion as concerns the relative chronology: “rinezm vydelilissa v ukazannoj pozicii do padenija reducirovannyx ili, po krajnej mere, do oglušenija zvonkix v isxode slova i pered gluximi.”

Although decomposed nasality in southern Macedonia is an old phenomenon, it cannot be regarded as an “archaic” feature, that is to say it does not represent a stage through which the remaining Bulgaro-Macedonian dialects have developed during their older history. Such more common forms as dąp, dąp, or dap cannot have developed through dąmp, because once arisen, the new m or n would have been in no way distinct from the etymological m and n which are retained in all dialects. Dialects of the dąmp type separated from the neighboring dialects before the general change of nasal to oral vowels. Contrary to what is often stated, South Macedonian dialects have not preserved nasal vowels longer than other dialects — they have rather LOST them earlier, through decomposition.¹⁶

Now, it is a plausible hypothesis that the Glagolitic alphabet, with its special nasality sign N, reflects the situation in just that type of dialect in which decomposed nasality can be observed nowadays. The decomposition was not yet a completed process, to be sure, or else we would find spellings such as **dombŭ or **dāmbŭ, instead of donbŭ. But the nasal vowels must have had a diphthongized pronunciation,

¹⁵ There is no lemma t'ěšká in Malecki’s vocabulary, but the word is found in a gloss s.v. tānžim.

¹⁶ Cf. Mareš (1969: 104), and Tolstaja’s (1966) diachronic typology of nasalization and denasalization.
with a concentration of nasality in the second, non-syllabic component of the diphthong. Trubetzkoy’s assumption that “vor Vokalen und im absoluten Auslaute war N vielleicht nur ein unsilbischer nasalierter Vokal” (see section 1 above) might be correct, after all, but a similar allophone could occur in other positions as well. Only later was it restricted to positions before certain consonants only, disappearing elsewhere.

It cannot be said whether in the Cyrillo–Methodian times, the decomposition of nasal vowels had already reached a stage at which we ought to analyze them as two phonemic segments each. At any rate, the diphthongization was clearly audible to a foreign ear, and was taken account of in Glagolitic orthography. With the letter N, St. Cyril marked the second, more strongly nasal component in the Thessalian pronunciation of the nasal vowels. For him, this sound was similar to the Greek velar nasal allophone [ŋ], and that is why he made use of the letter N in the word anγelũ (cf. van Wijk 1931: 682-683). This spelling does not, however, represent the Slavic pronunciation of the word — it is rather a transcription of the Greek (and literary Slavic) pronunciation. Slavic phonotactics would not have permitted N to stand after /a/.

As noted in section 1, Velčeva has suggested that N was actually a real velar nasal consonant, the combination [Vŋ] being a typologically plausible stage preceding the rise of nasal vowels proper. As concerns this typological plausibility, she refers to Chen & Wang (1975). It should perhaps be pointed out that Chen and Wang’s scheme of the rise of nasal vowels (1975: 267) primarily pertains to Chinese dialects; it is not meant to be such a universal scheme as Velčeva (1980: 41–42) presents it. But these dialects do present a possible typological parallel; and Chen & Wang suggest that a similar development might also have taken place in French, where “there are reasons to believe that the nasal endings were preserved as a weakly articulated velar nasal consonant at least until the end of the 17th century” (1975: 269).

Nevertheless, the existence of a separate consonant phoneme /ŋ/ in the Cyrillo–Methodian times is not a plausible hypothesis, as I already argued in section 1 above. But N obviously stood for something similar to [ŋ] — perhaps a nasalized non-syllabic high back vowel, such as IPA [ɨ̆] after o and ơ, and [ɨ̃] after e. My other objection to Velčeva’s hypothesis concerns the chronology: I do not think that the Glagolitic en, on, ŏn represent a stage before the Common Slavic rise of nasal

77
vowels proper; they are rather the result of a significantly later decomposition of those vowels in certain South Macedonian dialects only.

Velčeva (1980: 43) writes:

V slavjanskite ezići sâčetanjata ot [V+ŋ] se promenjat po različen način.
V povežeto bâlgarski govori ŋ izpadu slez nasализacijata na predvodnata glasna. V solunskite govori ŋ pretârpjava asimilacija ot sledvaštata ja sâгласna — svr. dâmp, pent, kräŋk. Podoben razvoj e sasvidetelstvuvan v kašubski dialetki.

Notice that this argumentation would make it a fortuitous fact that decomposed nasality is now found just in those dialects upon which the Glagolitic alphabet was based: in them, true nasal vowels never arose, according to Velčeva, but this would be something that separated them from the neighboring dialects only after the Cyrillo-Methodian times. I argue, on the contrary, that the Glagolitic ŋ reflects an innovation of South Macedonian dialects only, presenting an additional piece of evidence for the geographical basis of the first Slavic literary language.

It is easy to see that true nasal vowels must also have existed in the South Macedonian dialects. In practically all of the instances of decomposed nasality, the quality of the vowel can readily be explained on the basis of *ɛ and *ø: in stressed syllables, *ɛ is reflected as ə or e (the former being the older variant, cf. Golab 1962/63 pp. 219–220), and *ø as ə (+ the possible nasal consonant, of course). In unstressed syllables, ə, e, ə are realized ə, i, ə, respectively, according to the normal phonotactic rules of these dialects.17 In Common Slavic there must have existed, before the rise of nasal vowels, at least the combinations iN, ɛN, āN, and ūN (where N is n or m, and the breve denotes phonological brevity). The merger of high and low vowels in this position is

17 Deviant reflexes can be observed in the words muškā adj. ‘man’s’ (Sukho), pump ‘navel’ (< pop-), pūmek ‘bud’ (< ḫpoppika, probably not from pok-), mëŋkā ‘soft; nice’ (Visoka, < mëkikā), and kus ‘low, short’ (< kosi, cf. BER s.v. kās2). As regards the first three examples, in the dialect there are also other instances of a secondary labialization of ə next to a labial consonant, as in nap ’din’weðm / napùn’weðm ‘I fill’ (cf. Golab 1962/63: 228–229). There in fact exist m ’dik-, p ’dik, and p ’dik as well. As for the Visoka form m’vŋkā, in Sukho we have the more regular m’eŋkā; m’vŋkā originates from an older *m’vŋŋkā since in the dialect /a/ and /ā/ are, to a certain extent, interchangeable after palatalized consonants (Golab 1962/63: 218). Only kus remains a problem. Couldn’t it be a loan from the northwest?
understandable just because they became nasal vowels; it is a linguistic universal that (i) nasal vowels tend to have fewer oppositions than oral ones, and (ii) nasal vowels tend to be non-high. If we assumed that there never arose nasal vowels proper in southern Macedonia, we would still have to admit that in the position before nasal consonants (or the hypothetical nasal consonant /η/), vowels changed in the very way nasal vowels typically change. This would hardly be a convincing hypothesis.

The same line of argumentation is applicable to the Cyrillic-Methodian language as well. There are only the combinations eN, oN, and ŏN, and no **ǐN or **ũN. Moreover, the inflectional endings containing oN have front-vowel counterparts with ŏN after palatal consonants, whereas the counterpart of o in the same morphophonological environment is e. This proves that although St. Cyril identified the first part of the back nasal vowel as o, there must have been a period in the language when the nasal /o/ and the oral /o/ where distinct phonemes.18

As for Velčeva’s comparison with Kashubian, she refers to Tolstaja (1966: 135–136). In certain Kashubian dialects, the nasal consonant representing the nasality of the old *q and *q is not always homorganic with the following consonant: it is often [ŋ] — with different context conditions in different dialects. But as far I can see there is no evidence in Kashubian, either, that the Vŋ combinations would preserve a Common Slavic state of affairs.

To sum up, the overall development of the Southeast Macedonian nasal vowels can be presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original forms:</th>
<th>kōtı</th>
<th>kōšla</th>
<th>męso</th>
<th>těži-</th>
<th>těžků</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Decomposition begun:</td>
<td>koNti</td>
<td>koNšla</td>
<td>męNsō</td>
<td>teNži-</td>
<td>teNžků</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jer loss begun:</td>
<td>koNti(u)</td>
<td>koNšla</td>
<td>męNsō</td>
<td>teNži-</td>
<td>teNžků (teNšků)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New qualities of oN, eN:</td>
<td>kāNti(u)</td>
<td>kāNšla</td>
<td>māNsō</td>
<td>tāNži-</td>
<td>tāNžků (tāNšků)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Partial loss of N:</td>
<td>kāNti(u)</td>
<td>kāšla</td>
<td>māso</td>
<td>tāNži-</td>
<td>tāšků</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jer loss completed:</td>
<td>kānt</td>
<td>kāšla</td>
<td>māso</td>
<td>tānži-</td>
<td>tāšků</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affrication:</td>
<td>kānt</td>
<td>k’)ślů</td>
<td>m’’asū</td>
<td>tānži-</td>
<td>t’śků</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Glagolitic writing system reflects stage 1.

18 Cf. also Mareš (1969: 104) on Slavic as a whole.
3. A parallel case: Polish. For determining the nature and sound value of \( N \), an important parallel can be found in Modern Polish. It is customary there to distinguish three types of pronunciation of the “nasal vowels”, i.e. the graphemes \(<q>\) and \(<g>:\) “synchronous nasality” \([\varepsilon \ddot{o}]\), “asynchronous nasality” with a distinct nasal consonant \([e o] + [n m \eta]\), and the denasalized pronunciation \([e o]\). In what is considered the standard literary pronunciation (cf. SWP pp. XXVIII-XXIX), synchronous nasality is used before fricatives and, at least for \(<g>\), word-finally, as in \(k\ddot{e}s\) \([k\ddot{e}s]\) ‘piece’, \(id\ddot{g}\) \([i\ddot{d}\ddot{o}]\) ‘they go’; asynchronous nasality is normative before stops and affricates, as in \(pi\ddot{e}k\ddot{n}y\) \([p,(j)e\ddot{y}k\ddot{n}i]\) ‘beautiful’, \(d\ddot{e}t\ddot{k}a\) \([d\ddot{e}nt\ddot{k}a]\) ‘inner tube’; and denasalization is found before \(l\), \(l\), and, as regards \(<q>\), optionally in the word-final position. But there is also the DIPHONGIZED NASAL PRONUNCIATION of the type \([e\ddot{w}]\), \([o\ddot{w}]\), which could present the most exact parallel to the Glagolitic \(en\), \(on\).

Diphthongized nasality is commonly heard instead of synchronous nasality: \([k\ddot{e}\ddot{w}s]\), \([i\ddot{d}\ddot{o}\ddot{w}]\). The nasalized glide \([\ddot{w}]\) finds its place in the Polish phonological system as the back counterpart of the front nasal glide \([j]\), as in \(ko\ddot{i}ski\) \([ko\ddot{j}sk,i]\ adj. ‘horse’s’ (cf. Feldstein 1983 and the literature quoted there).\(^{19}\)

Diphthongized nasality can also be heard where the norm requires asynchronous nasality with a distinct nasal consonant, as in \(pi\ddot{e}k\ddot{n}y\) \([p,(j)e\ddot{w}k\ddot{n}i]\), \(d\ddot{e}t\ddot{k}a\) \([d\ddot{e}\ddot{w}t\ddot{k}a]\) (SWP, ibid.). The dialectal distribution of this phenomenon is difficult to determine, because the \(Maly\ alex\ gwar\ polskich\) only records the three standard types of synchronous, asynchronous, and lost nasality. But in its sixth volume (MAGP VI, part II passim) it is reported from several places that in asynchronous nasality, “spółgłoska nosowa bywa wymawiana słabo”, a description that must be interpreted as diphthongized nasality.

It may well be the case that diphthongized or decomposed nasality was historically the predecessor of the asynchronous \(en\), \(em\) (etc.) type. Stieber (1973: 81) tells us that in late fourteenth and early fifteenth

\(^{19}\) The systemic support given to \([\ddot{w}]\) by \([j]\) may not be very strong, though, since \([j]\) is only an allophone of \(/\acute{n}/\). That could be one of the reasons why, after the Second World War, \([\ddot{w}]\) tends to be denasalized, especially after \(/o/\) (Rospond 1973: 86; Stieber 1973: 129-130). It then merges with \(/w/\) (written \(l\)), which is why children may write \(jad\ddot{e}l\ dro\ddot{g}ot\) instead of \(jad\ddot{y} dro\ddot{g}y\) ‘they are riding along the road’. For other, sociolinguistic reasons for this change, see Stieber (ibid.).
century documents, great fluctuation can be observed in the spelling of nasal vowels, in spite of the fact that a special grapheme <ø> was introduced for them during the 14th century:

If, e.g., in the Poznań [lawcourt] records we find the nasal vowel before dental stops noted by an (or, exceptionally, en, in) in 368 instances, by simple letters (œ, ə, o) or the sequence aø in 126, and by the sequence øn in 31, this does not at all allow us the conclusion that the pronunciation prevailing in Great Poland was already tandy (tɛdy) 'there', damby (dɛby) 'oaks', etc., with the two-phoneme sequences an, am.

Stieber (ibid.) does, however, allow "asynchronous nasality before stops and affricates, [without] a complete disintegration of the nasal vowels into two-phonemes [sic] sequences" for the period in question. The spelling aø would thus be closest to the actual pronunciation, resembling the Glagolitic en, on, ðn. Needless to say, Polish diphthongized and asynchronous nasality are not genetically related to the corresponding phenomena in southern Macedonia; but the typological parallelism is striking.\(^{20}\)

Conclusion. The Glagolitic digraphs standing for nasal vowels reflect their dialectal decomposition, which was to lead to the vowel + nasal consonant sequences (Vn,Vm,Vŋ) that can still be observed in certain dialects of southern Macedonia. This is an additional piece of evidence showing that it was the Thessalonian dialect upon which St. Cyril and St. Methodius originally based the first Slavic literary language.

Kočev (1987) has recently pointed out that the term "Thessalonian dialect" (Bg. solunski gowor), when pertaining to the Cyrillo-Methodian times, can receive broader or smaller geographical interpretations. However, irrespective of the geographical distribution of the decomposed nasal vowels in the IXth century, it was certainly in the city of Thessaloniki and its immediate surroundings that the two holy brothers first came into contact with this and several other features of the Slavs' language.

\(^{20}\) Cf. the several other parallelisms between developments in Bulgarian and Polish vocalism (Gālkābov 1980: 17–18).
Postscript: I anticipate the question, what language was the Thessalonian dialect part of? There is, however, no scientific answer to this problem over and above what we already know, having determined the genetic affiliation (Slavic) and geographical location of that dialect. I can but quote Golab (1962/63: 275): “[...] morame jasno da ja potcrtao teznata genetička vrksa na makedonske govore so bugarske govore, osobeno rodopske, a so samoto toa besuslovno da ja tretirame jazičnata makedonsko-bugarska teritorija kato kategorički genetički edinstvena, pri koe makedonske, rodopske i, kako što možem da pretpolagame, tračkite govori vo minatoto bi pretstavувале mošte edinstvena grupa, najbliska do jazikot na Kiril i Metodiija.”
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APPENDIX:
Roots with decomposed nasal vowels in the dialects of Sukho and/or Visoka, as recorded by Malecki

I. *g before original stops and affricates: čgd- > čéndu; bratučent | gød- > pó-gl’induk; pugl’enduván’i; ugl’indálá, urg’indálá; ugl’indalu, urg’indálu | guvd- > guv’indár’in | gréd- > gr’éndá | jarg- > ir’imb’ycá | jvdr- > (j)éndrá | jstr(üv)- > (j)entrává | klet- > kl’éntfá | kókd- > kul’indár’in, kulándár’in | měk(ük)- > m’eňkä, m’aňkä | měšć- > m’ájánc, pl. m’ájn’c’i; m’ásn’ic (< *m’aš’n’ic); m’is’incínä | mět- > m’éntfá | pět- > p’ént’ (‘span’) | pět(a) > p’éntä, p’ent’, p’intá; p’inčá; p’incícä; p’inžé; p’intúrkä | pěnt’- ’5’ > p’éntuk (‘Friday’) | préd- > pr’éndá, pr’ind’ém | réd- > r’ent, def. r’indó; r’éndäm, r’ind’im; nar’édévám | sųt- > sf’int’éc; sà p(r)usť’int’y | šep- > šémplá | sajsc- > záinc, zájánc | zet- > z’ent’ | żet- > żéntfá; žintfär’in

II. *g before original stops and affricates: bľad- > blándájä | dgb- > dämp, def. dámbó(t) | drég- > dráňk, def. dráŋgó(t) | gób- > g’ámdbä | gog- ‘to press’ > gánči ‘is full of’ (cf. BER s.v. g’ača) | gabilidade, gámbok, gámbok, gámlök, dlâmbok | gréd- > gr’ànd’am, gr’énd’ä | kľob- > kl’àmbu; klámboškä | kód- > k’ànd’ä, kându ‘ubi; quo’; kándógud’ä ‘anywhere’; k’ànd’ä, kândy ‘towards’; drungánd’ä ‘elsewhere’; s’àkkánd’ä ‘everywhere’ | kółk- > k’ànkul’ | kop- > sà (u)k’àmp’ä(m) | kopín- > k’àmp’ínä | kyt- > kânt | krog- > kráňk, def. kr’àńgu; kr’änčä | lók- > láńk, def. láńkót, láńgö | měd- > m’àndu, pl. m’ànd’ä | mdr- > m’àndrä | měk- > m’aňkä;
adj.: "m̀ánčnà ràbutà"; s̀a m̀ánchà, s̀a m̀ánchà | mòt- > m̀ántà 'muddy'; (s̀a) zım̀ánt'uv'àm (but in Visoka the root appears with -tn-; I reconstruct the adjective as *mántnà) | ə̞q- > v 'àng'ìl, ə̞'ägliì | ə̞tor- > v 'ántur'i (pl.) | pa(j)uk- > pàjìŋk (def. pàjìŋgu), pàjìŋk (def. pàjìŋgut); cf. pàjìŋnì in section IV below | ə̞qà- (i)spànd'òvàm | pə̞p- > pàmp, pump 'navel'; p̀àmkà, pùmkà 'bud' (< p̀pem-tk-a) | ə̞qàt- > pànt; pànt'ìckà, p̀ànt'ìckà; ràsp 'ánt' | pə̞qàt- > prànt; pr̀ànčkà | rò̞b- > ràmp, def. ràmbò(t); r̀ə̞mb'kà(m); pur'em'b'uvàm | rò̞k- > r 'àngkà, pl. r̀ànckà; rànčkà; rànculkà; rànčkà; rànčkw'icà; nàránč; óbrànč; pur'tèncuvàm | skàp- > skàmp(à); skàmpàr'ìn, skàmpàr'ìn; skàmp'fjà; skàmp'fjà | sò̞bot- > s 'àngbutà | sò̞d- > s 'ànd'âm; s 'ànd'ìnì | sò̞k- > sàŋk | sò̞b- > sàmp, def. sàmbò(t) | žèld- > žèlìŋk (sic!), pl. žèlìŋg'ì

III. *q before z, ŋ made affricates: jìzyk- > inq'ík | të̞z- > tànším, t 'ànggà; ut'ınšávàm | vë̞z- > puv'ınšálkà

IV. *q before z, ŋ made affricates: gò̞z- > def. (u) gànžöt (but indef. gás) | mò̞z- > mànç, def. mànž(t) | gò̞t- > v 'àng'ìl; vàŋg'il'íf | gò̞z- > v 'àngi | pàjìŋnì - > pàjìŋnìnà, pàjìŋnìnà | The word gànžólkà 'gatunek drobnych, slodkich gruszek' would also belong here, were it somehow related to gò̞z- 'twist, twine', Bg. g 'ăzva 'turban' (q.v. in BER, cf. also Skok s.v. gùžva).

V. In addition, nasality has been preserved and generalized in the plural ending -(á)nta, as in p'ìrd'ántà 'curtains', kùçántà, def. kùçántató 'dogs' (cf. Golàb 1962/63: 186), as well as in several passive past participles, such as z'ent 'taken', pùmr'ánt 'frozen', umr'ánt 'dead', zàspánt 'sleepy' (cf. Golàb 1960/61: 145).

VI. Secondary nasalization: bù̞z- > bànč, def. bànžò | bù̞c(àv)- > b 'ànčfà | dîg- 'long' > dìl 'ànk, fem. dìl 'ànggà | lò̞g- > làŋ́ó; l'ànʒ(m); sl 'ànši 'deceives'; làŋ́f; làŋ́š'nìk, làŋ́š'ç'ìrk; cf. also jàl'ànšjì 'liar' (contamination with Turkish forms?) | lù̞šc- > làŋ́šçà | mìg- > m 'àngglà | pàpréc- > pàmp'ícà (Maclecki: 'paprzyca w młynie'; RRODD s.v. paprća: 'żelżazna czast na vodenica, kojato predava vārtenieto ot osta na kamka') | pè̞tel'- > p'int'él; p'int'élčà | rù̞z- > rànši 'it

neighs' | stíkł- > st'àngglu
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