



HÁSKÓLI ÍSLANDS

Hugvísindasvið

On the History of the Icelandic Pronouns
nokkur and *nokkuð*

*An Examination of Selected Manuscripts from the 13th to the 16th
century*

Ritgerð til M.A.-prófs

Bernhard Luxner

September 2011

Háskóli Íslands
Hugvísindasvið
Medieval Icelandic Studies

On the History of the Icelandic Pronouns *nokkur* and *nokkuð*

*An Examination of Selected Manuscripts from the 13th to the
16th century*

Ritgerð til M.A.-prófs

Bernhard Luxner

Kt.: 020987-3759

Leiðbeinendur: Haraldur Bernharðsson (Ph.D.)

Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir (Ph.D.)

September 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SURVEY OF EARLIER RESEARCH	4
2.1. THE ORIGIN OF ICELANDIC NOKKUR AND NOKKUÐ	4
2.2. THE EARLIEST EVIDENCE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY	6
2.3. THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.....	14
2.4. THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY	20
2.5. FROM 1500 UNTIL PRESENT.....	22
3. THE CORPUS	28
3.1. THE METHOD.....	28
3.2. PRESENTING THE CORPUS.....	30
3.3. THE MANUSCRIPTS	32
3.3.1 AM 134 4°.....	32
3.3.2. AM 154 4°.....	33
3.3.3. GKS 3271 4°.....	36
3.3.4. AM 343 fol.	37
3.3.5. AM 351 fol.	39
3.3.6. AM 350 fol.	40
3.3.7. AM 344 fol.	42
3.3.8. AM 354 fol.	43
3.3.9. AM 42 a 8°.....	45
3.3.10. AM 137 4°.....	46
3.3.11. AM 151 4°.....	48
3.3.12. AM 41 8°.....	50
3.3.13. AM 136 4°.....	51
3.3.14. AM 159 4°.....	52
3.3.15. AM 138 4°.....	53
3.3.16. AM 147 4°.....	54
3.3.17. NKS 1931 4°	57
3.3.18. NKS 340 8°	58
3.3.19. First print from 1578.....	59
4. THE CHANGES IN OLD ICELANDIC NÖKKURR AND NÖKKUT.....	61
4.1. THE VOWEL QUALITIES IN THE FIRST AND SECOND SYLLABLE	61
4.1.1. <i>The development until 1400</i>	61
4.1.2. <i>The development in the fifteenth century until present</i>	69
4.2. THE SYNCOPE IN THE SECOND SYLLABLE	74
4.3. SHORTENING OF LONG WORD-FINAL -RR AND INTERVOCALIC -RR-.....	78
5. CONCLUSION	82
REFERENCES	88
APPENDIX.....	91

1. Introduction

In his article “Óákv. forn. nokkur, nokkuð” published in *Lingua Islandica — Íslenzk tunga* in the years 1961-62 Hreinn Benediktsson presents a very thorough study of the Icelandic indefinite pronouns *nokkur* and *nokkuð*, especially concerning their earliest development. When in the year 2002 a revised and translated version of this article was published in Hreinn Benediktsson’s collected papers “Linguistic Studies, Historical and Comparative” no new major contributions on the history of these pronouns had appeared.¹ The lack of sufficient data was mentioned by Hreinn Benediktsson already in 1961-62, and in 2002 he still discusses more or less the same problems based on an insufficient amount of data (Hreinn Benediktsson 1961-62:29; 2002:495-96). As a consequence some aspects of the history of the Icelandic pronouns *nokkur*, *nokkuð* still deserve further examination. The present work aims at finding answers to the following three questions:

1. What was the nature of the change of the vowel in the first syllable? When did the change from /ö/ to /o/ happen?
2. When do the first indications of *u*-syncope in trisyllabic forms appear, i.e. when does the stem *nokkr-* appear?
3. What was the development of word-final *-rr* and intervocalic *r(r)* in these pronouns?

To do this, it was necessary to set up a corpus with sufficient data. This data was extracted from nineteen *Jónsbók* manuscripts from the late thirteenth century until the late sixteenth century. The task of finding all the instances of Old Icelandic

¹ In the following chapters, references are made to the article from 2002 as it is the more recent one.

nökkurr/nökkut would not have been possible in such an effective way, without the support of the following works:

- “Wortschatz der Jónsbók” by Hans Fix from 1984, which actually was the essential tool for finding examples of the pronoun in the text.
- “Jónsbók — Kong Magnus Lovbog for Island vedtaget paa Altinget 1281 — og Réttarbætr — de for Island givne Retterbøder af 1294, 1305 og 1314” edited by Ólafur Halldórsson in 1904 on which Fix’s concordance is based.
- “Jónsbók — Lögbók Íslendinga hver samþykkt var á alþingi árið 1281 og endurnýjuð um miðja 14. öld en fyrst prentuð árið 1578” edited by Már Jónsson in 2004, which was helpful for locating particular passages in the manuscripts of the AM 350 fol. type.
- “Jónsbók — The Laws of Later Iceland” by Jana K. Schulmann from 2010, which was especially helpful for understanding difficult passages and for locating particular passages in the manuscripts of the AM 351 fol. type.

Chapter 2. provides a survey of earlier research. This chapter is mainly based on the results presented in the articles by Hreinn Benediktsson (1961-62, 2002) and Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen (2003), and tries to trace the development of the pronouns from their earliest stage down to Modern Icelandic. Chapter 3. presents the corpus found in nineteen manuscripts. This corpus is normalised and generalised, but more detailed transcriptions of individual examples are found in the Appendix. The chapter 4. focuses on the three questions presented above.

The entire text is written in the font “Palemonas MUFI” designed by Vladas Tumasonis & colleagues and available for free download from the Medieval Unicode Font Initiative at <http://mufi.info/>.

Any mistakes or word forms which can be found in the manuscripts but not mentioned in this work are due to the author's negligence alone.

Finally I would like to thank my supervisors Haraldur Bernharðsson and Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir for their support and helpful advice.

2. Survey of earlier research

2.1. The origin of Icelandic *nokkur* and *nokkuð*

In the linguistic research of the history of Icelandic it is generally agreed on that the Modern Icelandic indefinite pronouns *nokkur* ‘someone’ and *nokkuð* ‘something’—*nökkurr* and *nökkut* at an earlier stage of Icelandic—originate in a Proto-Nordic phrase reconstructible as either **ni-wait-ek-hwarjar* or **ni-wait-hwarjar* for *nokkur*, and **ne-wait-ek-hwata* or **ne-wait-hwata* for *nokkuð*. This phrase might be a loan translation from the Latin phrase *nesciō quis/quod*, meaning ‘I do not know who’ and ‘I do not know what’. The first variant—the traditional one—assumes that the Proto-Nordic phrase still contained the personal pronoun **ek* (so in, e.g., Heusler 1921:41; Alexander Jóhannesson 1923–24:258; de Vries 1962:404, and Załuska-Strömberg 1982:85–86), whereas the second one without the pronoun was proposed by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:472). The main reason why there are two different reconstructions is the fact that the Icelandic variant of this pronoun contains the combination *-kk-* which had to be explained. This pronoun also occurs in other Germanic languages where it does not seem to need this personal pronoun. A reconstruction with **ek* could account for the *-kk-* in the Icelandic forms. Due to assimilation of the *k* in **ek*, *t* in **wait* and *hw* in **hwarjar* or **hwata* the combination *kk* was a probable result (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:472). As Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:472) points out, however, an assimilation of *t* and *hw* without an intervening *k* would have led to *kk*, and thus the personal pronoun **ek* is not a necessary element in the reconstruction. As indicated above, the variants of this indefinite pronoun in the other early Germanic languages suggest that the original phrase was without the 1st person pronoun **ek*.

The Old High German phrase *niweiz huër* corresponds to Lat. *aliquis* and OHG *niweiz huaz* can be compared with Lat. *aliquid*. According to Wilmanns (1922:588),

this first part was contracted to *neiz*, where it then became the contracted form *neiszwēr* and *neiszwaz* in Middle High German (see also Grimm 1889:593–94; Paul/Wiehl/Grosse 1989:377).² In Old English, the indefinite pronoun *nāthwa* ‘some’, ‘any’ is documented, having the same origins as the Old High German or Old Icelandic pronoun (Holthausen 1934:232; Campbell 1959:294).³ This word is, however, not preserved in Modern High German, and not in the other Modern West Germanic languages either.⁴

The development of the first part of this phrase—**ni-wait*—is described as follows by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:472): **ni-wait* becomes **nait* due to contraction, and this syllable becomes **neit* which then gets monophthongised to **net*. As has been described above, this *t* becomes *k* due to assimilation with *hw* which results in the syllable **nek*. In neuter **ni-wait-hwata* we find a slightly different development: The first steps of the development are the same as in the masculine or feminine stem. After the first syllable has developed to **nek*, however, the *a* in the second syllable—which has not changed to *e* due to *i*-umlaut as in the masculine and feminine—caused a change of *e* to *a* in the first syllable, so that we find **nak* as the first syllable in most of the oldest neuter forms (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:478–79).

The second part of the phrase, **-hwarjar*, became *-kuerr* and the vowel was affected by *i*-umlaut. This all resulted in the the oldest attested form of the pronoun

² Looking at other works on Old High German there seems to be no mentioning of an OHG form or phrase *niweiz huēr* or *niweiz huaz* (see Schützeichel 1989; Braune/Eggers 1987). There is, however, a phrase to be found in a manuscript from the tenth or eleventh century: *ne uueiz uuaz niuues* (Graff 1836:1110). In Old Frisian the contracted word *nēt* ‘do not know’, deriving from *ni wēt* can be found. Nothing like Middle High German *neiszwēr* or Old Icelandic *nekkver* is, however, quoted for Old Frisian (Holthausen/Hofmann 1985:76).

³ In Old Slavonic, too, the word *někŭto* ‘someone’ deriving from *ne věstī kŭto* ‘no one knows who’ can be found (Holthausen 1934:232).

⁴ Grimm (1889:593) mentions that it still is preserved in Alemannic dialects. Whether this still is true for Alemannic dialects nowadays needs, however, to be investigated.

nokkur in Icelandic: *nekkuer*.⁵ In the neuter, the second part, Proto-Nordic *-*hwata*, became -*huat*, so that we find *nakkuat* as the oldest attested form of *nokkuð* (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:478-79).

These two forms—*nekkuer*- and *nakkuat*—thus represent the earliest stage of what later became Modern Icelandic *nokkur* and *nokkuð*, as can be seen in concordances of the earliest Icelandic manuscripts (Larsson 1891:239-40; de Leeuw van Weenen 2004:116).

2.2. The earliest evidence in the second half of the twelfth century

Based on the earliest Icelandic manuscripts Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:471) presents the paradigm in *Table 1* for the stem *nekkuer*- (167 instances).⁶

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	necquer (SEG)	necquer (SERG)	-
	Acc.	necquern (SG)	necqueria (SG)	necquert (SG)
	Dat.	necqueriom (SG)	necquere (SHG)	necquerio (S)
	Gen.	necquers (SG)	necquerar (S)	necquers (S)
Pl.	Nom.	necquerer (SEG)	necqueriar (G)	-
	Acc.	necqueria (SEG)	-	necquer (SEG)
	Dat.	necqueriom (SEG)		
	Gen.	necquera (SEG)		

Table 1. The earliest paradigm in Old Icelandic according to Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:471).

⁵ Whether it is *nekkuer* or *nekkerr* will be discussed in the following chapter as part of the development in the late twelfth century.

⁶ These manuscripts are: Holm perg 15 4° (S), AM 677 4° B (G), AM 237 a fol. (H), AM 674 a 4° (E), GKS 1812 IV 4° (R), AM 673 a 4° (P). The capital letters in brackets after each manuscript are the same as used by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:472).

As can easily be seen in *Table 1*, the *i* or *j* from the original **-hwarjar* still is preserved before endings beginning in *a* or *o*.

The main question regarding this earliest paradigm of *nokkur* is whether the oldest stem in Icelandic actually was *nekkuer-* or *nekker-*. A firm answer is hard to obtain because in one of the most extensive manuscripts of the earliest period of Icelandic, Holm perg 15 4° (Book of Homilies), a variant which might be interpreted as *nekker-* always is abbreviated by the *er*-tittle (°). On the other hand, where the form is supposed to be *nekkuer-*, the *ue* in the second syllable always is the abbreviated part of the word, if the word is abbreviated. This is mainly done by superscript *e* or a macron (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:475). This fact gave rise to two different opinions on how to expand the *er*-tittle.

On the one hand Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:474) stated that in these forms the abbreviation has to be expanded in the same way as it is expanded elsewhere, that is as *er*. Consequently, “ten of the twenty-four examples from S [i.e. Holm perg 15 4°] left out in Table 1 [...] were interpreted as inflectional forms of a separate paradigm [in the article from 1961-62], whose stem form was listed as *nekker-*, spelled either “*necqer-*” or “*neqer-*”, [...]” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:474; see also Hreinn Benediktsson 1961-62:10).

On the other hand Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen (2003:101-02) maintained that there is no evidence for the stem *nekker-* and argued for a sub-rule for this *er*-tittle expanding it as *uer* whenever it is used in a form of *nokkur*. De Leeuw van Weenen writes:

In my analysis of the orthography of S [i.e. Holm perg 15 4°] [...] I found that in S the character ‘q’ is used solely for /k/ in the group /kv/. It is always either followed by ‘u’ or ‘v’ or accompanied by an

abbreviation mark. As abbreviation marks with ‘q’ occur the macron, the tittle and superscript vowel symbols. ‘q̄’ stands always for ‘que’. When ‘q’ is combined with a superscript vowel symbol, a combination which occurs 306 times in S, the combination never stands for /krV/, but always for /kvV/, where V denotes the vowel indicated by the superscript symbol. It seems therefore quite likely that ‘q’ + tittle does not stand for /kEr/, but for /kvEr/, where E stands for any vowel that can be written ‘e’ (de Leeuw van Weenen 2003:101-02).

This argumentation is quite convincing, and thus it might have been the right decision by Hreinn Benediktsson not to present a separate paradigm with *nekker-* for the earliest Icelandic in the revised version of his paper (even if he is not fully convinced by de Leeuw van Weenen’s reasoning). Besides *nekkuer-* a second stem, not as frequent as *nekkuer-*, appears: *nakkuar-*. A paradigm based on *nakkuar-* (24 instances) is shown in *Table 2* (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:471).

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nacquar (SG)	-	-
	Acc.	nacquarn (SP)	nacquara (G)	-
	Dat.	-	nacquare (G)	-
	Gen.	-	nacquarar (G)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nacquarer (G)	-	-
	Acc.	nacquara (G)	-	-
	Dat.	-		
	Gen.	-		

Table 2. The stem *nakkuar-* as presented by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:471) (same abbreviations as before).

This stem occurs only “a few times” in the earliest sources. Three different explanations about its origin have been proposed (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:479).

The first explanation is offered by Adolf Noreen (1903:284) who argues that *nakkuarr* derived from a combination of *nekkuer* and *nekkuarr*, as the former inflects like *huerr* and the latter like *huarr*.

As Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:480, footnote 11) states, this theory is problematic since a word like *huarr* never existed in Old Icelandic. Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:479–80) proposes to treat *nakkuar*- rather as

a transformation of *nekkuer*- under the influence of *nakkuat*, or in other words, to be a new formation on the basis of the neuter. The principal inflectional characteristics of this stem form, which shows that it is not an original parallel to *nekkuer*-, is the fact that the stemfinal *-i-* (or *-j-*) appears nowhere in the paradigm (cf. e.g., acc.sing.fem. *nakkuara*, never **nakkuaria*) (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:479–80).

A third theory can be found in Jan de Vries’s *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1962:404) where he deduces *nakkvarr*—as well as *nakkverr*—from the phrase **ni-veit-ek-hvárir*. As mentioned in 2.1 above, the personal pronoun **ek* should not be regarded as a necessary component in the reconstruction. The final part of the phrase in de Vries’s reconstruction is something different from Proto-Nordic **hwarjar* > *-huerr*, which basically means ‘who’. The pronoun *hvárir*—or *hvárr* in the nominative singular masculine—means ‘who of both/two’ or ‘each of both’, and thus one would get the meaning ‘I do not know who of both’ instead of ‘I do not know who’. Also

phonetically this development from *-hvárr* to *-hvarr* would have been possible, if one considers that the final syllable was less stressed until it became completely unstressed, so that *á* became *a* after some time (Noreen 1903:109; de Leeuw van Weenen 2003:99). Perhaps this could mean that the word *nakkuarr* actually had a slightly different meaning than *nekkuer*. It appears, however, to have been used sparingly in the earliest manuscripts and was replaced by *nekkuer* after some time.

Besides the stems *nekkuer-* and *nakkuar-* there occur some other variants for Modern Icelandic *nokkur* in Holm perg 15 4° (de Leeuw van Weenen 2004:116). These forms are shown in *Table 3*.⁷

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	-	nøccor (69v30)	-
	Acc.	nøcquern (44v8) nacquern (101r16)	nēcqueria (71v17)	-
	Dat.	nøckø2om (43r14) nøcco2om (70r17) nockorom (92v13)	naquer1 (43v7) næcquer1 (44r17)	-
	Gen.	necquarf (51v5)	-	-
Pl.	Nom.	-	-	-
	Acc.	-	-	nocquor (64r25)
	Dat.	nøckuerom (51r17) nøcyrom (73v1) nøcco2om (73v36)		
	Gen.	-		

Table 3. Sporadic stems of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript Holm perg 15 4°.

⁷ The abbreviations in de Leeuw van Weenen's concordance are expanded and presented in italics to offer better readability. Holm perg 15 4° also is the only manuscript in Larsson's *Ordförrådet* (1891), which shows deviations from the stems *nekkuer-* and *nakkuar-* except for the manuscript AM 645 4°, which is slightly younger—from around 1220—and thus will be dealt with in the chapter about the thirteenth century in this work.

The forms “*naqueri*” (dat.sing.fem., 43v7) and “*necquarl*” (gen.sing.masc., 51v5) are considered by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:480) as “hybrid formations of some kind” that seem to be “based on the stem *nekkuer-*, modified by *nakkuar-* and the neuter *nakkuat* [...]”. Also the variant “*nacquern*” (acc.sing.masc., 101r16) might go back to the same process.⁸

In the variants “*nøcquern*” (acc.sing.masc., 44v8) and “*nøckuerom*” (dat.plur.neut., 51r17) one can already observe the change of the stem vowel *e* to *ø*. This is interesting because no change in the second syllable can be observed (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:485).⁹ The other forms with *ø* in the stem go back to a stem *nøkkor-*. This development is described as follows by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:489):

Taking a form like the dat.sing.masc. *nekkueriom* as our starting-point, the new form, *nøkkorom*, is the outcome of a set of two bipartite changes: (a) assimilation of the second-syllable *e* to the third-syllable *o*, together with the loss of the semivocalic *-i-* (or *-j-*); and (b) assimilation (rounding) of the root vowel *e* to the second-syllable combination *-uo-*, yielding front mid rounded *ø*, together with the loss of the semivocalic *-u-* (or *-w-*); to this extent, then, the assumption of a change *ue* > *o* [...] is justified (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489).

⁸ In addition, the variant *nakkverr* is—together with *nakkvarr*—mentioned in de Vries’s etymological dictionary (de Vries 1962:404). Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:486) attributes this form to the stem *nakker-*, since he expands this variant in Holm perg 15 4° as “*nacqern*”.

⁹ These words are expanded without “u” by Hreinn Benediktsson, i.e. as “*nøcquern*” and “*nøckerom*” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:486).

Due to analogy the stem *nøkkor-* was transferred to the other forms, so that variants like “nøccor” (nom.sing.fem., 69v30) also occur at this early stage of development.¹⁰

The second syllables in the variants “nøcyrom” (dat.plur.neut., 73v1) and “nøckøzom” (dat.sing.masc., 43r14) are interesting. The “y” in the first writing might represent /u/, whereas the “ø” in the second spelling could be regarded as “a dittographic error” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489, footnote 19).

The two spellings “næcqueri” (dat.sing.fem., 44r17) and “nēcqueria” (acc.sing.fem., 71v17) might be representations of the stem *nekkuer-* with other orthographic variants for *e*. It is possible, however, that these spellings could be regarded not only as orthographic variants for *e* but perhaps rather as indications for a change in the quality of the root vowel. In the form “nøcquern” (acc.sing.masc., 44v8) a change of the first vowel can be observed without any changes in the second syllable.

All these forms are, however, more or less exceptions, and the main stem of the earliest form of *nokkur* can be regarded as *nekkuer-*, with *nakkuar-* as a less common variant.

Another interesting occurrence is the Old Icelandic adverb *nakkuar* ‘somewhere’ which contains the interrogative adverb *huar* ‘where?’, and has as such a quite similar way of development as the pronouns *nakkuarr* and *nakkuat* (de Vries 1962:404; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:479).¹¹

For Modern Icelandic *nokkuð*, Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:472) presents the paradigm in *Table 4*, based on three different stems.

¹⁰ The variants “nockorom” (dat.sing.masc., 92v13) and “nocquor” (acc.plur.neut., 64r25) with “o” in the first syllable are treated as belonging to the stem *nøkkor-*, since the writing with “o” representing /ø/ was quite common in Old Icelandic manuscripts (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489, footnote 19).

¹¹ This adverbial form occurs in some passages in Old Icelandic texts, however, its usage is not frequent and, as can be observed in the present corpus, it becomes obsolete in the course of time (for quotes see e.g. Fritzner 1973:856 Vol. 2).

		<i>nakkuat</i> (42)	<i>nekkuat</i> (18)	<i>nokkuat</i> (6)
Sg.	Nom.	–	–	–
	Acc.	nacquat (SERG)	necquat (SH)	nocquat (G)
	Dat.	–	necque (S)	nøcque (S) ¹² nøcki (S) nøckva (s)
	Gen.	–	–	–

Table 4. The earliest paradigm of *nokkuð* according to Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:472) (same abbreviations as before).

As mentioned in 2.1 above, Modern Icelandic *nokkuð* derives from the Proto-Nordic phrase **ni-wait-hwata* which then developed to *nakkuat* with some special variants, which will be discussed below. First we see forms based on *nekkuat* as the second most common variant. This form might indicate an older stage of development, since we see that the stem vowel still is *e* and thus has not yet been assimilated to the *a* of the second syllable. The dat.sing.neut. has *e* as a rule, since no *a* is to be found in the second syllable (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:478). The variant *nokkuat* seems to be due to *w*-umlaut of *e* resulting in *ø*, which in Old Icelandic manuscripts could have been represented by “o” as well (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:479, 492).

To summarise, the following can be stated for the Modern Icelandic indefinite pronouns *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the second half of the twelfth century. The masculine and feminine variants were mainly based on the stem *nekkuer-* with the stem *nakkuar-* as a side form. In some of the earliest instances the development of the root vowel *e* to *ø* can already be observed. For Modern Icelandic *nokkuð* the earliest stem is *nakkuat*. Besides *nakkuat*, the variants *nekkvat* and *nokkuat* occur. The former of these two can,

¹² The reading of this variant seems not to be consistent: Larsson (1891:239) reads “nócque” whereas de Leeuw van Weenen (2004:116) transcribes it as “nócq̃”.

however, be regarded as a slightly older stage, where the *e* in the first syllable has not yet been assimilated to the *a* in the second syllable. The *ø* in the latter variant is probably due to *w*-umlaut of *e*.

2.3. The thirteenth century

The research on *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the thirteenth century is mainly based on the following manuscripts: AM 645 4° (heilagra manna sögur) from the first half of the thirteenth century, GKS 1157 fol. (Grágás) from around 1250, AM 291 4° (Jómsvíkinga saga) from the last quarter of the thirteenth century and AM 519 a 4° (Alexanders saga) from around 1280 (ONP 1989:458, 471, 450, 453).¹³ Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:248) proposes the paradigm in *Table 5* for the thirteenth century. This paradigm is based on the two manuscripts GKS 1157 fol. (Gr) and AM 519 a 4° (A).¹⁴

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockorr (GrA)	nockor (GrA)	nockot (GrA) nockort (GrA)
	Acc.	nockorn (GrA)	nockora (GrA)	-
	Dat.	nockorum (GrA)	-	nockoro (GrA)
	Gen.	nockors (GrA)	-	nockors (GrA)
Pl.	Nom.	nockorir (GrA)	nockorar (Gr)	nockor (GrA)
	Acc.	nockora (GrA)	nockorar (A)	-
	Dat.	nockorum (GrA)		
	Gen.	nockorra (A)		

¹³ The manuscript AM 645 4° can actually be divided into two parts: fols. 1r(1)–42v(84) from around 1220 and fols. 43r(85)–66v(130) from a period between 1225 and 1250 (ONP 1989:458).

¹⁴ As Hreinn Benediktsson did not have the opportunity to use concordances for these texts he used two editions: the edition of *Grágás* by Vilhjálmur Finsen from 1852 and the edition of *Alexanders saga* by Finnur Jónsson from 1925 (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:480).

Table 5. The thirteenth-century paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* according to Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:481).

This agrees in general with the results Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen presents in her work on AM 519 a 4^o (Alexanders saga) when she states: “The normal form of the stem of this pronoun in AM 519a is *nocko-*, as is that of the related adverb *nokkur*. Three *nackva-* forms are found, and 4 *nockvo-* forms, against 91 *nocko-* forms” (de Leeuw van Weenen 2009:128).

The *nackva-* forms are limited to the nom./acc.sing.neut.: “*nackvat*” (3v3), “*nackvat*” (2r7) and “*nakkvat*” (1v25), whereas the *nokkvo-* form is found in all three genders: “*nockvo2r*” (nom.sing.masc., 4v22), “*nockvor1*” (dat.sing.fem., 27r31) and “*nockvot*” (acc.sing.neut., 4v14, 5r32) (de Leeuw van Weenen 2009:300).

The manuscript GKS 1157 fol., which is older than AM 519 a 4^o, basically shows the same forms. This manuscript still contains, however, some variants of the older stems *nekkver-/nokkver-* too: “*nøccver*” (nom./acc.plur.neut., 103504), “*necquern*” (acc.sing.masc., 202112), “*nequern*” (acc.sing.masc., 105612), and once the nom./acc.sing.neut. is written “*nacquat*” (221516) (Beck 1993:198).¹⁵

Forms to be found in the manuscript AM 291 4^o from the last quarter of the thirteenth century are presented in *Table 6*, based on Larsson (1956:60).¹⁶

¹⁵ Beck (1993:198) classifies this form as an adverb, Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:481) as nom./acc.sing.neut. Even though its syntactic function is adverbial, it is morphologically a nom./acc.sing.neut. Also the gen.sing.neut. “*neccvers*” (1.23¹¹) mentioned by Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:481) is not found in Beck’s concordance (see also Finsen 1852:23).

¹⁶ These forms are slightly generalised and normalised here to offer a better overview. Geminate “kk” is normalised as “cc”, since this is the most often used writing in the manuscript.

AM 291 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	noccorr (7) noccor (1) noccvrr (1)	noccor (7)	naccvat (13) noccot (9) naccvat (6) naccvaþ (2) noccort (1)
	Acc.	noccorn (3)	noccora (5) noccvria (1)	navccvð (1)
	Dat.	noccorom (3)	-	noccorv (5) noccoro (1) nockvi (1) nøckvi (1)
	Gen.	noccorf (1)	-	noccorf (1) noccvrs (1)
Pl.	Nom.	noccorir (3)	noccorar (2)	-
	Acc.	noccora (3) noccvra (1)		noccor (4)
	Dat.	noccorom (1)		
	Gen.	noccorra (2)		

Table 6. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 291 4° according to Larsson (1956:60).

Comparing Larsson's (1956) findings in AM 291 4° with AM 519 a 4°, which was written around the same time, we find basically the same results. In AM 291 4° the stem *nokkor-* is dominant (50 instances). In addition we find three forms of the stem *nokkuer-* which might be due to copying from older exemplars, and two dat.sing.neut. forms based on the older *nokkuð* variant *nokkuat*. The nom./acc.sing.neut. is interesting: fifteen forms are based on *nakkuat*, ten forms on *nokkot*, and six on

nokkuat. Thus we see that nom./acc.sing.neut. *nakkuat* still is a common variant at the end of the thirteenth century and seems to be as frequent as *nockot*.¹⁷

In the older part of the manuscript AM 645 4^o (heilagra manna sögur) from around 1220 the paradigm in *Table 7* can be set up according to Larsson (1891:240).¹⁸

AM 645 4 ^o		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	necqver (3) nøcqverr (2)	nøcqver (2) necqver (1)	nacqvæt (17) necqvæt (1)
	Acc.	necqvern (8) nøcqvern (3)	necqveria (5) nøcqveria (2) nøqvera (1)	nacqvæt (1)
	Dat.	nøcqveriom (1)	nøcqverri (3) necqverri (1)	necqvi (1) necqve (1) nøcqverio (1) nøcqvero (1)
	Gen.	necqverf (1)	-	necqvers (1)
Pl.	Nom.	necqverer (1) nøcqverer (1)	nøcqverar (1)	-
	Acc.	nøcqvera (1)	-	nøcqver (1) nøkor (1)
	Dat.	nøcqveriom (2) necqveriom (1)		
	Gen.	-		

Table 7. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 645 4^o according to Larsson (1891:240).

¹⁷ It is quite interesting too that in two instances a second-syllable *u* (written as “v”) is to be found: “noccvra” (acc.plur.masc., 22:7) and “navccvð” (nom./acc.sing.neut., 67:14). These two words represent thus some of the earliest examples of the change of “o” to “u” in the second syllable (Larsson 1956:60; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:493)

¹⁸ This paradigm is slightly generalised and normalised to offer a better overview. “kk” is written as “cq” since this is the writing in all the forms. Also, the discussion whether *nekker-* or *nekkver-* might be the correctly expanded version of the stem comes up here again. Here the forms are rendered as *nekkver-* even if Larsson expands the majority of the abbreviations as *er* (Larsson 1891:240).

Twenty-three forms are based on the stem *nekkuer-*, twenty-two on the stem *nokkuer-*, and one on *nokkor-*. Two forms in the dat.sing.neut. are based on the stem *nekkuat* and the vast majority of nom./acc.sing.neut. are based on *nakkuat*.

It emerges, then, that at the beginning, or first half of the thirteenth century, we actually have two equally frequent stems: *nekkuer-* and *nokkuer-*, where the latter probably arose from the former through rounding of the root vowel caused by the *u* in the second syllable. For Modern Icelandic *nokkuð*, *nakkuat* still is the preferred form. One may, however, go a little bit further and have a closer look at the distribution of this pronoun in this manuscript. As mentioned above (see footnote 12) this manuscript contains passages from two different time periods: fols. 1r1-42v84 are from around 1220 and fols. 43r85-66v130 are from between 1225 and 1250, thus slightly younger (ONP 1989:458). In the older part from around 1220 the stem *nekkver-* has a slightly higher frequency (twenty examples) than the stem *nokkuer-* (sixteen examples), whereas in the younger part from between 1225 and 1250 the stem *nokkuer-* is more often used (six examples) than *nekkuer-* (three examples) (Larsson 1891:240).

The following can be stated for the development from the twelfth to the thirteenth century, summarizing Hreinn Benediktsson's (2002) findings: Based on the most common stem in the twelfth century, *nekkuer-*, the indefinite pronoun developed to *nokkor-* through *nokkuer-*; this took place mainly in the beginning of the thirteenth century. This development may have its origins in the trisyllabic form of the dat.sing.masc. *nekkueriom* which first developed to a form like **nekkuorom* with an assimilation of the second-syllable *e* to the final-syllable *o* and loss of the semivocalic *-i-*. Subsequently assimilation in terms of rounding to the *uo* of the second syllable has occurred followed by the loss of semivocalic *-u-*, ultimately yielding *nokkorom*. Due to

analogy this stem then was transferred to the rest of the paradigm (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489).

The stem *nakkuar-*, which was less common than *nekkuer-*, but not uncommon, developed to *nøkkuor-* in the following steps: First we have the monosyllabic forms like nom.sing.fem. or nom./acc.plur.neut. *nakkuar*, consisting of a stressed first and a unstressed final syllable. According to Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:488) the development from *nakkuar* to *nøkkuor* seems to be due to “a case of the usual type of (morphological) analogy; the nom.sing.fem. and the nom./acc.plur.neut. were formed by means of the vocalic alternations *a* : *ø* and *a* : *o* alone, with no separate and independent morphological (inflectional) constituent, cf. *gømol* vs. *gamall*” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:488).

The development of the trisyllabic *nøkkuorom* was slightly different. As Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:488) states “*a* could not, in general, occur in a non-final syllable of a word form (or in a consecutive series of such syllables) if immediately followed by a syllable containing the (unstressed) vowel *o* (later *u*). In that case the *a* was replaced automatically by *ø* or by *o*, [...]” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:488). In other words, this form is basically due to *u*-umlaut.

In the early thirteenth century the merger of *ø* and *ø* to *ö* started to spread so that the two stems *nökkor-* and *nøkkuor-*—which replaced the stem *nakkuar-* after some time—were the basic stems towards the end of the thirteenth century (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489; Stefán Karlsson 2004:11, 29).

In his very detailed study of the manuscript GKS 1009 fol. (Morkinskinna) Alex Speed Kjeldsen (2010:465-67) states that for hand A *nökkor-/nökkot* is the most common stem, but *nakkvar-/nakkvat* and *nøkkvor-/nøkkvot* also appear quite often, whereas *nakkor-* is to be found only once. In hand B, however, the only stem which appears is *nøkkver-* which, on the other hand, does not appear in hand A.

The stem *nökkver-* of hand B in GKS 1009 fol. does not fit into the paradigm proposed by Hreinn Benediktsson for the thirteenth century. Hreinn Benediktsson himself is aware of this problem and states that these forms must be due to strict copying. Kjeldsen argues, however, that the fact that this stem is the only one in B indicates that *nökkver-* still was a part of the Icelandic language in the second half of the thirteenth century (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:481, 486-87, see also footnote 17; Kjeldsen 2010:465-67). Thus it should be stated for the thirteenth century that, even though the stem *nökkor-/nökkot* was dominant, also stems like *nakkvar-/nakkvat*, *nökkvor-/nökkvot* and *nökkver-/nökkvet* were quite frequent and still a part of the Icelandic language at this time.

It is interesting that in the earliest Old Norwegian manuscripts from around 1150 until 1250 the stem *nokkor-/nökkot* already was quite established, at a time when *nekkuer-/nakkuat* still dominated the Old Icelandic paradigm (Holtsmark 1955:443-44; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:481).

2.4. The fourteenth century

For this time period we have material from two major manuscripts: the Snorra-Edda manuscript DG 11 in Uppsala from the time between 1300 and 1325 and AM 132 fol. (Möðruvallabók) from the time between 1330 and 1370 (ONP 1989:469, 433). Based on these two manuscripts a paradigm for the main stem *nokkur-/nökkut* can be set up in *Table 8* (Grape 1977:246; de Leeuw van Weenen 2000:212).

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nokkurr	nokkur	nokkut
	Acc.	nokkurn	nokkura	nokkut
	Dat.	nokkurum	nokkurri	nokkuru
	Gen.	nokkurs	nokkurrar	nokkurs
Pl.	Nom.	nokkurir	nokkurar	nokkur
	Acc.	nokkura	nokkurar	nokkur
	Dat.	nokkurum		
	Gen.	nokkurra		

Table 8. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscripts DG 11 and AM 132 fol. according to Grape (1977:246) and de Leeuw van Weenen (2000:212).

In the older manuscript, DG 11, *nokkur-/nokkut-* seems to be the only stem which occurs. There is, however, one example which is spelled with “o” and not with “u”: “nocko2vm” 19:25 (Grape 1977:246). In AM 132 fol. there are some exceptional forms. They are, however, probably relic forms copied from older texts: four examples of nom./acc.sing.neut. “nakkvat” and “nakkuað”, six examples of acc.sing.neut. “nokkurt”, and two examples of dat.sing.neut. “nock¹⁹”. Here too we only find one example with “o” in the second syllable: “nocko2um” in 172va2 (van Arkel-de Leeuw van Weenen 1987:136; de Leeuw van Weenen 2000:212).¹⁹

There seem to be no significant changes from thirteenth-century *nokkor-* to fourteenth-century *nokkur-*. The change from “o” to “u” is merely of orthographic nature. As the vowel in the second syllable was unstressed, its orthographic representation was in accordance with the orthographic representation of unstressed vowels in general. Due to changes in the system of stressed vowels, the identification of the unstressed vowels [ɪ] and [ʊ] shifted from e and o, respectively, to i and u.

¹⁹ This form is expanded here; the abbreviated form in the concordance is “nocko2”.

Consequently the orthographic representation of the unstressed vowels changed from “e” and “o” to “i” and “u” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:483). Thus the spelling of the unstressed back, rounded vowel in the second syllable of the pronoun gradually shifted from “o” to “u”.

Another, more important, question regards the quality of the first vowel—or the root vowel—in this time period. All the instances in DG 11 and AM 132 fol. are written with “o” in the first syllable, and according to de Leeuw van Weenen (2000:75) /ö/ is written “o” “in most instances” in AM 132 fol. Also it still remains unclear when the change from /ö/ to /o/ in the root of Modern Icelandic *nokkur* and *nokkuð* actually happened. On the one hand it is believed that the first occurrences of /o/ as root vowel surface already in the latter half of the thirteenth century (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:492). On the other hand it has been stated that /ö/ was the root vowel throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth century (Björn K. Þórólfsson 1925:49). As this is a quite complicated topic and one of the main objects of the present investigation, it will be dealt with specifically in chapter 4.1.

2.5. From 1500 until present

As for the sixteenth century there are two major works which offer enough material to create a paradigm for this time period: a translation of the New Testament (NT) by Oddur Gottskálksson, printed in 1540, and the Guðbrandsbiblía (GB), the first complete translation of the Bible into Icelandic, printed in 1584. Based on these two works, Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:499) presents the following paradigm in *Table 9* for *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the sixteenth century.

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur	nockur	nockut, nockud, nockurt
	Acc.	nockurn	nockra	
	Dat.	nockrum	nockre nockur(r)e	nockru
	Gen.	nockurs	nockrar nockur(r)ar	nockurs
Pl.	Nom.	nockrer nockurer	nockrar	nockur
	Acc.	nockra	nockrar	
	Dat.	nockrum		
	Gen.	nockra nockurra		

Table 9. The sixteenth-century paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* according to Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:499).

The root vowel is generally written “o” with a few exceptions only: in NT there are two examples with “au”: “nauckrer” in Post. 19, 9, 13 (Jón Helgason 1929:79). In GB there is, according to Bandle (1956:369), “nur selten ö: *nockur* V Mos 18,10, *nockur Saal* III Mos 5,1, *nockrum* Ordzk 23,1, *nockru* III Mos 20,25, *nockurn* V Mos 14,1, *nockut* Es 41,20, *nockud* III Mos 25,28, *nockurt* V Mos 25,1 u.a.”

Another very important change is the appearance of syncope of second-syllable *u* before an ending beginning with a vowel. This phenomenon, however, seems not to be realised strictly in all forms, as can be seen in the nom.plur.masc. Quite interesting is the fact that syncope even occurs where it is not expected, i.e. in gen./dat.sing.fem. and gen.plur. where the ending starts with *r* instead of a vowel. In the NT there occurs dat.sing.fem. “nockre” in II Kor. 1,14 and gen.sing.fem. “nockrar” in Post. 27, but never in gen.plur. which always is “nockurra” (Jón Helgason 1929:79-80). In the about forty years younger GB syncope is to be found in dat./gen.sing.fem. and “wohl

durchwegs GenPl”, which stands in contrast to what can be found in the NT of Oddur Gottskálksson (Bandle 1956:369). These forms may be seen as analogical variants to forms like acc.sing.fem. “nockra” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:498).

Examining the forms in nom./acc.sing.neut. there seems to be no definite difference in their usage, as it is in Modern Icelandic, where *nokkuð* is used substantivally and *nokkurt* adjectivally (Bandle 1956:369; Guðrún Kvaran 2005:271-72).

For the following century we find the first grammar on Icelandic language with an entire paradigm for *nokkur* and *nokkuð* presented by Runólfur Jónsson (1651); this paradigm is reproduced in *Table 10*.

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur	nockur	nockurt
	Acc.	nockurn	nockra	nockurt
	Dat.	nockrum	nockre	nockru
	Gen.	nockurs	nockrar	nockurs
Pl.	Nom.	nockrer	nockrar	nockur
	Acc.	nockra	nockrar	nockur
	Dat.	nockrum		
	Gen.	nockra		

Table 10. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* according to Runólfur Jónsson 1651.

Here we still find the same phenomenon as in the sixteenth century: syncope of second-syllable *u* even before endings beginning with *r*, i.e. dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. That this way of writing was standard at this time is supported by three copies of medieval manuscripts from the seventeenth century examined by Haraldur Bernharðsson (1999). In two copies syncope is realised, even if the exemplar did not show syncope, and in one of these copies loss of second-syllable *u* even in

gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur.fem. is to be found. One scribe seems to have been quite confused about the syncope rule, so that he drops the “u” in some instances, where the exemplar did have “u” and it would have been necessary according to the copyist’s language. Moreover he also puts an “u” into words where the exemplar already did have syncope and it would not have been necessary. One major difference to the paradigm presented by Runólfur might be the form of nom.sing.neut. and acc.sing.neut. The writing *nockurt* is only found once, otherwise *nokkuð* is used (Haraldur Bernharðsson 1999:67-68, 94-95, 118, 176-77).

In the following century, not many changes did happen in the paradigm. In Jón Magnússon’s *Grammatica Islandica* from the early eighteenth century (ed. 1997) the following differences occur:

Paradoxically, long *-rr* in the nom.sing.masc. occurs again, even though it already disappeared in the middle of the sixteenth century at the latest, but the first traces of the shortening of word-final *rr* are considerably older (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:499). The same is true for intervocalic long *-rr-* in dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. More interesting is, however, that the syncope of *u* only occurs before endings beginning with a vowel. There is no loss of *u* in dat./gen.sing.fem. or gen.plur., as in the 16th and 17th-century sources just discussed. Thus this paradigm, presented by Jón Magnússon, already reveals the paradigm for Modern Icelandic *nokkur* and *nokkuð* (Jón Magnússon 1997:118-19; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:501).

Thus, finally in Modern Icelandic our indefinite pronoun has the paradigm in *Table 11* (Guðrún Kvaran 2005:271):

		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nokkur-Ø	nokkur-Ø	nokkur-t/nokku-ð
	Acc.	nokkur-n	nokkr-a	nokkur-t/nokku-ð
	Dat.	nokkr-um	nokkur-ri	nokkr-u
	Gen.	nokkur-s	nokkur-rar	nokkur-s
Pl.	Nom.	nokkr-ir	nokkr-ar	nokkur-Ø
	Acc.	nokkr-a ²⁰	nokkr-ar	nokkur-Ø
	Dat.	nokkr-um	nokkr-um	nokkr-um
	Gen.	nokkur-ra	nokkur-ra	nokkur-ra

Table 11. The Modern Icelandic paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* according to Guðrún Kvaran (2005:271).

In his Icelandic grammar from 1922, Valtýr Guðmundsson presents, however, a slightly different paradigm. For dat./gen.sing.fem. he also cites forms with only one *r*, i.e. the variants “nokku-ri” and “nokku-rar” besides the writings with double *rr*, which only appear in brackets, indicating that there still is some variation in Modern Icelandic (Valtýr Guðmundsson 1922:114).

Summarising, the following can be said about the history of the Modern Icelandic indefinite pronouns *nokkur* and *nokkuð*: starting from the Proto-Nordic phrases **ni-wait-hwarjar* and **ni-wait-hwata* the two stems *nekkuer*—along with the less frequent *nakkuar*—and *nakkuat* developed through contraction and assimilation. These earliest variants, which are to be found in the earliest manuscripts from the second half of the twelfth century, then changed to the stems *nøkkor*–/*nøkkuor* and *nøkkot* during the thirteenth century. The stem *nøkkor*– derived from *nekkuer*– due to processes of assimilation and loss of the semivocalic constituents *-i-* and *-u-*, whereas *nøkkuor*– has its origins in the stem *nakkuar*–, which underwent processes of umlaut

²⁰ Actually there is the form “nokku-a” to be found for the acc.plur.masc., however, this must be a mistake (Guðrún Kvaran 2005:271).

and analogy. As the two sounds /ø/ and /ɔ/ merged into /ö/ already in the early thirteenth century, the pronoun can be represented as *nökkor-* or *nökkuor-*, later represented with “u” in the second syllable so that *nökkur-* becomes the regular form towards the end of the thirteenth century. *nökkot*—derived from *nakkuat*—was then the main representative for Modern Icelandic *nokkuð*. This development of *nakkuat* consists of three processes: At first the semivocalic *-u-* in the second syllable caused *u*-umlaut of the root vowel from *a* to *ɔ*, at the same time it also rounded the *a* of the second syllable to *o* whereat this semivocalic *-u-* finally disappears (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:488).²¹ In the fifteenth century the first traces of *u*-syncope in the second syllable before an ending starting with a vowel was added. This also happened before endings beginning with *r*, giving rise to forms that seem to have been common until the seventeenth century. When exactly the change of the root vowel from /ö/ to /o/ did happen cannot be stated with certainty. It is, however, one of the main objectives of the present work to find an answer to this problem (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:478-79, 489-90, 498-501; Stefán Karlsson 2004:29).

²¹ In another passage of his article Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:484) proposes that the semivocalic *u* in the second syllable had been lost before the root vowels of the second syllable changed. Due to absence of stress these vowels, i.e. *a* and *e*, have changed to [U], i.e. *o* (later *u*) then.

3. The Corpus

3.1. The method

The corpus presented in this chapter is based on nineteen manuscripts of the Jónsbók text from 1281 until the first print from 1578. A list of the manuscripts and one printed edition in chronological order is presented in *Table 12*.

AM 134 4° (1281–1294/1300)
AM 154 4° (1320–1330)
GKS 3271 4° (1330)
AM 343 fol. (Svalbarðsbók) (1330–1340)
AM 351 fol. (Skálholtsbók eldri) (1360–1400)
AM 350 fol. (Skarðsbók/codex Scardensis) (1363)
AM 344 fol. (1375–1400)
AM 354 fol. (Skálholtsbók yngri) (1400)
AM 42 a 8° (1400)
AM 137 4° (1440–1480)
AM 151 4° (1450)
AM 41 8° (1450–1460)
AM 136 4° (Skinnastaðabók) (1480–1500)
AM 159 4° (1480–1500)
AM 138 4° (1500)
AM 147 4° (Heynessbók) (1525–1525 and around 1600)
NKS 1931 4° (1531)
NKS 340 8° (1532)
First print (1578)

Table 12. List of manuscripts which the present corpus is based on.

The method to collect this material was actually quite simple but nonetheless effective. The first step of this investigation was to find all forms of Old Icelandic *nökkurr/nökkut* in a standardised edition of Jónsbók. Two essential works made this possible: Ólafur Halldórsson's 1904 edition of Jónsbók and its re-printed version by

Gunnar Thoroddsen from 1970 and Hans Fix's *Wortschatz der Jónsbók* from 1984, based on Ólafur Halldórsson's edition. Having located the relevant forms of the pronouns in the Jónsbók text with the aid of the concordance and Ólafur Halldórsson's edition, the individual manuscripts were examined. Each example was carefully transcribed and the following information noted: leaf and line in the manuscript, grammatical information, transcription, line and page in the edition. When this procedure was finished, the data was sorted on a computer as it was necessary and to create detailed tables, as can be seen in the Appendix.

Due to the fact that one of the two central parts of this work is an investigation of the development of the root vowel in Old Icelandic *nökkurr/nökkut*, it also was necessary to examine the representation of the sound /ö/ in each manuscript. Scribes of medieval Icelandic employed a number of symbols to denote the sound /ö/, e.g. “ø”, “ö”, “a” and “au” (Hreinn Benediktsson 1965:69f.; Stefán Karlsson 2004:41). These notations are distinct, and the only way to read them is /ö/. Rendering the vowel /ö/ with the letter “o” was also quite common—in some manuscripts dominant—and this fact leads to problems. As the development that was to be examined is that of /ö/ to /o/ in the root of Old Icelandic *nökkurr/nökkut* it was necessary to determine—with as much certainty as possible—whether “o” in the forms of *nökkurr/nökkut* should be interpreted as /ö/ or /o/. To this end, ninety word forms with unambiguous phonological /ö/ in each manuscript were examined and transcribed. This provided a basis for deciding whether a scribe actually means /ö/ or /o/ when he writes “o” in a form of *nökkurr/nökkut*. Data on the spelling of /ö/ was collected in such a way that thirty examples were culled from each third of the manuscript—beginning, middle part and final part.

3.2. *Presenting the corpus*

As can be seen in the following chapter, examples from the manuscripts are presented in a normalised orthography. If the reader wishes, however, to have a look at a more detailed version, he is referred to the Appendix which includes a detailed transcription of each word form, including page and line of each manuscript. In addition an overview over the distribution of the writing of /ö/ in each manuscript is provided.

The material is presented in this particular way to give a more generalised but still accurate overview of the material that is being examined. Each manuscript will be presented in the following way: First some information is provided about the manuscript—mainly concerning the date, based on the most recent scholarly results. Secondly, the forms of the pronoun *nökkurr/nökkut* found in the manuscript in question are displayed in a table. Finally some notes follow on special variants or instances which might require a more detailed explanation. The manuscripts are discussed in a chronological order beginning with the oldest—AM 134 4^o—and ending with the youngest source—the first print from 1578.

As has been mentioned before the forms of *nökkurr/nökkut* are presented in a somewhat normalised orthography. At the same time it was considered important, however, to preserve the linguistically relevant parts of the words. This mainly concerns the root vowel and the vowel of the second syllable. The abbreviations are expanded as is customary in editorial practice and the expansions are presented in italics. There are some points, however, which might need separate explanations, and should be kept in mind by the reader:

As usual the small capital letter “r” is expanded as “rr”, and so is the dotted small capital “ṛ”, also dotted r-rotunda “z” is expanded as “rr”. R-rotunda “z” is normalised as normal “r”, and the unstressed back round vowel /u/—sometimes represented by “v”—is rendered as “u”. Round “ð” is written as Modern Icelandic “ð”, and “i”

without dot is normalised as “i”. Word forms divided between two lines are not marked as such in these tables; in the appendix, however, they are. Beside these points there also occur some unusual writings and variants of abbreviations which are dealt with separately under each table.

There is one form in the text which might need more detailed explanation. This is the form which Hans Fix (1984:258) classifies as adverb and is to be found in the following sentence in the text: “Umboðsmaðr konungs á fyrir at vera, ef hann er **nokkur** námuna, ok qðlaz með því konungi hálfa mörk fyrir búrán.” (Ólafur Halldórsson 1903:165) When discussing the single manuscripts this particular form will be included since it is—due to its history—closely connected to the pronoun and as such can provide more information concerning the root vowel. In the Appendix the adverbial form is quoted separately under the paradigm of each manuscript (see also chapter 2.2. above).

3.3. The manuscripts

3.3.1 AM 134 4°

This fragmentary manuscript of Jónsbók is the oldest copy of the text which is preserved. Generally it is dated to a period between 1281—which is the date of the adoption of this law text—and 1294 or at least to around 1300 (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:I, XLI; Hreinn Benediktsson 1965:liii; ONP 1989:445). The paradigm of *nökkurr/nökkut* in this manuscript is presented in *Table 13*.

AM 134 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nackurr (6x) nackorr (2x) nockurr nockur	nockur (2x)	nockut
	Acc.	nackurn nackorn	–	nackot
	Dat.	nockurum nackorum	–	–
	Gen.	–	nockurrar	
Pl.	Nom.	–	–	nockur
	Acc.	–	–	nockur
	Dat.	nackurum		
	Gen.	nackurra		

Table 13. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 134 4°.

The adverbial form is “nackur”. Although there are only twenty-four instances to be found, it can be said that no significant changes have taken place so far. Syncope in the second syllable does not occur and the final *-r* is still long in nom.sing.masc., gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur.—except for one instance in nom.sing.masc.

The writing of the root vowel with “a” is, however, remarkable. This writing of /*ö*/ with “a” may be due to East-Norwegian influence.²² If one considers that fifteen instances of this paradigm are written with “a”, it is likely that the root vowel must have been /*ö*/ rather than /*a*/ at this time of development (Hreinn Benediktsson 1965:70). This assumption is also supported by the fact that the writing of /*ö*/ with the letter “o”—which is the writing of the remaining nine—is very common in this manuscript (up to 90%). The interpretation of the acc.sing.neut. variant “nackot” is debatable, as “a” might represent /*a*/ rather than /*ö*/. Yet, as we have a nom.sing.neut. form written with “o”, which represents /*ö*/, we cannot be sure about the sound value of this specific letter.

3.3.2. AM 154 4°

AM 154 4° is manuscript from around 1320–30. According to Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XLI) there are similarities with AM 134 4° (see also ONP 1989:446). He also assumes that the scribe was not familiar with the language shown in his exemplar:

Det førstnævnte Haandskrift fra første Del af det 14. Aarh. [i.e. AM 154 4°], som er næsten helt frit for Interpolationer, indeholder i store Partier en saa gennemgribende Omredaktion ved Siden af en øjensynlig Omhu for dog ikke at forandre Meningen, at man ikke synes at kunne forklare sig dette uden ved at antage, at Sprogformen i det Haandskrift, Afskriveren har benyttet, har stødt ham som noget fremmed (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XXX, footnote 1).

²² That this East Norwegian phenomenon of representing /*q*/ (later /*ö*/) with “a” before preserved *u* is to be found in Icelandic manuscripts might have its reasons in the contact which existed between Icelandic and Norwegian scribes [Hreinn Benediktsson 1965:70 footnote 1].

AM 154 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nəkkur (7x) nəkur (5x) nəkr (3x) nəkkurr nokurr nockur	nəkr (2x) nəkur (2x)	nakvat (2x) n ^v akut
	Acc.	nəkkur ⁿ nəkkurn	–	nakuað nakkvað nakkuað nak ^k vat
	Dat.	nəkurum nəkkurum	nəkurri	nəkoru nəkuru
	Gen.	nəkurz	nəkurrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nokurir	–	nəkur
	Acc.	nokura	nəkurar nðkurrar	nəkur
	Dat.	nəkkurum		
	Gen.	nəkkurra		

Table 14. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 154 4°.

The adverbial form is “nəkkur”. In this manuscript two word forms occur on leaves from a later time period—fifteenth century: “nockut” (acc.sing.neut.) and “nockurar” (acc.plur.fem.). As can be seen very clearly, syncope still does not occur in any of the forty-seven word forms, and the quality of the root vowel has to be /ö/ as well. Thirty-six examples have a clear writing for /ö/—i.e. “ə”, “ð”, “ä”—and if one substracts the neuter forms which have to be /a/ in this paradigm—i.e. nom./acc.sing.neut.—this goes up to 87.81% of the paradigm. The form “n^vakvt” with its superscript “v” is, however, more likely to contain /ö/ than /a/. This supposition is supported by the fact that this is the only instance of nom./acc.sing.neut. which is missing a “v” or “u” for the semivocalic sound /v/ before the vowel of the second

syllable. If we consider this superscript “v” as an abbreviation one might expand this wordform as “naukv̇t”.

Besides these phenomena we observe that shortening of word-final *-rr* has taken place in nom.sing.masc.; only two instances still show long *-rr*. Long *-rr-* is still found in the middle of the words as we see in dat./gen.sing.fem. or gen.plur.

Two other interesting phenomena are to be noted here: First we see that twenty-nine of the forty-seven word forms are written with “k” instead of “kk” or “ck”. The second issue is the absence of the vowel *u* in the second syllable in some forms of nom.sing.masc./fem. This occurs five times only, and as we will see later on, it is quite common to drop this *u* in the writing of *nökkurr/nökkut*. This is, however, most likely a case of inverted spelling, and we still have to assume that forms like “naukr” have to be pronounced with the unstressed [u] in the second syllable.²³ The form “naukkur̄n” for acc.sing.masc. is quoted as a separate instance due to its spelling. The bar above the final *n* cannot be considered as indicating /nn/, as there was not phonological contrast between /n/ and /nn/ following a consonant. Consequently this variant is considered a deviant spelling.

²³ The examples of this phenomenon in this particular manuscript are difficult to interpret because they are combined with the spelling “k” instead of *kk* or *ck* as well. Whether “naukr” has to be pronounced like /noku r/ or /nö^hku r/ cannot be determined.

3.3.3. GKS 3271 4°

This manuscript is dated to around 1330 and is closely related to AM 134 4° (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLI; ONP 1989:473).

GKS 3271 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockurr (12x) nockurr (7x) nockur (3x) nockurr	nockur (3x) nockur	nackot (5x) nockot
	Acc.	nockurn (2x) nockurn	nockura	nackot (3x) nockot (2x)
	Dat.	nockurum (2x) nockurum	nockurri	nocku nockuru
	Gen.	nockurġ	nockurrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (2x) nockurir (2x) nackurir	nockurar	nockur
	Acc.	–	nockorar nockurar	nockur
	Dat.	nockurum		
	Gen.	nockurra		

Table 15. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript GKS 3271 4°.

The adverbial form is “*nokur*”. In none of the sixty-two instances is syncope to be found. Determining the quality of the root vowel, however, is difficult. Due to the fact that all instances—except those written with “a”—are represented by “o”, we only can determine which sound is represented here only by analysing the writing of /*ö*/ in general in the manuscript. The scribe of this manuscript writes 65.56% of /*ö*/ with “o”

and 34.44% with “a”. This fact—and the one form with “a” in nom.plur.masc.—makes it quite likely that the stem vowel still is /ö/ and not /o/.²⁴

That leaves the question of the “a”-variants in nom./acc.sing.neut. They might represent /ö/ as they do in the nom.plur.masc.-variant. Here one has to keep in mind that this manuscript is closely related to AM 134 4° and as such it is also bound to have some similarities also with AM 154 4° (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLI). In AM 154 4° it is clear that the root vowel of nom./acc.sing.neut. is /a/—except for one variant—but in the other two manuscripts we find the spelling with “a” together with “o” and we observe that the semivocalic /v/ seems to be lost in both manuscripts. Besides these phenomena only the shortening of word-final *-rr* in three nom.sing.masc.-forms seems worth mentioning.

The spelling “nocku” as a variant of dat.sing.neut. seems to be a scribal error.

3.3.4. AM 343 fol.

This manuscript—also known as Svalbarðsbók—is dated to the period between 1330 and 1340 (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLIV; ONP 1989:441). It seems also to be connected very closely to the manuscript AM 354 fol. which Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XXXI) classifies as direct copy of the first one.

²⁴ Writings with “a” are in all likelihood due to the predominately East Norwegian phenomenon whereby orthographic “a” is found before preserved *u* where Icelandic usually has /o/ and later /ö/ [Hreinn Benediktsson 1965:70]

AM 343 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nokkurr (11x) nockurr (4x) nockurr (2x) nðckurr nõckurr nokkurr nokkur	nðckur (2x) nokkur nokkurr	nockut (3x) nokcut
	Acc.	nokkurn (2x) nockurn	nokkura	nokkut (3x) nokcut nockut
	Dat.	nockurum nokkorum nokkurum	nockurri	nockuru nockuru
	Gen.	nokkurs	nockurrar	-
Pl.	Nom.	nokkurir (2x)	nokkurar	nockur
	Acc.	-	nokurar nockurar	nockur
	Dat.	nokkurum		
	Gen.	nokkurra		

Table 16. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 343 fol.

The adverbial form is “nokkur”. There also occurs one instance in a marginal note on fol. 79r on the left side. This form seems to belong to another scribe’s hand and might be a bit younger, perhaps around 1500: “nockurír” (nom.plur.masc.). Interestingly, it does not show syncope.

There is no trace of syncope and the root vowel definitely is /ö/ in the four examples represented by “ð” out of a total of fifty-seven examples; the rest is written with “o”. Examining the notation of /ö/ elsewhere in the entire manuscript we see that the scribe uses “o” for /ö/ quite often—in about 60% of the examples examined—and thus it is rather likely that the writing of *nökkurr/nökkut* with “o” represents /ö/ rather than /o/. Shortening of word-final *-rr* merely can be found in one variant of

nom.sing.masc. The writing with “k” instead of “kk” or “ck” occurs only once in the acc.plur.fem. form “nokurar”.

3.3.5. AM 351 fol.

The manuscript AM 351 fol.—also known as *Skálholtsbók eldri*—is dated to around 1360 or at least to the second half of the fourteenth century (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLI; ONP 1989:442).

AM 351 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nǫckurr (8x) nockurr (6x) nǫckur (3x) nockur (2x) nockur nokkurr nǫckürr	nockur (2x) nǫckur nǫckur	nǫckut (3x) nockut (2x) nokkut
	Acc.	nǫckurn nockurn nockurn	nǫckura	nockut (3x) nǫckut (3x)
	Dat.	nockurum nockurum nǫkkurum	nockurri	nockururu nockuro
	Gen.	nǫckurs	nockurar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (3x)	nockurar	nockur
	Acc.	nockura	nockurar nockurar	nǫckur (2x)
	Dat.	nǫkkurum		
	Gen.	nockurra nockurra		

Table 17. The paradigm of *nockur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 351 fol.

The adverbial form is “nǫckurr”. Syncope is found in none of the sixty-four instances and the root vowel appears to be /ö/. In almost half of the recorded examples—43.75%—the root vowel is written with “ð”. The remaining examples have a spelling with “o” which is a quite common writing for /ö/ in this manuscript: 38.89% “o” against 57.78% “ð” which is the major scribal practice.

Besides six examples of shortening of word-final *-rr* in nom.sing.masc. there is also shortening in the gen.sing.fem. A nom.sing.masc. form with dotted “ü” in the second syllable is interpreted as a separate variant since there is no reason to consider this dot as a kind of abbreviation, however, it might be a scribal error triggered by the dotted capital R that follows. The variant for dat.sing.neut. “nockururu” seems to be a scribal error too.

3.3.6. AM 350 fol.

Skarðsbók—or Codex Scardensis—is from around 1363, but parts are from the sixteenth century. Those additions seem to be copied from AM 343 fol. but also the rest indicates similarities with AM 343 fol. (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904: XLV; ONP 1989:442).

AM 350 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockurr (8x) nðckurr (7x) nðckurr (5x) nockurr (3x) nðckurr	nðckur (2x) nðckur nockur	nðckut (4x) nockut
	Acc.	nockurn nðckurn nðckurn	nðckura	nðckut (3x) nockut nockut
	Dat.	nockurum nockurum nðckurum	nðckurri	nðckuru
	Gen.	–	nðckurrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nðckurir (2x)	nðckurar	nðckur
	Acc.	–	nðckurar nðckurar	nðckur
	Dat.	nockurum		
	Gen.	nðckurra		

Table 18. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 350 fol.

As mentioned above, some of the leaves are from a later period, most likely from after 1400. Due to this there are three instances in this manuscript which are not mentioned in this table: “nockru” (dat.sing.neut.), “nockut” (nom.sing.neut.), “nockurs” (gen.sing.masc.). Looking at the table we notice that syncope does still not occur and we find a very clear proof that the root vowel at this time has to be pronounced as /ö/: up to 66.67% or thirty-eight of the examples are written with “ð”.

3.3.7. AM 344 fol.

Ólafur Hallórssón (1904:XLII) dates this manuscript to around 1400 or a bit earlier which basically agrees with the dating in the ONP register based on Stefán Karlsson: 1375–1400 (ONP 1989:442).

AM 344 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockor (18x) nockor (4x) nockorr	nockor (2x) nockor (2x) nokkor	nockot (5x) nockort nockot
	Acc.	nockorn (2x) nockorn	nockora	nockot (4x) nockot
	Dat.	nockorom (2x)	nockorri	nockoru nockoro
	Gen.	nockorlf	nockorrrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir nockorir (3x)	–	nockor
	Acc.	nockora	nockorar (2x)	nockor (2x)
	Dat.	nockorom		
	Gen.	nockorra nockorra		

Table 19. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 344 fol.

The adverbial form is “nockor”. Although it can be observed that syncope still is not in evidence at this time, deciding the quality of the root vowel seems to be rather difficult. In 96.92% of the sixty-five examples this vowel is represented by “o” and in the remaining 3.08% this letter is not legible with certainty; it is likely, however, that it also is “o”. In addition, the vowel /*ö*/ is in this manuscript represented mostly by “ö” or “ø”; the notation “o” for /*ö*/ is found in 22.22% of instances only. Furthermore it might be of interest that the scribe uses “o” also in the second syllable for /*u*/. Thus there is no clear argument for /*ö*/ as root vowel. Instead the quality of

the root vowel very likely is /o/, and this could thus be the first indication of the change from /ö/ to /o/ in the root.

Besides this it may be noted that shortening of word-final *-rr* has taken place in the majority of nom.sing.masc. forms: twenty-two of twenty-three word forms end in *-r*. The nom.sing.neut.-form “nockort” is the first occurrence of this kind in the corpus, abbreviated as “nockt” (23vb30).

3.3.8. AM 354 fol.

This manuscript—also known as Skálholtsbók yngri—is dated to around 1400 and is considered to be a copy of AM 343 fol. (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLV; ONP 1989:442).

AM 354 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (17x) nockur nockurr nockur nockurr	nockur (4x)	nockut (5x) nockut
	Acc.	nockurn (4x)	nockura	nockut (4x)
	Dat.	nockurum nockurum	nockurí	nockuru nockuru
	Gen.	nockurf	nockurrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (2x) nockurír	nockurar	nockur
	Acc.	–	nockurar (2x)	nockur (2x)
	Dat.	nockurum		
	Gen.	nockurra		

Table 20. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 354 fol.

The adverbial form is “nokur”. There is no trace of syncope and all the root vowel is represented by “o” in all the recorded examples. Even if the scribe uses “o” for /ö/ 71.11% of the time it is quite problematic to argue for /ö/ in the root of *nökkurr/nökkut* considering that he never uses a clear /ö/ grapheme in *nökkurr/nökkut*. Keeping this in mind and considering that the manuscript AM 344 fol., which is from about the same time period, shows indications of the change from /ö/ to /o/ in *nökkurr/nökkut*, we might consider the same interpretation for the manuscript AM 354 fol. This assumption can be supported if we compare these findings with the manuscript AM 343 fol., which Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XLV) assumed was the exemplar for AM 354 fol. In AM 343 fol. there are four instances of the clear /ö/ grapheme “ö”. None of them was copied by the scribe of AM 354 fol.

The shortening of word-final *-rr* in nom.sing.masc. occurs in the majority of recorded examples: nineteen out of twenty-one nom.sing.masc-forms end in *-r*. In AM 343 fol. this appears in only one nom.sing.masc.-form. The spelling “k” instead of “kk” or “ck” merely occurs in the adverbial form “nokur”.

3.3.9. AM 42 a 8°

This fragmentary manuscript is dated to around 1400 (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLII; ONP 1989:465).

AM 42 a 8°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockr (6x) nock[...] nockorr nocor	nockr (2x) nockor nockor	nockut (3x) nockuð
	Acc.	–	nocura	nockut (2x) nockut
	Dat.	nockurum nockrum	nockori	nockoru nockurru
	Gen.	nockorl	nockurar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir nocrir	–	nockor
	Acc.	–	nockorar (2x)	nockor
	Dat.	–		
	Gen.	–		

Table 21. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 42 a 8°.

The adverbial form is “nocr”. Here it seems at first glance that we can find syncope in two instances: dat.sing.masc. and nom.plur.masc. This case is not as clear as it seems, however, if one keeps in mind that the scribe also drops the *u* in forms like the nom.sing.masc./fem. Consequently we cannot be sure if these two cases are actually instances of syncope of second-syllable *u* or simply instances of inverted spelling due to the appearance of the epenthetic *u* in words like *hestr* > *hestur*.

The writing of the root vowel also offers some problems. In all instances it is written with “o” or abbreviated. It is, therefore, rather difficult to define the quality of this particular vowel. Although the scribe uses “o” for /ö/ in 94.44% of all examined

/ö/ writings, the relatively few instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in this manuscript make a definitive conclusion nearly impossible.

Again shortening of word-final *-rr* in nom.sing.masc. is in evidence and predominant if the six examples of “nockr” are explained as forms of inverted spelling representing “ur” rather than “urr”. The shortening also appears in dat./gen.sing.fem. Interestingly the scribe writes long *-rr-* in dat.sing.neut.: “nockurru”. This might be considered a scribal error or simple uncertainty on part of the scribe.

3.3.10. AM 137 4^o

According to ONP (1989:445) the manuscript AM 137 4^o can be dated to the middle or second half of the fifteenth century, 1440–1480.²⁵

²⁵ Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XLII) dates this manuscript to around 1400.

AM 137 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (10x) nockur (2x) nǫckur (3x) nǫckr (2x) nockrr nǫckur n[...]ckur nǫckurr	nockurr nockur nǫckr	nockut (4x) nockut (2x)
	Acc.	nǫckurñ	nockura nǫckura	nockut (2x) nockut (2x) nǫcku
	Dat.	nockurum nǫckurum	nockure	nockuru nockuro
	Gen.	nockurǫ	nockurar	-
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (4x)	nockurar	nockurr nǫckur
	Acc.	no[0000]	nockurar (2x)	nockur (2x)
	Dat.	nǫckurum		
	Gen.	-		

Table 22. The paradigm of *nockur* and *nockuð* in the manuscript AM 137 4°.

There is still no sign of syncope in any of the relevant forms. The root vowel is represented with “ð” in fourteen or 24.14% of the fifty-eight examples, 74.14% or forty-three are written with “o” and 1.72%—i.e. one instance—are not legible. The writing of the root vowel thus definitely represents /ö/ in nearly one quarter of the recorded instances. Considering that in general the scribe uses “o” for /ö/ in 58.89% of the instances examined, /ö/ as root vowel seems likely at first glance. Fourteen instances are, however, not even one third of the entire paradigm, and so the possibility of a rather accurate copyist adopting “ð” spellings from an earlier exemplar has to be considered as a much more likely interpretation.

Shortening of long *-rr* occurs in almost all nom.sing.masc. forms and so in dat./gen.sing.fem. There is, however, a long nom.plur.neut.-variant: “nockurr”. Cases of inverted spelling in nom.sing.masc./fem. appear in these cases only. The dotted “ñ” in acc.sing.masc. “nökkurñ” is not considered as abbreviated form, since phonological distinction was not made between long /nn/ and short /n/ following a consonant. The dat.sing.neut.-form “nökku” might be due to a scribal error.

3.3.11. AM 151 4°

This manuscript is dated to the middle of the fifteenth century , i.e. around 1450 (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLV; ONP 1989:446).

AM 151 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nokkur (10x) nokkur (8x) nockur nockur	nokkur (2x) nokkur nökkðr	nokkuð (2x) nockut (2x) nokkut nökkut
	Acc.	nökkurñ (2x) nökkurn	nökkura	nokkut (4x) nökkut
	Dat.	nökkurum (2x) nockurum	naukkurí	nokkuru
	Gen.	nökkurs	nökkurar nockurar	-
Pl.	Nom.	nökkðrír nokkurír nockurir nockurir	-	nokkur
	Acc.	-	nökkurar nokkrar	nokkur nökkðr
	Dat.	nökkurum		
	Gen.	nökkurra		

Table 23. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 151 4°.

The adverbial form is “nokkur”. This manuscript presents us with the first occurrence of *u*-syncope in one form of *nökkurr/nökkut*: acc.plur.fem. “nokkrar”. As none of the nom.sing.masc./fem.-forms shows inverted spelling this acc.plur.fem. can probably be interpreted as reflecting syncope. It is also remarkable that in three instances the vowel of the second syllable is written with “ö” instead of “u” or “o”. These are: “nokkör” (nom.sing.fem.), “nokkörir” (nom.plur.masc.) and “nokkör” (acc.plur.neut.). These special forms will be discussed in chapter 4.1.2.

Only four forms—“nökkut” (nom.sing.neut.), “nökkut” (acc.sing.neut.), “nökkurra” (gen.plur.), and “naukkurí” (dat.sing.fem.)—out of the fifty-nine examples have a definite writing representing /ö/: “ö” or “au”. The rest—i.e. 93.22%—has “o”. When we look at the other writings of /ö/ in this manuscript, we see that the scribe does not use “o” for /ö/ very often, only in 23.33% of recorded instances. For the remaining cases he uses clear /ö/ representations like “au”, “av” and “ö”. It seems therefore likely that the root vowel was /o/ in the language of the scribe of this manuscript and the remaining four writings with unambiguous /ö/ can be attributed to the influence of an earlier exemplar.

The shortening of *-rr* can be considered as more or less completed, only the gen.plur. form still shows *-rr-*; this can, however, be seen as an exception.

3.3.12. AM 41 8°

According to Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XLII) this manuscript is to be dated to 1450–1460 (see also ONP 1989:465).

AM 41 8°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (9x) nockur (3x) nokur	nockur	nockut
	Acc.	nockurn nockuñ	nockura	navckut (2x) nockut nokut
	Dat.	nockurum nockurum	–	–
	Gen.	–	–	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (2x)	–	–
	Acc.	–	–	–
	Dat.	–		
	Gen.	nockura		

Table 24. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nockuð* in the manuscript AM 41 8°.

This manuscript contains only twenty-seven examples. There is no evidence of syncope and the root vowel only occurs in two forms written with a clear representation of /ö/: “av”. The scribe in general seems to use “o” for /ö/—in 95.56%—and thus it is quite difficult to conclude something about the root vowel. In this manuscript “k” for “kk” or “ck” again appears in two forms: “nokur” (nom.sing.masc.) and “nokut” (acc.sing.neut.). Long *rr* is shortened in all relevant cases. The acc.sing.masc. form “nockuñ” lacks an “r” and has a dot above the “n”; these seem to be scribal errors.

3.3.13. AM 136 4°

The manuscript AM 136 4°—also known as *Skinnastaðabók*—is dated to the period between 1480 and 1500 (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLVI-XLVII; ONP 1989:445).

AM 136 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockr (17x) nockur (3x) nockurr (2x)	nockr (3x) nockur	nockut (4x) nockot nockut
	Acc.	nockurn (3x) nockrn	–	nockut (3x) nockut (2x)
	Dat.	nockurum nockurum	nockurí	nockuru (2x)
	Gen.	nockurs	nockurar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurír (3x) nockurir	nockrar	nockr
	Acc.	nockura	nockurar (2x)	nockur nockr
	Dat.	nockurum		
	Gen.	nockurra (2x)		

Table 25. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 136 4°.

The adverbial form is “nockr”. Regarding the syncope we find here the same problem as in AM 42 a 8° where the *u* in normal nominative forms is left out. Therefore we cannot be certain about forms like “nockrar” (18v23) for the acc.plur.fem., since it would be the only one among thirteen possible candidates. This might also be a case of inverted spelling as in the manuscripts AM 42 a 8° and AM 138 4° discussed above. This kind of spelling is to be found in nom.sing.masc./fem., but also in acc.sing.masc., nom./acc.plur.neut. and the adverbial form. The root vowel is always represented by “o”, and also for the general spelling of /ö/ we find “o” only.

3.3.14. AM 159 4°

The manuscript AM 159 4° is dated to the period from 1480 to 1500 (Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLVII; ONP 1989:446).

AM 159 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (16x) nockur (2x) noccu nockr	nockur (4x)	nockut (5x)
	Acc.	nockurn (3x)	–	nockut (3x) nokut
	Dat.	nockurum (2x) nockurum	nockure	nockru nockuru
	Gen.	nockurí	nockurar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (4x)	nockurar	nockur
	Acc.	–	nockurar	nauckur nockur
	Dat.	nockurum		
	Gen.	nockura (2x)		

Table 26. The paradigm of *nockur* and *nockuð* in the manuscript AM 159 4°.

The adverbial form is “nockur”. Here the question of syncope is somewhat difficult in a different way than before. Only one instance shows syncope. This particular dat.sing.neut. form is, however, abbreviated by a superscript *u* and has to be expanded as *ru* since *ur* would not make any sense. Expanded as such, we can claim that syncope of *u* is in evidence in this manuscript, although not very widely spread. The appearance of inverted spelling in one nom.sing.masc. form could, however, make this conclusion somewhat problematic.

In only one example out of the fifty-seven forms we find “au” as a clear representation of /ö/—i.e. 1.75%—the other 98.25% are written with “o”, and also the general representation of /ö/ is mainly with “o”—93.33%.

Shortening of *rr* seems to be finished completely in this paradigm and the one acc.sing.neut.-variant with “k” instead of “kk” or “ck” might be seen as a scribal error. The nom.plur.neut.-form “nockur” is marked with abbreviations twice: with a bar through the ascender of “k” and a superscript *r*-rotunda. The *r*-rotunda was expanded as a normal abbreviation and the bar is regarded as a special spelling. It does not, however, have any special meaning for the word.

3.3.15. AM 138 4°

Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XLVII) dates this manuscript to around 1500 (see also ONP 1989:445).

AM 138 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (11x) nockr (10x) nockur nokurr	nockr (2x) nockur (2x)	nockut (6x)
	Acc.	nockurn (2x) nockurn	nockura	nockut (5x)
	Dat.	nockrum (2x) nockurum	nockurri	nockuru nockuru
	Gen.	nockurs	nockurrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (2x)	nockrar	nockr
	Acc.	–	nockrar nockurar	nockur
	Dat.	nockrum		
	Gen.	nockurra		

Table 27. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript AM 138 4°.

Due to the fact that we find cases of inverted spelling in this manuscript it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the syncope of *u*. It should be noted, however, that it seems to appear in five of twelve possible cases which makes the supposition of actual syncope plausible. The writing of the root vowel offers clearer evidence. All instances are written with “o”, but in the manuscript “o” is used for /*ö*/ in only 62.22%; the other examples show a clear /*ö*/ grapheme. The fact that such a clear /*ö*/ writing is lacking in the pronoun, makes it quite likely that the root vowel is /*o*/. The shortening of long *rr* does not occur word internally as we can see in dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. Shortening does appear, however, in nom.sing.masc.—with only one exception.

3.3.16. AM 147 4°

This manuscript—also called Heynessbók—contains material from two different periods; consequently the findings from this manuscript are presented in two separate tables. The first table represents the material dated to a period from 1525 to 1550 (ONP 1989:445), whereas the second table contains the instances which belong, according to Ólafur Halldórsson (1903:XLIII), to the late sixteenth and seventeenth century.²⁶

²⁶ These leaves are not mentioned in ONP (1989:445), however, at <http://handrit.is> (visited on the 7th of September, 2011) they are. There the leaves 14r–20v and 93r–111v are dated to around 1600 and the leaves 86–88 are classified as additions from the seventeenth century. ONP (1989:445) dates the leaves 93r–111v to a period between 1400 and 1500. In this work the instances from the younger part are dated to around 1600, according to Ólafur Halldórsson (1903:XLIII) and <http://handrit.is> (visited on the 7th of September, 2011).

AM 147 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (10x) nockur (4x) nuckur (3x) nockurr (2x) nocur	nockur	nockut (3x) nõckut nuckut nockurt
	Acc.	nockürn nockurn nockurni	nockra	nockut (4x)
	Dat.	-	-	nockru nockuro
	Gen.	nockurf	-	-
Pl.	Nom.	nockurir (2x)	-	-
	Acc.	-	nockrar	-
	Dat.	nockrum		
	Gen.	nockura		

Table 28. The paradigm of *nockur* and *nockuð* in the older part of the manuscript AM 147 4°.

The adverbial form is “nockur”. In *Table 28* with examples from the part of the manuscript dated to the period between 1525 and 1550 there is clear evidence of *u*-syncope. There are seven forms where one might expect syncope and in four of them it actually occurs. The root vowel also shows some irregularities in this table. There are four instances of “u” and one of “ð”, the rest is “o”. The scribe in general uses “o” for /ö/ in 71.11% of recorded instances. The form “nocur” (nom.sing.masc.) is written with single “c” instead of *cc* or *ck*. This spelling, however, seems to be an exception in this manuscript and might be a scribal error. The form “nockurn” with the dotted *n* is listed separately, since the dot is not considered as an abbreviation. In the nom.sing.neut. we also find a variant with *r*: “nockurt”. This form is quite rare and so far we have only encountered it in the manuscript AM 344 fol. from 1375–1400.

AM 147 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur	nockur nockur	nockuð
	Acc.	–	–	nockuð
	Dat.	nockrum	nockuri	–
	Gen.	–	nockrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockrir	nockrar	nockur
	Acc.	–	nockrar	nockur (2x)
	Dat.	–		
	Gen.	–		

Table 29. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the younger part of the manuscript AM 147 4°.

These instances from from around 1600 constantly show *u*-syncope, even in gen.sing.fem., and it can be assumed that the root vowel is /o/ although four—i.e. 28.57%—of these examples are abbreviated by superscript “c” and thus not entirely clear.

3.3.17. NKS 1931 4°

According to the information found in NKS 1931 4°, this manuscript was written in 1531 (see also Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLIX).

NKS 1931 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	<i>nocr</i> (14x) <i>nockur</i> (11x)	<i>nockur</i> (2x) <i>nocr</i>	<i>nockuð</i> (4x)
	Acc.	<i>nockurn</i> <i>nocrn</i> <i>nockurn</i>	<i>nockra</i>	<i>nockut</i> (2x) <i>nockuð</i> (2x)
	Dat.	<i>nockrum</i> (2x)	<i>nockri</i>	<i>nockru</i> (2x)
	Gen.	<i>nockurz</i>	<i>nockrar</i>	–
Pl.	Nom.	<i>nocr</i> <i>nockrir</i>	<i>nockrar</i>	<i>nocr</i> (2x)
	Acc.	–	<i>nockrar</i> (2x)	<i>nockr</i>
	Dat.	<i>nockrum</i>		
	Gen.	–		

Table 30. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript NKS 1931 4°.

This paradigm constantly shows *u*-syncope in all forms in question, and even in the forms dat./gen.sing.fem. it appears. This indicates that *u*-syncope definitely was part of the *nokkur/nokkuð* paradigm, even if not regularly implemented. Due to the fact that many forms are abbreviated by superscript “c”, it is not completely clear to what extent the scribe uses inverted spelling; one might assume that a writing like “*ñr*” was seen as a standardised way of writing *nokkur(r)*. The scribe uses “o” for /ö/ in 83.33% of recorded examples; in 16.67% he uses a clear /ö/ spelling. The fact that he never uses a clear /ö/ spelling for the root vowel in *nokkur/nokkuð* in this manuscript indicates, however, that we have to read the root vowel as /o/.

The writing “nock̄r” with the bar going through the ascender of “k” is not considered as an abbreviation.

3.3.18. NKS 340 8°

Information found in this manuscript indicates that it was written in the year 1532 (see also Ólafur Halldórsson 1904:XLIX).

NKS 340 8°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (13x) nocr (5x) nockur	nockur (3x) nocr nock[...]	nockuð (5x) nockut
	Acc.	nockurn (2x)	nockra	nockuð (5x)
	Dat.	nockrum (3x) nðckrum	nockre	nockru (2x)
	Gen.	–	nockrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockrer nockrir	–	nocr
	Acc.	–	nockrar (2x)	nocr
	Dat.	nockrum		
	Gen.	nockra		

Table 31. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the manuscript NKS 340 8°.

The evidence found in this manuscript—like in NKS 1931 4° just discussed—indicates that *u*-syncope was quite prominent in the paradigm of *nokkur/nokkuð* in the first half of the sixteenth century. The syncope rule seems, however, to be a little bit different from the general rule found in many disyllabic substantives and adjectives where the second syllable is syncopated before an ending beginning with a vowel. As we can see in this paradigm—and the paradigm from NKS 1931 4°—the rule seems to be that the

u is dropped in trisyllabic forms of *nokkur/nokkuð*, as in the forms of dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur.

The representation of the root vowel in this paradigm is mainly with “o”—83.33%—and only once with “ö”. If we examine the general representation of /ö/ in this manuscript, we see, however, that the scribe never uses “ö” in other words. This single occurrence of “ö” may thus be due to slavish copying and does therefore not represent the actual pronunciation.

3.3.19. First print from 1578

First print from 1578		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (14x) nockr (11x)	nockur (2x) nockr (2x)	nockut (3x) nockuð (2x) ñockuð
	Acc.	nockurn (2x) nøckurn	nockra (2x)	nockuð (3x) nockut (2x)
	Dat.	nockrum (2x) nockrum	nockri	nockuru nockru
	Gen.	nockurs	nockrar	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockrer (2x)	nockrar	nockur
	Acc.	nockra	nockrar (2x)	nockur
	Dat.	nockrum		
	Gen.	nockra		

Table 32. The paradigm of *nokkur* and *nokkuð* in the first print from 1578.

This first printed edition of *Jónsbók* from the second half of the sixteenth century shows some irregularities: First, we would expect that *u*-syncope was fully implemented. This is, however, not the case in one dat.sing.neut.-form. Second, there is one writing with “ø” which is an often-used /ö/ spelling in the printed edition, used in 83.33% of all cases of /ö/ that were examined. This single “ø” example in the

pronouns may be due to slavish copying of an earlier text. The entire question of *u*-syncope becomes even more complicated if we consider the frequent occurrence of so-called inverted spellings, especially in nom.sing.masc. It was possible to ignore these writings in the two manuscripts from the first half of the sixteenth century—NKS 1931 4° and NKS 340 8°—because of the abbreviations used by the scribe. This is, however, not as easy in this case, since none of these forms is abbreviated.

4. The changes in Old Icelandic *nökkurr* and *nökkut*

4.1. The vowel qualities in the first and second syllable

4.1.1. The development until 1400

As has been mentioned before (in 2.4) one of the main objects of the present work is to describe the development of the first-syllable vowel of Old Icelandic *nökkurr/nökkut* to Modern Icelandic *nokkur/nokkuð*, i.e. from /ö/ to /o/. For this investigation we have to presume the following changes in the stem of this pronoun.

First we have the earliest stem *nekkuer-* which developed to *nøkkor-* with the dat.sing.masc. *nekkueriom* as its starting-point. Due to vowel-assimilation and loss of the semivocalic constituents the form *nøkkorom* emerged, which then spread all over the paradigm (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489). On the other hand there was the—less used but still quite frequent—stem *nakkuar-* which, due to morphological analogy and *u*-umlaut evolved to *nøkkuor-*, and actually the same can be assumed for the neuter form *nakkuat* which developed to *nøkkot* (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:488). These two originally different vowels /ø/ and /ɔ/ merged into /ö/ in the early thirteenth century, so that the stems *nøkkor-/nøkkuor-* and *nøkkot* dominated the paradigm towards the end of the thirteenth century, when also *nøkkuor-* was superseded by *nøkkor-* (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489; Stefán Karlsson 2004:11).

The evidence from the two manuscripts AM 519 a 4° (Alexanders saga) and AM 291 4° (Jómsvíkinga saga), which are accessible in concordances, confirm this development (Larsson 1956:60; de Leeuw van Weenen 2009:128). Another manuscript from about the same time, GKS 1009 fol. (Morkinskinna), demonstrates, however, that not only other stems like *nakkuat* as in AM 291 4° were quite common, but also *nakkuar-* and furthermore *nøkkver-/nøkkvet* have to be considered as part of the Icelandic language at the end of the thirteenth century (Kjeldsen 2010:465–67).

Nevertheless we are confronted with one fact which basically constitutes the problematic aspect of the development of the vowel of the first syllable: The vast majority of the forms in the two manuscripts AM 519 a 4° and AM 291 4° are written with “o” in the first syllable. Only two forms show clear /ö/ notation: “navccuð” (AM 291 4°, 67:14), “nœckvi” (AM 291 4° 66:20). In GKS 1009 fol. we find that in hand A only one form is written with “œ”, otherwise it is always written with “o”. In hand B there is, however, a more pronounced usage of the clear /ö/ grapheme “w” in the first part written by B, but B abandons this spelling altogether after fol. 12v. Thus Kjeldsen concludes that the root vowel may be /ö/ and he normalises it that way, although he cannot exclude the possibility that the root vowel already may have been /o/ (Kjeldsen 2010:460, 467-68, 471). Thus, even though “œ” was a common writing for /ö/ in the thirteenth century and afterwards—as shown by the fact that “o” is used for earlier /ø/ in 1025 instances in AM 519 a 4°—it has been assumed that /o/ already was a part of this paradigm by the late thirteenth century (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:492; de Leeuw van Weenen 2009:59). This assumption is quite reasonable, since it is rather unlikely that for example in AM 519 a 4° a clear /ö/ grapheme would never appear in any form of *nœkkur*-/*nœkkut* if the root vowel was in fact /ö/. Kjeldsen offers, however, offers the following explanation:

Det kan imidlertid ikke udelukkes at der er tale om et rent grafotaktisk fænomen. En søgning i Menotas tekstbank viser således at der også i alle ni andre tilfælde med sikre ordformer med /nœ/ i AM 519 a 4° konsekvent skrives <no>. Selvom overgangen /ö/ > /o/ kan være indtruffet i AM 519 a 4°, svækker denne iagttagelse styrken i Hreinn Benediktssons argumentation (Kjeldsen 2010:464).

In general, a phonotactically conditioned spelling in a frequent word like *nökkur-/nökkut* is not unlikely, although such an assumption would make a clear solution for this problem even more unlikely.

The oldest Jónsbók manuscript, AM 134 4°, which also dates from this time period, offers, by contrast, a slightly different image: Fifteen of the twenty-four instances are written with “a” which in all likelihood represent /ö/, and the fact that “o” is the predominant notation for /ö/ in this manuscript makes it very likely that the stem here is *nökkur-/nökkut*. Thus we might state that this manuscript represents a stage in the development of the pronoun where not only the root vowel very likely is /ö/ but also the vowel of the second syllable is represented by “u” and not by “o”, as part of the general change in the orthographic representation of the back rounded unstressed vowel. This later spelling with “u” (or “v”) can only be found in two other manuscripts of this time, which together with AM 134 4° represent the oldest sources for “u” in the second syllable: in AM 655 XXVIII a 4° “nakvrri” (dat.sing.fem., fol. 2r1) and in AM 291 4° “nockvra” (acc.plur.masc., 22:7) and “navccvð” (nom./acc.sing.neut., 67:14) (Larsson 1956:60; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:493). Here, i.e. at the time of the writing of AM 134 4°, one might say that the writing with “u” in the second syllable of *nökkur-/nökkut* started in Old Icelandic manuscripts.²⁷

The *o* in the second syllable basically derived, on the one hand, from *-ue-* in the second syllable of dat.sing.masc. *nekkueriom*, which assimilated to *o* in the third syllable and this syllable lost its semivocalic *-i-*; the resulting *-uo-* then lost its semivocalic *u* after some time. This *-uo-* in turn caused the rounding of the root vowel *e* to *ø*. On the other hand it has its origins in the second syllable *-ua-*, which became

²⁷ As Hreinn Benediktsson mentions, there are, according to Stefán Karlsson, no instances of “u” in the second syllable in documents from the first half of the fourteenth century. This seems, as can be seen in the manuscripts AM 145 4°, GKS 3271 4° and AM 343 fol. not to be the case in other texts (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:493, footnote 27).

-uo- due to *u*-umlaut in the dat.sing.masc. **nakkuarom* (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:488-89).

As can be seen in the manuscripts from the last part of the thirteenth century, second-syllable -o- already dominated the paradigm at this time until it replaced second-syllable -uo- completely (see e.g. AM 519 a 4° or GKS 1009 fol.). As [ʊ]—as one of the three vowels which could appear in unstressed syllables in Old Icelandic—more or less had the same value as stressed *o* in the earliest stage of development, we also find the unstressed [ʊ] in the pronoun represented by orthographic “o”. In the course of the thirteenth century stressed short *u* became similar to [ʊ] due to lowering and thus was then represented by orthographic “u” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:483). As can be seen, this change had already happened, or at least was in an advanced stage of development, when the manuscript AM 134 4° was written, as forms like “nockur” (nom.sing.masc., 09r12) or “nackurn” (acc.sing.masc., 31v11), etc., show.

The following three manuscripts AM 154 4°, GKS 3271 4° and AM 343 fol. offer some good material for analysing the development of the pronoun. AM 154 4°, which is from about 1320-30 and thus might be the oldest of these three, shows two facts clearly: The root vowel definitely was /ö/ and the orthographic change in the second syllable from “o” to “u” was more or less finished. In thirty-six of the forty-seven instances we find the clear /ö/ graphemes “a” and “ö”. Subtracting the *nakkuat*-forms all of the masculine and feminine forms, except for three, can be interpreted as clear manifestations of /ö/. It is interesting that the scribe consistently used the stem *nökkur*-, which actually represents the latest state in the development of this pronoun, but uses *nakkuat* for all the neuter forms in nominative and accusative except for one. This *nakkuat* actually represents an older state of development. It was, however, still used in manuscripts of the late thirteenth century as in AM 291 4°, about fifty years earlier. At the same time, however, this manuscript contains the last

evidence of the use of *nakkuat* for nom. or acc. neuter, like AM 134 4° does for the consistent use of the stem *nökkur*-.²⁸

Also in the slightly younger manuscript GKS 3271 4° from 1330 the scribe definitely used the stem *nökkur*-. Admittedly, all the instances in the text are written with either “o” or “a”. The scribe, however, also uses only these two graphemes for /ö/ elsewhere, i.e. “o” in 65.56% and “a” in 34.44% of the cases. For Modern Icelandic *nokkuð* the stem *nökkut* is the only one. As can be observed in older manuscripts from the latter half of the thirteenth century, the stem *nökkut* is not a new one (see e.g. AM 291 4° or AM 519 a 4°), and has its origins in a case of analogy to the development of the stem *nakkuar*- > *nokkuor*- plus the loss of semivocalic *u* in the second syllable. The manuscript GKS 3271 4° seems, however, to be the first manuscript where the stem *nökkut* can be seen as the only variant.²⁹

The third manuscript from the first half of the fourteenth century is AM 343 fol. (Svalbarðsbók) and might be slightly younger than GKS 3271 4°. Here we still find the stem *nökkur*- as is evident from the usage of the /ö/ grapheme “ð” in four out of the fifty-seven instances and by the fact that “o”, which is the writing of the first-syllable vowel in the other fifty-three instances, is used in about 60% of the /ö/ writings elsewhere in the manuscript. Another change can be seen in nom./acc.sing.neut. where the orthographic representation of the second-syllable vowel has changed from “o” to “u”. Even though “u” also occurs in earlier manuscripts, this is, however, sporadic (see e.g. AM 291 4° “navccvð”, AM 123 4° “nockut”), and AM 343 fol. seems to be the first manuscript where the stem *nökkut* is

²⁸ That nom./acc.sing.neut. often shows morphological forms which are deviant from the rest of the paradigm. This can be observed in other pronouns like *engi* (with the stem *eng-/öng-* but nom./acc.sing.neut. *ekki*), *sjá/þessi* (nom./acc.sing.neut. *þetta*), *einhverr* (nom./acc.sing.neut. *eitthvert*), etc. It looks like the nom./acc.sing.neut. in general is somewhat resistant to morphological levelling of the stem [see, for instance, Noreen 1903:278, 284-85].

²⁹ The form *nöckut* is also found in AM 134 4° from the late thirteenth century. There are, however, only two instances and as such the material is inconclusive.

regularly spelled “u” in the second syllable. For two other manuscripts from probably the same time period—the Snorra-Edda manuscript DG 11 and Möðruvallabók AM 132 fol.—more or less the same can be said.

Thus, for the development of the Modern Icelandic indefinite pronouns *nokkur* and *nokkuð* the following can be stated:

1. The orthographic variant with “o” in the second syllable changed to “u”, which then became the regular spelling.
2. The last remnants of nom./acc.sing.neut. *nakkuat* can be found towards the end of the thirteenth century; it then became *nökkut* in the course of the first half of the fourteenth century.

The other two major manuscripts from the fourteenth century, AM 351 fol. (Skálholtsbók eldri from around 1360 or the latter half of the fourteenth century) and AM 350 fol. (Skarðsbók from around 1363), basically confirm this development. In AM 351 fol. almost the half of the instances are written with “ö” (twenty-eight out of sixty-four) and in AM 350 fol. it is even more (thirty-eight out of fifty-seven). The rest is written with “o” which is in both manuscripts a quite common way to represent /ö/ (about one third).

The next three manuscripts under investigation are from around 1400: AM 344 fol., AM 354 fol. and AM 42 a 8°. The manuscripts from this time present some problems which make it quite difficult to come to definite conclusions about the development of the pronoun. In AM 344 fol. there are sixty-five instances and all of them are written with “o” in the first syllable, and in the rest of the manuscript “o” is not used that much in comparison with “ö” or “q” to warrant the assumption that “o”

is clearly used as an /ö/-grapheme here. That is, however, not the only notable finding in this manuscript.

In the second syllable all the instances—at least where they are not abbreviated—are written with “o”, the only exception being “nockv2” in 50ra18. And even if we assumed that the abbreviations had to be expanded as *ur* or *ut* in nom./acc.sing.neut., there still would be forty-six “o”-writings in the second syllable out of sixty-five instances. In the fragmentary manuscript AM 42 a 8° there also occur eight writings with “o”, five with “u” and the remaining twenty-two are either abbreviated or indicate a phenomenon in Old Icelandic writing which might best be described as “inverted spelling”.

The “inverted spellings” originate in the development of an epenthetic *u* before a postconsonantal *r* “followed by a consonant or in word-final position [...]” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:484) Thus forms like “nockr” (05r16) or “nockrū” (50v07) have to be pronounced with [u] in the second syllable. This fact does not, however, explain the reappearance of “o” in the second syllable after it seemed to have disappeared almost a century earlier. This could perhaps be explained as simple copying of an earlier manuscript.

The consistent usage of “o” in the second syllable in AM 344 fol. does, however, provoke some doubts. In the other manuscript from about this time—AM 354 fol.—“u” in the second syllable is the rule. However, also here the investigation is not without problems. As Ólafur Halldórsson (1904:XXXI) states AM 354 fol. seems to be a direct copy of AM 343 fol., which also had “u” in the second syllable. This must be taken into account when examining the paradigm of *nokkur/nokkuð*. Consequently, all the forms written with “u” in the second syllable in AM 354 fol. might be due to a strict copying process.

When we look at the first syllable, however, we discover some differences. In AM 343 fol.—thus the exemplar for AM 354 fol.—there are four instances written with “ð”: “nðckr” (06ra15), “nðckur” (08rb11) and “nðckur” (19rb13, 20va18). The same words are, however, written with “o” in AM 354 fol. This might indicate two things: On the one hand it makes it less probable that the writings with “u” in the second syllable in AM 354 fol. are due to simple copying only. On the other hand it shows that the development of /ö/ to /o/ in the first syllable is in a very much advanced state around 1400. Perhaps one might say that around 1400 we have to assume that the stem had become *nokkur*-, replacing *nökkur*-.

None of the manuscripts around 1400 show writings with clear /ö/ graphemes, and also the manuscript AM 132 fol. (Möðruvallabók), which is dated to the middle of the fourteenth century, has only “o” in the first syllable (de Leeuw van Weenen 2000:212). The fact that the scribe of Möðruvallabók uses other unambiguous /ö/ writings in the manuscript, supports the assumption that the stem vowel actually is /o/.³⁰

Looking at the manuscripts examined so far this development becomes even more obvious if one represents the distribution of clear /ö/ graphemes in the first syllable on a percentage basis, as is done in *Table 33* below. The figures in brackets in the first line indicate the date of the manuscript whereas those in the second line indicate the total number of examples of *nokkur/nokkuð* appearing in the manuscript.

³⁰ To represent /ö/ the scribe of Möðruvallabók uses “o” as the preferred variant (6260 times), but “au” is used quite often (1421 times). Variants with “av”, “ó” or “q” are used less often (de Leeuw van Weenen 2000:75).

Fourteenth century	AM 134 4° (1281–94)	AM 154 4° (1320–30)	GKS 3271 4° (1330)	AM 343 fol. (1330–40)	AM 351 fol. (1360–1400)	AM 350 fol. (1363)	AM 344 fol. (1375–1400)	AM 354 fol. (1400)	AM 42 a 8° (1400)
Total number	15 (24)	36 (41) ³¹	9 (62) ³²	4 (56)	28 (64)	38 (57)	0 (65)	0 (59)	0 (35)
Percent	62.50%	87.81%	14.52%	07.14%	43.75%	66.67%	00.00%	00.00%	00.00%

Table 33. Distribution of clear /ö/ writings in the first syllable in manuscripts of the fourteenth century.

Whether we actually can assume that the stem became *nokkur-* around 1400, which might be indicated by the last three manuscripts in *Table 33*, and occurrences of a stem *nökkur-* simply are exceptions due to copying, will be discussed after an examination of the manuscripts from the fifteenth century.

4.1.2. The development in the fifteenth century until present

Already in the first manuscript of this time period, AM 137 4° from the middle or second half of the fifteenth century, 1440–1480, this development seems to be reversed. Fourteen out of the fifty-eight instances have the clear /ö/ grapheme “ö”, i.e. 24.24% of the paradigm. What does this indicate? We must not ignore the fact that such manuscripts are basically copies from other, older manuscripts and thus it is—depending on the scribes, of course—always likely that archaic orthographic features that were not consistent with the scribe’s language could appear in the copies. That is how, for instance, writings with “o” in the second syllable even around 1400—as in

³¹ The neuter-forms based on *nakkuat* are not considered in this calculation.

³² Eight out of these nine are either nominative or accusative singular neuter, and thus it is not altogether clear whether it actually is /ö/ or /a/. As “a” also occurs once in nom.plur.masc. and the semivocalic *u* is missing in all the nom./acc.sing.neut. forms, the pronunciation /ö/ is probable.

the manuscripts AM 344 fol. and AM 42 a 8^o—can be explained. If we take a look at the other manuscripts between 1400 and 1500, we see that a clear /*ö*/ grapheme can be found sporadically.

The distribution of clear /*ö*/ graphemes for the root vowel in the fifteenth-century manuscripts examined is presented in *Table 34* below. The figures in brackets in the first line indicate the date of the manuscript whereas those in the second line indicate the total number of examples of *nokkur/nokkuð* appearing in the manuscript.

Fifteenth century	AM 137 4 ^o (1440–80)	AM 151 4 ^o (1450)	AM 41 8 ^o (1450–60)	AM 136 4 ^o (1480–1500)	AM 159 4 ^o (1480–1500)	AM 138 4 ^o (1500)
Total number	14 (58)	3 (59)	2 (27)	0 (63)	1 (57)	0 (59)
Percent	24.14%	05.09%	07.41%	00.00%	01.75%	00.00%
Examples	see Appendix	nðkkvt (nom.sing.neut., 26v14); nðkkvt (acc.sing.neut. 80r15); nðkkurra (gen.plur. 89r13)	navckvt (acc.sing.neut., 12v20, 49r19)	–	nauck (acc.plur.neut., 14v04)	–

Table 34. Distribution of clear /*ö*/ writings in the first syllable in manuscripts from the fifteenth century.

These findings are at odds with Björn K. Þórólfsson’s (1925:49) statement that the quality of the root vowel must have been /*ö*/ all throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth century. It rather is more probable that the change /*ö*/ > /*o*/ happened around 1400 and *nokkur-* was the dominant stem of the paradigm thereafter. It seems

certain, however, judging by the evidence from the fifteenth century, that the stem *nökkur*- still was present, but was about to disappear.

At the same time it also seems certain that the stem *nokkur*- had appeared already in the beginning of the fourteenth century or perhaps even earlier (Björn K. Þórólfsson 1925:49; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:492). This assumption is based on the idea that in the pronoun /o/ arose from /ö/ after the merger of /o/ and /q/. Another theory argues “that it was from *q* to *o*, thus antedating the merger of *q* and *ø* to *ö* — a relative chronology supported, in particular, by the fact that no doublets are found in the case of *ø* [i.e. those forms which have *ø* as the root vowel], cf., e.g., *døkkur* ‘dark’, *slökkua* ‘extinguish’, *stökkua* ‘jump’” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:491–92). As Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:492) points out, forms of *nökkurr/nökkut* with /q/ were not as frequent as those with /ø/; consequently /q/ is an unlikely source for /o/ in this pronoun.

This conclusion seems reasonable, if one examines *nokkvor*-stems in late thirteenth-century manuscripts like GKS 1009 fol. or AM 519 a 4^o and compares their frequency with that of others like *nokkor*- or *nakkuar*- (de Leeuw van Weenen 2009:128; Kjeldsen 2010:465). Another argument has been made that what we see here is not necessarily a phonetic change, but rather “the preservation of the old pronunciation of *q*” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:492; also see Jakob Jóhannes Smári 1932:7).

Even if we conclude that the change from /ö/ to /o/ took place around 1400 or a little earlier there still is, however, one characteristic which might stand in direct connection with the development of the root vowel. That is the three forms with “ð” in the second syllable in the manuscript AM 151 4^o from about 1450: nom.sing.fem. “nökkðr” (022r11), nom.plur.masc. “nökkðír” (042v10) and acc.plur.neut. “nökkðr” (022r04). The writing with “ð” in the second syllable, as we can see, is to be found in

both bisyllabic and trisyllabic forms and is used by the scribe to represent /ö/ in about 55.56% elsewhere in the manuscript. Thus we have to assume /ö/ also in this second syllable. What might be the reason? As no other instances of this kind were found in the present corpus nor in other material, this surely could be some kind of scribal error, a metathesis, reversing the “ö” in the first syllable with the “o” in the second syllable.

There are, however, two arguments which contradict this assumption: Firstly this would mean that the actual correct form is based on a stem with *o* in the second syllable. This is, of course, possible, however, unlikely, since there is no other variant written with *o* in the second syllable, and such a spelling, in general, is very rare at this time of development. Secondly, as said before, there is no other evidence for such a misspelling in none of the manuscripts examined. As this phenomenon appears, as far as we know, only in this manuscript, it could reflect some confusion of the scribe regarding the writings of the first or second syllable.³³ This phenomenon can also be observed in alternations between regular /u/ notation (i.e. with “o”, “u” and “v”) and /ö/ notation (e.g. “ö”) in other second syllables before preserved *u*. For instance, the dat.plur. of *gefandi* is found both as *geföndum* and *gefundum*. It is possible that those spellings in the *nökkurr* paradigm are analogous to the *ö/u* alternation in *geföndum/gefundum*. Also the form “nökkorum” found in Holm perg 15 4° (fol. 43r14) might be regarded as such. The possibility of a scribal error, however, never should be ignored, as long as such instances are so few (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:489, footnote 19).³⁴

³³ The form “nökkorum” in the manuscript Holm perg 15 4° (fol. 43r14) might be regarded as such too, however, it shows a different spelling in the first syllable.

³⁴ This possibility of analogy was mentioned by Haraldur Bernharðsson in a private conversation.

In all the manuscripts from the fifteenth century the stem *nokkur-/nokkut* is the dominant one, with sporadic occurrences of *nökkur-/nökkut*—except of the possibly oldest one AM 137 4° where the latter is more frequent—as shown in *Table 34*.

The last four manuscripts examined represent the state of the pronoun in the course of the sixteenth century. To begin with AM 147 4° from the first half of the sixteenth century, we can assume a paradigm dominated by the stem *nokkur-/nokkut*. Besides one occurrence of the stem *nökkut*—“nöckut” (nom.sing.neut., 02v12)—there are, however, four instances with “u” in the first syllable: “nucku2” (nom.sing.masc., 07v07, 10v11, 12v03) and “nuckut” (nom.sing.neut., 05v10).

These writings with “u” are exceptional in the present corpus. There are, however, examples with *u* from other manuscripts. In the manuscript AM 764 4° from the late fourteenth century the stem *nuckur-* seems to be quite frequent, and there are even sections in this manuscript where only this particular stem occurs (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:496-97, see also footnote 29). In *Guðbrandsbiblíá* from 1584 we find one instance with “u” in the first syllable: “nuckure” (I Cor. 1,7) (Bandle 1956:82). Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:497, footnote 29), however, classifies this single instance in GB as “a simple misprint”, since in the translation of the New Testament by Oddur Gottskálksson in 1540 the corresponding form is “nockurre” (Jón Helgason 1929:80).

As there is only this single occurrence, Hreinn Benediktsson’s explanation sounds plausible, but the fact that this stem *nuckur-* occurs again at the beginning of the sixteenth century, indicates that this probably is not a misprint. Perhaps this rather indicates that there was some confusion as late as the sixteenth century regarding the quality of the vowel of the first syllable based on a conflict between the scribe’s language and the language found in the exemplar, and that the usage of “u” in the first syllable, which—according to Hreinn Benediktsson—could be an indication of a

transitional stage between the stems *nökkur-* and *nokkur-*, thus still occurred as late as in the sixteenth century. Of course, this uncertainty must have been much more significant in the course of the fourteenth century, when this change actually happened, so that this occurrence of the stem *nuckur-* in AM 764 4° might rather be considered as natural (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:496-97).³⁵

The other two manuscripts NKS 1931 4° and NKS 340 8° from about the same time—1531 and 1532—represent the expected stem *nokkur-/nokkut*. The only exception is the dat.sing.masc.-form “nöckz” in NKS 340 8° (150v15).³⁶ The first print from 1578 finally also has one exceptional variant: “nöckurn” (acc.sing.masc., 187v19) which can be regarded as a relic of the *nökkur-* stem.

4.2. The syncope in the second syllable

The development of the new monosyllabic stem *nokkr-* as part of the modern paradigm of *nokkur/nokkuð* will be discussed in this chapter. This new stem is due to syncope of the second-syllable *u* before an ending starting with a vowel, e.g. OIcel. nom.plur.masc. *nökkurir* > Mod. Icel. *nokkrir*. This new stem is to be found in the following forms: dat.sing.masc. *nokkrum*, acc.sing.fem. *nokkra*, dat.sing.neut. *nokkru*, nom.plur.masc. *nokkrir*, acc.plur.masc. *nokkra*, nom./acc.plur.fem. *nokkrar* and dat.plur. *nokkrum* (Guðrún Kvaran 2005:271).

In works on (Old) Icelandic it is stated that this syncope started to appear towards the end of the fourteenth century and around 1400 (see Björn K. Þórólfsson 1925:49). Others maintain it appeared towards the end of the fifteenth century (see Guðrún Kvaran 2005:414). Looking at texts from the fourteenth century, it becomes apparent,

³⁵ In general, as it is with special forms like “u” in the first or “ð” in the second syllable, dialectal differences are always a possibility too. The manuscript AM 764 4° was written in Skagafjörður, the Guðbrandsbiblíá was printed at Hólar in Skagafjörður. This variant may therefore have been a northern dialectal feature (Haraldur Bernharðsson in a private conversation).

³⁶ As will be shown in the next chapter, the stem *nokkr-* already is part of the paradigm as well.

however, that there is no syncope to be found (Grape 1977:246; de Leeuw van Weenen 2000:212). It rather is likely that this change took place in the course of the fifteenth century and was more or less completed in the beginning or middle of the sixteenth century as can be seen in the translation of the New Testament from 1540 (Jón Helgason 1929:79-80) and the entire Bible (Guðbrandsbiblía) from 1584 (Bandle 1956:369). Whether it is possible to trace this change more exactly, will be demonstrated now, based on the corpus of the Jónsbók manuscripts.

Before we start this investigation, one phenomenon has to be mentioned, which makes this search for the first occurrence of syncope quite complicated: inverted spelling. This phenomenon of Old Icelandic scribal practice results from “the development of epenthetic *u* before a postconsonantal *r* followed by a consonant or in the word-final position [...]” (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:484). Due to a certain confusion caused by this development, words originally ending in *-ur* suddenly have been written *-r* since *u* by way of hypercorrection.

This phenomenon can be observed in forms of *nökkurr/nökkut* all over the Old Icelandic text tradition: orthographic “*r*” for the expected “*ur*”/“*vr*”. The first example in the present corpus is in the manuscript AM 154 4° from between 1320 and 1330: “*nàkr*” (nom.sing.masc., 27v22, 28v04, 30r16) and “*nàkr*” (nom.sing.fam., 14v02, 14v13). In the second occurrence in AM 42 a 8° about seventy or eighty years later the problem connected with this phenomenon becomes apparent: nom.sing.masc./fem. again appear with inverted spelling (“*nockr*”); also the adverbial form “*ñr*” (72r07) may be interpreted as containing an inverted spelling. In addition the dat.sing.masc. form “*nockrū*” (50v07) and nom.plur.masc. form “*ñrir*” (80v10) appear. Considering the use of inverted spelling by the scribe and the fact that these two would be the only ones showing syncope out of nine possible candidates, they have to be considered as simple cases of inverted spelling. Another fact supporting this

statement is that one of these two forms, i.e. “*ñrir*” in 80v10, even is abbreviated in such a way that a definite statement is rather uncertain.

In the manuscript AM 137 4° from between 1440 and 1480 inverted spelling occurs in only four forms, again nom.sing.masc./fem. In the manuscript AM 151 4° from about 1450 we might, however, see unambiguous evidence for syncope: There is no indication that the scribe of AM 151 4° used inverted spelling, but one writing of acc.plur.fem. is “*nokkr^r*” (20v21).

Thus, we can state with some certainty, that in the middle of the fifteenth century, around 1450, syncope of second-syllable *u* in a trisyllabic form of *nökkurr/nökkut* occurs.³⁷

The next manuscript where we could assume *u*-syncope is AM 136 4° from the end of the fifteenth century. This manuscript, however, also shows major use of inverted spelling in the nom.sing.forms of masculine and feminine, but also in others: “*nockrn*” (acc.sing.masc., 77r23), “*nockr*” (nom.plur.neut., 19v21), “*nockr*” (acc.plur.neut., 20v13) and the adverbial form “*nockr*” (57r18); the uncertain case is “*nockr^r*” (nom.plur.fem., 18v23). Due to the frequent usage of this special spelling and the fact that syncope would occur merely once among thirteen possible candidates, the case of actual *u*-syncope is not very persuasive.

In the manuscript AM 154 4° from the beginning of the fourteenth century two instances appear written on leaves, which can be dated to the fifteenth century. One of them is a candidate for *u*-syncope, but it does not show signs of syncope: “*nockur^r*” (acc.plur.fem., 02r11).

AM 138 4° from about 1500 is the next problematic manuscript. Here we find cases of clear inverted spelling quite often (thirteen times). Five of twelve possible

³⁷ On the other hand it should not be ignored that all the other possible candidates still show “*u*”. Thus a scribal error is a possibility. AM 151 4° also is the only manuscript so far which shows variants with “*ö*” in the second syllable. Whether this stands in connection with *u*-syncope remains open so far.

candidates for *u*-syncope, however, also lack an *u* in the second syllable. Here we actually can assume syncope, since it seems to appear more often than in any of the other manuscripts so far, and the manuscript AM 147 4°—twenty-five to fifty years younger—finally shows *u*-syncope for certain: “nock[~]” (acc.sing.fem., 75r06), “nock^{2u}” (dat.sing.neut., 06v07), “nock²” (acc.plur.fem., 02r09) and “nock^{2ū}” (dat.plur., 56r22).

The two manuscripts contemporary to AM 147 4°—NKS 1931 4° and NKS 340 8°—finally show the total integration of *u*-syncope in the paradigm of *nokkur/nokkuð*. Even though both manuscripts have instances of inverted spelling as well, the fact that *u* is missing in all the relevant forms allows us to ignore that fact. Basically the same can be said about the first print from 1578.

Thus, summarising, one can state that the first occurrence of clear *u*-syncope is to be found at about 1450; 1500 has, however, to be determined as the date when syncope and thus the monosyllabic stem *nokkr-* seems to be a part of the paradigm. The single occurrence in AM 151 4° from the middle of the fifteenth century is not sufficient to speak of it as part of the entire paradigm; nonetheless it can be defined as starting point for this development.³⁸

Another phenomenon closely connected to the *u*-syncope before endings starting with a vowel, is the syncope of *u* before endings starting with an *r*. This occurs later than *u*-syncope caused by the normal rules and thus surely is due to analogy. In the younger part of the manuscript AM 147 4°, which is dated to the sixteenth or seventeenth century, we find the gen.sing.fem. form “nock^{2~}” (19v08). In the

³⁸ In the manuscript AM 343 fol. from the first half of the fourteenth century the nom.plur.masc.-form “nockurír” (79rMarg) can be found in a marginal note from about 1500. As can be seen this one does not show syncope; it is quite probable, however, that the scribe of this note was anxious to conform this with the spelling of the rest of the manuscript. In AM 350 fol. three other instances which have to be from at least after 1400 occur. One of them is a dat.sing.neut. and might show *u*-syncope: “nock^u” (18ra23). Even though this ending is abbreviated, syncope is likely and thus these forms might rather be dated to the end of the fifteenth century, or even to around 1500.

manuscripts NKS 1931 4° and NKS 340 8° as well as in the first print from 1578 this seems to be adopted to the paradigm as a rule: all forms of dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. have syncope. This became a fully accepted part of the paradigm of *nokkur/nokkuð* as shown by the paradigm in Runólfur Jónsson's grammar of 1651.³⁹

This must have changed, however, in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, as can be seen in Jón Magnússon's Icelandic grammar and grammars of Modern Icelandic, although syncopated forms still occur in Modern Icelandic (Valtýr Guðmundsson 1922:114; Jón Magnússon 1997:118-19; Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:499, footnote 31).⁴⁰

4.3. Shortening of long word-final -rr and intervocalic -rr-

In the development from Old Icelandic to Modern Icelandic the shortening of long *rr* is one phenomenon which can be observed all over the language. In word-final position long *rr* was shortened after a long stressed vowel in monosyllabic words and after an unstressed vowel. This process of shortening is dated to about the middle of the fourteenth century. The shortening of long *rr* after a short vowel in monosyllabic words may, however, have happened a little later. It is likely that intervocalic long *rr* was also shortened at about the same time as word-final *rr* after short vowels in monosyllabics (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:496, 499).

In the present corpus of *nökkurr/nökkut* the shortening of word-final *rr* in nom.sing.masc. appears as follows in *Table 35*. The information in *Table 35* presented in the following order: manuscript (date)—number of shortened forms (total number of nom.sing.masc. forms)—percentage of shortened forms.

³⁹ In one of three examined manuscripts from the seventeenth century, the scribe also changed the originally bisyllabic stem of gen.sing./plur.fem. to a monosyllabic stem (Haraldur Bernharðsson 1999:118).

⁴⁰ In those later grammars it is also possible that the author was anxious to archaïse the language. The syncope may also have been a dialectal feature, at least to some extent.

AM 134 4° (1281–1294/1300) — 1 (10), 10.00%
AM 154 4° (1320–1330) — 16 (18), 88.89%
GKS 3271 4° (1330) — 3 (23), 13.04%
AM 343 fol. (1330–1340) — 1 (21), 04.76%
AM 351 fol. (1360–1400) — 6 (22), 27.27%
AM 350 fol. (1363) — 0 (24), 00.00%
AM 344 fol. (1375–1400) — 22 (23), 95.65%
AM 354 fol. (1400) — 19 (21), 90.48%
AM 42 a 8° (1400) — 7 (9), 77.78% ⁴¹
AM 137 4° (1440–1480) — 19 (21), 90.48%
AM 151 4° (1450) — 20 (20), 100.00%
AM 41 8° (1450–1460) — 13 (13), 100.00%
AM 136 4° (1480–1500) — 20 (22), 90.90%
AM 159 4° (1480–1500) — 20 (20), 100.00%
AM 138 4° (1500) — 22 (23), 95.65%
AM 147 4° (1525–1550) — 18 (20), 90.00% ⁴²
NKS 1931 4° (1531) — 25 (25), 100.00%
NKS 340 8° (1532) — 19 (19), 100.00%
First print (1578) — 25 (25), 100.00%

Table 35. Shortening of word final *rr* in nom.sing.masc.

As can be seen from this, shortened word-final *rr* becomes a more or less permanent feature of the paradigm around 1400; the manuscript AM 154 4° from the early fourteenth century might be regarded as an exception. Thus it can be stated that the forms nom.sing.masc. and nom.sing.fem. of the stem *nökkur*- became identical at this time (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:496).⁴³

⁴¹ The second part of the form in 08r15 is not legible.

⁴² Only the older part of the manuscript AM 147 4° is considered in this table, since the dating of the younger part is quite uncertain.

⁴³ Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:496) dates this development a little earlier. This does not, however, change much since the manuscript AM 344 fol. might as well be a little older than 1400.

The shortening of intervocalic *rr* in dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. is shown in *Table 36*. The information in *Table 36* is presented in the following order: manuscript (date)—number of shortened forms (total number of dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. forms)—percentage of shortened forms.

AM 134 4° (1281–1294/1300) — 0 (2), 00.00%
AM 154 4° (1320–1330) — 0 (3), 00.00%
GKS 3271 4° (1330) — 0 (3), 00.00%
AM 343 fol. (1330–1340) — 0 (3), 00.00%
AM 351 fol. (1360–1400) — 1 (4), 25.00%
AM 350 fol. (1363) — 0 (3), 00.00%
AM 344 fol. (1375–1400) — 0 (4), 00.00%
AM 354 fol. (1400) — 0 (3), 00.00%
AM 42 a 8° (1400) — 2 (2), 100.00%
AM 137 4° (1440–1480) — 2 (2), 100.00%
AM 151 4° (1450) — 3 (4), 75.00%
AM 41 8° (1450–1460) — 1 (1), 100.00%
AM 136 4° (1480–1500) — 2 (4), 50.00%
AM 159 4° (1480–1500) — 4 (4), 100.00%
AM 138 4° (1500) — 0 (3), 00.00%
AM 147 4° (1525–1550) — 1 (1), 100.00% ⁴⁴
NKS 1931 4° (1531) — 2 (2), 100.00%
NKS 340 8° (1532) — 3 (3), 100.00%
First print (1578) — 3 (3), 100.00%

Table 36. Shortening of intervocalic *rr* in dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur.

In general it is more difficult to come to a definite conclusion from this than concerning the shortening of word-final *rr*, since we have far fewer examples here. We might, however, assume more or less the same tendency as for the shortening of word-final *rr*: it seems to begin around 1400. As stated above, syncope of

⁴⁴ Only the older part of the manuscript AM 147 4° is considered in this table, since the dating of the younger part is quite uncertain.

second-syllable *u* in these forms does not occur before the sixteenth century and thus Hreinn Benediktsson's assumption concerning this syncope-phenomenon is supported by what has been found here: "The prerequisite for the occurrence of such a change [i.e. *u*-syncope in dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur.] would appear to be that the shortening of *-rr-* in the unstressed position had already taken place" (Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:498-99).⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Once this intermediate *-rr-* was shortened, the remaining single *-r-* might have been considered as belonging to the stem, and thus the added ending became an ending starting with a vowel.

5. Conclusion

After presenting these results based on the corpus it might be necessary to bring the questions proposed in the Introduction to mind and to consider whether we achieved satisfying answers. These questions are:

1. What was the nature of the change of the vowel in the first syllable? When did the change from /ö/ to /o/ happen?
2. When do the first indications of *u*-syncope in trisyllabic forms appear, i.e. when does the stem *nokkr-* appear?
3. What was the development of word-final *-rr* and intervocalic *r(r)* in these pronouns?

To answer the first question we had to start with the stems *nökkur-* and *nökkut*. Concluding from the present corpus only and considering the *Tables 33* and *34* in the chapters 4.1.1. and 4.1.2. we can state the following:

The stem *nökkur-* had been part of the Icelandic language until the last third of the fourteenth century. In the last quarter of the fourteenth century and especially around 1400 we observe that the stem *nokkur-* dominates the language of the corpus. For better understanding it might be helpful to bring *Table 33* to mind again:

Fourteenth century	AM 134 4° (1281–94)	AM 154 4° (1320–30)	GKS 3271 4° (1330)	AM 343 fol. (1330–40)	AM 351 fol. (1360–1400)	AM 350 fol. (1363)	AM 344 fol. (1375–1400)	AM 354 fol. (1400)	AM 42 a 8° (1400)
Total number	15 (24)	36 (41) ⁴⁶	9 (62) ⁴⁷	4 (56)	28 (64)	38 (57)	0 (65)	0 (59)	0 (35)
Percent	62.50%	87.81%	14.52%	07.14%	43.75%	66.67%	00.00%	00.00%	00.00%

Table 33. Distribution of clear /ö/ writings in the first syllable in manuscripts of the fourteenth century.

For the next century *Table 34* from chapter 4.1.2. describes the further development quite explicitly:

Fifteenth century	AM 137 4° (1440–80)	AM 151 4° (1450)	AM 41 8° (1450–60)	AM 136 4° (1480–1500)	AM 159 4° (1480–1500)	AM 138 4° (1500)
Total number	14 (58)	3 (59)	2 (27)	0 (63)	1 (57)	0 (59)
Percent	24.14%	05.09%	07.41%	00.00%	01.75%	00.00%
Examples	see Appendix	nōkkvt (nom.sing.neut., 26v14); nōkkvt (acc.sing.neut. 80r15); nōkkurra (gen.plur. 89r13)	navckvt (acc.sing.neut., 12v20, 49r19)	–	nauck (acc.plur.neut., 14v04)	–

⁴⁶ The neuter-forms based on *nakkuat* are not considered in this calculation.

⁴⁷ Eight out of these nine are either nominative or accusative singular neuter, and thus it is not altogether clear whether it actually is /ö/ or /a/. As “a” also occurs once in nom.plur.masc. and the semivocalic *u* is missing in all the nom./acc.sing.neut. forms, the pronunciation /ö/ is probable.

Table 34. Distribution of clear /ö/ writings in the first syllable in manuscripts from the fifteenth century.

Although the manuscript AM 137 4° from the period between 1440 and 1480 shows 24.14% of its forms with unambiguous /ö/ writings, this still is merely a quarter of all examples and is not a convincing argument for the stem *nökkur*–. *Table 34* rather shows quite clear that the stem had been *nokkur*– in the fifteenth century.

Concluding now, from these tables, that the stem *nökkur*– disappeared in the second half of the fourteenth century and has been replaced by the stem *nokkur*–, we also have to consider other material from this time. As shown in chapter 2.4. and *Table 8* the two major manuscripts from this century—DG 11 from 1300–1325 and AM 132 fol. from 1330–1370—show no indication for the stem *nökkur*–, the writings rather suggest *nokkur*–.⁴⁸ If we have a look at *Table 33* again and observe those manuscripts more or less contemporary to AM 132 fol., the manuscripts GKS 3271 4° and AM 343 fol., it becomes quite clear that the stem *nokkur*– must have been present in the Icelandic language already in the middle of the thirteenth century, and that this time also might be the starting point when the stem *nokkur*– is about to replace *nökkur*– more and more, until *nökkur*– disappears around 1400.

Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:492) proposes that the stem *nokkur*– already was part of the Icelandic language in the late thirteenth century. This assumption is based on the fact that the manuscript AM 519 a 4° (*Alexanders saga*) from around 1280 always has “o” in the first syllable of the pronoun. Also de Leeuw van Weenen (2009:128) states that “it is rather unlikely that among 95 forms (including the adverb *nokkur*) not a single variant spelling should occur, if the underlying phoneme were /ö/.” In his

⁴⁸ As mentioned in chapter 4.1.1. the scribe of *Möðruvallabók* also uses other, unambiguous variants for /ö/ than “o”, e.g. “au”, “av” or “ó”. This fact makes the stem *nokkur*– in the manuscript AM 132 fol. even more probable (de Leeuw van Weenen 2000:75).

study on the manuscript GKS 1009 fol. (Morkinskinna) Alex Speed Kjeldsen proposes the stem *nökkur*– for this manuscript and provides an explanation for the writing “no” for /nö/ in the pronoun based on a merely graphotactic phenomenon as mentioned in chapter 4.1.1. Whether this explanation can be stated as reasonable has to be proven (Kjeldsen 2010:464).⁴⁹ Looking again at the corpus of this work and especially at the manuscripts AM 134 4° (1281–94) and AM 154 4° (1320–30), which have the stem *nökkur*–, it might be more reasonable to date the process when the stem *nokkur*– starts to dominate and to replace the stem *nökkur*– to the middle of the fourteenth century. Around 1400 this process can be regarded as more or less completed.

To find an answer for the second question was the purpose of chapter 4.2. There it has been stated that the first occurrence of *u*-syncope and thus of the stem *nokkr*– was in the middle of the fifteenth century (cf. ms. AM 151 4° from around 1450). This single occurrence is, however, no sufficient evidence to conclude that the stem *nokkr*– had been part of the paradigm. About fifty years later, around 1500, we find more sufficient evidence of actual syncope in the manuscript AM 138 4° and the following manuscripts—i.e. AM 147 4° (1525–50), NKS 1931 4° (1531) and NKS 340 8° (1532)—definitely show syncope. Thus 1500 can be considered as the date, when the stem *nokkr*– had become a fully integrated part of the paradigm of *nokkur/nokkuð*.

The third question is about the shortening of word-final long *–rr* and intervocalic long *–rr–*. As has been shown in chapter 4.3. word-final *–rr* has been shortened around 1400 (see *Table 35*). The shortening of intervocalic *–rr–* in dat./gen.sing.fem. and gen.plur. might have happened at the same time, however, we have not a sufficient amount of material to make any definite conclusions here (see *Table 36*).

⁴⁹ Kjeldsen’s graphotactic theory is based on what he found in the manuscript AM 519 a 4°. That is merely nine instances of /nö/ which are written with “no”. To prove this theory more material might be necessary (Kjeldsen 2010:464).

Based on these results and conclusions it appears to be possible to create an absolute chronology of the development from the Old Icelandic stems *nökkur-/nökkut* to the Modern Icelandic stems *nokkur-/nokkuð*. The steps (1), (3) and (4) of their earliest development are based on Hreinn Benediktsson (2002:484; for the early development of the root vowel see pp. 488–89, step (2) in this work) and have to be regarded as relative chronology. For the problematic aspects which might occur in this part of the chronology, see also de Leeuw van Weenen (2003:102).

1. *-i-* (*-j-*) preceded by *r* and followed by *a* or *o* disappears throughout the entire paradigm of *nekkuer-*.
2. The root vowel *e* changes to *ø*, due to rounding caused by the semivocalic *u* in the second syllable. The root vowel *a* changes to *ø* due to morphological analogy and processes of umlaut.
3. *-u-* (*-w-*) in the second constituent disappears.
4. *e* and *a* in the second constituent of *nekkuer-* and *nakkuar-/nakkuat* change to [u] (spelled “o”, later “u”) due to absence of stress. The form of nom./acc.sing.neut. *nakkuat* remains a little longer and changes definitely around 1300 (see chapter 4.1.1.).
5. The vowels *ø* and *ø* in the first syllable merge to *ö*.
6. The stem *nökkur-* dominates the paradigm, *nökkuor-/nakkuar-/nökkuer-* disappear. The steps (5) and (6) already started towards the end of the thirteenth century or around 1300 and are connected very closely.
7. For the vowel in the second syllable, orthographic “o” is replaced by “u”.

8. First-syllable *ö* becomes *o*, the new stem is *nokkur-*. In the middle of the fourteenth century the stem *nokkur-* starts to replace *nökkur-* which disappears more or less towards the end of the fourteenth century.⁵⁰
9. Word-final and intervocalic *rr* are shortened around 1400.
10. The new stem *nokkr-* becomes part of the paradigm, due to *u*-syncope of all trisyllabic word-forms. The syncope also happens before endings starting with *r*, which might be considered as a case of analogy. This happened around 1500 or a little later. It can be regarded as the last major change in this paradigm.
11. Syncope of second-syllable *u* finally happens as the rule states: before endings starting with a vowel. This last minor change happened around 1700 or at least in the course the eighteenth century.

As has been demonstrated in this work, such an analysis is confronted with some difficulties which basically are due to the orthographic practice of medieval Icelandic scribes. Such difficulties could be eased by thorough linguistic and palaeographic investigations of each manuscript; this, however, is far beyond the scope of the present work. Nevertheless, it was the purpose of this investigation to gain new insights into the history of the Modern Icelandic pronouns *nokkur/nokkuð*, especially concerning the development of the first-syllable vowel and the syncope of second-syllable *u*. Furthermore it is the hope of the author that the corpus, collected and presented here and in greater detail in the Appendix, may be of some value for other scholars wishing to gain new and deeper insights into the history of this word.

⁵⁰ The first traces of the development /*ö*/ > /*o*/ might to be found as early as in the end of the thirteenth century (see Hreinn Benediktsson 2002:492); de Leeuw van Weenen 2009:128; Kjeldsen (2010:464) tries to argue against this assumption).

References

The Icelandic authors are listed under their first name, the other authors under their last name. The alphabetical order corresponds to the Icelandic alphabet, thus *ó* after *o*. The place of publication is given in the English version of the name.

- Alexander Jóhannesson. 1923–24. *Íslensk tunga í fornöld*. Bókaverzlun Ársæls Árnasonar, Reykjavík.
- van Arkel-de Leeuw van Weenen, Andrea. 1987. *Möðruvallabók AM 132 fol. — Volume One: Index and Concordance*. E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Bandle, Oskar. 1956. *Die Sprache der Guðbrandsbiblíá*. Ejnar Munksgaard, Copenhagen.
- Beck, Heinrich. 1993. *Wortschatz der altisländischen Grágás (Konungsbók)*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Björn K. Þórólfsson. 1925. *Um íslenskar orðmyndir á 14. og 15. öld og breytingar þeirra úr fornmálinu*. Fjelagsprentsmiðjan, Reykjavík.
- Braune, Wilhelm and Eggers, Hans. 1987. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*. 14th ed. Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Campbell, Alistair. 1962. *Old English Grammar*. 2nd ed. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Finnur Jónsson (ed.). 1925. *Alexanders saga*. Gyldendalske Boghandel, Copenhagen.
- Fix, Hans. 1984. *Wortschatz der Jónsbók*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt/Main.
- Fritzner, Johan. 1973. *Ordbog over Det gamle norske Sprog*. 4th ed. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo/Bergen/Tromsø.
- Graff, Eberhard Gottlieb. 1834. *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz*. Berlin. [Reprint. 1963. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.]
- Grape, Anders, Kallstenius, Gottfrid and Thorell, Olof (eds.). 1977. *Snorre Sturlassons Edda. Uppsala-Handschriften DG 11. II*. Almqvist & Wiksell International, Uppsala.
- Grimm, Jacob and Grimm, Wilhelm. 1889. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. S. Hirzel, Leipzig. [Reprint. 1991. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, Munich.]
- Guðrún Kvaran. 2005. *Íslensk tunga. II. bindi*. Almenna bókafélagið, Reykjavík.
- handrit.is. 2009–2011. [Online manuscript catalog.] Landsbókasafn Íslands – Háskólabókasafn, Reykjavík. (Visited on the 7th of September, 2011.)
- Haraldur Bernharðsson. 1999. *Málblöndun í sautjándu aldar uppskriftum íslenskra miðalaldahandrita*. Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, Reykjavík.
- Heusler, Andreas. 1921. *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*. 2nd ed. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg.
- Holthausen, Ferdinand. 1934. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Carl Winter, Heidelberg.

- Holthausen, Ferdinand and Hofmann, Dietrich. 1985. *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd ed. Carl Winter, Heidelberg.
- Holtmark, Anne. 1955. *Ordforrådet i de eldste norske håndskrifter til ca. 1250*. Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, Oslo.
- Hreinn Benediktsson. 1961-62. Óákv. forn. *nokkur, nokkuð*. *Lingua Islandica – Íslenzk tunga* 3:7-38. [Revised and translated reprint in *Hreinn Benediktsson – Linguistic Studies, Historical and Comparative* as “The Modern Icelandic Indefinite Pronouns *nokkur, nokkuð*”.]
- Hreinn Benediktsson. 1965. *Early Icelandic Script as illustrated in vernacular Texts from the twelfth and thirteenth Centuries*. The Manuscript Institute of Iceland, Reykjavík.
- Hreinn Benediktsson. 2002. The Modern Icelandic Indefinite Pronouns *nokkur, nokkuð*. Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir, Höskuldur Þráinsson, Jón G. Friðjónsson, Kjartan Ottosson (eds.): *Hreinn Benediktsson – Linguistic Studies, Historical and Comparative*, pp. 470-519. Institute of Linguistics, Reykjavík.
- Jakob Jóhannes Smári. 1932. *Íslenzk málfræði*. 2nd ed. Félagsprentsmiðjan, Reykjavík.
- Jón Helgason. 1929. *Málið á nýja testamenti Odds Gottskálkssonar*. Íslenska fræðafjelagið, Copenhagen.
- Jón Magnússon. 1997. *Grammatica Islandica — Íslenzk málfræði*. Ed. Jón Axel Harðarson. Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, Reykjavík.
- Kjeldsen, Alex Speed. 2010. *Et mørt håndskrift og dets skrivere — Filologiske studier i kongesagahåndskriftet Morkinskinna*. Nordisk Forskningsinstitut, Copenhagen.
- Larsson, Ludvig. 1891. *Ordforrådet i de älsta isländska handskrifterna*. Ph. Lindstedts Universitets-Bokhandel, Lund.
- Larsson, Ludvig. 1956. *Glossar till Codex AM 291, 4:to (Jómsvíkinga saga)*. CWK Gleerup, Lund.
- de Leeuw van Weenen, Andrea. 2000. *A Grammar of Möðruvallabók*. Research School CNWS, Leiden.
- de Leeuw van Weenen, Andrea. 2003. *A note on nokkurr*. *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði* 25:99-109.
- de Leeuw van Weenen, Andrea. 2004. *Lemmatized Index to The Icelandic Homily Book Perg. 15 4° in the Royal Library Stockholm*. Stofnun Árna Magnússonar á Íslandi, Reykjavík.
- de Leeuw van Weenen, Andrea (ed.). 2009. *Alexanders saga. AM 519a 4° in The Arnamagnæan Collection, Copenhagen*. Museum Tusculanum Press, Copenhagen.
- Már Jónsson (ed.). 2004. *Jónsbók — Lögbók Íslendinga hver samþykkt var á alþingi árið 1281 og endurnýjuð um miðja 14. öld en fyrst prentuð árið 1578*. Háskólaútgáfan, Reykjavík.

- Noreen, Adolf. 1903. *Altnordische Grammatik I*. 3rd ed. Max Niemeyer, Halle.
- ONP. 1989. *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog. Registre*. Den arnamagnæanske kommission, Copenhagen.
- Ólafur Halldórsson. 1904. *Jónsbók — Kong Magnus Lovbog for Island vedtaget paa Altinget 1281 og Réttarbætr de for Island givne Retterboder af 1294, 1305 og 1314*. S. L. Møller, Copenhagen. [Reprint by Gunnar Thoroddsen. 1970. Universitetsforlag, Odense.]
- Paul, Hermann, Wiehl, Peter and Grosse, Siegfried. 1989. *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*. 23rd ed. Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Runólfur Jónsson. 1651. *Recentissima Antiquissimæ Linguæ Septentrionalis Incunabula Id est Grammaticæ Islandicæ. Nunc primum adornari cæpta & edita Per Runolphum Jonam Islandum*. Petrus Harius, Copenhagen.
- Schulmann, Jana K. 2010. *Jónsbók — The Laws of Later Iceland*. AQ-Verlag, Saarbrücken.
- Schützeichel, Rudolf. 1989. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. 4th ed. Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Sigurður Nordal. 1934. *Monumenta typographica islandica. Vol. 3: Lögbók Íslendinga, Jónsbók 1578*. Levin & Munksgaard, Copenhagen.
- Stefán Karlsson. 2004. *Icelandic Language*. Viking Society for Northern Research, London.
- Valtýr Guðmundsson. 1922. *Islandsk Grammatik*. H. Hegerups Forlag, Copenhagen.
- Vilhjálmur Finsen (ed.). 1852. *Grágás*. Nordiske Literatur-Samfund, Copenhagen. [Reprint. 1974. Universitetsforlag, Odense.]
- de Vries, Jan. 1962. *Altnordisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd ed. E.J.Brill, Leiden.
- Wilmanns, Wilhelm. 1922. *Deutsche Grammatik: Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- und Neuhochdeutsch. Zweite Abteilung: Wortbildung*. 2nd ed. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin/Leipzig.
- Załoska-Strömberg, Apolonia. 1982. *Grammatik des Altisländischen*. Helmut Buske, Hamburg.

Appendix

In this Appendix the material of the present research is listed. The entries are ordered by the date of the manuscript, beginning with the oldest. Each section contains the name and the assumed date of the manuscript, a table of the found instances, a table of those instances which were not found—but are to be found in the edition by Ólafur Halldórsson from 1904—and a note on the distribution of the writing of the vocalic sound /ö/. This distribution is based on ninety instances which cover the entire manuscript: thirty in the beginning, thirty in the middle and thirty in the end of each manuscript.

AM 134 4° — 1281-94

AM 134 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (09r12) nackozr (09v24, 11v18) nockurr (11v22) nackurr (13v23, 18r16, 24v16, 26v08, 28v05, 35v06)	nockur (03r01, 03r07)	nockut (02r05)
	Acc.	nackurn (31v11) nackozn (36v18)	-	nackot (09v15)
	Dat.	nackozū (11v21) nockurū (41r14)	-	-
	Gen.	-	nockurrar (02v11)	
Pl.	Nom.	-	-	nockur (02r02)
	Acc.	-	-	nockur (02v24)
	Dat.	nackurum (26r13)		
	Gen.	nackurra (32r7)		

Additional the adverbial form “nackur” (20r06).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

001 07 12	048 10 01	149 02 11	250 01 04
003 07 12	048 14 13	149 07 09	250 04 12
004 10 16	049 05 02	189 07 16	252 02 01
008 17 01	052 02 02	199 06 05	252 17 09
010 16 12	052 13 10	199 07 06	254 16 15
012 16 09	053 04 07	202 08 10	281 05 12
015 09 13	055 01 13	202 08 10	287 16 02
024 16 04	066 10 07	240 05 06	289 16 09
035 14 12	067 13 06	240 09 10	294 05 05
041 09 16	071 13 03	245 09 06	297 01 06
048 09 09	140 02 11	249 14 16	299 08 04

There are twenty-four instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 134 4° for the period from 1281 to 1294.

Fifteen instances are written with “a” (62.50%).

Nine instances are written with “o” (37.50%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ø/ in the manuscript AM 134 4° is as follows:

81 x “o” (90.00%)

6 x “a” (6.67%)

2 x “ó” (2.22%)

1 x “ø” (1.11%)

AM 154 4° — 1320–30

AM 154 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nəkvz (03v17) nəkv̥r (05v21, 09v24, 11v09, 30r20) nəkr (27v22, 28v04, 30r16) nəck ^z (32r10) nəkkv̥r (38v03, 51r13, 56r03) nəkkur (43v26, 49v19, 53r07) nəkkv̥R (57r02) nək kv̥r (60r09) nəkv̥R (72v10)	nəkr (14v02, 14v13) nəkv̥r (16r07, 16r12)	nəkv̥t (04r29) nəkv̥at (15r24, 18v19)
	Acc.	nəkk ur̥n (41v02) nəkkv̥rn (62r28)	–	nəkuəð (13v03) nəkv̥at (28r23) nəkkv̥əð (56r04) nəkkuað (57v02)
	Dat.	nəkurū (13v13) nəkkv̥rū (69r11)	nəkv̥rn̥ (13v04)	nəkorv (05r06) nəkv̥rv (18v01)
	Gen.	nəkv̥rz (19v23)	nəkv̥rrar (15v22)	
Pl.	Nom.	nəkv̥r̥ (71v03)	–	nəkv̥r (15r22)
	Acc.	nəkv̥ra (70r01)	nəkurar (15r20) nəkuRar (71v12)	nəkv̥r (14v18)
	Dat.	nəkkv̥rū (50v24)		
	Gen.	nəkkv̥rra (62v17)		

According to the ONP-registry, the following instances are from another period and thus not mentioned in this table: “nəkut” (acc.sing.neut., 01v05) and “nəku^{r̥}” (acc.plur.fem., 02r11): c1400–1500 (ONP 1989:446).

Additional the adverbial form “nəkkur” (46r13).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

004 10 16	240 05 06	252 02 01
024 16 04	240 09 10	252 17 09
048 14 13	245 09 06	254 16 15
057 05 09	249 14 16	264 15 07
108 14 12	250 01 04	297 01 06
234 08 15	250 04 12	299 08 04

There are forty-seven instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 154 4° for the period from 1320 to 1330.

Thirty-five instances are written with “a” (74.47%).

Seven instances are written with “o” (14.89%).

Four instances are written with “u” (8.51%).

One instance is written with “ö” (2.13%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 154 4° is as follows:

65 x “a” (72.22%)

19 x “o” (21.11%)

4 x “au” (4.44%)

2 x “v” (2.22%)

GKS 3271 4° — 1330

GKS 3271 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockurr (02r16) noc[kvR] (03v01) nockvR (05r06, 06r13, 07r24) nockuR (08v21, 20v18) noc kuR (19r08) nock ^ø (19v06, 20v15, 33v10) nock ^ø r (25v27, 29r20, 32v21, 33v10, 34v17, 36v03, 37r05, 38v22, 42v15, 45v17, 46r21, 53v30)	nockur (09v10, 10v18) nockvr (10v15) nock ^ø (46v16)	nackot (01r24, 12v26, 45v14) nac kot (02v06) nac- kot (10r13) nockot (45v20)
	Acc.	noc ^ø n (27v21) nockurn (40r16) nockur[n] (48r25)	nockura (43v22)	nackot (08v17, 19r30, 36v03) nockot (37r22, 46r11)
	Dat.	nockurum (08v26, 20v17) noc ^ø kum (50v28)	nockuRi (08v17)	nocku (03r03) nockvrv (12v10)
	Gen.	nockurf (13v11)	nockuRar (10v06)	-

Pl.	Nom.	nock urır (43v18) nocķır (44v22, 54r26) [noc] kurır (53r10) nacķır (53r27)	nocku[r]ar (09v01)	nockvr (10r12)
	Acc.	–	nockozar (09v13) nockvř (10r10)	nock̊ (10v14)
	Dat.	nocķvm (33r30)		
	Gen.	nockuRa (40r27)		

Additional the adverbial form “nok̊” (30v14).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

001 07 12	116 01 14
003 07 12	281 05 12
053 04 07	289 16 09

An additional instance was found: “nockozar” (acc.plur.fem., 09v13).

There are sixty-two instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript GKS 3271 4° for the time around 1330.

Fifty-three instances are written with “o” (85.48%).

Nine instances were written with “a” (14.52%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript GKS 3271 4° is as follows:

59 x “o” (65.56%)

31 x “a” (34.44%)

AM 343 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockuR (03vb26, 06rb13, 18rb08, 35vb12) nōckr (06ra15) nōckuR (08rb11) nokkr (14vb06) nockr (16rb19, 18rb07) nokkuR (33ra17, 33vb08, 50vb02, 57vb12, 61vb14, 65rb13, 66rb21, 70ra19, 82ra03) nok kuR (37vb17, 44vb14) n okkur (59va06)	nōckur (19rb13, 20va18) nok kur (20va26) no kkuR (82va17)	n okcut (02va12) nockut (04va15, 20ra02, 23va07)
	Acc.	nockurn (48ra16) nökkurn (73ra15, 85ra10)	nökkura (79ra10)	nokcut (01va12) nockut (18ra26) nökkut (33va19, 67ra02) nokk ut (65rb15)
	Dat.	nock urum (18rb17) nökkurum (35vb19) nökkurū (88va25)	nockr (18ra27)	nocku (05rb07) nockuru (23ra26)
	Gen.	nökkurs (24vb16)	nockr ar (20rb22)	–
Pl.	Nom.	nökkurir (34va18, 80va26)	no kkurar (19ra19)	nockur (19vb27)
	Acc.	–	noðar (02ra24) nockurar (19vb24)	nockur (19rb21)
	Dat.	nökkurum (59ra20)		
	Gen.	nokkuRa (73va02)		

Additional the adverbial form “nokk²” (53rb18).

There is one instance in 79ra04Marg which belongs to another, most likely, younger hand: “nockurír” (nom.plur.masc., 79ra04Marg).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

057 05 09	250 01 04	287 16 02
108 15 04	250 04 12	289 16 09
234 08 15	252 02 01	299 08 04
249 14 16	281 05 12	

There are fifty-six instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 343 fol. for the period from 1330 to 1340.

Fifty-two instances are written with “o” (92.86%).

Four instances are written with “ö” (7.14%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 343 fol. is as follows:

54 x “o” (60.00%)

34 x “ö” (37.78%)

1 x “au” (1.11%)

1 x “a” (1.11%)

AM 351 fol. — 1360-1400

AM 351 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (03ra26, 06vb21) nock ² (05ra07) nōckur (08rb25, 66vb24) nok kuṚ (10rb05) nockuṚ (22va07, 24va07, 26ra12, 31rb13, 48vb21, 61va18) nōckuṚ (23ra17) nōckuṚ (24va15, 35va22, 41va19, 62rb12) nō ckuṚ (40va09) nō ckur (43ra19) nōckuR (45va16, 67va11) nōckuṛ (46rb18)	nōckur (11rb5) nockur (12rb25, 12va03) nōck ² (62vb11)	nok kut (01vb27) nōckut (03vb07, 15ra10, 61va13) nockut (11vb17, 61va25)
	Acc.	nōckurn (33va28) nocḱn (50vb06) nockurn (54rb02)	nōckḱa (59rb25)	nockut (01ra12, 46vb05, 62ra16) nōckut (10ra23, 23ra02, 45va18)
	Dat.	nocḱum (10rb16) nockurū (24va14) nōk kurum (56vb25)	nocḱn (10ra24)	nocḱuru (04rb14) nocḱo (14vb04)
	Gen.	nōckḱs (16ra01)	nocḱar (12rb03)	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockur ¹ (59rb17, 60va12, 68ra18)	nocḱar (11ra13)	nock ² (11vb13)
	Acc.	nockura (64va07)	nockurar (01va17) nocḱar (11vb10)	nōckur (11rb14, 12rb22)
	Dat.	nōk kurum (41rb20)		
	Gen.	nockuṚa (51ra06) nocḱra (66ra12)		

Additional the adverbial form “nōckuṚ” (37va08).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

024 16 04	287 16 02
234 08 15	

There are sixty-four instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 351 fol. for the period from 1360 to 1400.

Thirty-six instances are written with “o” (56.25%).

Twenty-eight instances are written with “ð” (43.75%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 351 fol. is as follows:

52 x “ð” (57.78%)

35 x “o” (38.89%)

2 x “au” (2.22%)

1 x “a” (1.11%)

AM 350 fol. — 1363

AM 350 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockr (03rb25, 07va20, 10ra26, 26vb18, 29rb07, 36vb28, 65ra06, 73ra15) nockuR (05rb16) nockuR (05va25, 11vb06) nockr (13va14, 27va04, 41va28, 47ra20, 52va26, 56ra25, 65vb01) nockuR (28ra28, 31ra18) nockuR (29rb15) nock ^R (48rb16) noc kuR (50ra09) nock uR (53va02)	nockur (14va13) nock ² (15vb08) noc kur (15vb15) nock ² (66ra28)	nockut (02rb13) nockut (04ra04, 15rb01, 65ra01, 65ra12)
	Acc.	nockn (39va10) nockurn (58rb24) nockn (68ra21)	nocka (62vb01)	nockut (01va09, 13va06, 53vb21) nockut (27rb18) nock (52va28)
	Dat.	nockurū (13va24) nock urum (29rb13) nockurū (70vb28)	nockuRi (13va07)	nocku (04va16)
	Gen.	-	nockuR ^r (15va15)	-

Pl.	Nom.	nöckur' (62va22) nôc kur' (63vb24)	nöckur ^f (14rb20)	nöckur (15ra25)
	Acc.	-	nöckurar (02ra07) nöckur ^f (15ra22)	nöck ^z (14va22)
	Dat.	nökkum (48ra15)		
	Gen.	nökkra (58va25)		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

057 05 09	281 05 12
165 02 06	287 16 02
234 08 15	289 16 09
252 02 01	299 08 04

One additional instance was found: “nökk^r” (nom.sing.masc., 73ra15).

The following forms belong—according to the ONP-registry—to a later period (1400–1500 or 1500–1550) (ONP 1989:442):

“nock^u” (dat.sing.neut., 18ra23)

“ñkut” (nom.sing.neut., 18rb26)

“nocks” (gen.sing.masc., 19va09)

These instances are not shown in the table above.

There are fifty-seven instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 350 fol. for the time around 1363.

Thirty-eight instances are written with “ö” (66.67%).

Nineteen instances are written with “o” (33.33%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 350 fol. is as follows:

61 x “ö” (67.78%)

23 x “o” (25.56%)

6 x “aw” (6.67%)

AM 344 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockoz (03vb12, 05rb17, 07rb04, 09ra29, 11vb33, 22rb01, 23vb24, 23vb31, 25rb31, 29va19, 33rb24, 37va26, 38va26, 40ra02, 42vb20, 45ra12, 51ra34, 52va26) nocĕr (10rb33) nock ^o (22va32, 42ra30, 52ra15, 60va03)	nock ^o (12va20, 53ra15) n[ok] k ^o (12vb05) nockoz (13vb01, 13vb10)	nockot (02vb12, 04rb13, 13rb06, 15vb13) nocĕt (23vb30) n[o]ckot (52ra11) nock (52ra23)
	Acc.	nocĕn (31va29) nockozn (46va19, 54vb17)	nocĕa (50ra33)	nockot (02ra12, 11vb23, 42ra32, 43ra33) nock (22va17)
	Dat.	nockoz (12ra09, 57rb03)	nockozrī (11vb24)	nockozv (04vb09) nocĕo (15va14)
	Gen.	noc ĕf (16va14)	nocĕrar (13va16)	–
Pl.	Nom.	nockvz' (50ra18) nockoz' (59vb02, 61ra04) noc koz' (61rb29)	–	nockoz (13rb02)
	Acc.	nocĕa (58vb05)	nockoz' (02va08, 13ra33)	nockoz (12vb14, 13va33)
	Dat.	nockoz (38rb31)		
	Gen.	nocĕra (59vb16) nockozra (46vb14)		

Additional the adverbial form “nockoz” (35ra09).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

234 08 15
252 02 01

There are sixty-five instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 344 fol. for the period from 1375 to 1400.

Sixty-three instances are written with “o” (96.92%).

Two instances are not exactly legible, but “o” is very likely (3.08%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 344 fol. is as follows:

36 x “ö” (40.00%)

31 x “q” (34.44%)

20 x “o” (22.22%)

2 x “av” (2.22%)

1 x “ö” (1.11%)

AM 354 fol. — 1400

AM 354 fol.		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockur (050r20, 052v04, 052v20, 055r04, 062r27, 083v07, 088v17, 095v16, 101v07, 108v01, 110r07, 112r15, 115r28, 116r27, 119v12, 130r27, 131r15) no ckʀ (064r23) nockuʀ (066v10) nockʀ (084r19) nockurr (086v02)	nockur (067v20, 069r21, 069r27, 131v20)	nockut (049r01, 068v08, 072v22, 130r24) nockʰ (050v27) noc kut (130v02)
	Acc.	nockurn (099r07, 122r24, 134r02, 137r25)	nockura (127v11)	nockut (048r06, 066v04, 084r10, 116v28)
	Dat.	nockurum (066v15) nockurū (086v06)	nockuRí (066v05)	nockū (051v08) nockuru (072r28)
	Gen.	nockurí (074r24)	nockuʀar (069r08)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nockurʰ (085r13, 129r12) nockurír (127v06)	noc kurar (067v07)	nockur (068v06)
	Acc.	-	nockurar (048v10, 068v04)	no ckur (067v25) nockur (115r29)
	Dat.	nockurum (109v16)		
	Gen.	nockuRa (122v14)		

Additional the adverbial form “nokur” (104r10).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

057 05 09	281 05 12
108 15 04	287 16 02
234 08 15	289 16 09
252 02 01	299 08 04

There are fifty-nine instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 354 fol. for the time around 1400.

All fifty-nine instances are written with “o” (100%)

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 354 fol. is as follows:

64 x “o” (71.11%)

23 x “au” (25.56%)

3 x “ö” (3.33%)

AM 42 a 8° — 1400

AM 42 a 8°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockr (05r16, 12v11, 45r03, 46v06, 50v03, 50v08) nock[...] (08r15) nockozr (16v12) ñ[o2] (54r06)	nockr (18v01, 21v09) nock ^z (18v13) nockoz (21v14)	no ckuð (03r02) nock (06v08, 20r15, 27r01)
	Acc.	-	ñu ^a (80v15)	nock (01r07, 16v06) nockut (46r11)
	Dat.	nock ^z um (17r01) nockrū (50v07)	no cko2i (16v06)	nockozu (07v13) nockv2ru (26r14)
	Gen.	nockozf (29r08)	nocku ^z (21r13)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nock ^z ir (67v18) ñrir (80v10)	-	nock ^z (20r13)
	Acc.	-	no cko ^z (02r11) nocko ^z (20r12)	nock ^z (19r03)
	Dat.	-		
	Gen.	-		

Additional the adverbial form “ñr” (72r07).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

035 14 12	189 07 16	234 08 15	276 08 07
041 09 16	199 06 05	245 09 06	281 05 12
057 05 09	199 07 06	249 14 16	287 16 02
140 02 11	202 08 10	250 01 04	289 16 09
149 07 09	204 02 02	252 02 01	294 05 05
178 06 03	213 06 03	252 17 09	297 01 06
182 02 01	221 10 12	254 16 15	299 08 04
182 16 11	222 12 07	264 15 07	250 04 12

There are thirty-five instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 42 a 8° for the time around 1400.

Thirty-one instances are written with “o” (88.57%).

Four instances are abbreviated in such a way that there is no vowel written (11.43%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 42 a 8° is as follows:

85 x “o” (94.44%)

3 x “ö” (3.33%)

2 x “au” (2.22%)

AM 137 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nock ² (03r02, 08v01, 14r24, 18r01, 20r06, 21r26, 39v10, 58r22, 74v28) nockR (16r09) no ck ² (23r06) nockuz (36r26) nōck ² (38r06) nōckuz (39v24) n[...] ² ck ² (49v31) nockur (55r15) nōckur (56r26, 61r20) nōckuR (62r18) nōckr (65r19) nōckz (75v16)	nockuR (24r03) nockuz (25r12) nōckz (76r21)	no ck (13r19) nock (14v25) nockut (24v08, 27v14, 74v26, 75r04)
	Acc.	nōckurñ (47v23)	no ckura (25r16) nōckā (72v08)	nock (12v04, 23r02) nockut (36r17, 61r21) nōcku (62v16)
	Dat.	nocku ^m (23r10) nōckuz ^m (81v23)	nockure (23r03)	nockū (15r28) nockuro (27r25)
	Gen.	nockur ^f (28v12)	nockur ^r (25r02)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nockur ¹ (08r08, 09r10, 09v14) nockuz ¹ (73v21)	nockur ^r (23v21)	nockuR (24v07) nōck ² (38r08)
	Acc.	no[0000] (06v09)	nockur ^r (13r03, 24v05)	nock ur (24r06) nockuz (25r11)
	Dat.	nōckurū (56r10)		
	Gen.	-		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

099 09 10	222 12 07	264 15 07
140 02 11	234 08 15	289 16 09
165 02 06	240 05 06	108 15 04
221 10 12	252 02 01	

Two additional instances were found: “nock” (nom.sing.masc., 03r02) and “nock” (nom.sing.masc., 39v10).

There are fifty-eight instances of *nōkkurr/nōkkut* in the manuscript AM 137 4° for the period from 1440 to 1480.

Forty-three instances are written with “o” (74.14%).

Fourteen instances are written with “ō” (24.14%).

One instance is not completely legible (1.72%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 137 4° is as follows:

53 x “o” (58.89%)

21 x “ö” (23.33%)

16 x “au” (17.78%)

AM 151 4° – 1450

AM 151 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nokk ² (006r02, 010r02, 012r02, 018r12, 040v03, 071v10, 073v08, 081v05) no- kk ² (009r16) nok k ² (014v16) nokkur (041v02, 044r21, 076r11, 080r14, 085v14) nokkvr (044r16) nok kur (047r11) nok- kvr (056r21) nockvr (106v10) nock ² (107v12)	nokk ² (019v07) nokkur (019v19, 022r06) nokkðz (022r11)	nokkut (004r02) nokkuð (006v21, 021r04) nðkkvt (026v14) nockvt (106v07, 106v14)
	Acc.	nokkñ (060r16) nokku2ñ (088v18, 094v15)	nokkura (008r03)	nokkut (002v06, 018r05) nokkvt (041r14, 082r10) nðkkvt (080r15)
	Dat.	nokku2ū (018r18) nokku2v̄ (044r21) nocku2ū (099r15)	naukkurí (018r06)	nokkv- ru (026r14)
	Gen.	nok- k̃s (028v06)	nokku2 ^r (021v14) nockv ^a 2 (103r06)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nokkðzír (042v10) nokkvzír (063v04) nocku2 ^r (103r02) nokk̃r (105r03)	-	nokk ² (021r02)
	Acc.	-	nokkur ^r (003r21) nokkr ^r (020v21)	nokk ² (020r03) nokkðz (022r04)
	Dat.	nokkv2v̄ (073r13)		
	Gen.	nðkkurra (089r13)		

Additional the adverbial form “nokk²” (066v06).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

024 16 04	281 05 12
234 08 15	287 16 02
252 02 01	289 16 09
254 16 15	299 08 04

There are fifty-nine instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 151 4° for the time around 1450.

Fifty-five instances are written with “o” (93.22%).

Three instances are written with “ð” (5.09%).

One instance is written with “au” (1.69%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 151 4° is as follows:

50 x “ð” (55.56%)

21 x “o” (23.33%)

12 x “au” (13.33%)

7 x “av” (7.78%)

AM 41 8° — 1450-60

AM 41 8°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nock ² (13r14, 17r14, 17r20, 24r15, 40r17, 59r06, 73r16, 73v02, 75r08) nocku ² (35v19) nockv ² (49r17, 63v08) no k ² (51r20)	nock ² (76v07)	nockvt (73r11)
	Acc.	nočk ⁿ (30r21) no ckv ⁿ (81v04)	nočk ^a (67r12)	navckvt (12v20, 49r19) nočk ^ġ (52v06) no kv ^t (74v02)
	Dat.	nočk ^v (17r19) nočk ^{vm} (88r21)	-	-
	Gen.	-	-	-
Pl.	Nom.	nočk ^{ir} (70v04, 92r10)	-	-
	Acc.	-	-	-
	Dat.	-		
	Gen.	nočk ^a (92v05)		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

001 07 12	048 09 09	056 10 09	178 06 03
003 07 12	048 10 01	057 05 09	182 02 01
004 10 16	048 14 13	057 07 01	189 07 16
008 17 01	049 05 02	057 11 05	221 10 12
010 16 12	052 02 02	066 10 07	222 12 07
012 16 09	052 13 10	067 13 06	240 05 06
015 09 13	053 04 07	071 13 03	281 05 12
024 16 04	055 01 13	099 09 10	287 16 02
035 14 12	055 03 05	116 01 14	294 05 05
041 09 16	055 05 02	165 02 06	297 01 06

There are twenty-seven instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 41 8° for the period from 1450 to 1460.

Twenty-five instances are written with “o” (92.59%).

Two instances are written with “av” (7.41%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 41 8° is as follows:

86 x “o” (95.56%)

3 x “av” (3.33%)

1 x “ð” (1.11%)

AM 136 4° — 1480–1500

AM 136 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockr (04r20, 07r08, 10r02, 13r14, 15r17, 36r11, 38v02, 38v07, 41r02, 54v11, 61v24, 63v15, 66r11, 69v20, 70v24, 86r05, 86v25) nock (17v16) no cĳr (48v12) nocĳr (74v08) nock ² (97v17) n ock ² (98v09)	nock (19r10) nockr (20v15, 20v20, 87v08)	nockot (02v15) nockut (06r10, 86r02) nockvt (19v23, 86r09) nock (24r20)
	Acc.	nockn (51v24, 90r23, 94r07) nockrn (77r23)	–	nock (01v07, 71v01) nockvt (17v10, 36r02) nockut (69v21)
	Dat.	nockv ^m (17v22) nocĳvm (38v06)	nockí (17v11)	nockv (05r03, 23v24)
	Gen.	nocks (25v19)	nockur ^r (20v01)	–

Pl.	Nom.	nockur ¹ (83r02) nockīr (84v10, 97r19, 99r20)	nockr ¹ (18v23)	nockr (19v21)
	Acc.	nock ² a (95r21)	nockār (02r20, 19v20)	nock (19r15) nockr (20v13)
	Dat.	nockū (63r22)		
	Gen.	no ckra (83r06) nockra (77v16)		

Additional the adverbial form “nockr” (57r18).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

099 09 10	252 02 01
234 08 15	289 16 09

There are sixty-three instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 136 4° for the period from 1480 to 1500

All sixty-three instances are written with “o” (100%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 136 4° is as follows:

90 x “o” (100%)

AM 159 4° — 1480–1500

AM 159 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nocku ² (02v19, 29v21) nock ² (05r12, 09r23, 13r26, 28r07, 29v25, 31v21, 38r17, 49v03, 50v26, 52v19, 55v16, 56v09, 59v02, 69v25, 77r28) nocc ² (11r10) no ck ² (43r23) nockr (69r08)	nock ² (14v01, 15v17, 15v21, 70r28)	nock (01r15, 15r10, 18v14, 69r05, 69r12)
	Acc.	nockn (41r08, 61v14, 72v17)	-	nock (13r20, 27v28, 55v17) nok (57r10)
	Dat.	nockum (13v03, 75v22) nocku ^{2m} (29v25)	no cke (13r20)	nock ^u (04r15) nocku (18r24)
	Gen.	nockí (19v20)	nockæ (15v05)	-

Pl.	Nom.	nock ^k ir (66v08, 67v28, 78v01, 79r12)	nocku ^r (14r19)	nock ^k (15r08)
	Acc.	-	nock ^k æ (15r07)	nauck ^k (14v04) nock ^k (15v16)
	Dat.	nocku ^m (50v10)		
	Gen.	nock ^k a (62r03, 66v12)		

Additional the adverbial form “nock^k” (45v16).

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

001 07 12	099 09 10	287 16 02
003 07 12	234 08 15	289 16 09
010 16 12	252 02 01	
024 16 04	281 05 12	

There are fifty-seven instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 159 4° for the period from 1480 to 1500.

Fifty-six instances are written with “o” (98.25%).

One instance is written with “au” (1.75%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 159 4° is as follows:

84 x “o” (93.33%)

4 x “au” (4.44%)

1 x “ð” (1.11%)

1 x “av” (1.11%)

AM 138 4° – 1500

AM 138 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nock ^z (04r23, 08r02, 11r05, 14v25, 43v17, 57r16, 66r04, 71v02, 72r26, 75v14) nockur (07v01) nock ^z (17r15) no ^k r (19v20) nockr (38r20, 39r13, 40r11, 41v05, 41v09, 51r19, 64r26, 68r15, 86v13) no ck ^z (87v07)	nockr (21r16, 23r05) nock ^z (22v26, 88r15)	nockut (02v12, 05r18, 22r11, 26v15, 86v10, 86v17)
	Acc.	no ^k n (54v05, 78r23) nockur (90v15)	no ^k a (83v19)	nockut (01v06, 19v15, 39r04, 71v03, 72v26)
	Dat.	nockrum (19v26) nock rum (41v08) nockurū (94r18)	nockuri (19v15)	no ^k u (06r14) nockuru (26r19)
	Gen.	nockuzs (28v03)	no ^k raz (22v13)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nockur' (83v15, 85r19)	nockr̃ (21r02)	nockr (22r09)
	Acc.	-	nockž (02r15) nockur ^r (22r06)	nock ^z (21r22)
	Dat.	nockrum (65v13)		
	Gen.	no ^k ra (78v14)		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

057 05 09	234 08 15	281 05 12	289 16 09
165 02 06	252 02 01	287 16 02	299 08 04

There are fifty-nine instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript AM 138 4° for the time around 1500.

All fifty-nine instances are written with “o” (100%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript AM 138 4° is as follows:

56 x “o” (62.22%)

26 x “au” (28.89%)

8 x “ö” (8.89%)

AM 147 4° — 1525-50

This manuscript contains leaves from two different time periods, thus the instances are split into two tables.

For the period from 1525 to 1550:

AM 147 4° — 1525-50		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nocku2 (04v13, 33r19, 35r11, 35r16, 37r07, 48v15, 55r14, 56v13) nucku2 (07v07, 10v11, 12v03) nock [̃] (32v10, 43v17, 58v02, 78r09) nockv2 (62r09, 66v17) nockvž (63r11) nockuž (76v15) noc [̃] (91v19)	nock [̃] (78v13)	nockkut (02v12) nuckut (05v10) nockut (23r17, 78r06, 78r13) nocku2t (35r15)
	Acc.	nockū2n (46r28) nocku2n (69r25) nockužn (82r22)	nock [̃] (75r06)	noc kut (01r08) nockut (33r10, 63v12) nockvt (62r10)
	Dat.	-	-	nockzu (06v07) nockv2o (22v20)
	Gen.	nocku2f (24v17)	-	-
Pl.	Nom.	nocku2' (75r02) no ckuz' (79r02)	-	-
	Acc.	-	nock2 ^r (02r09)	-
	Dat.	nockzū (56r22)		
	Gen.	nocku2a (69v20)		

Additional the adverbial form “nocku2” (51r21).

Around 1600:

AM 147 4° — 1600		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nock ² (14v19)	nock ² (18r22) ñk ² (19v20)	ñkuð (19r08)
	Acc.	-	-	nockuð (17r18)
	Dat.	nockzum (17v01)	nock ² i (17r19)	-
	Gen.	-	nockž [~] (19v08)	-
Pl.	Nom.	no ckzi2 (94v21)	nockž [~] (18r12)	ñk ² (19r07)
	Acc.	-	ñkž [~] (19r05)	nock ² (18r26, 19v18)
	Dat.	-		
	Gen.	-		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

048 14 13	276 08 07	297 01 06
057 11 05	281 05 12	299 08 04
234 08 15	287 16 02	
252 02 01	289 16 09	

One additional instance was found for the time around 1600:

“no | ck2i2” (nom.plur.masc., 94v21).

There are forty-four instances for *nökkurr/nökkut* in the first table of the manuscript AM 147 4° for the period from 1525 to 1550.

Thirty-nine instances are written with “o” (88.64%).

Four instances are written with “u” (9.09%).

One instance is written with “ð” (2.27%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ for this period in the manuscript AM 147 4° is as follows:

64 x “o” (71.11%)

24 x “ð” (26.67%)

2 x “u” (2.22%)

In the second table for the time around 1600 are fourteen instances for *nökkurr/nökkut*.

Ten instances are written with “o” (71.43%).

Four instances are abbreviated (28.57%).

NKS 1931 4° — 1531

NKS 1931 4°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nock ² (05r15, 06r05, 07v25, 08r23, 11r09, 34v31, 36v03, 47v10, 73v22, 78r20, 79r01) ñ2 (15v08, 17v04, 19v11, 37r26, 38v05, 38v10, 40v15, 52v17, 58r22, 59v10, 61v02, 64r29, 64r29, 68r23)	ñ2 (20v21) nock ² (22r17, 79v03)	nockuð (03r03, 25r14, 78r17, 78r24)
	Acc.	nockñ (50r24) ñ2n (70v12) nocku2 (82v12)	nock ² (75v25)	nockut (01v09, 19v06) nockuð (36r24, 65v18)
	Dat.	nockzū (19v17, 85v11)	nock ¹ (19v07)	nockzu (06v23, 24v23)
	Gen.	nock ² ₃ (26v08)	nock ¹ ₂ (21v30)	–

Pl.	Nom.	ñz (75v21) nockz' (77r11)	nockza2 (20v08)	ñz (21v02, 38v09)
	Acc.	-	nockza2 (02v05, 21r31)	nockz (20v26)
	Dat.	nockzū (59r24)		
	Gen.	-		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

055 05 02	165 02 06	252 02 01	289 16 09
057 05 09	202 08 10	281 05 12	299 08 04
057 07 01	222 12 07	287 16 02	

There are fifty-six instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript NKS 1931 4° from 1531.

Thirty-seven instances are written with “o” (66.07%).

Nineteen instances are abbreviated (33.93%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript NKS 1931 4° is as follows:

75 x “o” (83.33%)

14 x “au” (15.56%)

1 x “ö” (1.11%)

NKS 340 8° — 1532

NKS 340 8°		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	ñz (005v15, 009v03, 013v01, 017v10, 020r22) nockz' (010r10, 051r10, 052v03, 054r10, 073r18, 095v19, 098v14, 102v01, 108v09, 110v03, 116v06, 137r06, 138v04) nockuz (083v10)	nockz' (024v12, 026v20, 139v12) ñz (024v20) nock[...] (026v14)	nockut (003v09) nockuð (006v21, 032r18, 137r01, 137r12, 163r06)
	Acc.	nockñ (079r05, 144r14)	nockza (131v18)	nockuð (002r09, 023r15, 052r11, 108v11, 111v01)
	Dat.	nockzū (023v04, 056v07, 121v14) nðckz (150v15)	nockze (023r16)	nockzu (008r05, 031v10)
	Gen.	-	nockz ^r (026r22)	-

Pl.	Nom.	nockze2 (131v10) nockz' (134v08)	-	ñz (025v13)
	Acc.	-	nockz ^r (003r05, 025v11)	ñz (025r03)
	Dat.	nockzū (098r09)		
	Gen.	nock̃ (122r19)		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the manuscript:

048 14 13	108 15 04	281 05 12
055 05 02	116 01 14	287 16 02
057 05 09	165 02 06	289 16 09
071 13 03	234 08 15	299 08 04
108 10 15	252 02 01	

One additional instance was found: “nockuð” (nom.sing.neut., 163r06).

There are fifty-four instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the manuscript NKS 340 8° from 1532.

Forty-five instances are written with “o” (83.33%).

Eight instances are abbreviated (14.82%).

One instance is written with “ð” (1.85%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ö/ in the manuscript NKS 340 8° is as follows:

79 x “o” (87.78%)

5 x “ó” (5.56%)

4 x “ø” (4.44%)

2 x “au” (2.22%)

First print from 1578

First print		Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sg.	Nom.	nockz (008v04, 014v19, 035v15, 090r02, 134r04, 151v21, 155v10, 172r02, 210v12, 213r05, 260v22) nockur (015v22, 022r20, 031r02, 036v02, 041v15, 085r22, 087v07, 093r18, 093v06, 099r16, 119r02, 161r12, 169v03, 180v19)	nockur (045r05, 049r07) nockz (214v12, 266r18)	nockuð (004r23) nockuð (010r18, 047r09) nock- ut (058r06) nockut (210v07, 210v20)
	Acc.	nockurn (127r12, 221r07) nøckurn (187v19)	nockra (202v07, 266r16)	nockut (002r13, 087r12) nockuð (041v05, 169v05, 173r14)
	Dat.	nockrū (042r05) nockrum (093v05, 230r20)	nockri (041v06)	nockuru (012r16) nockru (057r03)
	Gen.	nockurs (061v19)	nockrar (048r13)	-
Pl.	Nom.	nockrer (202r17, 207r01)	nockrar (044r21)	nockur (047r05)
	Acc.	nockra (262v03)	nockrar (003v05, 047r01)	nock- ur (045r17)
	Dat.	nockrum (154v20)		
	Gen.	nockra (188v12)		

The following instances in the edition were not found in the first print:

057 05 09	165 02 06	252 02 01	289 16 09
057 07 01	234 08 15	287 16 02	299 08 04

Four additional instances were found: “nockur” (nom.sing.masc., 036v02); “nockz” (nom.sing.masc., 260v22); “nockra” (acc.sing.fem., 266r16); “nockz” (nom.sing.fem., 266r18).

There are sixty-three instances of *nökkurr/nökkut* in the first print from 1578.

Sixty-two instances are written with “o” (98.41%).

One instance is written with “ø” (1.59%).

The distribution of the writing of the sound /ø/ in the first print from 1578 is as follows:

75 x “ø” (83.33%)

11 x “o” (12.22%)

4 x “au” (4.44%)