

SLOVO, sv. 56-57 (2006-'07), 319-332, Zagreb 2008.

UDK: 801.32 : 091(003.349.1'.2/.7

ALPHABETIC SUSPENSION IN GLAGOLITIC AND CYRILLIC MANUSCRIPTS

Catherine Mary MACROBERT, Oxford

One of the ways in which the presentation of texts in pre-modern Glagolitic and Cyrillic manuscripts differs from modern practice is the method of abbreviating words: it is commonplace for medieval scribes to employ abbreviation *per contractionem*, preserving the initial and final letters while omitting one or more medial one; abbreviation *per suspensionem* where the word is curtailed to its first syllable is also found, particularly in headings and rubrics, though the more extreme form of suspension in which the initial letter stands alone for the whole word is comparatively rare and necessitates special marking, for instance enclosure in a circle, to distinguish it clearly from the use of letters in numerical function; abbreviation *per litteras superpositas*, where one of the letters in the word is written superscript, may be used on its own or in combination with contraction or suspension. These methods of abbreviation have antecedents in both Greek and Latin scribal practice. There is however a type of abbreviation *per suspensionem* which is peculiar to medieval Glagolitic and Cyrillic manuscripts, because it relies on the fact that the names of letters in those alphabets were meaningful words, which could therefore be shortened, when they occurred in continuous text, to their initials marked with a distinctive *titla*, e.g. $a' = azŭ$, $z' = zělo$, $s' = slovo$. VAJS (1922-3: 271; 1932: 108-109), noting the prevalence of this practice in the Glagolitic Vienna or Fraščićevo commented Psalter written in 1463, styles it 'conventional' suspension; as all types of abbreviation can be said to involve some element of convention, it will here be termed 'alphabetic suspension'.

Alphabetic suspension is undoubtedly a characteristic feature of the Fraščićevo Psalter (HAMM 1967), which contains numerous instances, especially in the commentary: $a' = azŭ$ (at least x11 in psalms and x9 in commentary), $d' = dobro$ (at least x4 in psalms and x2 in commentary), $z' = zělo$, (at least x12 in psalms and x8 in commentary), $z' = zemlja$ (x 2 in psalms, x3 in commentary), $i'^1 = iže$ (ps.78:3), $k' =$

¹ Not ř, apparently, since HAMM (1967: 14) distinguishes the occasional instances of this letter in the manuscript.

kako (at least x5 in commentary), *l'* = *ljudi* (at least x48 in psalms and headings, more than x100 in commentary), *n'* = *naši* (at least x8 in psalms and x2 in commentary), *s'* = *slovo* (at least x19 in psalms and headings, more than x50 in commentary) and above all *e'* = *estī* (*passim*). However, it has to be said that the distinction between alphabetic suspension and contraction is not entirely clearcut in this manuscript. The scribe was more enthusiastic than systematic in his use of abbreviations: for instance, he wrote *kako* indiscriminately as *k'*, *kk*, *kko* or left it unabbreviated. Similarly in representing the forms of the verb *glagolati* he vacillated between the standard *gl-* plus endings, i.e. contraction, and the use of *g'* = *glagolje* plus endings, which can be interpreted either as an alternative contraction or as an extension of the principle of alphabetic suspension. The same indeterminacy attaches to the abbreviations *z'*, *l'* or *s'* plus endings which are used frequently — but not consistently — for all forms of *zemlja* and for the oblique case forms of *ljudie* and *slovo*. The main reasons for supposing that alphabetic suspension was a starting point for this scribe's practice are that non-alphabetic suspension using initial letters, though it is found in the manuscript, e.g. *m'* = *město* (ps.41:5), *d'* = *dan'* (ps.109:5), is exceedingly rare, and that alphabetic suspension occurs in other Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts, such as the Oxford Missal MS Canon liturg. 373 (TADIN 1953: 158), which provides instances of *a'* = *azū*,² *g'* = *glagolje*,³ *z'* = *zělo*,⁴ *z'* = *zemlja*,⁵ *l'* = *ljudi*,⁶ *n'* = *naši*,⁷ *s'* = *slovo*,⁸ as well as the pervasive *e'* = *estī*; they are clearly marked with a short vertical *titla*,⁹ occur at line end and within the line, in combinations with case-endings and in sequence, e.g. *e'z'* = *estī zemlja*,¹⁰ *e's'* = *estī slovo*,¹¹ *n'e'* = *naši estī*,¹² *s'g'a'* = *slovo glagolju azū*.¹³ Further examples can be found in other manuscripts, such as the Hrvoje Missal (NAZOR 1973: 511), the Breviary of the priest Mavar (PANTELIC 1967: 132-146), the Homiliary on the Gospel of S. Matthew (ŠTEFANIĆ 1960: 210) and the Oxford MSS Canon. lit. 412 and 414 (TADIN 1954: 137, 142); the list could doubtless be expanded.

In the Glagolitic tradition alphabetic suspension seems to be found mainly in the fifteenth century: indeed JAGIĆ (1911/1972: 146, 154, 157, 158) regards the commonest instance of this abbreviation, *e'* = *estī*, as one of the criteria for ascribing

² e.g. ff.45v col.1, 92r col.2, 118r col.1, 134r col.1, 170v col.1.

³ e.g. ff.20v col.2, 96r col.2, 103v col.2.

⁴ e.g. 22v col.1, 139v col.2, 142r col.2, 146v col.2, 147r col. and 2.

⁵ Frequently, on its own and with case-endings, e.g. ff.5r col.1, 13r col.2, 27v col.2, 46r col.1, 105v col.2, 128r col.1, 151r col.1, 161v col.1.

⁶ With case-endings, ff. 133v col.2, 147r col.1.

⁷ e.g. ff.14r col.2, 14v col.2, 47v col.2, 68v col.1, 119r col.2, 149v col.1, 160r col.2.

⁸ Frequently, on its own and with case-endings, e.g. ff.5r col.1, 11r col.1, 14r col.2, 43v col.2, 47r col.2, 60v col.2, 69r col.2, 92v col.1, 117v col.2, 129v col.2, 134r col.1.

⁹ A similar vertical mark is used with *e'* = *estī* by hands B and D in the II Novljanski Brevijar (PANTELIC, NAZOR 1977).

¹⁰ e.g. ff.3r col.1, 7r col.1.

¹¹ e.g. ff.14r col.1, 33v col.1, 44r col.2, 47r col.1.

¹² e.g. ff.14r col.2, 161v col.1.

¹³ e.g. ff.126v col.2, 134r col.2.

manuscripts to the fifteenth rather than the fourteenth century. In his palaeographical analysis of the New York Missal, CORIN (1991: 204-205), following ŠTEFANIĆ (1964:109) and SVANE (1965: 79-80), argues that alphabetic suspension emerged in Croatian Glagolitic towards the end of the fourteenth century. He suggests that it was at first a means of abbreviating the frequently occurring form *estī* and that its extension to other words was a fifteenth-century phenomenon, which depended on the Church Slavonic names of the letters involved rather than on their phonological equivalents and therefore included the letters *ī* and *ǝ* even though by the fifteenth century these were otherwise scarcely used except in numerical function (CORIN 1991: 38-39, 77-78). Ambiguity was often avoided by employing different forms of *titla* from those associated with the numerical use of letters (CORIN 1991: 39, 76-77, 204). It is also apparent from Corin's investigation that the extent to which alphabetic suspension was used, if at all, varies from one scribe to another: so Hand B in the New York Missal displays a range of such abbreviations comparable to those of the Fraščićeve Psalter: *a' = azǔ*, *d' = dobro*, *e' = estī*, *ǝ' = ǝělo*, *z' = zemlja*, *ī' = iže*, *k' = kako*, *l' = ljudi*, *n' = našī*, *s' = slovo*; other hands use a selection of them, and Hand F does not have recourse to alphabetic suspension (CORIN 1991: 76-78, 204-206). The Oxford Missal Canon. lit. 349 (TADIN 1953: 156-158) appears to be another product of teamwork where the scribes differed in their use of this abbreviation. In parts of the manuscript it seems not to be used; where it does occur, the forms of *titla* are not always distinctive, but I have found a few instances of *a' = azǔ*,¹⁴ *g' = glagolje*,¹⁵ *k' = kako*,¹⁶ *l' = ljudi*,¹⁷ *s' = slovo*¹⁸ and, more frequently, *e' = estī*.

The extent to which alphabetic suspension was a matter of individual scribal preference is also illustrated by the conventions applied to the psalms in the Lobkowitz and Paris breviaries (VAJS 1916). The Lobkowitz scribe, writing in 1359, betrays no acquaintance with this type of abbreviation. The scribe of the Paris manuscript, supposedly working about twenty years later,¹⁹ employs a modest range of alphabetic suspensions: *d' = dobro* (x2), *e' = estī* (*passim*), *z' = zemlja* (x2), *l' = ljudi* (x1), *s' = slove-* in plural forms (at least x34, of which x26 occur in ps.118). However, he regularly uses the contraction *slvo* in the singular, in contrast to the use of *s' = slovo* in the Fraščićeve Psalter. The contracted spelling is presumably a relic of the time when abbreviation consisted predominantly in the contraction of *nomina sacra*, but it is applied mechanically, in references both to the Word of God and to the thoughts and utterances of the ungodly, and so cannot be regarded as a deliberate, motivated choice

¹⁴ e.g. f.52v col.1.

¹⁵ e.g. f.51r col.2.

¹⁶ e.g. f.138v col.1.

¹⁷ e.g. f.135v col.2.

¹⁸ e.g. f.89v col.1.

¹⁹ But subsequently VAJS (1932: 150) allowed the possibility that the Paris manuscript was begun in a hand of the late 14th century and continued in the 15th century; unfortunately he does not specify where he believes the change of hands takes place.

on the scribe's part. Thus the distribution of contracted and suspended abbreviations of *slovo* in the Paris manuscript might be an indication that the scribe worked in a transitional period when alphabetic suspension was a novelty.

There is a significant interdependence between attempts to date the use of alphabetic suspension in Croatian Glagolitic and the dating of the Oxford Breviary, MS Canon. lit. 172. TADIN (1953: 152-155) argues in favour of 1310; but the scribal note which states that the manuscript was completed in this year has been added in a different hand (DU FEU 1971), and on palaeographical grounds VAJS (1932: 147-148) finds so early a date implausible. If alphabetic suspension is a feature of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, then Vajs's position gains support from the fact that the scribe of MS Canon. lit. 172 employs this type of abbreviation frequently, on its own or with case-endings, both at line end and within the line: on the first forty folia, apart from the common $e' = esti$, I have found instances of $a' = azŭ$,²⁰ $z' = zemlja$,²¹ $l' = ljudi$,²² $n' = našŭ$,²³ $o' = omŭ$,²⁴ $s' = slovo$,²⁵ usually marked with a *titla* which slants upwards from left to right. Conversely, if the date of 1310 for this manuscript is held to be reliable, the emergence of alphabetic suspension in Croatian Glagolitic must be referred back to the beginning of the fourteenth century.

The use of alphabetic suspension in Cyrillic manuscripts is less well known, but is actually attested from an earlier date: the first instance noted by KARSKIJ (1928: 243) is found in the *Rjazanskaja kormčaja* (SVODNYJ KATALOG 1984: 212-214): *ôče n. i. esi na nŭsi*.²⁶ It may be no accident that this is the only example from the *Rjazanskaja kormčaja* reported by Karskij's source, VOSTOKOV (1863/1980: 7-8): alphabetic suspension is unproblematic in an allusion to such a well known text as the Lord's Prayer, but could be a source of confusion elsewhere in a text characterized by frequent occurrence of numerals referring to the years of church councils and the canons which they drew up, and a scan of about half the manuscript did not discover further examples. However, Vostokov and Karskij also mention that the last folia in the Laurentian manuscript of the Suzdal' Chronicle (PSRL 1927/1962) contain a few instances of the alphabetic suspensions $z' = zŕlo$ ²⁷ and $z' = zemlju$,²⁸ and Vostokov cites its more widespread use in copies of the *Dioptra*, which was translated from Greek in the South Slav lands during the fourteenth century and reached the East Slavs before the end of that century, and in an early fourteenth-century East Slavonic manuscript containing the commentary of Andrew of Caesarea on the Apocalypse (SVODNYJ KATALOG 2002:93-4)²⁹

²⁰ e.g. ff.9v col.2, 26v col.2.

²¹ e.g. ff.2v col.2, 7r col.1, 14r col.1 and 2, 18r and v col.1, 23r col.2, 30r col.1, 40r col.2.

²² e.g. ff.9v col.1, 21r col.2.

²³ e.g. ff.2v col.2, 14v col.2, 16v col.2, 31v col.1, 40v col.2.

²⁴ e.g. ff.29r col.2.

²⁵ e.g. ff.3v col.2, 6r col.2, 16v col.1, 23v col.2, 24v col.1, 31r col.2, 38r col.2.

²⁶ f.14r col.1, 148v col.1.

²⁷ ff. 150r, 154r x2, 156r, 158r.

²⁸ f. 168v x2.

²⁹ I have to thank Professor R.M. Cleminson for drawing my attention to alphabetic suspension in this manuscript.

More recently ZAGREBIN (1995, 1998) has returned to the use of *a'*, *d'*, *e'*, *z'*, *z'*, *i'*, *k'*, *s'* and *t'* to stand for the corresponding words, including adjectival forms indicated by *d'* = *dobro* plus case endings, in an East Slavonic fragment of the *Dioptra* assigned to the late fourteenth century, F.п.I.50 in the Russian National Library (SVODNYJ KATALOG 2002: 207). He points out that the same phenomenon can be found in at least two manuscripts written by the protodiakon Spiridon, the Aprakos Gospel of 1393 (SVODNYJ KATALOG 2002: 311-13) and the Kiev Psalter of 1397 (VZDORNOV, JUROVA 1978), which has one instance of *z'*.³⁰

To these examples three more psalter manuscripts of the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century can be added: MSS 2 and 3 from the Pogodin collection in the Russian National Library (GRANSTREM 1953: 52; TVOROV, ZAGREBIN 1988: 23-24) and MS F.п.I.4 in the same library (GRANSTREM 1953: 52). Of these Pogodin 3 is closest to the *Dioptra* manuscript and the Glagolitic tradition in the range of alphabetic suspensions which it displays. In it I have found instances of *a'* = *azŭ* (x4),³¹ *e'* = *estĭ* (x4),³² *z'* = *zĕlo* (x5),³³ *z'* = *zemlja* (x1),³⁴ *n'* = *našĭ* (x1)³⁵ and *s'* = *slovo* (x2);³⁶ the letters are placed between points and marked by the double *oksia* which in this manuscript also appears over vocalic letters in hiatus. By contrast the scribe of Pogodin 2 appears to have used only *z'* = *zĕlo* (x5)³⁷ and *z'* = *zemlja* (x5),³⁸ placed between points without additional marking. However, the manuscript has a number of lacunae³⁹ which have been made good on paper additions in a later hand, so the record of the scribe's practice is incomplete. The range of alphabetic suspensions in F.п.I.4 is also limited, though their occurrence is more frequent than in the other two manuscripts: *a'* = *azŭ* (x3),⁴⁰ *z'* = *zĕlo* (x6)⁴¹ and *z'* = *zemlja* (x19),⁴² placed between points and marked with a *titlo* in the form of a *dasia*, which in this manuscript also appears over letters used with numerical value. Here again the evidence is not complete, as the manuscript breaks off in ps.132. The discrepancies in the range and presentation of alphabetic suspension in these manuscripts, together with other divergences in letter forms and spelling conventions, indicate that they were written

³⁰ f.198v, ps.144:3.

³¹ f.40r, ps.34:3; f.111r, ps.87:16; f.142r, ps.108:22; f.147v, ps.115:7.

³² f.28r, ps.24:11; f.98v, ps.77:35; f.146r, ps.113:18; f.165v, ps.118:97.

³³ f.46r, ps.37:9; f.102r, ps.78:8; f.132r, ps.104:24; f.134r, ps.106:38; f.165v, ps.118:96.

³⁴ f.95r, ps.76:19.

³⁵ f.107r, ps.83:10.

³⁶ f.37v, ps.32:4; f.55v, ps.44:2.

³⁷ f.109r, ps.45:2; f.243r, ps.95:4; f.264r, ps.104:24; f.281r, ps.106:38; f.297v, ps.115:1.

³⁸ f.69r, ps.32:8; f.180v, ps.73:12; f.243r, ps.95:1; f.244r, ps.95:9; f.247r, ps.97:4.

³⁹ pss. 13-15, 20-21, 23-25, 117-118, 125-138, 141-end. MS OLDP.Q.136/I in the Russian National Library appears to be a fragment of the same manuscript; it contains parts of the Canticles which usually follow the psalms, and has an instance of *z* = *zĕlo* in v.10 of the first Song of Moses (Exodus 15:1-99).

⁴⁰ f.29r, ps.24:16; f.50r (kathismatic text); f.126r, ps.118:125.

⁴¹ f.11r, ps.6:4; f.24r, ps.20:2; f.49v, ps.45:2; f.51r, ps.47:2; f.82r, ps.78:8; f.104r, ps.103:1.

⁴² f.1v, ps.1:4; f.12v, ps.8:2; f.19r, ps.16:11; f.26r, ps.21:28; f.26r, ps.21:30; f.28v, ps.24:13; f.35v, ps.32:8; f.41r, ps.36:29; f.47r, ps.43:4; f.49v, ps.45:3; f.49v, ps.45:11; f.50v, ps.46:3; f.51r, ps.47:3; f.59r, ps.57:3; f.82v, ps.79:10; f.97r, ps.95:1; f.102v, ps.101:20; f.118r, ps.113:23; f.123v, ps.118:64.

by different scribes, but they present general palaeographical similarities which place them, like the manuscripts listed by Zagrebin, in the late fourteenth century.

The use of alphabetic suspension in these three manuscripts is curiously inconsequential. On the one hand it is not simply a means of saving space: although the majority of examples occur at line-end, there would sometimes have been enough space to write the word in full,⁴³ and there are four places in Pogodin 3,⁴⁴ one in Pogodin 2⁴⁵ and six in F.п.I.4⁴⁶ where alphabetic suspension occurs within the line. On the other hand it seems to have been treated as an optional convenience, to be used when it happened to strike the scribe's fancy: the number of opportunities in the text of the psalms for employing the device — for instance the repeated occurrence of *slovo* in ps.118 — far exceeds its actual use by any of the three scribes, even when allowance is made for the fact that, unlike their Croatian counterparts, they did not combine alphabetic suspension with explicit case-marking. The fact that some of the instances in F.п.I.4 have been expanded with further letters by a corrector⁴⁷ suggests that alphabetic suspension was not a widely established practice in the East Slav area.

These psalter manuscripts illustrate in a particularly striking way a point which emerges generally from the sources listed above, that alphabetic suspension is not directly associated with the contents of manuscripts or with particular textual traditions. None of the three stands in a close textual relationship to the Kiev Psalter, which reflects various South Slavonic revisions carried out in the fourteenth century (ČEŠKO 1981: 84). The Pogodin manuscripts belong to the older tradition known as Redaction II (THOMSON 1998: 810). By contrast F.п.I.4 exhibits peculiarities, particularly in the first half of its text, which link it immediately to a distinctive group of East Slavonic psalter manuscripts from the late thirteenth to early fifteenth centuries: the Simonovskaja psalter (= Amf; AMFILOXIJ 1880-1881); MS F.п.I.2 in the Russian National Library (GRANSTREM 1953: 51); MS 8662 from the Troice-Sergieiev collection⁴⁸ in the Russian State Library; the Luck Psalter of 1384, now in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence (= Luc; VERDIANI 1954); MSS 64 and 60 from the Sofijskij collection in the Russian National Library (= Sf64, Sf60; GRANSTREM 1953: 52-53); MSS 28 and 33 from the Library of the Moscow Synodal Typography in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (= T28, T33; KATALOG 1988: 282-283; KATALOG 2000: 192-194); the Vatican Psalter (=

⁴³ e.g. in Pog. 3, f.134r, ps.106:38.

⁴⁴ f.37v, ps.32:4; f.55v, ps.44:2; f.111r, ps.87:16; f.147v, ps.115:7.

⁴⁵ 297v, ps.115:1.

⁴⁶ f.12v, ps.8:2; f.26r, ps.21:28; f.50r (kathismatic text); f.51r, ps.47:2; f.123v, ps.118:64; f.126r, ps.118:125.

⁴⁷ f.1v, ps.1:4; f.11r, ps.6:4; f.12v, ps.8:2; f.26r, ps.21:30; f.28v, ps.24:13; f.29r, ps.24:16; f.35v, ps.32:8; ps.43:4; f.49v, f.49v, ps.45:2; ps.45:3; f.102v, ps.101:20; f.123v, ps.118:64; f.126r, ps.118:125. The corrector seems to have started with the intention of amending the text in F.п.I.4 to one of the new South Slavonic redactions of the fourteenth century, but rapidly abandoned what would have been a considerable labour and confined his attention to the omissions and a few of the more striking idiosyncrasies of the original scribe's work.

⁴⁸ *fond* 304.

Vat; DŽUROVA, STANČEV, JAPUNDŽIĆ 1985: 72-74); and the Church Slavonic translation of the commentary on the psalms by Theodoret of Cyrrihus in MS 7/177 from the Čudov monastery in the State Historical Museum in Moscow (= 7/177; POGORELOV 1910; LÉPISSIER 1968).⁴⁹ There is also a more distant relationship between F.π.I.4 and certain idiosyncratic representatives of South Slavonic revision from the late thirteenth to the early fifteenth centuries, the Dečani Psalter (= Deč; MITREVSKI 2000), the Norov Psalter (= Nor; ČEŠKO *et al.* 1989), the Oxford Psalter (= Ox; MACROBERT 1994) and the version of the psalms included in the *Hvalov zbornik* of 1404 (= Hval; KUNA *et al.* 1986; JURIC-KAPPEL 1992) — and so, indirectly, with the Kiev Psalter (= Ki; MACROBERT 1994: 151-152). The most distinctive readings which F.π.I.4 has in common with these various manuscripts are listed below:

ps.17:30 ὑπερβήσομαι *preidu* Amf 8662 Luc Sf60 Vat 7/177 Ox.

pss.32:12 κληρονομιᾶν *naslědije* F.π.I.2; 46:5 *naslědije* T28 Sf60; 93:5 and 14 *naslědija* Amf.

ps.39:9 κοιλίας *čreva*⁵⁰ F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 Sf60 Vat Nor Hval Ki.

ps.39:13 κατέλαβον *postigoša* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 Vat 7/177.

ps.44:9 βάρεων *stěni* F.π.I.2 T28 Deč; ps.47:4 βάρεων *sněxū* Sf64 T28 Sf60 Vat, *stěna*<x> Ox; 47:14 βάρεις *sñy* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 T28 Vat 7/177.

ps.55:8 σώσεις / ὤσεις *ō<t>rinedi* F.π.I.2 T28 T33 (cf. *izrineši* 8662 Vat 7/177 Nor).

ps.56:9 ψαλτήριον *pě<s>ju - pěsnīnica* F.π.I.2 7/177; ps.91:4 erasure in F.π.I.4 containing *ě*, cf. *pě<s>nici* Amf; ps.94:2 ψαλμοῖς *pě<s>x7* 7/177; ps.97:5 ψαλμοῦ *pěsnii* Amf Luc T28 (cf. pss.143:9, 149:3, 150:3 ψαλτηρίω *pěsnīnici* F.π.I.2).

ps.58:2 λύτρωσαι *izbavi* F.π.I.2 8662 T33 7/177 Nor.

ps.63:3 πονηρευομένων *lukavy<x>* F.π.I.2 T28 T33 7/177.

ps.67:15 διαστέλλειν *rastrajajeti* F.π.I.2 (cf. *razloučajeti* 7/177 Deč).

ps.68:20 ἐντροπήν *sramū* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 7/177.

ps.68:26 ὁ κατοικῶν *živuštago* F.π.I.2 8662 T28.

ps.73:20 ἀνομιῶν *beza<konii>* cf. *bezakonīnyxū* 8662 Sf64 Nor.

ps.73:22 ἀνάστα *vūstani* F.π.I.2 T28.

ps.74:7 ἐξόδων *vūsto<k>* F.π.I.2 Luc T33 Sf60 Deč Ox.

ps.74:9 κεράσματα *čerpani<ε>* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 Nor.

ps.75:4 ὄπλον καὶ ῥομφαίαν *ōružije i mečī* Luc Ox?⁵¹ (*kopbe* 8662 Sf64).

ps.75:10 ἀναστήναι εἰς κρίσιν τὸν θεόν *vūstati n<a> su<d> bū* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 Nor.

⁴⁹ The eleventh-century Čudov psalter fragment containing the same text is not explicitly cited here because its witness, where available, agrees with that of MS 7/177.

⁵⁰ Immediately preceded by *sr<d>ca*, i.e. a conflated reading.

⁵¹ Here and subsequently ? indicates an erasure in Ox, where the text has been corrected to Redaction III.

ps.75:11 ἑορτάσει *praz<d>nujetī* F.π.I.2 T28 Nor Ox Hval Ki (cf. *prazdīnistviti* Amf 8662 Luc Sf64 Sf60).

ps.76:7 ἡδολέσχουν *skorbexū* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 Nor Ox?; ἔσκαλλεν *tuž<a>še* F.π.I.2 8662 Sf64 Vat Ox?.

ps.77:26 λίβα *zapadny* Luc Sf64 *na zapa<d>* Deč.

ps.77:28 παρεμβολῆς *polka* 7/177.

ps.83:13 ἄνθρωπος *člŋkū* F.π.I.2 (correction) 8662 Luc Sf64 Vat Nor Ox Ki.

ps.87:8 μετεωρισμοῦς *preščeniya* (cf. *vysoty* Nor), 17 φοβερισμοί *preščeniya* (cf. *pritraništva* 7/177).

ps.88:12 πλήρωμα *ispolnenije* Amf 8662 Nor.

ps.93:6 ἀπέκτειναν *pog<u>biša* Amf *pobiša* Nor.

ps.93:15 ἐχόμενοι *prideržašče se* Amf Hval.

ps.130:1 ἐμετεωρίσθησαν *vūzvysista se* T33 *vūzvysiste se* F.π.I.2 Nor *vūzvysiste se* T28.

These readings — and numerous others, particularly in F.π.I.2 — are alien to the early Redactions I and II of the psalter text, and though some of them⁵² ultimately make their way into the South Slavonic revision of the psalms reflected in the Gennadian Bible (FREIDHOF 1974), the majority represent attempts at literalistic and compilatory revision peculiar to the fourteenth century (MACROBERT 1996⁵³).

However, the antecedents of F.π.I.4 are complex: they also go back in part to the distinctive version of Redaction I which is attested in the Tolstoj commentated Psalter of the eleventh or twelfth century (= Tol; SVODNYJ KATALOG 1984: 86) and the fourteenth-century psalter MS 34 from the Library of the Moscow Synodal Typography in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (= T34; KATALOG 1988: 283-284). This textual influence is most apparent in ps.118, where F.π.I.4 shares with the Tolstoy Psalter, the Sluck fragment (now lost) and T34 the use of *pravida* instead of *opraviđanija*, in the genitive rather than the dative case as the complement of the verb *naučiti se*: ps.118:24 τὰ δικαιώματά σου *pravdy tvoe*, 26 τὰ δικαιώματά σου *pravdy tvoe<e>*, 27 δικαιωμάτων σου *pravdū tvoī<x>*, 71 τὰ δικαιώματά σου *pravdy tvoe*, 112 τὰ δικαιώματά σου *pravdy tvoe*, 171 τὰ δικαιώματά σου *pravdy tvoe<e>* (MACROBERT 1993: 69-71).

The extent to which F.π.I.4 draws on this version of Redaction I is not entirely clear, because of competing textual influences: some of the unusual readings which F.π.I.4 shares with Tol and T34 are also found here and there in the manuscripts adduced above from the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, e.g. the choice of lexical items in ps.32:20 ὑπερασπιστῆς *zastupnikū* T34 T28 and ps. 39:18 *zastupni<k>* Tol T34 T28, ps.105:24 ἐξουδένωσαν *poxuliša* Tol T34 F.π.I.2 Luc 7/177 and ps.107:14 ἐξουδενώσει *poxuliti* Tol T34 7/177,⁵⁴ and ps.115:6 ὄστων *sixū* T34 Amf F.π.I.2 Deč,

⁵² The variants cited from pss.39:9 and 13, 58:3, 68:26, 73:22, 75:11, the second variant in 76:7, and 83:13.

⁵³ NB in this article the *siglum* Rum refers to MS 8662.

⁵⁴ MACROBERT 1993: 75-77.

or the use of the plural in ps.103:8 εἰς τόπον *v mĕsta jaže* T34 Luc Deč (cf. T28 T33 *v mĕsta ježe*)⁵⁵. Certain textual oddities merely indicate that the textual tradition goes back to South Slavonic manuscripts whose forms and spelling sometimes caused difficulty to East Slav scribes. For instance unfamiliarity with an old aorist 1st person singular form gave rise to 3rd person singular or infinitive in ps.108:23 ἀντανηρόθην *ô<t>jatŭ se* Tol T34⁵⁶ T33 *ôtjati <s>* Sf64 Sf60 Pogodin 2. Elsewhere confusion of the letters representing the nasal vowels has changed adjectival forms into verbal ones in ps.129:6a προΐας *outrenjuja* T34 Sf64, *outrenjuju* T33 Pogodin 3 Ki, *outrĭnjjuťi* Luc and 129:6b προΐας *outrenjuja* T34 Luc Sf64, *outrenjuju* T33 Pogodin 3 Ki, *outrĭnouetĭ* Deč.

Nevertheless there are some significant agreements with Tol and T34 from the later part of the psalter text in F.π.I.4, notably the use of a primary sigmatic aorist in ps.108:23 ἐξεννάχθην *stresŭ se* and the highly unusual variants in ps.123:3 ὀργισθῆναι τὸν θυμὸν *prognĕvaetĭ<s> jarostĭ* and ps.126:4 τῶν ἐκτετιναγμένων *otĕ*, cf. *otĕ ja* Tol T34⁵⁷. A close relationship to T34 is indicated by the shared omission of ps.106:2b,⁵⁸ and by certain variant readings: ps.87:14 προφθάσει σε *varitĭ me* T34 Nor., ps.106:40 ἐξουδένωσις *ponošĕn<i>je*,⁵⁹ 108:23 σιῶ *stĕnĭ*. However F.π.I.4 may go back to an intermediate stage between the manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth century and their fourteenth century descendent, because it occasionally retains traces, albeit garbled, of a tradition more conservative than that of T34, particularly in ps.68:5 δωρεάν *postydĕša se*, a misinterpretation of Redaction I *spyti*, where T34 has the Redaction II reading *bezuma*, and ps.101:8 ἐπι δώματι *po zdĕ*, based on Redaction I *na zdĕ*, where T34 reinterprets to *na gnĕzdĕ*. Through these links F.π.I.4 comes to stand in a textual relationship, mediated by T34,⁶⁰ with the eleventh-century Eugenius psalter fragment, which is a copy from a Glagolitic exemplar, and with the Frašćićev Psalter, whose conservative character has been long recognised (VAJS 1922-1924), even if the geographical location of its Cyrillic antecedent has been a matter of debate (HAMM 1976; GRABAR 1985). If the paleographical characteristics of F.π.I.4, especially its use of alphabetic suspension, provided clues which could help to establish where it was written, it might be possible to identify the centre of scribal activity which brought together such diverse textual traditions, ancient and innovatory.

The particularities described above give rise to some more general questions. The idea of alphabetic suspension could of course have arisen independently at various times and places, since it could readily have occurred to anyone who acquired

⁵⁵ *ibid.* 71-72.

⁵⁶ *ibid.* 74.

⁵⁷ *ibid.* 73.

⁵⁸ *ibid.* 60.

⁵⁹ *ibid.* 76.

⁶⁰ *ibid.* 72.

literacy by the traditional method of naming letters and combining them in syllables, but it is at least curious that this type of abbreviation seems to come into vogue at approximately the same time, the late fourteenth century, among the Croatian users of Glagolitic and the East Slav users of Cyrillic: was this mere coincidence? Again, given the obvious starting point for the practice, why is it apparently not found in South Slavonic Cyrillic manuscripts? For instance the Serbian counterpart to the *Rjazanskaja kormčaja*, the Ilovica manuscript of 1262 (PETROVIĆ 1991), does not use alphabetic suspension in citing the Lord's Prayer.⁶¹

Setting aside the question of possible common origin, it would surely be useful if the temporal and local distribution of alphabetic suspension in the Glagolitic and Cyrillic traditions could be established in more detail, because its use serves to distinguish individual scribes and could help to date manuscripts, to identify scribal schools and to cast light on their activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AMFILOXIJ, ARCHIMANDRITE. 1880-1881. *Drevle-slavjanskaja Psaltir' Simonovskaja do 1280 goda* 1-4. 2nd ed. Moscow: L. F. Snigirev.
- ČEŠKO, E. V. 1981. Vtoroe južnoslavjanskoe vlijanie v redakcii psaltyrnogo teksta na Rusi XIV-XV vv. *Palaeobulgarica* 5/4: 79-85.
- ČEŠKO, E. V. et al. 1989. *Norovskaja psaltir': Srednebolgarskaja rukopis' XIV veka* 1-2. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- CORIN, A. R. 1991. *The New York Missal: A Paleographic and Phonetic Analysis*. UCLA Slavic Studies 21. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- DU FEU, V. M. 1971. The glagolitic Mss in the Bodley Library. *Slovo* 21: 301-303 and plate.
- DŽUROVA, A., STANČEV, K., JAPUNDŽIĆ, M. 1985. *Opis na slavjanskite rākopisi vāv Vatikanskata biblioteka*. Sofia: Svjat.
- FREIDHOF, G. 1974. *Auszüge aus der Gennadius-Bibel (1499). Nr. 1: Der Psalter*. Specimina philologiae slavicae 5. Frankfurt am Main: O. Horbatsch and G. Freidhof.
- GRABAR, B. 1985. Osobitosti grafije i jezika glagoljskog Fraščićeve psaltira. *Litterae slavicae Medii Aevi Francisco Venceslao Mareš Sexagenario Oblatae*. J. Reinhart (ed.). Munich: Sagner, 75-96.
- GRANSTREM, E. È. 1953. *Opisanie russkix i slavjanskix pergamennyx rukopisej*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennaja publičnaja biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova-Ščedrina.
- HAMM, J. 1967. *Psalterium Vindobonense. Der kommentierte glagolitische*

⁶¹ f.16v col.1

- Psalter der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Schriften der Balkankommission, Linguistische Abteilung 19. Vienna: Böhlau.
- HAMM, J. 1976. K istorii drevneslavjanskogo perevoda psaltyri. *Kul'turnoe nasledie drevnej Rusi*. V. G. Bazanov et al. (ed.). Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 359-363.
- JAGIĆ, I. V. 1911/1972. Glagoličeskoe pis'mo. *Enciklopedija slavjanskoj filologiji*. 3:iii. St Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk. Reprinted Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR.
- JURIĆ-KAPPEL, J. 1992. Die Stellung des bosnischen Psalters (1404) innerhalb der verwandten slawischen Texte. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 38: 37-52.
- KARSKIJ, E. F. 1928. *Slavjanskaja kirillovskaia paleografija*. Leningrad: Akademija nauk SSSR.
- KATALOG. 1988. *Katalog slavjano-russkix rukopisnyx knig XI-XIV vv., xranjaščixsja v CGADA SSSR*. čast' 2. O. A. Knjazevskaja, N S. Koval', O. E. Košeleva, L. V. Moškova. (ed.). Moscow: Glavnoe arxivnoe upravlenie pri Sovete ministrov SSSR, Central'nyj gosudarstvennyj arxiv drevnix aktov SSSR.
- KATALOG. 2000. *Katalog slavjano-russkix rukopisnyx knig XV veka, xranjaščixsja v Rossijskom gosudarstvennom arxive drevnix aktov*. I. L. Žučkova, L. V. Moškova, A. A. Turilov (ed.). Moscow: Drevlexranilišče.
- KUNA, H. et al. 1986. *Zbornik Hvala Krstjanina 1-2*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.
- LÉPISSEIER, J. 1968. *Les Commentaires des Psaumes de Théodoret*. Paris: Institut des études slaves.
- MACROBERT, C. M. 1993. A Missing Link in the Early Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter (the Tolstoy, Sluck, Eugenius and Vienna Psalters and MS 34 of the Moscow Synodal Typography). *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 39: 57-81.
- MACROBERT, C. M. 1994. The Textual Tradition of the Oxford Serbian Psalter MS e Mus 184. *Polata k'nigopis'naja* 25-26: 146-154.
- MACROBERT, C. M. 1996. The classificatory importance of headings and liturgical directions in Church Slavonic psalters of the 11th-15th centuries. *Byzantinoslavica* 57: 156-181.
- MITREVSKI, Lj. 2000. Dečanski psaltir. Makedonski srednovekovni rakopisi 5. Prilep: Institut za staroslovenska kultura.
- NAZOR, A. 1973. Karakteristike jezika i pisma Hrvojeva misala. *Missale Hervoiae ducis spalatensis croatico-glagoliticum. Transcriptio et commentarium*. B. Grabar, A. Nazor, M. Pantelić, V. Štefanić (ed.). Zagreb-

- Ljubljana-Graz: Staroslavenski institut 'Svetozar Ritig', Mladinska knjiga and Akademische Druck u. Verlagsanstalt, 508-511.
- PANTELIĆ, M. 1967. Glagoljski brevijar popa Mavra iz godine 1460. *Slovo 15-16*: 94-149.
- PANTELIĆ, M., A. NAZOR, (ed.). 1977. *II. Novljanski brevijar. Hrvatsko-glagoljski rukopis iz 1495. Fototipsko izdanje*. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut 'Svetozar Ritig' and Turistkomerc.
- PETROVIĆ, M. M. 1991. *Zakonopravilo ili Nomokanon svetoga Save. Ilovički prepis 1262. godina*. Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine.
- POGORELOV, V. P. 1910. *Čudovskaja Psalmyr' XI veka: otryvok. Tolkovanija Feodorita Kirrskogo na Psalmyr' v drevne-bolgarskom perevode*. Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka 3:1. St. Petersburg: Otdelenije ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk.
- POGORELOV, V. A. 1910. *Tolkovanija Feodorita Kirrskogo na Psalmyr' v drevne-bolgarskom perevode. Rassmotrenie spiskov i issledovanie osobennostej Psalmyrnogo teksta*. Warsaw: Varšavskij učebnyj okrug.
- PSRL 1927/1962. *Polnoe Sobranie Russkix Letopisej*, tom 1: *Lavrent'evskaja letopis'*, vypusk 2: *Suzdal'skaja letopis' po Lavrent'evskomu spisku*. Leningrad: Akademija nauk SSSR. Reprinted Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
- ŠTEFANIĆ, Vj. 1960. *Glagoljski rukopisi otoka Krka*. Djela Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti 51. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- ŠTEFANIĆ, Vj. 1964. Glagoljski Transit svetog Jeronima u starijem prijevodu. *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta 5*: 99-161.
- SVANE, G. O. 1965. Kopenhagenski glagoljski misal. *Slovo 15-16*: 59-93.
- SVODNYJ KATALOG. 1984. *Svodnyj katalog slavjano-russkix rukopisnyx knig, xranjaščixsja v SSSR. XI-XIII v.* S. O. Šmidt, L. P. Žukovskaja et al. (ed.). Moscow: Nauka.
- SVODNYJ KATALOG. 2002. *Svodnyj katalog slavjano-russkix rukopisnyx knig, xranjaščixsja v Rossii, stranax SNG i Baltii. XIV vek*. vypusk 1. A. A. Turilov et al. (ed.). Moscow: Indrik.
- TADIN, M. 1953, 1954. Glagolitic manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. *Oxford Slavonic Papers 4*: 151-155, *5*: 133-144.
- THOMSON, F. J. 1998. The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament. *Interpretation of the Bible*. J. Krašovec (ed.). Ljubljana - Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 605-920.
- TVOROGOVIĆ, O. V., V. M. ZAGREBIN. 1988. *Rukopisnye knigi sobranija M. P. Pogodina. Katalog*. vypusk 1. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennaja publičnaja

- biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova- Ščedrina.
- VAJS, J. 1916. *Psalterium palaeoslovenicum croatico-glagoliticum* 1. Krk-Prague: Academia palaeoslovenica Veglensis.
- VAJS, J. 1922-3. Žaltář Frašičův. *Slavia* 1: 269-284, 2: 304-309.
- VAJS, J. 1932. *Rukověť hlaholské paleografie*. Prague: Slovanský Ústav - v Komisi nakladatelství 'Orbis'.
- VZDORNOV, G., T. A. JUROVA. 1978. *Kievskaja psaltyr' 1397. Issledovanie Kievskoj Psaltyri*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- VERDIANI, C. 1954. Il Salterio Laurenziano-Voliniense. Codice paleoslavo del 1384. *Ricerche slavistiche* 3: 1-29.
- VOSTOKOV, A. X. 1863/1980. *Grammatika cerkovno-slovenskago jazyka*. St Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk. Reprinted Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR.
- ZAGREBIN, V. M. 1995. Neobyčnyj sposob naimenovanija bukv slavjanskogo alfavita v tekste ruskoj rukopisi XIV veka. T. Totev (ed.). *1100 godini Veliki Preslav* 2. Šumen: VPI 'Konstantin Preslavski', 222-228.
- ZAGREBIN, V. M. 1998. Ob odnoj osobennosti orfografii protod'jakona Spiridona (konec XIV v.). È. N. Dobrynina (ed.). *Iskusstvo rukopisnoj knigi. Vizantija. Drevnjaja Rus'*. Moskva 17-19 nojabrja 1998. St Petersburg: Russkaja Akademija nauk, Gosudarstvennyj institut iskusstvovedenija and Dimitrij Bulanin, 6-7.

Abstract

This article deals with a type of abbreviation, here termed 'alphabetic suspension', which relies on the fact that the names of letters in the Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets were meaningful words, which could therefore be shortened, when they occurred in continuous text, to their initials. It reviews the evidence for alphabetic suspension in the sources available to the author, and concludes that it would be useful if the temporal and local distribution of alphabetic suspension in the Glagolitic and Cyrillic traditions could be established in more detail, because its use serves to distinguish individual scribes and could help to date manuscripts, to identify scribal schools and to cast light on their activities.

Key words: abbreviation, suspension, Glagolitic, Cyrillic, dating of manuscripts, scribal schools

S a ž e t a k

ALFABETSKA SUSPENZIJA U GLAGOLJSKIM I ĆIRILSKIM RUKOPISIMA

Članak govori o specifičnom tipu kraćenja koji se ovdje označava izrazom “alfabetska suspenzija”, a temelji se na činjenici da su nazivi slova i u glagoljici i u ćirilici bili smislene riječi te je postojala mogućnost da se u tekstu takve riječi skrate samo na početno slovo. U članku je razmotrena dokazna građa o alfabetskoj suspenziji u izvorima dostupnim autorici. Zaključeno je da bi bilo korisno utvrditi točniju vremensku i zemljopisnu distribuciju alfabetske suspenzije u glagoljskoj i ćirilskoj tradiciji, jer je na temelju uporabe takvih kratica moguće razlikovati pojedinačne prepisivače i eventualno datirati rukopise, identificirati pisarske škole i osvijetliti njihovu djelatnost.

Ključne riječi: kraćenje, suspenzija, glagoljica, ćirilica, datiranje rukopisa, prepisivačke škole

Izvorni znanstveni članak

*Autor: Catherine Mary MacRobert
Oxford University*