

Cynthia M. Vakareliyska (Eugene)

## DOTS AND ACUTE ACCENT SHAPES IN THE DOBREJŠO GOSPEL

### 1. Introduction

Dots, accents, and other diacritical marks positioned over letters are common features of medieval Church Slavonic manuscripts. For the purposes of this paper, these can be very generally categorized as either primarily paleographic or primarily orthographic in nature, although the boundary between the two categories is fuzzy. Paleographic diacritics generally imitate meaningful orthographic conventions in Greek manuscripts, but have only a decorative function in Slavic manuscripts, since they were not a standard part of the Glagolitic or Old Cyrillic orthographic system. These can include a regularly-occurring dot over the letter *w*; breathing marks over vowel letters; and apparent accent marks whose placement does not reflect the actual stressed syllable of the Church Slavonic words they appear over. In contrast, orthographic-level diacritics, which are the focus of this paper, have a disambiguating punctuational function, and serve to assist readers in parsing the text. Examples of these are acute accents placed over the stressed syllable of the words in which they appear; a regularly-occurring double dot over *i* and ligated vowel letters *ѣ*, *ѥ*, *ѧ*, disambiguating them from *и* and other similarly-shaped letters; and a single dot or breathing mark over any vowel letter that immediately follows another vowel letter, either word-internally or word-initially.

This paper examines four unusual patterns in orthographic-level diacritical markings in the Dobrejšo Gospel, a western Bulgarian liturgical tetraevangelion generally dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century<sup>1</sup>. The sporadic nature of the diacritics distinguishes them from the types described above. So far I have not come across any of the four Dobrejšo

---

<sup>1</sup> No. 17 (307), Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia; typeset edition: Б. ЦОНЕВ, *Добрейшово четвороевангелие. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век (Софийска Нар. Библиотека No. 307 и Белградска Нар. Библиотека No. 214)*, БСт 1, 1906. A digital facsimile of the manuscript is available at [http://www.europeana.eu/portal/en/record/2063614/BU\\_280\\_01.html](http://www.europeana.eu/portal/en/record/2063614/BU_280_01.html). The analysis in this paper is based on my first-hand examination of the manuscript and handwritten corrections of Conev's flawed 1906 transcription edition, in connection with a second, corrected diplomatic edition and analysis of the manuscript that I am currently compiling.

patterns in other medieval Slavic manuscripts, with the exception of one somewhat similar diacritic type in a few early East Slavic manuscripts (see subsection 3.1 below, n. 5). Following the overview in section 2 below, each diacritic pattern is discussed separately in sections 3 through 6, and conclusions are presented in section 7.

## 2. Orthographic diacritics in the Dobrejšo Gospel

The diacritics that are the focus of this study are written by the main scribe of the Dobrejšo Gospel, the priest Dobrejšo, whose name appears twice in the manuscript and whose self-portrait is included in the frontispiece to the Book of John<sup>2</sup>. Dobrejšo regularly employs double dots in *ī* (including in *иī*) and *ū*, and over the ligatures in *īī*, *īe*, and *īo*; and a single dot over vowel letters immediately preceded by another vowel letter: e.g., *и́ида, зидѣи́тъ*. It is important to note that the manuscript does not mark either accentuation or, with only rare exceptions, dropped etymological weak jers.

A frequent diacritic in the Dobrejšo Gospel with an extralinguistic function is what looks like a single acute accent or a series of three acutes over or near a letter that immediately follows the large red initial letter marking the beginning of a lection: e.g., *Г'а́ава* (with red *Г*). As the introduction to Conev's transcription edition of the manuscript explains, this is simply a placemaker left by the scribe for himself to show where to insert a red letter after he had completed writing a page of text in black ink<sup>3</sup>. Finally, as in very common in medieval Slavic manuscripts, there are many ambiguous superfluous dots in the Dobrejšo Gospel that look like accent marks, but that were clearly produced inadvertently as the scribe rested his pen as he consulted his copying source.

The four sporadic diacritic patterns in the manuscript that are the subject of this paper are less straightforward in function than the ones described above. Most frequent among these is a dot or a shape similar to an acute accent placed over or near the letter *ρ*: i.e., in some places *ρ̇*, in others *ρ́*. Since distribution of the dot vs. accent shapes is random, the scribe appears to have intended both to represent a single symbol. Although Conev remarks on this diacritic in his introduction<sup>4</sup>, he does not offer an explanation for it, and apparently he did not observe any

<sup>2</sup> Although Conev expresses reservations in the introduction to his edition of the manuscript as to whether the primary scribe is priest Dobrejšo, this can be extrapolated from Dobrejšo's appearance in the frontispiece to the Book of John (fol. 72v), together with the illustrator's note on the frontispiece to the Book of Luke seeking divine assistance to do a better job on the upcoming portrait of St. John (fol. 18v). Although Conev identified numerous contributing copyists, including a guest scribe who marked dropped weak jers with a double acute accent on fols. 12v and 13r, the writing on both frontispieces appears to be in the hand of the primary scribe. Cf. Б. ЦОНЕВ, *Добрейшово четвъроевангелие...*, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*

pattern behind its occurrence. In fact, the dotted/“accented” ρ most often occurs in the manuscript in canonical Old Church Slavonic (OCS) spellings of historical *\*ṪorT*, *\*ṪorT*, *\*TṙoT*, and *\*TṙoT* formations (hereafter referred to generally as *\*ṪorT* and *\*TṙoT*) such as *п̇ръсѣтъ* (fol. 5v5).

Less commonly, the dot or acute accent shape appears in the Dobrejšo Gospel over a letter ρ adjacent to another consonant letter in words that did not historically have a jer either immediately preceding or immediately following /r/ in a consonant cluster: e.g., *п̇іт̇ръкъ* (fols. 8r5, 31r21), *т̇р̇ѣти* (fol. 9r21), *п̇́р̇ост̇р̇и* (fol. 4v6). This phenomenon is analyzed in section 2 below.

The second sporadic pattern, discussed in section 3.5 and 4, is a series of two or three apparent acute accent forms over ρ, and from one to three acute accents or a single dot over л, where that letter immediately follows another consonant letter in a word that did not historically have a jer either immediately before or immediately after the liquid consonant: e.g., *п̇́́́р̇́́́авѣдѣнѣ* (fol. 61v1), *гл̇́́́а́́́сѡмъ* (fol. 114r6), *възг̇́́́ласитѣ* (fol. 67r15), *възг̇́́́ласитѣ* (fol. 67r18). These diacritics are distinguishable from the acute shapes following a red letter that are discussed above, since they do not come at the beginning of a lection.

From one to three acute accent shapes, or, alternatively, a single dot, also occur sporadically over н, predominantly in forms of OCS *dnv̇*: e.g., fol. 39r2 *д̇́́́н̇́́́нъ*, fol. 64r19 *д̇́́́н̇́́́нъ*, fol. 3r19 *д̇́́́н̇́́́нъ*. This pattern is examined in section 5. Finally, in approximately one-third of the occurrences of the OCS lexeme *sqbota*, there is a dot, a single acute shape, or three consecutive acute accent shapes over or near the ж: e.g., fol. 4r5 *с̇́́́ж̇́́́бот̇́́́ж*, fol. 48r3 *с̇́́́ж̇́́́бот̇́́́и*, fol. 4r12 *с̇́́́ж̇́́́б̇́́́от̇́́́ж* (see section 6 below).

### 3. Dotted/accented ρ

**3.1. *\*ṪorT* and *\*TṙoT* formations.** As noted above, scribe Dobrejšo has occasionally placed a dot or acute accent shape over the ρ in his canonical OCS spelling of words that contained a neutral jer<sup>5</sup>. Examples include the following historical *\*ṪorT* formations, i.e., words with a historical neutral front or back jer immediately preceding a consonant cluster ending in /r/: fol. 4r2 *въс̇́́́т̇́́́ръгати*, fol. 4r16 *скв̇́́́рън̇́́́жтъ* (cf. fol. 26r4 *скръ̇́́́жца*), fol. 4r16 *н̇́́́ ж̇́́́рътвѣ*, fol. 5v5 *п̇́́́ръсѣтъ*, fol. 11r18

<sup>5</sup> Following H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, <sup>7</sup>Berlin–New York 2001, p. 38–39, I use the term “neutral jer” to mean a written jer letter (usually ѣ in OCS manuscripts) between the letter ρ or л and an immediately following consonant letter in the same word. As Lunt observed (*ibidem*, p. 38), evidence from later Slavic dialects and languages suggests that in this configuration, the neutral jer letter represents a jer vowel that originally preceded the liquid consonant /r/ or /l/ in Common Slavic. (Cf., in Early East Slavic manuscripts, the characteristic positioning of the jer letter to the left of the ρ or л; H.G. LUNT, *op. cit.*, and В.М. МАРКОВ, *К истории редуцированных гласных в русском языке*, <sup>2</sup>Казань 2007, among others.) There is no attestation in OCS manuscripts of the lowering of such jer vowels to full vowels in strong position. I have extended the scope of this term in this paper to refer to phonological jers as well as orthographic jer letters.

–19 трѣжни|комѣ, fol. 62v3 трѣжницихъ (cf. 76r21 трѣжникомѣ), fol. 26r16–17 четѣврѣтовластоуѣщоу (cf. l. 18 четѣврѣтовлаस्थ्यствоуѣщоу), fol. 48v20 ѿврѣзи, fol. 54r5 жрѣвѣнѣ (sic!, for OCS жрѣновѣнѣ), fol. 76r1 почрѣпѣте (cf. врѣха earlier on same line, fol. 78v3 почрѣпала). The dot or acute accent also occurs in words that contain historical Common Slavic \**Tr̥T* formations, in which the jer followed the /r/: for example, fol. 47v22 ѿкрѣстѣ, fol. 2r22 трѣсти, fol. 33v14 крѣви (with a barely visible dot). That the convention covers both historical \**T̥rT* and \**Tr̥T* roots is unsurprising, of course, since both formations are believed to have merged into the syllabic liquid formation *TRT* in Early South Slavic before being reanalyzed in OCS solely as the formation \**Tr̥T* (but cf. Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects, in section 3.4 below)<sup>6</sup>.

This sporadic diacritic is similar to the fairly regular use of a dot over a consonant letter that immediately precedes either *ρ* or *λ* in some East Slavic manuscripts, including the Archangel Gospel and the 11<sup>th</sup>-century Putjata Menaion<sup>7</sup>, to mark a vocalic element before the liquid consonant in OCS *tr̥ot* and *tr̥ot* forms<sup>8</sup>. In contrast to the East Slavic manuscripts, however, no equivalent diacritic ever occurs over the letter *λ* in Dobrejšo's canonical OCS spellings of historical \**T̥lT*/*\*T̥lT* formations (both hereafter \**T̥lT*), or \**Tl̥T*/*\*Tl̥T* formation (both hereafter \**Tl̥T*), such as мльчѣ. This lack of symmetry may explain why Conev failed to recognize the meaning of the diacritics over *ρ*, despite the fact that his introduction discusses the representation of roots containing neutral jers<sup>9</sup>. Indeed, in the introduction Conev has more to say about \**T̥lT* roots than \**T̥rT* roots: he lists 31 instances of historical \**T̥lT* forms in the manuscript in which the jer precedes the *λ* rather than following it as in OCS spelling (*t̥olt* spelling; e.g., мльчѣ- or мльчѣ- for OCS мльчѣ- in Mt 27,24; 26,5; 26,63; Mc 5,39; 9,23; Lc 10,40)<sup>10</sup>. A parallel spelling pattern of *t̥ort* for historical \**T̥rT* or \**Tr̥T* formations does not occur anywhere in the manuscript<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> On the development of new syllabic liquids in Middle Bulgarian, see A.-M. ТОТОМАНОВА, *За природата и съдбата на гласната ѱ в българския език*, [in:] ЕАДЕМ, *Из българската историческа фонетика*, София 2001, p. 45–67 (57).

<sup>7</sup> Markov (*op. cit.*, p. 82) gives these examples from the Putjata Menaion: плькъ (fol. 5r), оумльва (6v), ёрѣжѣ (14v), испльнение (73r), жрѣтѣвѣ (73r), мльниана (76v), ёлѣништѣта (114r), ёлѣноуѣтѣ (114v), дльга (79r), дльжѣно (108v), ёлѣнишиѣ сѣ (111r), мльва (126v), орѣёрѣзи (126v), сѣлѣпѣ (134); see also discussion on p. 93.

<sup>8</sup> В.М. МАРКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

<sup>9</sup> Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 55–56.

<sup>10</sup> Conev provides a list of 34 instances of what he calls *̥p* and *̥l* spellings (referred to in this paper as *t̥ort* and *t̥olt*, where *t* represents any consonant letter and *̥* represents either jer letter). Cf. Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 56. All but three of these are with *λ*, and one is incorrect: Conev has mistakenly included in the list as “мльчѣ” the canonically spelled root мльчѣ- in Lc 10,41, which he rendered correctly, however, in the transcription portion of the edition. Moreover, three of the instances that Conev lists as *t̥olt* spellings in the manuscript actually are spelled *t̥olt̥*; see discussion in section 3.3 below.

<sup>11</sup> The three instances that Conev includes in his list as *t̥ort* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel actually have the form *t̥ort̥*, not *t̥ort*; see discussion in section 3.3 below.

To summarize, the Dobrejšo Gospel's sporadic non-canonical spellings of historical neutral jer formations are in complementary distribution. Historical *\*TǫlT* and *\*TlǫT* formations occasionally are written as *tǫlt*<sup>12</sup>, but historical *\*TǫrT* and *\*TrǫT* are not written as *tǫrt* (with the exception of a correction of a *tǫrǫt* spelling, discussed in 3.2 below). Instead, while generally the historical *\*TǫrT*/*\*TrǫT* formations appear in the manuscript in the canonical OCS spelling *trǫt*, sporadically a dot or a mark that looks like an acute accent (i.e., a longish diagonal line ascending upward to the right) is placed over or near the *ρ* (hereafter referred to as 'dotted/'accented' *ρ*'). This diacritic does not appear correspondingly over *λ* in historical *\*TǫlT* or *\*TlǫT* forms.

**3.2. *Tǫrǫt* and *tǫlǫt* spellings.** Conev's introduction obscures the issue of the distribution between 'dotted/'accented' *ρ*' and *tǫlt* spellings in the manuscript, because seven of the forms in his list of what he claims are *tǫrt* or *tǫlt* spellings actually have the shape *tǫrǫt*/*tǫlǫt*: *мѣлѣва* (fol. 30r of the Belgrade portion of the manuscript, which was lost during World War II), *вѣлѣкѣ* (fol. 38v, Belgrade portion), *оу|мѣлѣчѣшѣ* (fol. 61v11–12), *сѣ|вѣрѣшениѣ* (fol. 51r7–8), *мѣрѣзостѣ* (fols. 21r, 22r, Belgrade portion), *тѣрѣми (дѣ'н'ми)* (fol. 76v8)<sup>13</sup>. This sporadic spelling of neutral-jer formations – which also occurs on fol. 119v3, in *вѣρ<ѣ>гѣшѣ*<sup>14</sup> – is the only one that is used in the manuscript to represent both OCS *trǫt* and *tlǫt* forms.

The *tǫrǫt*/*tǫlǫt* orthographic forms in the Dobrejšo Gospel are graphically identical to the secondary pleophony spellings in East Slavic manuscripts. Both Conev and Koneski treat these essentially as *tǫrt*/*tǫlt* spellings, however, listing them together with the *tǫlt* examples<sup>15</sup> – although Conev argues that in *tǫlǫt* forms the copyist was deliberately preserving the OCS spelling while at the same time also deliberately inserting a jer before the *λ* to represent his own dialect pronunciation. If both jers in the *tǫlǫt* spelling were indeed deliberate, however, then it is puzzling why this spelling is so rare in the manuscript. A more likely explanation is that scribe Dobrejšo was striving throughout to reproduce canonical OCS spelling and to suppress orthographic expression of the *tǫlt* feature in his vernacular dialect, but that the dialect feature occasionally crept in nevertheless, both in the superfluous jer in the three *tǫlǫt* forms, and in the 30 *tǫlt* forms, which occur

<sup>12</sup> Since the Dobrejšo Gospel's sporadic *tǫlt* spelling is not a feature of its close relatives, the Curzon and Banica liturgical gospels, it must be a fairly late development in the manuscript's prehistory. Cf. Add. MS 39,628, British Library, London, c.1354; typeset edition by C.M. VAKARELIYSKA, *The Curzon Gospel*, vol. I, *An Annotated Edition*, vol. II, *A Linguistic and Textual Introduction*, Oxford 2008; НБКМ No. 17, Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia; typeset edition by E. ДОГРАМАДЖИЕВА, Б. РАЙКОВ, *Банишко евангелие. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век*, София 1981.

<sup>13</sup> Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>14</sup> The symbol <> represents an erased segment.

<sup>15</sup> Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Б. КОНЕСКИ, *История на македонскиот јазик*, Скопје 1965, p. 33.

primarily in the OCS root *mlōv-*: *мѣлѣ-/мѣлѣ-* Mt 27,24; 26,5; 26,63; Mc 5,39; 9,23; Lc 10,40–41, and *мѣлѣва*, fol. 30r, Belgrade portion; see 3.4 below.

The four *tōrt* occurrences in the manuscript are difficult to explain as failures to suppress a *tōrt* dialect feature, because the Dobrejšo Gospel has no occurrences of unambiguous *tōrt* spellings to suggest that the extra jer in *tōrt* results from a combination of OCS *trōt* and vernacular *tōrt* spelling variants, whether deliberate or not<sup>16</sup>. This differs from the situation in East Slavic manuscripts, which can contain both *tōrt*/*tōlt* and *tōrt*/*tōlt* spellings of the same word.

**3.3. *Tōlt*, *tōlt*, *tōrt*, and dotted/“accented” *trōt* spellings within the context of modern Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects.** While it must be kept in mind that not all features of modern Bulgarian dialects date back to Middle Bulgarian vernaculars, a brief look at the Dobrejšo Gospel’s various OCS *trōt* and *tlōt* representations from the perspective of Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects is nevertheless somewhat instructive with respect to any phonological significance of the asymmetry in the manuscript’s sporadic *tōrt*, *tōlt*, and dotted/“accented” *trōt* spellings.

Considering first the sporadic dotted/“accented” *ρ* in the Dobrejšo Gospel’s *trōt* spellings, which seems to be indicating a non-OCS phonological treatment of the neutral jer, might the diacritic be intended to mark a syllabic /r/? The manuscript does have two instances of *trt* spellings (*вѣрѣѣ* Mt 14,2, *мртѣѣхъ* Lc 9,7)<sup>17</sup>, which Blaže Koneski identifies in the twelfth-century Ohrid Apostolus, and other Macedonian manuscripts of the same general time period, as a reflection of a syllabic liquid<sup>18</sup>. Koneski’s examples from the Ohrid Apostolus include *пана* and *мртвѣхъ*,

<sup>16</sup> In their volume of Macedonian manuscripts, Despodova and Slaveva misread *сѣвѣръшени* in Conev’s introduction as *сѣвѣршени*, and thus presented it as an example of sporadic *tōrt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel, when in fact the manuscript has none of these, with the exception of the correction of *вѣрѣѣ* to *вѣрѣѣ* (cf. В. ДЕСПОДОВА, Л. СЛАВЕВА, *Македонски средновековни ракописи*, Прилеп 1988, p. 116.). The spelling *вѣрѣѣ* on fol. 119v cannot be counted as a *tōrt* spelling, however, because the erasure probably was made by a later editor. This is suggested by the fact that the erasure in the manuscript leaves a gap in the word and is not written over. In any event, in contrast both to Koneski and to Despodova and Slaveva, I find the Dobrejšo Gospel generally to reflect western Bulgarian rather than Macedonian phonological features (cf. C.M. VAKARELIYSKA, *Western Bulgarian or Macedonian? The Dobrejšo Gospel (XIII c.)*, Slo 50, 2010, p. 13–26, [http://www.moderna.uu.se/slovo/Issue\\_Pages/2010issue50.html](http://www.moderna.uu.se/slovo/Issue_Pages/2010issue50.html) [14 XII 2014]). Also relying on p. 56 of Conev’s introduction, Horace Lunt specifically mentioned the Dobrejšo Gospel’s *tōrt*/*tōlt* spellings in his article on syllabic liquids, but stated generally that the Dobrejšo Gospel has more of what he called “jer + liquid” spellings than the earlier Bologna Psalter, since Conev’s discussion does not indicate that that the “jer + liquid” spelling occurs only as *tōlt* and not *tōrt* (cf. H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?*, WS 7, 1962, p. 350–358 (p. 358, n. 21)).

<sup>17</sup> The numbers provided in this paper are based on a single preliminary search through the manuscript; hence there may be some other instances that I have missed this time round.

<sup>18</sup> Б. КОНЕСКИ, *op. cit.*, p. 33.



Citing *вълны*, *хълмиъ*, and *мьръзостъ* from Conev's introduction as sporadic *tōlt* and *tōrt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel, Koneski stated that the jer preceding the liquid consonant letter reflected *the dark vocalic overtone [темниот вокален призвук] before the syllabic r and l*<sup>25</sup>, going on to note that most modern Macedonian dialects are characterized by the development of a similar vocalic element (*вокален приспан*) before a liquid into a full vowel<sup>26</sup>.

In assuming that both the *tōrōrt/tōlōt* and the *tōlt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel represent a single reflex of *\*TōrT/\*TōlT* forms in the scribe's dialect, both Conev and Koneski were apparently unperturbed by the fact that the same reflex is expressed by two different spelling conventions. It may be for this reason that Conev, and those scholars who relied on his description, did not differentiate between the exceedingly rare *tōrōrt/tōlōt* spellings in the manuscript, on one hand, and *tōlt* and (actually non-existent) *tōrt* spellings, on the other. (Since Conev had not observed the sporadic dotted/"accented" ρ and its potential phonological significance, of course Koneski was unaware that there was another possible marker of a vocalic element preceding what at least used to have been a syllabic liquid.)

Some support for the proposition that the *tōrōt* spelling in the Dobrejšo Gospel reflected a vocalic element both before and after /r/ can be found in Miletič's transcription of the sequence he transcribes as *q̄r̄q̄* (that is, /ürü/) for CSB /ür/ in early twentieth-century Preslav-area dialects (in the sole example *m̄q̄r̄q̄zlivičk̄o*)<sup>27</sup>, but a relationship between this feature of certain eastern Bulgarian dialects and the western Bulgarian Dobrejšo Gospel would be tenuous. Moreover, Miletič provided no equivalent sequence of /ülü/ for /ül/ that might offer a parallel phonological explanation the manuscript's *tōlōt* spellings.

The apparent absence of Bulgarian dialect /ülü/ forms corresponding to Miletič's single /ürü/ example reflects the general asymmetry in many Bulgarian

---

the 1981 Bulgarian dialect atlas did not use acoustic measurements, the phonetic values that they recorded for the reflexes of *\*TōRT* and *\*TrōT* formations could be simply the values that they were perceiving under the influence of the general phonemic system of Contemporary Standard Bulgarian (CSB). Consequently, he questioned the accuracy of any transcriptions of a syllabic /r/ in Bulgarian dialects that have the vowel /ü/, citing Trubetzkoy's statement that recorded differences could simply reflect variations in tempo or emphasis caused by extralinguistic factors. Horace Lunt made a similar observation about South Slavic syllabic liquids earlier, grounded in the same work by Trubetzkoy: *The descriptions of dialects vary considerably according to the perception of the observer, and one must always reckon with the automatic subjective reaction based on the situation on the observer's native speech. Thus Serbs and Bulgars recording the same Macedonian words will write now trt, now tr̄rt or tr̄t̄t (...)*. H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?*, WS 61.2, 1962, p. 353, n. 14.

<sup>25</sup> My translation. Koneski also cites the late 11<sup>th</sup>-century Macedonian Cyrillic Folio for *върхъ*, *гьрдъ*, *пълтн*, and the early 13<sup>th</sup>-century Bologne Psalter for sporadic occurrences of *гьрдн*, *пьрстъ*, *лгьлннж*. Cf. B. КОНЕСКИ, *op. cit.*

<sup>26</sup> Koneski also notes that in some southeastern Macedonian dialects, the vowel develops *following* the liquid (*grüb*, *vrūx*, *trūgna*, *vlūk*, *žlūt*). *Ibidem.*

<sup>27</sup> L. МИЛЕТИЧ, *Südslavische Dialektstudien*, vol. II, *Das Ostbulgarische*, Wien 1903, p. 75.



and Macedonian dialects between the reflexes of *\*T̄bRT* and *\*T̄bLT* – an asymmetry that also likely is behind the distribution of dotted/“accented” *tr̄ot* vs. *t̄olt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel. For example, the 2001 Academy dialect atlas records syllabic /r/ in Teteven, Vraca, Blagoevgrad, Trūn, Skopje, and Niš, as opposed to syllabic /l/ in Teteven, Vraca, Vidin, Sofia and Trūn<sup>28</sup>, thus demonstrating that in some dialects, *\*T̄bRT* and *\*T̄bLT* reflexes have not evolved in parallel. Moreover, not only does the 2001 atlas record more variation and inconsistency in *\*T̄bLT* reflexes than in *\*T̄bRT* reflexes, but it also includes maps devoted to the geographic distribution of the reflexes of specific *\*T̄bLT* roots (OCS *vl̄bk̄o*, *dl̄vḡo*, *žl̄bt̄*) that tend to be exceptions to the usual *\*T̄bLT* reflexes in some dialects<sup>29</sup>. No similar set of maps is provided for the reflexes of any *\*T̄bRT* roots. Similarly, Bojadžiev observed in his study of Thracian dialects that *\*T̄bLT* and *\*T̄bRT* reflexes are often flexible and even word-specific, as in *želt* for OCS *žl̄bt̄o* but *dlek* for *dl̄vḡo*<sup>30</sup>. The existence of specific roots in *t̄olt* in some dialects that usually exhibit *tl̄ot* suggests that the Dobrejšo Gospel’s higher occurrence of *t̄olt* spellings with OCS root *ml̄ov-* is not coincidental, but that it instead reflects a similar word-specific pattern in *\*T̄bLT* reflexes in the scribe’s vernacular. If so, the scribe may have found it more difficult to suppress the *t̄olt* spellings of words that took exceptional *t̄olt* or *telt* shapes in his dialect.

Bojadžiev’s examples of discrepancies within individual dialects include the Dedagackso and Lozengradsko dialects, which have both /ūr/ and /rū/, and /ül/ and /lū/, in monosyllabic forms and in polysyllabic forms with a single consonant following the liquid<sup>31</sup>; the Odrinsko dialect, which has /ūr/–/rū/ variation, but only /ül/, in monosyllabic forms<sup>32</sup>; the Malgarsko and Kešansko dialects, which exhibit *s̄v̄rp*, *ḡv̄rk*, *v̄l̄k*, *p̄v̄l̄*, *ž̄v̄lt/ž̄elt*, and *dlek* but *p̄v̄s*, *tl̄v̄s*<sup>33</sup>; and the dialects of Silivrija, Čorlu and Carigradsko/Čataldžansko, which have *ḡv̄rk*, *pl̄v̄x*, *v̄r̄v̄x*, *tl̄v̄s*, the doublets *br̄v̄s/b̄v̄s* (Čanakča), *v̄l̄k/v̄l̄k* (Dajakadūn and Tarfa), and *ž̄v̄lt/ž̄l̄v̄t* (Tarfa), and polysyllabic *ḡv̄rcki* with two consonants following the liquid, but no equivalent in polysyllabic forms in /l/.<sup>34</sup>

The extent of /ūr/–/rū/ and /ül/–/lū/ discrepancies within individual modern dialects – not to mention within CSB itself – suggests that there is no reason to assume that the sporadic non-OCS spellings of either *\*T̄bRT* or *\*T̄bLT* reflexes reflect consistent phonological features in the Dobrejšo scribe’s vernacular dialect either.

<sup>28</sup> Български диалектичен атлас..., F 142, 146. See also discussion of syllabic /r/ and /l/ in J. ДУМА, *Wokalizacja jerów słabych w rdzennej sylabie nagłosowej w południowo-wschodniej słowiańszczyźnie*, Wrocław 1979, p. 19 (map 12), 20 (map 14), 21 (map 16), 45.

<sup>29</sup> Български диалектичен атлас..., F 150, 151, 152.

<sup>30</sup> Т. БОЯДЖИЕВ, *Български говори в западна /беломорска/ и източна /одринска/ Тракия*, София 1991.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 134, 149.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 142–43.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 185.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 192.

**3.4. Titla over non-abbreviated OCS *tr̥ot* spellings.** In opposition to the Dobrejšo Gospel's two *tr̥t* spellings without diacritics (въскр̥се, мртвѣхѣ), discussed in 3.3 above, considerably more frequently a titlo appears over an unabbreviated canonical OCS *tr̥ot* spelling in which the jer has not been omitted. These occasional titla appear predominantly over the same two roots that occur once apiece as *tr̥t* spellings without titla: for example, fol. 9r10 мр̣ѣтъвътъ, fol. 52v13 мр̣ѣтъвъвъ, fol. 53r8 мр̣ѣтъвътъ, fol. 70v6 мр̣ѣтъвъѣиѣни, fol. 8r18 мр̣ѣтъвъѣиѣхъ въскр̣ѣтъ, fol. 13v10 въскр̣ѣснѣтъ, fol. 17r21 вѣтъ ѣскр̣ѣтъ<sup>35</sup>, fol. 35r1 въскр̣ѣтъсе, fol. 97v5 въскр̣ѣснѣтъ, fol. 79v11 въскр̣ѣснѣти, fol. 97r12 съмр̣ѣти, fol. 1v10 кр̣ѣста, fol. 98v3 ѡкр̣ѣстѣтъ. These titla likely have no phonological significance and are simply automatic, since they are limited to OCS *tr̥ot* forms that commonly are abbreviated in Church Slavonic manuscripts. That is, the scribe has inserted a titlo out of habit after he has already written the form in full, including the jer. In this respect the titla over unabbreviated *tr̥ot* word forms in which the neutral jer is still present differ from the sporadic dot or acute accent shape over the  $\rho$  in *tr̥ot* forms, which appears over both commonly abbreviated forms and forms that are not generally abbreviated.

**3.5. Dotted/“accented”  $\rho$  in non-*tr̥ot* consonant clusters.** Although a dot or accent shape over or near an  $\rho$  occurs most frequently in OCS *tr̥ot* spellings, it can be found in the manuscript also over forms containing a consonant cluster ending in /r/ that never included a historical neutral jer. I have observed the following forms with non-*tr̥ot* dotted/“accented”  $\rho$ :

*tr*, *dr*: fol. 2r22 вѣтр̣омъ, fol. 3r16 дръе, fols. 8r5 пѣтр̣ъ, 31r21 пѣтр̣ъ, fol. 4v6 п̣ростр̣и, fol. 9r21 тр̣ети, fol. 11r7 въоутр̣ѣннѣи  
*pr*: fol. 4r21 въпр̣осишѣ, fol. 4v6 п̣ростр̣и, fol. 8v4 пр̣ишедѣ, fol. 30v12 п̣ривождѣхъ, fol. 25v10 п̣аскы (originally пр̣аскы, with erased  $\rho$ )  
*vr*: fol. 1v5 в̣рази  
*mr*: fol. 34r7 оум̣рѣтъ, fol. 62r1 оум̣рѣтъ

While it is possible that one or more of the above diacritics are simply resting points, their distribution indicates that at least the majority of them are deliberate. In three of the six OCS forms above with dental clusters, the historical /tr/ or /dr/ later developed into /tŭr/ or /dŭr/, respectively, in CSB (*vjatŭr*, *dŭrvo*, *Petŭr*), suggesting that the diacritic over the  $\rho$  marks an immediately preceding vocalic element, as it likely does in the dotted/“accented” *tr̥ot* spellings. The preceding vocalic element that is suggested by the two instances of dotted/“accented”  $\rho$  in OCS aorist *umrĕtŭ* is less interesting, of course, since it likely developed by analogy to the non-past stem *umŕ-*<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> Conev's typeset edition omits the titlo in this example.

<sup>36</sup> A dot is used over the first of two consecutive consonant letters in non-*tr̥ot* (and non-*tl̥ot*) formations also in the East Slavic Putjata Menaion, and in a broader range of environments than in the

The manuscript also contains four instances of double or triple acute accent shapes in historical non-*trōt* forms. To demonstrate that the accent shapes do not correlate to sentence stress or location, I have included the textual context for each form: fol. 16v23, Мс 16,3 ѿ дв''ери гроба<sup>37</sup>; fol. 18r21–22, Лс 17,20 ѿ слово оутверъ''ждаѿщюу ѿ послѣдѣствующи; fol. 61v1, Лс 20,21 Оучителю • въмъ іако п''р'аведнѣ глѣши; fol. 39v8, Лс 10,21 Бъ ть ч'ѣсъ въз''радова сѧ. With the exception of въз''радова сѧ, in which the double acute accent shapes may simply be marking the location of the beginning of the lection text following the incipit formula Бъ ть ч'ѣсъ, possibly together with the accent in ч'ѣсъ, there appears to be no relation between the acute accent shapes in these occurrences and the location of the lexeme either syntactically or within the lection. Instead, like the single diacritics above, the double or triple acute accent shapes in these forms appear to be indicating a vocalic element between the first consonant in the cluster and the /r/. There is also a single instance of a dot over л in a non-*trōt* consonant cluster: fol. 1v14 приѣмлетъ. The dot may have been intended to be placed over the segment пр, or it could be an inadvertent resting point. On the other hand, if, as other spellings in the manuscript suggest, Dobrejšo's dialect did not retain epenthetic /l/, the dot could be appropriately be marking word-internal /ml/ as an unnatural consonant cluster<sup>38</sup>.

A related orthographic pattern in the Dobrejšo Gospel that sheds some light on the meaning of the dotted/"accented" ρ in OCS *trōt* and non-*trōt* forms alike (as well as the dotted л in приѣмлетъ) is a sporadically-occurring dotted ρ in forms of OCS *arxierei*: fol. 66v21 ἀρχιερὼνъ; fols. 68r10, 71r17, 98v16 and 23 ἀρχιερε̇и (cf. 99r4 ἀρχιερε̇и). In contrast to the non-*trōt* forms above, in which the dotted/"accented" ρ immediately follows another consonant letter in a cluster, in *arxierei* the ρ is the first consonant letter in the cluster. It is telling that this particular Greek borrowing is often written in other Church Slavonic manuscripts with a jer or a *paerok* between the ρ and the χ, as if it were an etymologically Slavic word, in order to break up the consonant sequence /rx/, which was not a natural cluster in Slavic vernaculars. Like the dotted/"accented" ρ in *trōt* spellings, the occasional dot or accent shape over the first ρ in *arxierei* appears to be indicating a vocalic element between the consonants /r/ and /x/, while at the same time preserving the canonical OCS spelling. This diacritic has essentially the same function as the dot in some

Dobrejšo Gospel: for example, ѿсѣда (fols. 81v, 98r, 106v, 124r), ѿвон (fol. 4r), and forms in жд (В.М. МАРКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 93).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. дьври in Mt 25,10, Лс 13,25, and Io 10,7 and 9 of the Curzon Gospel. See also А.-М. ТОТОНА-НОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 59, on the likelihood of the reflection of a syllabic /v/ in the spelling дьври; and J. ДУМА, *op. cit.*, on syllabic /v/ in southeastern Slavic dialects, p. 49.

<sup>38</sup> On this issue, see С.М. ВАКАРЕЛИСКА, *The Dobrejšo Gospel...* Cf., however, the high frequency of word-initial /ml/ in forms of *mladъ* and *mlěko*, which are never marked with a diacritic in the manuscript.

Greek manuscripts that is placed over word-final consonant clusters, which were unnatural in Greek, and it may well have been adopted from Greek manuscripts<sup>39</sup>.

The occurrence of a dot over the *Ϸ* in the Slavic form *пѣомѣ* on fol. 5r18, the first in a series of two letters representing obstruents, offers further evidence that a diacritic above or near *Ϸ* immediately following or preceding another consonant letter marks what would be an unnatural consonant cluster in etymologically Slavic words. The word-initial cluster /*ps*/ did not exist historically in Common Slavic until the loss of the weak jer in forms of *pvs̆* that ended in a full vowel, and in the root *pvs-* ‘write’ (cf. later regularized *pis-*). Scribe Dobrejšo may have perceived a vocalic element between the two obstruents in this form in the same way that Bulgarian speakers might perceive an /*ǔ*/ before or after the /*r*/ Serbian *trt* forms (see section 3.3 above). In borrowings with initial cluster /*ps*/, such as *psalm̆*, he avoids this issue by using the Greek digraph *ψ*, but he feels obliged to write the initial cluster in OCS *pvsom̆* as *пѣ* because the word is Slavic. It is fortunate that he did not circumvent the problem by writing out the first weak jer rather than inserting the diacritic, but instead left this indirect evidence the function of the diacritic over the letter *Ϸ*<sup>40</sup>.

In the forms of *arxierei* above, the dot seems to function as a *paerok*, although no jer is written between the /*r*/ and /*x*/ in this word in OCS. While the /*rx*/ cluster in *arxierei* is not native to Slavic cluster, some of the consonant clusters shown above that the Dobrejšo Gospel has sporadically marks with a dotted/“accented” *Ϸ* are native and fairly high-frequency, including as /*tr*/ and, particularly, /*pr*/, which occurs word-initially in several different prefixes and in the preposition *prěd̆*. Relevant here is Lunt’s observation that numerous regional dialects of Standard American English, including his own, have a liquid /*r*/ following initial /*p*/ in unstressed syllables of certain words, including ‘perplex’, ‘propose’, and ‘prevent’, and that he vacillated between transcribing these in his own idiolect as, for example, /*pərpléks*/ vs. /*prpléks*/<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> I am most grateful to Mary MacRobert for pointing out to me the convention in some Greek manuscripts of inserting a diacritic over word-final consonant clusters (personal communication, May 2016; see also B.M. METZGER, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: Introduction to Paleography*, Oxford 1981, p. 3, describing the diacritic in that environment as looking like a grave accent or a smooth breathing mark), and for her comments on the significance of the distribution of *пѣ* and *ψ* in the manuscript. Of course, I am solely responsible for any misunderstanding or misapplication of this information. Cf. the use of a *kamora* to mark stress after a sonorant in the much later Russian Pandekt of Nikon Černogorca (1570) (B.B. КОЛЕСОВ, *Надстрочные знаки «силы» в русской орфографической традиции*, [in:] *Восточнославянские языки. Источники для их изучения*, ed. Л.П. ЖУКОВСКАЯ, Н.И. ТАРАБАСОВА, Москва 1973, p. 228–257 (242).

<sup>40</sup> Note a similar dot in *псаннемѣ* in the 11<sup>th</sup>-century East Slavic codex of the Thirteen Homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzus (fol. 297r.) and in the Greek borrowing *псаннехѣ* in the Ostromir Gospel; see B.M. МАРКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

<sup>41</sup> H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?...*, p. 354, n. 12.

These facts together suggest that Dobrejšo's *t̄r̄t̄* and *t̄l̄t̄* spellings indicate a vocalic element that he perceived to occur before the liquid consonant in the cluster in that particular word, either in addition to, or, more likely, instead of, the vocalic element represented by the jer following the ρ or λ in the canonical OCS spelling. Similarly, the dotted/"accented" ρ adjacent to another consonant letter in both *tr̄t̄* and non-*tr̄t̄* spellings, likely reflects his perception of a vocalic element between the two consonants. The reason that vocalic elements are indicated by a diacritic rather than by a jer is probably because Dobrejšo was striving to reproduce OCS and had no interest in replacing the OCS spelling with a phonemic transcription of his vernacular.<sup>42</sup> Hence the diacritic probably was intended to convey that the reader either should, or could (but did not have to), read aloud the word with a left-adjacent vocalic element rather than a right-adjacent one as the OCS spelling indicated. The reason why a corresponding dot does not occur over the letter λ in the manuscript's OCS *tl̄t̄* spellings likely is that while Dobrejšo's dialect was characterized, at least inconsistently, by *t̄rt̄* forms, it had primarily *tl̄t̄* forms, with the exception of certain roots in *t̄olt̄* that occasionally appear spelled in the manuscript as they likely were pronounced in that dialect<sup>43</sup>.

#### 4. Dotted/"accented" λ

The dots and acute accent shapes that occur over the letter λ in the manuscript have a distinctly different function from that of the sporadic dots and acute accent shapes over ρ. None of these occurs in a historical \**T̄l̄LT* or \**TL̄t̄T* formation, and in all but one instance, they appear in a word formed from the root *glas-*: fol. 16r1, Mc 15,34 ΓΛ´Α´ΣΟΜЪ (ВЕЛИЕ|МЪ); fol. 16r10, Mc 15,37 Γ´Λ´ΑΣЬ (ВЕЛИКЪ); fol. 61v14–15, Lc 20,27 Γ´Λ´Α|ΓΟΛЖЦЕ; fol. 67r15 ВЪЗΓΛ´АСИТЬ; fols. 67r18, 98v18 ВЪЗΓΛ´АСИТЬ; fol. 69v17 ВЪЗΓΛАСИ ΓΛ´СОМЪ (ВЕЛИЕМЪ; cf. fol. 98v5 ΓΛ´СОМЪ, with superfluous titlo); fol. 114r6 (ЁДИНЪМЪ) ΓΛ´Α´СОМЪ. Their function appears to be punctuational, aiding the reader to distinguish forms in *glas-* from the very high-frequency abbreviation ΓΛ for the third person singular aorist form *glagola*<sup>44</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> For other examples of Dobrejšo's efforts to preserve OCS orthographic and morphological forms, see C.M. VAKARELIYSKA, *The Dobrejšo Gospel: An Annotated Edition and Comparative Analysis* (forthcoming).

<sup>43</sup> See discussion of *telt* pronunciation in specific words in modern Bulgarian dialects, above in section 3.3. That the *telt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel likely are Dobrejšo's and not a predecessor scribe's is suggested by the absence of these spellings in the related Curzon and Banica Gospels (cf. C.M. VAKARELIYSKA, *The Curzon Gospel...*, chapters 2 and 4).

<sup>44</sup> The possibility must also be considered that a secondary function of the triple acute accent shapes in this environment is to indicate a perceived vocalic element between the /g/ and /l/. If so, the vocalic element would probably be similar to the inserted /ə/ between /p/ and /l/ in emphatic or facetious pronunciation of the word "please" in numerous American English dialects. The spelling "puh-leeze" for emphatic/facetious "please" is even sometimes listed in online dictionaries as a separate lexeme.



preceding the /n/ in the root. It remains unclear, however, what the point of the diacritic is in this form. Perhaps the original purpose was to disambiguate nominative/accusative singular *дѣнь* from the pronominal form *нѣ* (not the conjunction *нѣ*, however, since that form is spelled through the manuscript as *нѣ*).

Triple acute accent shapes, and in one case a titlo, occur on three occasions over the preposition *на* in the phrase *на небо*, and once over both elements of the phrase: fol. 18r14–15, Мс 16,19 *вѣзънесѣ сѧ нѣ́а́ | нѣ́́́ево*; fol. 35v3, Лс 9,16 *и́ вѣзърѣкѣтъ нѣ́́а́ нево*; fol. 52v4, Лс 15,21 *ѡ́чѣ сѣргрѣшихѣ ꙗ́а нево*. The titlo over *ꙗ́а* on fol. 52v4 may be a perseveration from *ѡ́чѣ* in place of an intended triple acute accent. The diacritics over *на* in this phrase appear to have a disambiguating function, although it is unclear what that might be: perhaps to help the readers parse the phrase as two separate words, or to indicate stress on *на* within the phrase?

Acute accent shapes also occur over *н* in fol. 16v22 *слѣ́нѣ́́цѡу*, fol. 41v1 *нѣ́́́твори ми трѡудѣ́*, and fol. 41r9 *Ѡ́чѣ нѣ́́а́шѣ́*. In the last case, they likely are meant to highlight the beginning of the Lord's Prayer (which is also the beginning of the lection, as indicated by the red initial *Ѡ*), so that it can be found easily by the reader. The other two occurrences are more difficult to explain. The double acute accent shapes in *слѣ́нѣ́́цѡу* may also be marking a (in this case historical) vocalic element between the consonants /n/ and /c/, like the dot over the cluster in *ѡ́рхидерѣи* and *пѣ́омь*. Since the phrase *нѣ́́́твори* is at the beginning of a sentence, perhaps the triple acute shapes are intended to show that, or to indicate sentence stress on *не*?

Triple acute accent shapes occur in one other environment, next to *р*, in *и́ ѡ́бло-вѣ́зѧ и́ • нѣ́́́рѣ́́че ю́моу сѣ́нѣ́* (fol. 52v4, Лс 15,21). This segment, which is part of the Prodigal Son lection, immediately precedes *ѡ́чѣ сѣргрѣшихѣ ꙗ́а нево*, which was discussed above in the context of the triple acute accent shapes that sporadically appear over *на небо*. Although, according to the rubrication, the lection does not start at *рѣ́́́че ю́моу сѣ́нѣ́*, perhaps the triple acute shape here is meant to highlight the introduction to the son's famous speech, since one of the two most common incipit formulae begins with *reče*<sup>47</sup>. If that is the case, then, to revisit the titlo over *на*, perhaps Dobrejšo felt obliged to use a different diacritic to mark *на небо* later in the same line, and in the same sentence.

Thus the double and triple acute accent shapes in the phrases examined in this section appear to have multiple functions. What precisely these intended functions are is a matter of conjecture, but, as shown above in the case of *слѣ́нѣ́́цѡу*, one of them appears to be the *paerok*-like marking of a vocalic element (in this case the etymological *jer* in the word) between the two consonants in the cluster. It remains unclear, however, why the manuscript marks a dropped weak *jer* letter, or a phonological vocalic element, only in these few instances.

<sup>47</sup> I.e., *reče imъ gospodъ* (the other most common incipit formula being *въ оно врѣмѣ*).

## 6. Diacritics over forms of *sġbota*

The remaining environment for sporadic diacritics is over or near the *jus major* in *sġbot-*. The whole gamut of diacritics is found here: dots, single acute accent shapes, triple acute accent shapes, and titla over unabbreviated word forms: fol. 4r5  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ; fol. 4r12  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\dot{\text{в}}\text{от}\dot{\text{ж}}$  (with dots over the two consonant letters);  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{'}\text{в''отж}$  (cf. l. 22  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ , l. 17  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ); fol. 4v2  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ; fol. 16v16–17  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{''}\text{в|отж}$ ; fol. 16v20–21  $\text{с''}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ; fol. 48r3  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{'}\text{вотж}$ , fol. 48r10  $\dot{\text{в}}\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{'}\text{вотж}$ , l. 15  $\dot{\text{в}}\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ; fol. 49v6  $\text{в}\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{'}\text{вотж}$  (cf. l. 11  $\text{в}\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ); fol. 70r12, 15  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ; fol. 88r1  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$  (cf.  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$  in the rubric on l. 17). Since the diacritics are mostly above or next to the first  $\text{ж}$ , it seems that this is where they were intended to go. In two of these instances, both on fol. 48r, a *paerok*-like dot appears over the preceding preposition  $\dot{\text{в}}$ , appearing to mark a dropped weak jer ( $\dot{\text{в}}\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{'}\text{вотж}$ ,  $\dot{\text{в}}\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ). Because there is no diacritic over  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$  in the second occurrence, however, it seems likely that in both instances the dot was intended to be placed over  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$  rather than over  $\dot{\text{в}}$ .

It is unlikely that the diacritic is intended to disambiguate the full word *sġbota* from the abbreviated form that appears in the rubrics, because the latter is distinguished by a superscript letter ( $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}$ ). Perhaps it is meant to mark the word *sġbota* as a *nomen sacrum*. If *sġbota* were to be abbreviated in the text, as *nomina sacra* generally are, the usual abbreviation  $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}$  could indeed cause confusion, since it appears only in rubric instructions. A way to avoid confusion would be to add a titlo to the unabbreviated form of the word, as Dobrejšo does in the last three occurrences of *sġbota* with diacritic ( $\text{с}\dot{\text{ж}}\text{вотж}$ ). Perhaps he came to this solution at that point in the text after finding unsatisfactory the multi-purpose dot and triple acute accent shapes that he had been using earlier for that purpose. A closer study of the distribution of textual environments for forms of *sġbota* with and without a diacritic may yield a clearer answer to this puzzle.

## 7. Conclusion

The most certain conclusion that can be drawn from the analysis above is that the sporadic dots, acute accent shapes, and superfluous titla in the Dobrejšo Gospel have more than one purpose apiece. Although their purposes in certain environments is presently unclear, and while it is often difficult to determine whether a given single dot or acute accent is a deliberate marking or a slip of the pen or resting point, nevertheless the following generalizations can be made on the basis of the diacritic patterns in the manuscript:

a. The dot and single acute accent shape are essentially two paleographic variants of a single diacritic. This is unsurprising, considering that in many medieval Slavic manuscripts that do not mark accentuation, hurriedly or carelessly executed superscript dots often look like acute accents.





(iv) in three instances, to mark unabbreviated forms of the word *sǫbota* in the Gospel text, probably in order to indicate that the word is a *nomen sacrum* (сѣ́бѣ́тѣ́). The single dot or acute accent is used more commonly in this environment (see (c)(iii) above);

(v) in two instances, apparently to highlight the beginning of a often-quoted passage within a lection (и́ рѣ́че ю́моу сѣ́тъ; О́че нѣ́тъ).

The overlap in functions between the single dot/acute accent shape, on one hand, and the double or triple acute accent shape, on the other, suggests that for Dobrejšo, these two diacritic types were more or less interchangeable, except in instances where he sought to highlight a word in the text. In those case, he used the multiple acute accent shapes, undoubtedly because they were more noticeable.

The above-described diacritics occur rarely, and only twice in an appropriate environment for a *paerok* from an OCS perspective (пѣ́омь, сѣ́тънѣ́тъ). When a diacritic occurs over *ρ* left- or right-adjacently to another consonant letter (and also over *л* in прѣ́млетъ, fol. 1v14, if the dot here is not an inadvertent resting point), it appears to be marking a consonant cluster that Dobrejšo perceives as unnatural either on the phonological level, in the absence of an intervening vocalic element, or on the orthographic level, in the absence of a jer letter.

There remains the vexed question of the strict complementary distribution in the sporadic spellings of OCS *trǫt* vs. *tlǫt* forms: that is, why canonical OCS *trǫt* spellings in the manuscript sporadically include a dot or acute accent shape, suggesting the insertion of a vocalic element left-adjacent to the /r/, whereas OCS *tlǫt* forms sporadically are written as *tǫt* but never as *tlǫt* with a diacritic. The orthographic distinction between OCS *trǫt* and *tlǫt* forms, when it occurs, probably reflects asymmetry in the reflexes of \**TǫrT*/\**TrǫT* and \**TǫlT*/\**TlǫT* in Dobrejšo's vernacular dialect. A likely explanation is that, like certain modern western Bulgarian dialects, Dobrejšo's Middle Bulgarian dialect tended to have *tǫrt* as the reflex of \**TǫrT*/\**TrǫT* (at least when not followed by another consonant), but *tlǫt* as the reflex of \**TǫlT*/\**TlǫT*, with the exception of certain specific lexemes, some of which show up sporadically in the manuscript in *tǫt* spellings.

In conclusion, the most important issue regarding the diacritics in the Dobrejšo Gospel is not the use of a dot or acute accent shape over the letter *ρ* to mark a preceding vocalic element, but rather the distribution of the diacritics. Rampant and maddening inconsistencies on both the orthographic and the dialectological levels present serious obstructions at this point to a definitive determination of the various functions of those dots and acute accent shapes in the manuscript that occur in environments other than sequences of two consonant letters. These inconsistencies include the sporadic and inconsistent placement of the diacritics; frequent ambiguities between dots and acute accent shapes (and between deliberate dots and inadvertent inkstains); a general tendency of scribes sometimes to miss the

target letter when inserting diacritics; overlap in the environments where the scribe has used single vs. multiple diacritics; and asymmetry in numerous Bulgarian dialects between the reflexes of *T̄orT*/*\*Tr̄oT* and *\*T̄olT*/*\*Tl̄oT*, as well as variations within the reflexes of each of those two historical forms. The combination of these obstacles may make it impossible ever to know for certain what was going on in Dobrejšo's mind when he sporadically employed these diacritics, but further investigation may yield more certainty, particularly once an index verborum to the manuscript is completed. Meanwhile, there may be some reassurance in recalling that consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds.

## Bibliography

### Sources

- Banica Gospel, НБКМ No. 847, Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia; typeset edition: Е. ДОГРАМАДЖИЕВА, Б. РАЙКОВ, *Банишко евангеле. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век*, София 1981.
- Curzon Gospel, Add MS 39,628, British Library; typeset edition: C.M. VAKARELIYSKA, *The Curzon Gospel*, vol. I, *An Annotated Edition*, Oxford 2008.
- Dobrejšo Gospel, НБКМ No. 17 (307), Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia; typeset edition: Б. ЦОНЕВ, *Добрейшово четвроеванелие. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век (Софийска Нар. Библиотека No. 307 и Белградска Нар. Библиотека No. 214)*, БСт 1, 1906.

### Secondary literature

- DUMA J., *Wokalizacja jerów słabych w rdzennej sylabie nagłosowej w południowo-wschodniej słowiańszczyźnie*, Wrocław 1979.
- LEHISTE I., K. ПОПОВ, *Akustische Analyse bulgarischer Silbenkerne*, Phon 21, 1970, p. 40–48.
- LUNT H.G., *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, <sup>7</sup>Berlin–New York 2001.
- LUNT H.G., *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?*, WS 7, 1962, p. 350–358.
- METZGER B.M., *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: Introduction to Paleography*, Oxford 1981.
- MILETIČ LJ., *Südslavische Dialektstudien*, vol. II, *Das Ostbulgarische*, Wien 1903.
- SCATTON E., *Syllabic-[r] and vowel/[r] Sequences in Some Southwest Bulgarian Dialects: I*, LBa 36.1, 1993, p. 59–64.
- SCATTON E., *Syllabic [r] and Schwa-[r] Sequences in Bulgarian Dialects: I. The Northwest*, [in:] *Alexander Lipson: In Memoriam*, ed. C.E. GRIBBLE, R.A. ROTHSTEIN, E.C. HABER, H.M. OLMSTED, R. SZULKIN, C.E. TOWNSEND, Columbus 1994, p. 232–249.
- TRUBETZKOY N.S., *Grundzüge der Phonologie*, TCLP 8, 1938.
- VAKARELIYSKA C.M., *Western Bulgarian or Macedonian? The Dobrejšo Gospel (XIII c.)*, Slo 50, 2010, p. 13–26, [http://www.moderna.uu.se/slovo/Issue\\_Pages/2010issue50.html](http://www.moderna.uu.se/slovo/Issue_Pages/2010issue50.html) [14 XII 2014].
- VAKARELIYSKA C.M., *The Dobrejšo Gospel: An Annotated Edition and Comparative Analysis* (forthcoming).

\* \* \*

- Бояджиев Т., *Български говори в западна (беломорска) и източна (одринска) Тракия*, София 1991.
- Български диалектичен атлас. Обобщаващ том*, vol. I–III, *Фонетика, Акцентология, Лексика*, ed. И. Кочев *et al.*, София 2001.
- Десподова В., Л. СЛАВЕВА, *Македонски средновековни ракописи*, Прилеп 1988.
- КОЛЕСОВ В.В., *Надстрочные знаки «силы» в русской орфографической традиции*, [in:] *Восточнославянские языки. Источники для их изучения*, ed. Л.П. ЖУКОВСКАЯ, Н.И. ТАРАБАСОВА, Москва 1973, p. 228–257.
- КОНЕСКИ Б., *История на македонскиот јазик*, Скопје 1965.
- МАРКОВ В.М., *К истории редуцированных гласных в русском языке*, <sup>2</sup>Казань 2007.
- ТОТОМАНОВА А.-М., *За природата и съдбата на гласната ^ в българския език*, [in:] ЕАДЕМ, *Из българската историческа фонетика*, София 2001, p. 45–67.

**Abstract.** This paper examines the distribution of three types of sporadic and infrequent diacritics in the Dobrejšo Gospel and their functions: a dot or acute-accent shape over a liquid consonant letter in OCS *trǫt/trǫt* formations, and, more rarely, over other consonant letters in clusters; a single or multiple acute-accent shape over the letter л or н in certain words; and a titlo over unabbreviated words containing OCS *trǫt/trǫt* formations.

**Keywords:** Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian Church Slavonic, Slavic linguistics, medieval Slavic manuscripts, liquid consonants, vocalic liquids, historical Slavic phonology, Gospels.

**Cynthia M. Vakareliyska**

University of Oregon  
Department of Linguistics  
Eugene, OR 97403, USA  
vakarel@uoregon.edu