

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА СРПСКОХРВАТСКИ ЈЕЗИК

ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИ ФИЛОЛОГ

Уређивачки одбор:

др *Ирена Грицкай*, др *Милка Ивић*, др *Павле Ивић*, др *Радослав Кайиџић*,
Блаже Конески, др *Александар Младеновић*, др *Берислав Николић*, др *Асим Пецо*,
др *Мишар Пешикан*, др *Живојин Ситанојчић*

Главни уредник

МИЛКА ИВИЋ

XXXII књ.

БЕОГРАД

1976

ON THE PROBLEM OF THE PARTICIPATION OF Y AND I IN THE LOSS OF JERS

The following abbreviations are used for the names of languages and related terms:

Bg — Bulgarian Br — Belorussian ChSl — Church Slavonic CS — Common Slavic Cz — Czech E — east(ern) Gr — Greek IE — Indo-European La — Latin Li — Lithuanian M — Macedonian Mo — modern N — north(ern) O — old OCS — Old Church Slavonic P — Polish PN — personal name PU — Proto-Ukrainian R — Russian SC — Serbo-Croatian Sk — Slovak Sl — Slavic W — west(ern).

The abbreviations for grammatical terms are the customary ones.

In the transliteration of OU texts *r* is rendered as *g*, *н* and *i* as *i* and the *jers* are retained; in that of Middle Ukrainian (MU) *р* is rendered as *h*, *и* and *i* as *y*, *ѣ* as *ʼ*, *ѡ* as *ʼ*, and *ѣ* as *ʼ*. The cut-offdate between the two periods is 1387 (this is purely conventional and does not imply that the sound changes in question necessarily occurred at or about that year). For both periods „*jat*“ is rendered as *ě* and „*jus mal*“ as *ę* independently of their sound value.

When *jers* arose from *i* and *ü* in late CS, presumably by the 9th c¹, they were excluded from the position next to *j*. In that position, after *j*, only *i* (*ĩ*) was admitted, before *j* it was *i* unchanged and *ŷ* (4), from *ü*. This situation basically obtains in all Sl languages except R, in which the adjacency of *j* did not preclude the evolution of *i* and *ü* to *ь* and *ѡ*² which afterwards followed the normal development of these vowels (except word-initially).

¹ G. Y. Shevelov. *A Prehistory of Slavic*. Heidelberg 1964, p. 438.

² The term „tense *jers*“ popularized by A. Šaxmatov in the middle period of his scholarly activity (e.g. in his *Očerk sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka* written in 1911—1912 and published posthumously, see *Iz trudov Šaxmatova po sovremennomu russkomu jazyku*. M 1952, p. 260) was an awkward and unnecessary disguise for these *i* and *ü*. He did not use this term in his early studies — he spoke then of „irrational“ *i* and *y*, see e.g. his „Issledovanija v oblasti russkoj fonetiki“, *RFV* 29, 1893, p. 33, — nor in his later work, including his *opus magnum*, *Očerk drevnejšego perioda istorii russkogo jazyka*, P 1915, where he called them *polukratkie*, e.g. p. 20. This unjustified term still survives in some derivative works.

The inadmissible sequences $j + b$, $b + j$ and $b + j$ were, however, constantly generated on syntactic and morphemic boundaries. In principle this could have led to an expansion of the sequences jb , vj and vj at the expense of ji , yj and ij resp. This may have been a prerequisite for an involvement of the latter sequences in the forthcoming loss of *jers*. Many facts of the historically attested Sl languages apparently indeed point to such an involvement. This phenomenon of the partial involvement of *i* and *y* in the loss of *jers* varies from one Sl language to another. Moreover the pertinent facts are often inconsistent and even seemingly contradictory within a single language. Attempts to find some comprehensive regularities which would apply to all Sl languages have failed.³

Under these conditions, it is expedient to postpone any all-Sl generalizations until the problem has been tackled in individual Sl languages, including all their historical and dialectal minutiae. It is hoped that, when we have adequate knowledge of what occurred in the individual languages, certain regularities of a more general character will become graspable.

The present study, in partial fulfillment of this task, concentrates on Ukrainian.⁴ Four configurations are discussed: *ji* word-initially; *ji* word-medially and word-finally; *yj*; and *ij*. This is followed by remarks on the scope and impact of the introduction of *jers*, instead of *i* and *y*, in these configurations.

1. Word-initial sequence *ji*

On the basis of such forms as dial *ihlá* 'needle' vs. *hólka* (< **jǫgola*, **jǫgǫlka*), it is traditionally assumed that *ǫ* after *j* in word-initial syllables

³ Most typical is Šaxmatov's struggling with the problem in his *Očerok drevnejšego perioda*. In many parts of the book he returned to the Sl data devoting over 30 pages to it (15—18, 20—28, 219—227, 257—265, 305—307) but could not arrive at any satisfactory general solution. Likewise unsuccessful was the attempt by N. Pšeničnova („K istorii reducirovannyx *y*, *i* v vostočnoslavjanskix jazykax“. *Filologičeskie nauki* 3, 1, 1960) limited to ESl and basing only on dialects (with insufficient knowledge of the U ones) in complete disregard of any historical evidence.

⁴ The author operates here under the following assumptions which he has attempted to prove elsewhere and which are to be taken for granted in this article: Phonemic pitch and quantity were lost in the PU dialects in the 10th c; the phonetic value of *ǫ* in OU was [ê] in the S dialects, [ie] in the N dialects; the strong *jers* were not „reduced vowels“; *jers* were completely lost by the mid-12th c; the loss of *jers* was preceded by the loss of their stressability; the loss of weak *jers* caused no compensatory lengthening in *o* and *e* of preceding syllables, but did cause the narrowing of these vowels into *o* and, in a position before *v*, *ě* resp. The latter coalesced with *ě*.

The periodization of the history of U adapted here is as follows: Proto-Ukrainian (PU), before the appearance of written texts (the mid-11th c); Old Ukrainian (OU), from

was like *jers* subject to loss in the weak position but preserved as a vowel in the strong position, though as *i* and not as *e*. When *ǐ* was lost, according to this view, the cluster *j+C* was simplified somewhat later by the loss of *j*: **jǐgoloka* > **jgolka* > *hólka*. This explanation seems also to apply to a few other words to wit *máty* 'have', *hra* 'play', *skrýtyjsja* 'sparkle' (H. Barvinok 1902)⁵, *kryha* 'ice' (< **jǐmati*, **jǐgra*, **jǐskr-*, **jǐkr-*, cf. R dial *ikrá* 'ice-floe'), possibly *iz* ~ *z* 'from' (< **jǐz*), if one assumes that *iz* first arose before words which had a weak *jer* in the initial syllable (*iz pšenicě* 'from wheat') while *z* arose in all other positions (*z travy* 'from grass').

This view does not, however, explain, the forms *ikrá* 'spawn' (with probably the same root as in *krýha*), *imjá* 'name' (with optional *j* in *jménija*, and dial *mnja* ~ *mnje* — N Bukovyna, Hucul, Pokuttia a.o.) and *imovǐrnyj* 'likely' (with an optional change *i-* > *j-*).

The alternations *i*: # or *i*: *j* or zero-vowel forms alone are found not only in those words which began in **jǐ-* but also in those which had (*j*)*ǐ-*, notably *itý* ~ *jty* 'walk', *s'káty* 'delouse'⁶ and *i* ~ *j* 'and' (cf. Li *eiti* 'go', *ieškóti* 'seek'; *i* 'and' most likely goes back to IE **ei*); some PN, that were introduced with Christianity also participate in these alternations: *Iván* ~ *Jvan*, *Iváško* ~ *Váško*, hence the family name *Váščenko*,⁷ *Illjá* ~ dial *na Llju* 'at the day of St. Elias' (Drohyčyn).⁸

On the other hand, the presence of stress keeps an *i-* of whatever origin intact and not subject to alternations: *ǐvolha* 'auriole', *ǐho* 'yoke', *ǐhor* PN, *ǐhraška* 'toy', *ǐlem* 'elm', *ǐnšyj* 'other', *ǐnij* ~ *ǐnej* 'hoarfrost', *ǐskra* 'spark', *ǐstyk* 'plow scraper', *ǐstyna* 'truth'. Some of these words are later loans from ChSl (*ǐho*) and possibly P (*ǐstyk*) but not all of them.

Cases of the type *itý* ~ *jty* show that, in losing the vowel of the initial syllable, no distinction was made between *ǐ* and *i*; the lack of the loss of the vowel under stress shows that, at the time when the *jers* had lost their stressability (which preceded the general loss of *jers* by about a century) the vowel in question was not *jer*-like. These observations suggest that the vowel subject to loss in all the cases under examination was not a *ǐ* but an *i* and that the loss of that vowel was not identical with the loss of *jers*.

the mid-11th to the last quarter of the 14th c; Middle Ukrainian (MU), from the end of the 14th to the end of the 18th c; Modern Ukrainian (MoU), since the late 18th c.

⁵ Quoted from B. Hrinčenko, *Slovar ukrajijns'koji movy*, K 1909, s.v.

⁶ The palatalization of *s'* may be due to the transitory presence of *j*: **jskati* > *s'káty*.

⁷ It may also go back to *Vas'ko*: *Vasyl'*.

⁸ F. Klimčuk. „Specifičeskaja leksika drogičinskogo Poles'ja“ in AN SSSR, Institut slavjanovedenija. *Leksika Poles'ja*. M 1968, p. 45.

That conclusion drawn from MoU data is corroborated by OU data. There is not a single record of the loss of that vowel in the initial syllable of the words under consideration at the time of the loss of *jers*, i.e., the mid-12th c.⁹ As a matter of fact, the earliest instances of that kind stem from the late 13th c and become common in the 14th c but even then they concern only two words: *iměti* ~ *měti* and *iz* ~ *z*: (*ne*)*matъ* 1 sg, (*ne*)*mate* 2 pl, *věrou mēte* 'have faith' (Evs 1283); (*ne*)*matъ* (Plkrp 1307); *b(o)žimъ istvorěnyjemъ* 'by God's will', *istalosja* 'take place' neut sg pret (Ch 1370, Lvov—replacing older *sъ* and *s*); *izъ bratomъ* 'with brother', *istalasja torhwoľja* 'trading took place' (Ch 1378, Peremyšl' — replacing older *s*); *o isveršeni* 'on completion' (FIPs 1384); *s toho sela* 'from that village' (Ch 1421, Lvov); *is'vezan* 'tied' (LG 14c); *majet* 3 sg (Ch 1434, Luc'k), etc.¹⁰

The inference from these data is that CS *ĭ* after *j* in the word-initial syllable never changed in PU into *ь* but remained *ĭ*. When quantity was lost in vowels this *ĭ* coalesced with *i*; hence the identity of treatment of both, possible only after the loss of distinction in quantity. The loss of *jers* should not and did not concern this vowel; hence there is no trace of its disappearance in the 12th and most of the 13th c.¹¹

The new development that began at the end of the 13th c was probably triggered by the confusion of two prepositions/prefixes: *sъ* and *izъ*. When *sъ* lost its *ь*, in a position before a (paired) voiced consonant, it was realized as *z*; on the other hand, *izъ* before voiceless consonants was realized as *is*: *z domom* 'with house' — *s selom* 'with village', *iz domu* 'from house' — *is sela* 'from village'. Thus the two prepositions/prefixes became confused and merged into *iz/is* ~ *z/s* grasped as one, and *i-* obtained the status of optionality. Upon that, *i-* was easily assigned the function of a cluster-breaker. In this capacity it was added to some other words which did not have it

⁹ The forms without *i-* before *je* in foreign words (*Jerusalým*, *Jeryxón*, *Jeremĭja*) common in U were used in OCS and ChSl and do not constitute a U change proper. The loss of *i-* in some Christian names (*Sydir* 'Ισίδωρος, *Sákij* 'Ισαάκιος, *Hnat* 'Γνάτιος a.o. Cf. *Lariona* gen — HankM 14c, *Sydorenko* — Reg 1649, Čyhyryn, *Patěja* gen — PAK 1667. Quoted from MS 163v, ČOIDR 1874, 2, p. 3, Modzalevskij 1, 103) probably was U although the possibility, slight as it is, cannot be ruled out that the forms without *i-* may have come from Gr dialects. In either case such forms are of a later date.

¹⁰ H. Holoskevyc̆ in *IsslPRJa* 3, 2 (1914), p. 38; Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 38; Rozov, pp. 18, 25, 92, 128; MS, f. 6; P. Buzuk in *ZbKDIUM*, p. 127.

¹¹ This is also confirmed by geographical considerations. The loss of *jers* was common to all the dialects of OU; but this was not true of the loss of (*j*)*i-* in the word-initial syllable. The Transcarpathian dialects as a rule preserve *i-* in such words as *ihráty* 'play', *is'káty*, *ihlá*, *imát* 3 sg. Cf. I. Paňkevyc̆. *Narys istoriji ukrajins'kyx zakarpats'kyx hovoriv*. Pr 1958, p. 38.

etymologically, notably rather soon, in the 15th c, to the preposition *k* 'to', e.g. *yk* 'semu' 'to this' (Mold 1463), *yk kotorým* (Izm 1496); cf. also *yškody* 'damage' dat sg (Mold 1435), *bez yzradý* 'without treason' (Mold 1462), etc.; in MoU *ik*, *íklo* 'fang', dial *id* 'to' (a blend of *ik* and *do*, cf. *yd žencjum* 'to reapers' — UK 1695,¹² and secondarily *d* : *d mórju* 'to sea' — Stefanyk 1897)¹³, Transc E of the Rika *iždáty* 'wait' (*yždal* masc sg pret — Njag 1758)¹⁴, Donec *ispljar* 'sleep' 3 pl¹⁵ — cf. R *k*, *klyk*, *ždat*, *spjat*, — on the other hand dial (Polissia) *stótny* 'identical' vs. StU *istótnyj* 'essential'.¹⁶ The introduction of *i-* in *išov*, *išlá* 'go' masc and fem pret (previously *švlo*, *šbla*) was favored by its presence in the inf and pres tense (*itý*, *idú*), but essentially it is the same new *i-* as in *ik*, etc. (Prsp 1561 : *yšly*... *narodove* 'people walked'; IV 1600 : *znajšol* 'find' masc sg pret; Smvd 1702 : *žeby yšly* 'so that they walk').¹⁷

From the contextually motivated pairs with no semantic distinction, *z* ~ *iz*, *k* ~ *ik*, *klo* ~ *iklo*, the optionality in the use of the word-initial *i-* spread to words with etymologically justified (*j*)*i-*, whether from CS *ž*, *ī* or *ei*, and to some words of foreign origin, but not to the stressed *i-*. It is likely that in optionally losing their *i-* these words first retained *j*: *itý* ~ *jty* and *ihrá* ~ **jhra* (cf. *na jmja* 'by name' — PAK 1665).^{17a} Whether in a given word *j* before a consonant was retained or lost before modern times depended on the morphemic make-up of the word and contexts in which it was typically used. E.g., in *ity* ~ *jty* the loss of *j* was inadmissible because the word would be reduced to a mere ending; in **jhra* this factor did not preclude the loss of *j* (*hr-* sufficiently represented the root) and, after words ending in a consonant, the cluster C+*jhr-* craved for simplification. The entire

¹² E. Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitor la istoria Românilor* I, 2 (Bucharest 1890), p. 861; II, 2 (1891), pp. 693, 700; O. Trebin, *ZNTK* 7 (1910), p. 14; Ju. Javorskij, *NZb-UžhTPr* 5 (1927), p. 159.

¹³ V. Stefanyk, *Tvory*. Regensburg 1947, p. 10.

¹⁴ *SbORJaS* 97, 1921, p. 6.

¹⁵ Oral information from Dr. D. Ijewliw, from Soncivka (Krasne), rajon Velyka Novosilka, obl. Donec'k.

¹⁶ *Leksika Poles'ja*, p. 91. But MoU *iščé* 'yet' (e.g. *iszczé* — Duma 1651 [ASPb 2, 1876, p. 300], Kotl I, 6 pass.) in alternation with *šče* (replacing OU *ješčé*) may go back to OU *žšče* (e.g. Hyp 1151, 1164, 1169) with the regular change *ž* > *i*. In OU records such forms typically appear after the conjunctions *i*, *ti* and may have resulted from a partial assimilation of the initial (*j*)*e-* to the preceding *i*. However, it cannot be ruled out that *ješčé* could have lost its first syllable by a leveling with other monosyllabic particles (cf. *šče* — PKM 1690 *Storoženki* 6 (1908), p. 63 and subsequently a prothetic *i* was added.

¹⁷ *Trudy* 3 ArxS 2. K 1878, p. 90; Vyšens'kyj, p. 62; Samovydec', p. 8.

^{17a} Modzalevskii 1, p. 39.

development was thus not a universal phonetic law but a contextually spreading analogical process. This accounts for a certain irregularity in its representation in MoU, although the general pattern of the distribution *i-* ~ ~ *j-* ~ # is fairly obvious: only *i-* under stress; typically # in alternation with *i-* before consonantal clusters if not stressed (*Hnat* PN, *hra*, *klo*, *krýha*: *Ihnát*, *ihrá*, *íklo*,¹⁸ *ikrá*); and *j-* in alternation with *i-* (unstressed) before single consonants (*Jvan*, *jménjja*, *jmovtrnyj*, *jnákše* 'otherwise': *Iván*, *iménjja*, *imovtrnyj*, *inákše*). The use of *i-* and # forms is not contextually conditioned; on the contrary, *j-* forms may be used only if the preceding word ends in a vowel and there is no pause in between. On the phonetic level, this vowel in combination with *j* forms a diphthong as, e.g., in *mojé jménjja* 'my name'.

The loss of *i-* in the verb *měti* : *mamě* 'have' is documented as early as *iz* : *z* and even a little earlier. It was, however, a special case both in cause and in treatment. It is first found in Evs 1283 written in Peremyšl' or Xolm, i.e., in the western borderland of the Ukraine. The first charters in which it appears also originated in Peremyšl'. Then it spread eastwards, and, in the 15th c, one also finds such forms in Volhynia and Moldavia (*maly pl pret* — Mold 1454, *majut 3 pl* — Mold 1460)^{18a}. All the early records with these forms contain no other words with *i-* lost. Thus the forms without *i-* in this root must have had a special cause. Most likely they arose in the phrases *ne+imam*, *ne+ima*, etc., which were widely used as negation (MoU *nemá* 'is not') and in which, under the condition of emphasis on *ne*, the following vowel was dropped. A factor favoring this change was that the omission of *i-* introduced an equasyllabicity between the affirmative and the negative forms.¹⁹ The western origin of the forms without *i-* in U makes one suspect a P influence. In P the forms *miec* : *mam* (but only *imac* 'catch') are attested from 1387 on, i.e., a century later than in U (the forms *imiec* : *imam* survived in P — but not in U — well into the 16th c), but this is due to the lack of P records before that time.²⁰ The forms without *i-* could easily have arisen in P much earlier than 1387. However, in Poland the center of irradiation of the *miec*-type forms, as shown by M. Zembaty-Michalakowa,²¹ was Great Poland, while in E Poland (Little Poland and Mazovia) the *imiec* : *imam* forms had not been abandoned even in the 15th c. This fact speaks

¹⁸ Probably the secondary stress taken over from the pl.

^{18a} V. Rusaniv's'kyj, ed. *Ukrajins'ki hramoty XV st.* K 1965, pp. 103, 111.

¹⁹ A parallel development in this verb can be observed in Bg and SC, languages which otherwise preserve the word-initial *i* intact: Bg *imam* 'I have': *njámam* 'I have not'.

²⁰ Polska Akademia Nauk, *Słownik staropolski*, IV, s.v. *miec*.

²¹ M. Zembaty-Michalakowa. „Oboczność *imiec* || *miec* w staropolszczyźnie“. *Język polski*, XXXIX, 5, pp. 339 ff.

for the independent rise of *měti* : *mam* forms in WU; moreover, it is quite possible that in E Poland, which is situated between the two *měti*/*mieć* : *mam* areas, such forms spread not only under Great P but also WU influence.

In records of the 12th to 14th c, cases are numerous in which the negation particle *ne* before *i-* of the next word is spelled as *ně*, e.g., *ně iznesěť sę* 'not to carry out' 3 sg (EPCross 1161), *ně imamъ* 'I do not have' (Dobr 1164), *ně izgnaša* 'banish' 3 pl aor (ApFr 13c), *ně iděte* 'do not go' (Hank 13c), *ně istergněť* 'he will not wrench' (PG 13c), *ně iměti* (PA 1307), *ně i(z)ženou* 1 sg, *něizmolimo* 'implacably' (ESPrm 1325), *ně iščete* 'do not seek' (LG 14c), *ně iščětъ* 3 sg (ByAp 14c), *ně ispravišъ* 'correct' 2 sg (Hyp 1140) and many more.²² Usually such a „new *ě*“ occurs before a syllable with a weak *j*, e.g., *ně zriši* 'see' 2 sg (< *ne zъriši*. HorG 13c).²³ Instances of that type seem to imply that *i-* affected the preceding *e* precisely as *ъ*, i.e., it was, contrary to the statements above, **jъ-*. Such a conclusion, however, would be incorrect. The facts show that the two developments *ne* > *ně*, before a syllable with *i-* and before a syllable with a weak *ъ* were not of the same character. First, U charters of the 14th c, which have many cases of the „new *ě*“ before a lost *ъ* do not have it before *i-*. Secondly, even in those texts which do have the „new *ě*“ in both cases the frequency before *i-* seems to be much lower and diminishing in course of time: Dobr 1164 has 74 × *e* vs. 86 × *ě* before *i-*, GalG 1288 resp. 102 vs. 51, — whereas the curve of the frequency of the „new *ě*“ before the lost *ъ* increases.²⁴ Since the „new *ě*“ was [ě], one may assume that there took place in the mid-12th c a narrowing of the vowel in *ne* before *j-* which, however, did not survive beyond the 14th c, possibly because the *j-* which conditioned this narrowing was lost in the sequence *ji-*; in contrast, the „new *ě*“ from *e* before a lost *ъ* typically (albeit not in the particle *ne*) developed into *i*.

2. Word-medial and word-final sequence *ji*

In the word-medial position (as well as word-finally) after a vowel, *i* (*ji*) was treated as *jъ* should. In the strong position this *ъ* as usual yielded *e*,

²² B. Rybakov. *Russkie datirovannye nadpisi XI—XIV vekov*. M 1964, p. 32; Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 11; N. Volkov in *RFV* 24 (1890), p. 236; MS, 218 v; Kałužniacki 1888, p. 110; I. Pařkevyč in *ZNTŠ*, 123—124 (1917), p. 23; Ja. Hordyn's'kyj in *ZNTŠ* 126—127 (1918), p. 189; Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 42; P. Kopko in *DS* 51 (1912), p. 8.

²³ Ol. Kolessa in *Naukovyj juvilejnyj zbirnyk Ukrajin's'koho universytetu v Prazi, prysojačenyj T. H. Masarykovi*, I. Prague 1925, p. 415.

²⁴ O. Malkova. „K voprosu o vlijanii „nejotirovannyx glasnyx“ na predšestvujuščij *ъ* v predlogax i *e* v otricanii v drevnerusskom jazyke“. AN SSSR, *Russkaja istoričeskaja leksikologija*. M 1968, pp. 134, 136.

in the weak position it was lost: *vъ zajemъ* 'loanwise' (PA 1307, FIPs 1384), *zaemъ* 'borrow' nom sg masc past part (Hyp 1176), (Cf. *vzaemъ* — Litk 1600, *zajemnyk* 'borrower' — Sln 1642, *vzajemne* adv — Hrab 1710), *priemъ* 'accept' nom sg masc past part (Dobr 1164, Hyp 1190) — MoU *vzajémnyj* 'mutual' (*pryjémnyj* 'pleasant' is rather borrowed from P and Cz); *dostojenъ* 'worthy' (Dobr 1164, GalG 1288, PG 13c, Hank 13c, Verk 14c) — MoU *dostójnstvo* 'dignity' is a later borrowing from RChSl or R — cf. *dostoénstvě* loc sg — PB 1623; *naemnikъ* 'hireling' (PG 13c) — MoU dial *najémnyk*; *hnojenъ* 'purulent' (Verk 14c); MoU gen pl of the type *jajéc'* from *jajéc'* 'egg' (Cf. *iaiec* — Lst Luc'k 1552, *jaječok''* — Rad 1676), *vójen* from *vijná* 'war' (cf. *vóen''* — Sak 1622); MoU inst sg forms of the type *hnójem* from *hmij* 'manure' (< **gnoj-ьmъ*, cf. ChSl *gnoimъ* in Usp 12c), etc.²⁵

It is true that in OU texts forms with *i* are not rare in this position, e.g. *vъ zaimъ* (PSin 11c), *naimnikiy* 'hirelings' (Hal 1144, Jur 1128, LvrG 1329), *vodolěicъ* 'water carrier' (Izb 1073), *srebrobiicъ* 'silver chaser' (ApXr 12c) a.o., but these are ChSl. A special case was an interplay of *i* in the word-initial position and *je* word-medially. E. g., in Hyp *imъ věry* 'believing' (1097) vs. *priemъ* (1190) is what one expects; but *primъ* (1185) is a blend of the two and so is *emъ ju za roukou* 'taking her hand' (PG 13c). MoU *vójin* 'warrior' probably is ChSl (Cf. *edinъ otъ voenъ* 'one of warriors' — PG 13c),²⁶ but it may have resulted from grammatical leveling with other words which contained the singulative suffix *-in-* (MoU *-yn-*) as *seljanyn* 'peasant'.

In the word-final position, *-i* after *j* was also treated as expected, i.e., as weak and to be lost, e.g., in 2 sg imp (**stojъ* — MoU *stij* 'stand'), nom sg masc of the pronominalized adj (**zvolъjъ* — MoU *zlyj* 'evil'), dat — loc sg fem (**zloji* — MoU *zlij*), but not in the nom pl masc: from **zlijji* we would expect **zlyj*, but in fact the old form is represented by **zlijji*, later **zlyjy* (MoU *zli* results from a later development). Obviously, as in subst and pron, that form was influenced by the acc pl (*zlyjě*) and the nom pl masc **ji* from **ji* 'he' which, being monosyllabic, was to preserve its vowel.

²⁵ I. Paňkevyč in *ZNTŠ*, 123—124 (1917), p. 22; MS, 48; A. Gruzinskij in *ČONL*, 22 (1911), p. 23; OI. Horbač, *Peršyj rukopysnyj ukrajins'ko-latyns'kyj slovnyk Arsenija Korec'koho-Satanovs'koho ta Jepifanija Slavynec'koho*. Rome 1968, p. 69; Hr. Hrabjanka, *Děstvyja prezěl'noy... brany Bohdana Xmel'nyckoho*. K 1854, p. 10; Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, pp. 6, 12; Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 39; Kaľužniacki 1888, p. 3; MS, 272 v; A. Nikol'skij in *RFV*, 32 (1894), p. 287; Titov, pp. 82, 46; *AJuZR* vi, 1 (1887), p. 180; V. Šimanovskij, *Očerki po istorii russkix narečij*, W 1893, p. 21; *Uspenskij sbornik*, p. 162.

²⁶ *Sinajskij paterik*, p. 300; Voskresenskij, p. 100; MS, p. 234; *Izbornik... 1073 g.*, p. 251; Kaľužniacki 1896, p. 46; Kaľužniacki 1888, p. 101, 210.

In summary, since the word-medial and word-final sequence *ji*, contrary to the word-initial one, did participate in the loss of *jers* and as a rule was treated as *j̣*, one can assume that this *ji* had changed into *j̣*. The reason for such a development should have been morphological. Except in the root **j̣m-* (*im-*) after a prefix, this sound sequence appeared on morphemic boundaries, in the same positions and with the same functions as C (other than *j*)+*̣*, cf., e.g. **gnoj-in-̣* and *grud-yn-̣* 'bumpy', **gnoj-i* and *kon'-̣*. The articulatory difference between the two allomorphs was minimal. When the two allomorphs merged in the formula C (including *j*)+*̣*, this in turn was transferred to what was virtually the only root involved, where the change was supported by the morphological pattern, in 3rd-class verbs, of alternating *ɛ* (later 'a) with *̣*: *žati* : *ẓ̌ṇju*, *tjati* : *ṭnu*, etc. and accordingly, *jati* : **j̣̣nu*. Similarly, when allomorphic endings *-ji* were reshaped into *-j̣*, this was generalized for all word-final *ji* sequences so that, e.g., the gen pl of the type **nočiji* (when *-i/-̣* did not occur after consonants other than *j*) was transformed into **nočij̣* (or *nočj̣* — see below, section 4).

The preceding discussion may thus be paraphrased as follows: word-initial *ji* did not change into *j̣* and consequently did not participate in the loss of *jers*; word-internal and word-final *ji* secondarily changed into *j̣* and consequently did participate in the loss of *jers* without any peculiarities of its own.

The above applies only to *i* after *j*. Attempts to explain the loss of word-final *i* in 2 sg pres, 2 sg imp (after other consonants than *j*), inf a.o. as other manifestations of the same alleged phonetic law (Šaxmatov²⁷) have failed for good reason. These phenomena belonged mostly to an other time and certainly had different causes.

3. The sequence *yj*

In this sequence, *y* was never identified with *̣* either phonetically (the only such spelling in OU known to me is *uṃj̣o* 'wash' 1 sg in Jur 1128,²⁸ probably a scribal error or a R feature) or in the double treatment according to the position, weak or strong. In other words, the loss of *jers* did not affect *y*: it has been preserved in all positions, e.g. *myj* 'wash' 2 sg imp and *mỵju* 1 sg pres and correspondingly *ryj* 'dig' and *rỵju*, *vyj* 'howl' and *vỵju*, *nyj*

²⁷ *Očerk drevnejšego perioda*, p. 222 f.

²⁸ As cited by Šaxmatov, *Očerk drevnejšego perioda*, p. 226.

'ache' and *nyju* and also *stryj* 'uncle': *stryjá* gen sg (Hyp 1093: *stryja*), *potyjji* 'slops', *kyj* 'stick': *kyjá* gen sg, *Kyjiv* 'Kiev'; OU also *syj* 'being' (Izb 1076 a.o.; cf. in MJ 1641: *ofiy: qui est*).²⁹

4. The sequence *ij*

This sequence was treated strikingly differently from the sequence *yj*. In the weak position, as a rule, *i* in this sequence was treated as *ь*, i.e. it was lost. The roots involved are MoU *byj* 'strike' 2 sg imp: *bju* 1 sg pres, *pyj* 'drink': *pju* (and *pjányj* 'drunk', *pjávka* 'leech'³⁰), *vyj* 'wind': *vju* and *lyj* 'pour': *lju*. The forms *sjáaty* 'shine' and *zjáaty* 'yawn' are secondary and are based on *sjáty*, still in use, and *zjáty* (dial), which go back to OU *sijati*, *zijati* (*svjaxu* 3 pl impf — Hyp 1074, *zvjanija* 'yawning' — Usp 12c; cf. *vzljva* 'pour' 3 sg aor — Arx 1092³¹). Forms with a vowel in the weak position are found in two or three of these roots in OU (e.g. *vzljva* 3 sg aor — Arx 1092, possibly *vosbe* — HankM 14c) and MU (e.g. *vyju* 'wind' 1 sg — IUŽ 1643; *věnc*''...*vyje* 'weaves garland' — Onuf 1699; *yzlyetsja* — Hust 1670³²), but the OU spellings are inconclusive because of the optionality of spelling *i* vs. *ь* before *j* in OCS, and the examples in MU are too sporadic to reverse the above rule.

A suffix was involved in this treatment, notably *-ij-* as in *solověj* 'nightingale': *solovjá* gen sg < **soloviji* : *solovija*, dial also *voroběj*: 'sparrow': *vorobjá*³³ and in numerous subst neut usually denoting collectivity or action in its result.³⁴ In the strong position, this suffix was reflected after the loss of *jers* as *ij*, e.g. *kopiinyj* 'of spears' (Hyp 1174), *žitiisko* 'concerning life' (e.g. *žitiiskaja* fem ApXr 13c, FIPs 1384 a.o.³⁵ MoU *žytějs'kyj* is a loan word from R or RChSl). In the weak position, the spelling of this suffix in eccle-

²⁹ *Izbornik 1076 g.*, f. 557; M. Karaś, A. Karasiowa, *Mariana z Jaślisk dykcjonarz słowiańsko-polski z roku 1641*, Wr 1969, p. 78.

³⁰ *Pyjátka* 'carousel' (Cf. *pěťtýky* — Gal 1663, p. 14) is borrowed from P where it was a humorous P-La blend; *propyjáka* 'drunkard' is a recent derivation from *propýty* 'squander in drink'.

³¹ *Uspenskij sbornik*, p. 147; *Arx. Ev.*, f. 92v.

³² *Arx. Ev.*, f. 92v; MS, f. 165v; *Hramatyka slovjans'ka I. Uževyča* (ed. I. Bilodid, Je. Kudryc'kyj). K 1970, p. 33; V. Peretc in *SbORJaS* 101 (1926), p. 143; *PSRL* 2 (1843), p. 363.

³³ For *e* instead of the expected *y*, see below, at the end of section 4.

³⁴ Identical rules apply to the instr sg of subst fem in a consonant, originally *i*-stems as *noč*: *nočju*, MoU *níčju*.

³⁵ *Kałužniacki* 1896, p. 144. MS, f. 125 *pass*.

siastic texts before the loss of *fers* is irrelevant, again because of its optionality (*i* or *ь*) in OCS and OU; domestically originated texts of the time decisively show a preference for *i* spellings, e.g. *knęženije* 'reign', *poljudije* 'a tax' (Ch 1130),³⁶ also in the domestic parts of Usp 12c. The situation strikingly changed with the loss of *fers*: the traditional *-ije* forms did not disappear entirely but many texts have, alongside with them, numerous forms in *-yje* (e.g. Hank 13c, Mold 14c) and others give clear or absolute preference to *-yje* forms (e.g. Dobr 1164, Evs 1283, RK 1284, GalG 1288, PG 13c, ŽSO 13c, PA 1307, ESPrm 1325, LG 14c, BybAp 14c, Hyp a.o.). According to Kuraszkievicz, charters dating from approximately 1350—1459 (some of which are Br) have *ь* 341 ×, *i* 96 ×.³⁷ Texts such as Vyg 12c with a predominance of *-ije* forms³⁸ became the exception. The spellings with *ь* after the loss of *fers* of course do not render a vowel but the absence of one; they also shed light on the preceding epoch by indicating that the spellings both *-yje* and *-ije* rendered either *ь* or a front vowel subject to the same treatment as *ь*. Furthermore, the entire phonetic evolution of such forms in the centuries to come proves the same thing: the appearance of the „new *ě*“ in the preceding syllable (e.g. *kaměnyje* 'rocks' — PA 1307) and the lengthening of consonants (MoU *kaměnnija*) may be explained only by the loss of the vowel before the ending.

Thus *i* (but not *y*) in the weak position before *j* was consistently lost in both roots and suffixes, except in the following words: *šyj* 'sew' 2 sg imp: *šýju* 1 sg pres, *čyj* 'whose': *čyjá* fem, *šýja* 'neck', *prýjatel'* 'friend', *zmijá* 'snake' — OU *zmija* (Izb 1076) ~ *zmyja* (Dobr 1164)^{38a}. In *prýjatel'*, the vowel is retained because of a secondary association with the prefix *pry-* (which etymologically it was not: the word is a CS borrowing from OHG *friudil* or akin to it) and in *zmijá*, *i* can be derived only from *ě*, which speaks for a suffix substitution (cf. such words as *tečijá* 'current', *pečijá* 'heartburn'). This leaves us with three words, *šýju*, *šýja*, and *čyjá* all whether by accident or not beginning with a postdental.

The reason for the different treatments of *y* and *i* before *j*, *y* contrary to *i* not identified with a *jer*, may be sought in the fact that articulatorily the distance between *i* and *ь* was smaller than between *y* and *ь*, the latter comprising a labial articulation (rounding) directly opposed to that of *y* (unrounding).

³⁶ G. Y. Shevelov, F. Holling. *A Reader in the History of the Eastern Slavic Languages*. NY 1958, p. 2.

³⁷ W. Kuraszkievicz. *Gramoty halicko-wołyńskie XIV—XV wieku*. Kr 1934, p. 31 f.

³⁸ T. Sudnik in *UZISl* 27 (1963), p. 201.

^{38a} *Izbornik 1076*, f. 226v; Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 6.

There was, however, no phonetic coalescence of *i* and *ь* before *j*, they came together only in conditions under which the two vowels were lost or preserved. This follows from the fact that strong *i* was reflected as *i*, unlike *ь*, which yielded *e* (in the later development of U every *i* changed to *y*, so that in MoU that *i*, too, is represented as *y*). There are two deviations in the reflex of the strong *i*, in an ending and in a suffix, where MoU has *e*. The two cases in question are the ending of the gen pl of the original *i* stems and the suffix *-ьj(ь)*. The two cases are well known, have been discussed many times, and may, thus, be treated here only briefly.

In the gen pl the expected reflex of **-iji*, i.e., *-yj* is found in quite a few dialects, especially SW (roughly Pinsk — W of Rivne — N of Ternopil' — N of Xmel'nyc'kyj — SW of Berdyčiv — E of Vinnycja — across Hajsyn — W of Pervomaj's'k) but also in enclaves around Xvastiv, at the Lower Prypjat', around Kaniv, around Poltava and in S Voronež obl.³⁹ But, in the remaining and greater number of dialects and in MoStU, only the ending *-ej* is used: *noč'ej* 'night', *host'ej* 'visitor'. This ending can go back to *-ьj* only. It is generally assumed that still in PU period or in any case before the loss of *jers* in many dialects *ь* was introduced in that case form as a replacement for *ї*. This *ь* was represented in oblique cases of pl in fem and masc *i*-stems: dat pl *gost'ьmъ, noč'ьmъ*, inst pl *gost'ьmi, noč'ьmi*, loc pl *gost'ьxъ, noč'ьxъ*. Once transferred into the gen pl, the *ь* (*gost'ьjъ, noč'ьjъ*) followed the same development as *ь* in the dat and loc pl: it was reflected as *e* after the loss of *jers*. An additional factor, of later date, which contributed to the spread of *-ej* was probably a metanalysis of the form of the gen pl in subst in *-ija*, of the type *svin'ija* 'pig', *sud'ija* 'judge'. After the loss of *jers* they ended in the gen pl in *-ij*, a zero ending with the fugitive vowel *i* (later *y*); because the typical fugitive vowel was *e*, the latter was substituted for *i*; due to a metanalysis the final sequence *-ej* after the loss of *j* in the stem of such words (MoU [svyn'á], [sud'á]) was assigned the function of an ending. Of the competing endings, *-yj* (*noč'ьj*) and *-ej* (*svyn'ej*), some dialects gave preference to one, some to the other.

In the suffix *-ij(ь)*, *e* before *j* appears against the general rule in the nom sg of the word *solov'ej* : *solov'já*, dialectally also in *horob'ej* ~ *vereb'ej* ~ *vorob'ej* (NKiev, Černihiv, Sumy, Rivne, Kobryn). Both words display a variety of suffixes in Sl: P *slowik*, *wróbel*, Sk *slávik*, *vrabec*, SC *slávŭj*, *vrabac*, Bg *slávej* (< *-ěj-*), *vrabéc*. Within U, the suffix *-ěj(ь)* was introduced

³⁹ See maps in AN UkRSR, *Seredn'onaddniprjans'ki hovory*, K 1960, p. 160; F. Žylko, *Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy*, K 1966, p. 250 (less detailed), and AN UkRSR, *Praci XII respublikans'koji dialektolohičnoji narady*, K 1971, pp. 208, 210.

in the SW dialects (*solovij* : *solovija*), whereas the expected form ⁺*solovyj* : ⁺*solov(y)ja* is not represented either in OU (except in a ChSl form *slavij*) or in MoU.⁴⁰ This form was inconvenient because in the nom sg it did not differ externally from a pronominalized adj. To avoid this, in most Sl languages and in some of the U dialects a different suffix was introduced, as shown above. In other U dialects (as well as in Br) the change was limited to a substitution of *e* for *y*. This was possible because in oblique cases the vowel of the nom sg (OU **solovij*) alternated with # (see above) and, in nominal suffixes, the typical alternants of # were *e* or *o* but not *i* (> *y*).

5. The new sequence *ɔ+j*

The sequence *ɔ+j* within morphemes was absent from OU because *ɔ* had never developed from *ǔ* before *j* in PU. But, on morphemic boundaries, such a sequence was constantly regenerated in word derivation and in syntactic groups. Here three main cases come into consideration.

a) Pronominalized forms of the adj. Most nominal adj ended in the nom sg masc (and gen pl) in *-ǔ* > *-ɔ*. Their pronominalization by adding the pron **ji* falls chiefly into the late CS period, which is not documented in records, making it impossible to establish documentally which came first: the change *ǔ* > *y* or the formation of the pronominalized adj. StU and all dialects point to the second alternative: **dobrǔ+jǐ* > *dóbryj*.

This development of the masc sg in adj was followed by the demonstrative pron *tɔ* 'that', although this was pronominalized later, in OU or PU. In this pron, *ɔ* changed into *y* before **ji*. (It is of course possible that this was not a regular phonetic change but patterned on the adj). The ensuing form *tyj* is found in numerous texts, e.g., Ch 1352 (Vollhynian?), Hyp (1152, 1158, 1197, 1261), Veik 14c, Moh 1635, PAK 1668, PKM 1690 a.o.⁴¹ The texts in question originate from all major areas of the Ukraine. In MoU, the form *tyj* possibly survives in *tyžden* 'week' < *tyj-že-den*' (patterned on

⁴⁰ *Solovyj* in PB 1627 (*Leksykon slovenoros'kyj Pamvy Beryndy*, ed. V. Nimčuk, K 1961), p. 115 is ambiguous. It also can be read *solovij*, i.e. going back to **solověi*. According to Pšeničnova 53 *solovyj* is found in „several settlements“ in obl. Sumy, Černihiv and Rivne.

⁴¹ Rozov, p. 5; A. Nikol'skij in *RFV*, 32 (1894), p. 288; *AJuZR*, I, 7 (K 1887), p. 60; Modzalevskij, 1, p. 136; *Storoženki*, 6, p. 59.

P *tydzien*), otherwise *toj* is used, a product of the secondary pronominalization, after the loss of *jers*: *tъ* > *to* and then *to+j* > *toj* (a parallel to SC *tâj*).^{41a}

b) In syntactic contexts, the sequences *-ъ+j-* were potentially arising in virtually every speech utterance. It cannot be established if the sequences *-ъ+j-* were inadmissible, but it is certain that in numerous cases *ъ* was realized in them as *y*. Spellings of that kind abound in OU records and constitute one of their distinctive marks, being much less frequent in OCS and rather exceptional in OR texts:⁴² *отъ плодовъ* (= *plodovъ* gen pl) *ихъ* 'of their fruit', *vy imę* (= *vъ imę*) 'in name' (Izb 1073), *prijaty i* 'he accepted him', *vy istinou* 'in truth' (Arx 1092), etc.⁴³ In cases where the sequence *-ъ+j-* is rendered intact in OU records there is no way to say whether this was merely a traditional (and morphophonemic) spelling or whether there were actual fluctuations and optionality in the language. Orthographically, the choice of *-ъ* or *-y* was clearly optional and apparently arbitrary. In any event, the adequacy of the *-y* < *-ъ* spellings is established by the fact that they continue well after the loss of weak *jers*. If these letters rendered *-ъ*, it would have been lost; it should have been *y* that was retained in the weak position.⁴⁴

The decline of such sandhī forms probably began in the late 13th c. From that time on, one finds before (*j*)*i-* prepositions in *-o* spreading alongside those in *-y*: *ko Is(us)ou* 'to Jesus' (GalG 1288), *vo isxodъ* 'on way out' (PA 1307), *izo istlěnye* 'from rotting' (HankM 14c), *oto izbiščnogo* 'from household tax' (Ch after 1349), etc.⁴⁵ The forms in *-o* that arose before a weak *jer* not preceded by *j* were now transferred into the position before *j-*: the motivation for the distinction of the two cases obviously was lost.

^{41a} According to Pšeničnova 50 *tyj* is „encountered“ in „separate places“ in obl Kharkov. (Where?)

⁴² Šaxmatov, „Beiträge zur russischen Grammatik“, *ASPh* 7, 1884, p. 73 ff, considered this phenomenon so typical of OU that he suggested assigning texts to OU (in his terminology of the time, SR) on the basis of this feature alone.

⁴³ *Izbornik... 1073*, ff. 117b, 246; *Arx. Ev.*, ff. 126, 1v.

⁴⁴ Because the actual pronunciation tended to be *y*, for the sophisticated contemporaries it may have become fashionable to write *ъ* where *y* was pronounced. This is in all likelihood what caused the choice of *ъ* in the inscription *Ana rsina* on the French royal charter of 1063 (M. Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er} roi de France*. Chartes et diplomes relatifs à l'histoire de France, I. P 1908, p. 47). We cannot consider here the more than half a century of debate on this „signature“. It suffices to say that this *jer* before *j* is not a true *jer* and is therefore worthless for restoring the sound value of that vowel.

⁴⁵ Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 41; I. Pañkevych in *ZNTŠ* 123—124 (1917), p. 13; MS, f 41v; Rozov, p. 3.

c) Prefixes in *-z* before roots in *j-* were subject to the general rule of the replacement of *z* by *y*; but those prefixes in other contexts appeared, with high frequency, ending in *-z*. Hence, with a tendency to generalize one form, a conflict arose between the two treatments. However, the phonetic innovation obviously dominated, to judge by the fact that *y* forms were virtually generalized and prevailed through the entire MU period; they still survive in many dialects, especially NU, Sjan, Lemk and Transc NW of Mukačeve (If a dialect has different reflexes of OU *i* and *y*, it is always that of *y* which is used, e.g. Lemk *odýjti* 'go away', *rozýbrati* 'take asunder'). Moreover from the prefixes which ended in *-z* (*sž, podž, nadž, peredž*), *y* spread to those which had *-z* optionally (*ot ~ otž*), those which did not have it at all (*vžž, rozž, bezž, izž*) and finally it was transferred even into words whose roots did not begin in *j*. It is only in MoU that forms in *-i* (from *o*) and more rarely *-o* were introduced into the above-mentioned types of words to replace the *-y-* forms.

Thus one can speak of three periods in the history of prefixes ending in a consonant (originally with or without a *jer*). In OU, even prefixes ending in *-z* and followed by *j-* usually were not allowed — at least in writing — to change this *z* into *y*; other prefixes did not bring about any changes in the root nor did they themselves change before a vowel (1). In MU, *y* was generalized as a link between the prefix and the root beginning in *j* or in a consonantal cluster, forms in *-o* being used only marginally (2). In MoU *i* and partly *o* was substituted for MU *y* (3).

In tabular form (arrows indicate the scope and the direction of generalizations):

	<i>-z</i> or C+(<i>j</i>) <i>i-</i>	<i>-z</i> or C+syl- lable with weak <i>jer</i>	<i>-z</i> or C in any other configu- ration	<i>-o</i> +(<i>j</i>) <i>i</i> or syl- lable with weak <i>jer</i> or <i>i</i>	<i>-o</i> in any other confi- guration
OU	<i>sž + iti</i>	<i>sž + ržvati</i>	<i>sž + biti</i>	<i>po + iti</i>	<i>po + biti</i>
	<i>roz + iti(sž)</i>	<i>roz + ržvati</i>	<i>roz + kazati</i>	<i>po + ržvati</i>	
MU	<i>zy(j)ty</i>	<i>zyrvaty</i>	<i>zbyty</i>	<i>pujty</i>	<i>pobyty</i>
	<i>rozy(j)ty(sja)</i>	<i>rozyrvaty</i>	<i>rozkazaty</i>	<i>purvaty</i>	
Late MU	<i>zijty</i>	<i>zirvaty</i>	<i>zbýty</i>	<i>pitý</i>	<i>pobýty</i>
and MoU	<i>rozijty(sja)</i>	<i>rozirvaty</i>	<i>rozkazaty</i>	<i>pirvaty</i>	

The problem of prefixes is however a special topic to be treated elsewhere. It has been studied by Hancov and Andersen⁴⁶ but many details still await clarification and some aspects of the views expressed need revision.

6. The new sequence $\text{ь}+j$.

Like $\text{ь}+j$, the sequence $\text{ь}+j$ was constantly regenerated on morpheme and word boundaries. The three cases discussed in section 5 for $\text{ь}+j$ apply here as well, but in a different scope.

a) In the pronominalized adj, the same rules operated as in relation to ь , but the number of adj involved was much smaller. Thus a MoU adj of the „soft“ type, say, *večernij* 'evening' may come either from PU **večer-in'č+jī* or from **večer-ь'ь+jī* to become **večer-ь'ījī* (the first alternative is the more likely).

Later, in the OU period, a similar development affected the demonstrative pron *sb*, in pronominalization **sb+jī*. The ensuing form *sij* (later *syj*) is broadly represented in MU texts, though in competition with *sej* and *ses'* e.g., in SES 1284, Halyč charters 1409, 1418 and 1424, Hyp (1037), Verk m14c, PeretcG ca 1500, MoldG 1502, MichG 1526, ZahorivG 1563, DG 1585, JazIG 116c, Kop 1624 (*sěj zákon* 'this law'), KTriod 1627, PerProl 1632, Marg Xust NW 1645, PAK (1664, 1678), KZ 1690, UžhMen 17c, UK 1695, PKM 1740 a.o.⁴⁷, thus representing all regions except NU, albeit at present this form survives in WPolissia.

b) Under *sandhī* conditions, word-final -ь before j - changed into i either regularly or optionally. Spellings with i in OU records are plentiful, but the traditional ь spellings are frequent, too. The high number of -i from -ь before j is an earmark of OU texts. The situation and the time-range do not differ from that with -y from -ь in the same environment (see section 5b).

⁴⁶ V. Hancov. „Do istoriji zvukiv v ukrajins'kij movi. 1. Ukr. *zity, pidijmaty, rozirvaty*“. *ZIFV* 7—8, 1926; H. Andersen. „A Study in Diachronic Morphophonemics: The Ukrainian Prefixes“. *Language* 45, 4, 1969.

⁴⁷ Sobolevskij, *Očerki*, p. 50; Rozov, pp. 74, 89, 106; A. Nikol'skij in *RFV* 32, 1894, p. 288; V. Peretc in *ZNTŠ* 93 (1910), p. 28; G. Voskresenskij in *SbORJaS* 31 (1883), p. 31; G. Kryžanovskij 1889, p. 171; *Trudy 9 ArxS*, Vil'na (1893), II, M 1897, p. 279; I. Svjencik'kyj in *Ukrajins'ko-rus'kyj arxiv*, VII. Lv 1911, p. 13; G. Kryžanovskij in *Volynskij istoriko-arxeologičeskij sbornik* 1. Žytomyr 1896, p. 48; Titov, p. 96; V. Peretc in *SbpRJaS* I, 3, 1929, p. 27; I. Franko, *Apokryfy i legendy z ukrajins'kyx rukopysiv*, III (NTŠ, Pamjatky ukrajins'ko-rus'koji movy i literatury, III), Lv 1902, p. 10; I. Paňkevč in *NZbUžhTPr* I, 1929, p. 159; Modzalevskij I, p. 13 and III, 98; Klymentij Zinovijiv. *Virši. Prypovisti pospolyti*. K 1971, p. 84; Ju. Javorskij. *Novye rukopisnye nazodki v oblasti starinnoj karpatorusskoj pis'mennosti*. Pr 1931, p. 115; *Storoženki* I, K 1902, p. 36.

Almost all examples involve verbal forms of 3 sg or pl: *o(tb)cb moi vьzljubiti i* 'my father shall love him', *pravьda... izbaviti i* 'truth will salvage him' (Izb 1073); *ousěknuti ja* 'they will behead them' (PC ml lc); *počsteti i* 'honors him' (Mst 1117); *molěxouti i* 'they besought him' (Hal 1144); *znajuti i* 'they know him' (BCV 12c) a.o. ⁴⁸

Such forms were no longer used by the end of the 14th c, except probably as a mannerism. This explains their absence from 14th c charters.

c) Prefixes and prepositions did not end in *-b*, except *obь* 'about', an alternate form to *o ~ ob*. Its very existence in OU is dubious. Possibly *obi-imaše* 'embrace' 3 sg impf (Vyg 12c)⁴⁹ reflects such a form with the expected change *ь > i*.

★

The findings of this study may be summarized, for OU, as follows:

1. *y* did not participate in the loss of *jers*;
2. word-initial *i* (*ji*) did not participate in the loss of *jers*;
3. word-medial and word-final *i* preceded by *j* was identified with and treated as *ь*, i.e., it yielded *e* in a strong position and *ɨ* in a weak position.
4. *i* followed by *j* participated in the loss of *jers* but was not identified with *ь*. In a weak position, it yielded *ɨ*, in a strong position, its reflex was *i* (MoU *y*).

Septembar 1975.
Columbia University

George Y. Shevelov

Abbreviations in the titles of the sources used

- ApFr — Fragment of *Apostol* (Acts and Epistles)
 ApXr — *Apostol* (Acts and Epistles) of Xrystynopii'
 Arx — The Gospel of Archangel
 BGV — *Besědy Grigorija Velikago* (Commentaries on the Gospel by Gregory the Great)
 BybAp — *Apostol* of Byblo
 Ch — charter
 DG — Didactic Gospel (*Jevanhelyje učytel'noje*)

⁴⁸ *Izbornik... 1073*, ff. 27v, 36; *ASPh* 6, 1882, p. 231; E. Karskij. *Trudy po be-lorusskomu i drugim slavjanskim jazykam*. M 1962, p. 17; V. Jagić in *SbORJaS* 33 (1884), 2, p. 95; P. Kopko. *Issledovanie o jazyke „Besed na Evangelija“*. Lv 1909, p. 44.

⁴⁹ T. Sudnik in *UZISl* 27 (1963), p. 193.

- Dobr — Dobrilo's Gospel
 Duma — Duma kozackaia o woyni s kozakamy nad rikoiu Styru
 EPCross — Cross of Princess Euphrosyne of Polock, inscription. Manufactured presumably in Kiev.
 ESPrm — Fragments of sermons by St. Ephraem the Syriac in a copy made possibly in Peremyšl'
 Evs — The Gospel written by the priest's son Evsevij
 FIPs — The Psalter preserved in Florence, Italy
 Gal — *Ključ razuměnija* by Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj
 GalG — The Gospel written in Galicia in 1266—1304, probably 1288
 Hal — The Gospel of Halyč
 Hank — Codex of von Hankenstein; HankM — text written in the 14th c on margins of Hank
 HorG — The Gospel from Horodyšče
 Hrab — *Děstvyja... brany Bohdana Xmel'nyc'koho* by Hryhorij Hrabjanka
 Hust — Chronicle of the Hustyn monastery
 Hyp — Chronicle in the Hypatian recension (quoted by year entries)
 IUŽ — *Hramatyka slovenskaja* by Ivan Uževyč
 IV — *Knyžka*, a collection of works by Ivan Vyšens'kyj
 Izb 1073 — Prince Svjatoslav Izbornik
 Izb 1076 — Anthology (*Izbornik*) of 1076
 Izm — *Izmarahd*, anthology copied between 1462 and 1496
 JazlG — The didactic Gospel of Jazlovec'
 JurG — The Gospel commissioned by the St. George (Jurij) Monastery of Novgorod
 Kop — Theological writings of Z. Kopystens'kyj
 Kotl — „Enejida“ by Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj (quoted with reference to chapter and stanza)
 KTriod — *Triodion* published in Kiev
 KZ — Poems by Klymentij Zinovijiv
 LG — The Gospel of Luc'k
 Litk — The Gospel of Litky
 Lst — Lustracija (census) of castles in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania
 LvrG — The Gospel of the Lavryševo Monastery written before 1329
 Marg — *Pokrajni zapysy* (records on margins of church books)
 MichG — The Gospel of the St. Michael Monastery in Kiev
 MJ — Dictionarium Sclauo-Polonicum by Marian from Jašliska
 Moh — Diary (tales of miracles and notes) by Metroplitan Petro Mohyla
 Mold — Moldavian charters
 Mst — The Gospel of Prince Mstislav, before 1117
 Njag — Sermons from Njagiv
 Onuf — Poems by Archimandrite Onufrij of Kharkov
 PA — Pandects of Antiochus
 PAK — Municipal (court) books of Poltava
 PB — Pamva Berynda's poems (1623) and *Leksykon Sloveno-rosskyj* (1627)
 PC — Passio S. Condrati
 PeretcG — The Gospel described by V. Peretc, ca 1510
 PerProh — *Proloh* from Peremyšl'
 PG — The Gospel of Putna (Bukovyna)

- PKM — Municipal books of Pyrvatyn
 Plkrp — The Polikarp Gospel
 Prsp — The Gospel of Peresopnycja (Volhynia)
 PSin — Patericon Sinaiticum
 Rad — Sermons of Ant. Radyvylovs'kyj
 Reg — Register of Cossacks after the Treaty of Zboriv
 RK — *Kormčaja* (Nomocanon) of Rjazan' (copied from Kievan original)
 Sak — *Věršě na žalosnyj pohreb zacnoho rjčera Petra Konaševyča Sahajdačnoho*
 by K. Sakovyč and assistants
 SES — *Slova* (sermons) by Ephraem Syriac
 Sln — *Leksykon slovenolatynskij* by A. Korec'kyj-Satanovs'kyj and Je. Slavynec'kyj
 Smvd — Chronicle by Samovydec'
 UK — *Ključ*, anthology from the Uglja Monastery (Transcarpathia)
 Usp — Uspenskij sbornik
 Verk — Verkovič's Gospel
 ZahorivG — The Gospel of Zahoriv (Volhynia)
 ŽSO — *Žitije Savy Osvjaščenago* (The Life of St. Sava)

Abbreviations used in the bibliography

- AJuZR — *Arxiv Jugo-zapadnoj Rossii*. Kiev.
 Arx. Ev. — *Arxangel'skoe Evangelie 1092 g.* M 1912
 ASPh — *Archiv für slavische Philologie*. Berlin.
 ČOISR — *Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix*. Moscow.
 ČONL — *Čtenija v Istoričeskom obščestve Nestora Letopisca*. Kiev.
 DS — *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen (Österreichischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Vienna.
 IsslRJa — (Russian Academy of Sciences). *Issledovanija po ruskomu jazyku*. SPb.
Izbornik... 1073 g. — *Izbornik velikogo knjazja Svjatoslava Jaroslaviča 1073 goda*. SPb 1880 (reprinted Wiesbaden 1965).
Izbornik 1076 g. — V. Golyšenko, V. Dubrovina, V. Dem'janov, G. Nefedov. *Izbornik 1076 goda*. Moscow 1965.
 Kalužniacki 1888 — Ae. Kalužniacki. *Monumenta linguae paleoslovenicae collecta et in lucem edita*. Vienna 1888.
 Kalužniacki 1896 — Ae. Kalužniacki. *Actus epistolaeque apostolorum paleoslovenice, ad fidem codices Christinopolitani saeculo xii scripti*. Vienna 1896.
 Kryžanovskij — G. Kryžanovskij. *Rukopisnye evangeliija kievskix knigoxranilišč*. Kiev 1889.
 Modzalevskij — V. Modzalevskij ed. *Aktovye knigi Poltavskogo gorodovogo urjada*, 1 — 3. Černihiv 1912—1914.
 MS — manuscript. The following manuscripts have been used: FIPs — The Psalter of Florence, Italy (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Courtesy of Professor Carlo Verdiani); Hank — Codex of von Hankenstein (Nationalbibliothek, Vienna); LavrG — the Gospel of Lavryševo monastery (Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Warsaw).
 NZbUžhTPr — *Naukovyj zbirnyk Užhorods'koho tovarystva Prosvita*. Užhorod.
 PSRL — *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*. SPb and Moscow.
 RFV — *Russkij filologičeskij vestnik*. Warsaw and Kazan'.
 Rozov — V. Rozov. *Ukrajins'ki hramoty*. Kiev 1928.

- Samovydec' — Or. Levickij ed. *Letopis' Samovidca po novootkrytim spisкам*. Kiev 1878.
- SbORJaS, SbpRJaS* — (Russian Academy of Sciences). *Sbornik Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti*, later *Sbornik po ruskomu jazyku i slovesnosti*. SPb.
- Sinajskij paterik* — V. Golyšenko, V. Dubrovina. *Sinajskij paterik*. Moscow 1967.
- Sobolevskij, *Očerki* — A. Sobolevskij. *Očerki iz istorii ruskogo jazyka*. Kiev 1884. (Two paginations).
- Storoženki* — *Storoženki. Famil'nyj arxiv*, vols., 1 and 6. Kiev 1902, 1908.
- Titov — X. Titov. *Materialy dlja istoriji knyžnoj sprav na Vkraini v XVI—XVIII vv.* Kiev 1924.
- Trudy ArxS* — *Trudy... arxeologičeskogo s'esda*.
- Uspenskij sbornik* — S. Kotkov ed. *Uspenskij sbornik XII—XIII vv.* Moscow 1971.
- UZISI* — *Učenyje zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija*. Moscow.
- Voskresenskij — G. Voskresenskij. *Drevne-slavjanskoe evangelie. Evangelie ot Marka*. Sergiev Posad 1894.
- Vyšens'kyj — Ivan Vyšens'kyj. *Tvory*. Kiev 1959.
- ZIFV* — (Ukrainian Academy of Sciences). *Zapysky Istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddivu*. Kiev.
- ZNTK* — *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva v Kyjevi*. Kiev.
- ZNTŠ* — *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. T. Ševčenka*. Lvov.

Резиме

George Y. Shevelov

О ПРОБЛЕМУ УЧЕШЋА У И I У ГУБЉЕЊУ ПОЛУГЛАСНИКА

У прасловенском језику кратки вокали *ī* и *ÿ* прешли су у полугласнике, али у суседству *j*, вокал *ī* се сачувао неизмењен, док је *ÿ* претворено у *ÿ̇* у већини дијалеката (у свима осим у руском). У појединим словенским језицима, у доцније време, ови гласови *i* и *u* били су обухваћени процесима губљења полугласника. Мера ове обухваћености и рефлeksi у разним положајима варирају од једног словенског језика до другог, делимично услед неједнаког статуса вокалског квантитета. Због ове околности претрпели су неуспех покушаји да се утврде правилности које би важиле за све словенске језике.

Овај чланак се бави посебно овим проблемом у праукрајинском и староукрајинском, где је дистинкција између дугих и кратких вокала била изгубљена пре губљења полугласника. Анализа дијалекатских података и оних из писаних споменика воде закључку да *ÿ̇* било којег по-

рекла и иницијално *ǰ-* (*ǰǰ-*) нису учествовали у губљењу полугласника, да је медијално и финално *ǰ* иза *ǰ* било потпуно идентификовано са *ь*, док је медијално *ǰ* испред *ǰ* учествовало у губљењу полугласника тако што се губило у слабом положају а чувало у јаком; и то без икакве измене, то јест без изједначавања са *ь* у погледу вокалског квалитета.