Studia Ceranea 6, 2016, p. 205–224
DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.06.11
ISSN: 2084-140X
e-ISSN: 2449-8378

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 ѡ; 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 ї and ligated vowel letters ѫ, ѭ, ѩ, 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 13th century[1]. 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

[1] No. 17 (307), Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia; typeset edition: Б. Цонев, *Добрейшово четвероеванелие. 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. 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[2]. Dobrejšo regularly employs double dots in ї (including in ьї) and ѡ̈, and over the ligatures ин̈ꙗ, ин̈ю, and дн̈ю; and a single dot over vowel letters immediately preceded by another vowel letter: e.g., ꙗ́гда, ꙁнаꙗ́мъ. 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., **С**́л́́ава (with red **С**). As the introduction to Conev's transcription edition of the manuscript explains, this is simply a placemarker 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[3]. 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 ҁ: i.e., in some places ҁ̇, in others ҁ́. 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[4], he does not offer an explanation for it, and apparently he did not observe any

[2] 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 четвероеванелие...*, p. 16.

[3] *Ibidem*, p. 19.

[4] Б. Цонев, *op. cit.*

pattern behind its occurrence. In fact, the dotted/"accented" ѓ most often occurs in the manuscript in canonical Old Church Slavonic (OCS) spellings of historical **TъrT*, **TьrT*, **TrъT*, and **TrьT* formations (hereafter referred to generally as **TъrT* and **TrъT*) such as п҃рьсть (fol. 5v5).

Less commonly, the dot or acute accent shape appears in the Dobrejšo Gospel over a letter ѓ 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., пѣ́тѓъ (fols. 8r5, 31r21), тѓ́ети (fol. 9r21), п҃ѓостѓ́и (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 ѓ, 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., п҃́ѓ́авѣдникъ (fol. 61v1), гл҃́а́сомъ (fol. 114r6), въѕгл҃́аситъ (fol. 67r15), въѕгл҃ласитъ (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 *dьnь*: e.g., fol. 39r2 д҃́ѣ́нь, fol. 64r19 дънѝ, fol. 3r19 дн҃ь. This pattern is examined in section 5. Finally, in approximately one-third of the occurrences of the OCS lexeme *sǫbota*, there is a dot, a single acute shape, or three consecutive acute accent shapes over or near the ж: e.g., fol. 4r5 сж҃́вотѫ, fol. 48r3 сж҃́вотьї, fol. 4r12 сж҃́в҃́отѫ (see section 6 below).

3. Dotted/accented ѓ

3.1. **TъrT* and **TrъT* formations. As noted above, scribe Dobrejšo has occasionally placed a dot or acute accent shape over the ѓ in his canonical OCS spelling of words that contained a neutral jer[5]. Examples include the following historical **TъrT* formations, i.e., words with a historical neutral front or back jer immediately preceding a consonant cluster ending in /r/: fol. 4r2 въстѓ́ѣгати, fol. 4r16 скв҃ѓ́ьнѫть (cf. fol. 26r4 скрьбѫща), fol. 4r16 нѣ жрътвѣ, fol. 5v5 п҃рьсть, fol. 11r18

[5] Following H.G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, [7]Berlin–New York 2001, p. 38–39, I use the term "neutral jer" to mean a written jer letter (usually ъ in OCS manuscripts) between the letter ѓ 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 ѓ or л; H.G. Lunt, *op. cit.*, and B.M. Марков, *К истории редуцированных гласных в русском языке*, [2]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 тр҃ьжни|комъ, fol. 62v3 тр҃ьжищихъ (cf. 76r21 тр҃ьжникомъ), fol. 26r16–17 чет҃врътов|ластоу҃жщоу (cf. l. 18 четвръртовластьствоу҃жщоу), fol. 48v20 ѿвр҃ъзи, fol. 54r5 жр҃ъвънъ (sic!, for OCS жрѫновьнъı), fol. 76r1 почр҃ъпѣтє (cf. врѫха earlier on same line, fol. 78v3 почрѫпала). The dot or acute accent also occurs in words that contain historical Common Slavic **TrъT* formations, in which the jer followed the /r/: for example, fol. 47v22 ѿк҃рьстъ, fol. 2r22 тр҃ъсти, fol. 33v14 кр҃ъви (with a barely visible dot). That the convention covers both historical **TъrT* and **TrъT* 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 **TrъT* (but cf. Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects, in section 3.4 below)[6].

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

---

[6] On the development of new syllabic liquids in Middle Bulgarian, see А.-М. ТОТОМАНОВА, *За природата и съдбата на гласната ^ в българския език*, [in:] EADEM, *Из българската историческа фонетика*, София 2001, p. 45–67 (57).

[7] Markov (*op. cit.*, p. 82) gives these examples from the Putjata Menaion: ѩлъкь (fol. 5r), оу҃мл҃ъва (6v), ѣрьхж (14v), исп҃льнѥниѥ (73r), жр҃ътвы (73r), мл҃ъниꙗма (76v), ѣлъниꙗшта (114r), ѣлъноу҃ѥть (114v), дл҃ъга (79r), дл҃ъжьно (108v), ѣлъниꙗщѥ сѧ (111r), мл҃ъва (126v), отъѣрьзи (126v), сѣлъпъ (134); see also discussion on p. 93.

[8] В.М. МАРКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[9] Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 55–56.

[10] Conev provides a list of 34 instances of what he calls *ър* and *ъл* spellings (referred to in this paper as *tъrt* and *tъlt*, where *t* represents any consonant letter and *ъ* represents either jer letter). Cf. Б. ЦОНЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 56. All but three of these are with л, and one is incorrect: Conev has mistakenly included in the list as "мълв-" the canonically spelled root млъв- 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 *tъlt* spellings in the manuscript actually are spelled *tъlъt*; see discussion in section 3.3 below.

[11] The three instances that Conev includes in his list as *tъrt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel actually have the form *tъrъt*, not *tъrt*; 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 **TъlT* and **TlъT* formations occasionally are written as *tъlt*[12], but historical **TъrT* and **TrъT* are not written as *tъrt* (with the exception of a correction of a *tъrъt* spelling, discussed in 3.2 below). Instead, while generally the historical **TъrT*/**TrъT* formations appear in the manuscript in the canonical OCS spelling *trъt*, 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 ꙟ (hereafter referred to as 'dotted/"accented" ꙟ'). This diacritic does not appear correspondingly over л in historical **TъlT* or **TlъT* forms.

3.2. *Tъrъt* and *tъlъt* spellings. Conev's introduction obscures the issue of the distribution between 'dotted/"accented" ꙟ' and *tъlt* spellings in the manuscript, because seven of the forms in his list of what he claims are *tъrt* or *tъlt* spellings actually have the shape *tъrъt*/*tъlъt*: **мьлъвл** (fol. 30r of the Belgrade portion of the manuscript, which was lost during World War II), **вълькъ** (fol. 38v, Belgrade portion), **ѻ҆|мъльчѣшѫ** (fol. 61v11–12), **съ|въръшєниє** (fol. 51r7–8), **мьрьзость** (fols. 21r, 22r, Belgrade portion), **тьръми** (**дє́ни́ми**) (fol. 76v8)[13]. This sporadic spelling of neutral-jer formations – which also occurs on fol. 119v3, in **вър<ъ>гѡшѫ**[14] – is the only one that is used in the manuscript to represent both OCS *trъt* and *tlъt* forms.

The *tъrъt*/*tъlъt* 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 *tъrt*/*tъlt* spellings, however, listing them together with the *tъlt* examples[15] – although Conev argues that in *tъlъt* forms the copyist was deliberately preserving the OCS spelling while at the same time also deliberately inserting a jer before the л to represent his own dialect pronunciation. If both jers in the *tъlъt* 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 *tъlt* feature in his vernacular dialect, but that the dialect feature occasionally crept in nevertheless, both in the superfluous jer in the three *tъlъt* forms, and in the 30 *tъlt* forms, which occur

[12] Since the Dobrejšo Gospel's sporadic *tъlt* 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 Е. Дограмаджиева, Б. Райков, *Банишко евангелие. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век*, София 1981.

[13] Б. Цонев, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

[14] The symbol < > represents an erased segment.

[15] Б. Цонев, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Б. Конески, *История на македонскиот јазик*, Скопје 1965, p. 33.

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

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

3.3. *Tъlt*, *tъlъt*, *tъrъt*, and dotted/"accented" *trъt* 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 *trъt* and *tlъt* 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 *tъrъt*, *tъlъt*, and dotted/"accented" *trъt* spellings.

Considering first the sporadic dotted/"accented" ҏ in the Dobrejšo Gospel's *trъt* 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 (**вꙗскрсѥ** Mt 14,2, **мртвъїχъ** Lc 9,7)[17], 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[18]. Koneski's examples from the Ohrid Apostolus include **плна** and **мртвыχъ**,

[16] In their volume of Macedonian manuscripts, Despodova and Slaveva misread **съвъръшениѥ** in Conev's introduction as **съвършениѥ**, and thus presented it as an example of sporadic *tъrt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel, when in fact the manuscript has none of these, with the exception of the correction of **вър<ъ>гошѫ** to **въргошѫ** (cf. В. Десподова, Л. Славева, *Македонски средновековни ракописи*, Прилеп 1988, p. 116.). The spelling **вър<ъ>гошѫ** on fol. 119v cannot be counted as a *tъrt* 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 [14 XII 2014]). Also relying on p. 56 of Conev's introduction, Horace Lunt specifically mentioned the Dobrejšo Gospel's *tъrъt*/*tъlъt* 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 *tъlt* and not *tъrt* (cf. H.G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?*, WS 7, 1962, p. 350–358 (p. 358, n. 21)).

[17] 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.

[18] Б. Конески, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

the latter of which is, coincidentally, precisely the same form that appears in the Dobrejšo Gospel[19]. In contrast to the *trt* spellings in the Ohrid Apostolus however, the Dobrejšo Gospel's two occurrences of *trt* without a diacritic are in words that routinely are written with a titlo, which indicates that they are abbreviated: i.e., **въск̄рсє, мр̄твъїхъ**. Hence the explanation for the two *trt* spellings without a diacritic in the manuscript must be that they were intended as the usual abbreviated forms, but that scribe Dobrejšo inadvertently omitted the titlo over them[20].

Even if there were evidence to support the claim that the Dobrejso Gospel's dotted/"accented" **ꙋ** reflects a syllabic /r/, however, it would not be an indicator that the manuscript is Macedonian, as Koneski assumed, for two reasons. First, all of the Dobrejšo Gospel's other Macedonian-type features are found also in its close relatives the Curzon and Banica Gospels[21], indicating that they predate the three manuscripts and stem from their shared common source[22]. Second, if modern dialects are any indication, the 2001 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences dialect atlas shows syllabic /r/ for OCS *rъ/rь* in dialects as far east as Teteven[23, 24].

---

[19] Potentially relevant for the Dobrejšo Gospel's orthographic asymmetry between dotted/"accented" *trꙋt* and *tꙋlt* is Koneski's comment here that while some Macedonian dialects have both syllabic /r/ and /l/, others have only syllabic /r/. Cf. Б. Конески, *op. cit.*

[20] Some, but not all, of the examples cited by Koneski from other manuscripts are forms that could also simply be missing a titlo: e.g., **мꙋтвы** in the thirteenth-century Macedonian Gospel, and in the Bologna Psalter, from the same century. That too much should not be read into the occurrence of such written forms without a titlo is suggested by **дврь** (fol. 79r), also without a titlo, in the 13th-century East Slavic Sofia Menaion, which presumably does not reflect a *trt* dialect, and which also has the variant spelling **дьврь** (fol. 70r), cited in В.М. Марков, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

[21] Curzon Gospel: Add. MS 39,628, British Library; typeset edition by C.M. Vakareliyska, *op. cit.*; Dobrejšo Gospel: НБКМ No. 17 (307), Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia; typeset edition by Б. Цонев, *op. cit.*

[22] For further discussion, cf. C.M. Vakareliyska, *Western Bulgarian or Macedonian...*

[23] *Български диалектичен атлас. Обобщаващ том*, vol. I–III, *Фонетика*, *Акцентология*, *Лексика*, ed. *И.* Кочев *et al.*, София 2001, F 142.

[24] Scatton's 1994 study of modern Bulgarian dialect patterns in the distribution of the segments /*ŭr*/ and /*rŭ*/ raises a pertinent issue about the reliability of the 1981 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences dialect atlas that must be considered with regard to the 2001 atlas also (E. Scatton, *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 (241–42)). Noting Lehiste and Popov's findings that there is only a barely discernible acoustic difference between Bulgarian and Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian cognate pairs with /ŭr/ vs. syllabic /r/ (I. Lehiste, K. Popov, *Akustische Analyse bulgarischer Silbenkerne*, Phon 21, 1970, p. 40–48), and Trubetzkoy's proposition that a language with /ə/ in its phonemic inventory will treat a syllabic liquid as a combination of /ə/ and liquid (N.S. Trubetzkoy, *Grundzüge der Phonologie*, TCLP 8, 1938, p. 54), Scatton concluded that because Bulgarian has the phoneme /ŭ/ and Serbian does not, therefore Bulgarian linguists, being influenced by the phonemic system of Bulgarian, will likely perceive a sequence of two segments in the same dialect form of a historical **TъrT* or **TrъT* formation where Serbian linguists, influenced by the phonemic system of Serbian, will likely perceive a single syllabic liquid. Hence, he argued, since the students who were collecting the dialect data for

Citing **вълны**, **хълмъ**, and **мьрьзость** from Conev's introduction as sporadic *tъlt* and *tъrt* 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[25], going on to note that most modern Macedonian dialects are characterized by the development of a similar vocalic element (*вокален пристан*) before a liquid into a full vowel[26].

In assuming that both the *tъrъrt*/*tъlъt* and the *tъlt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel represent a single reflex of **TъrT*/**TъlT* 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 *tъrъrt*/*tъlъt* spellings in the manuscript, on one hand, and *tъlt* and (actually non-existent) *tъrt* spellings, on the other. (Since Conev had not observed the sporadic dotted/"accented" ꙋ 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 *tъrъt* 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 *ar̥a* (that is, /ŭrŭ/) for CSB /ŭr/ in early twentieth-century Preslav-area dialects (in the sole example *mar̥azličkъ*)[27], 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 /ŭlŭ/ for /ŭl/ that might offer a parallel phonological explanation the manuscript's *tъlъt* spellings.

The apparent absence of Bulgarian dialect /ŭlŭ/ forms corresponding to Miletič's single /ŭrŭ/ 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 **TъRT* and **TrъT* 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 /ŭ/, 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* tъrt *or* trъt (...). H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?*, WS 61.2, 1962, p. 353, n. 14.

[25] My translation. Koneski also cites the late 11th-century Macedonian Cyrillic Folio for **вьрхъ**, **гърдь**, **пълти**, and the early 13th-century Bologne Psalter for sporadic occurrences of **гърдии**, **пърстъ**, **мълниѭ**. Cf. Б. КОНЕСКИ, *op. cit.*

[26] Koneski also notes that in some southeastern Macedonian dialects, the vowel develops *following* the liquid (*grŭb*, *vrŭx*, *trŭgna*, *vlŭk*, *žlŭt*). *Ibidem*.

[27] LJ. MILETIČ, *Südslavische Dialektstudien*, vol. II, *Das Ostbulgarische*, Wien 1903, p. 75.

and Macedonian dialects between the reflexes of **TъRT* and **TъLT* – an asymmetry that also likely is behind the distribution of dotted/"accented" *trъt* vs. *tъlt* spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel. For example, the 2001 Academy dialect atlas records syllabic /r/ in Teteven, Vraca, Blagoevgrad, Trŭn, Skopje, and Niš, as opposed to syllabic /l/ in Teteven, Vraca, Vidin, Sofia and Trŭn[28], thus demonstrating that in some dialects, **TъRT* and **TъLT* reflexes have not evolved in parallel. Moreover, not only does the 2001 atlas record more variation and inconsistency in **TъLT* reflexes than in **TъRT* reflexes, but it also includes maps devoted to the geographic distribution of the reflexes of specific **TъLT* roots (OCS *vlъkъ*, *dlъgъ*, *žlъt*) that tend be exceptions to the usual **TъLT* reflexes in some dialects[29]. No similar set of maps is provided for the reflexes of any **TъRT* roots. Similarly, Bojadžiev observed in his study of Thracian dialects that **TъLT* and **TъRT* reflexes are often flexible and even word-specific, as in *želt* for OCS *žlъtъ* but *dlek* for *dlъgъ*[30]. The existence of specific roots in *tъlt* in some dialects that usually exhibit *tlъt* suggests that the Dobrejšo Gospel's higher occurrence of *tъlt* spellings with OCS root *mlъv-* is not coincidental, but that it instead reflects a similar word-specific pattern in **TъLT* reflexes in the scribe's vernacular. If so, the scribe may have found it more difficult to suppress the *tъlt* spellings of words that took exceptional *tъlt* or *telt* shapes in his dialect.

Bojadžiev's examples of discrepancies within individual dialects include the Dedagackso and Lozengradsko dialects, which have both /ŭr/ and /rŭ/, and /ŭl/ and /lŭ/, in monosyllabic forms and in polysyllablic forms with a single consonant following the liquid[31]; the Odrinsko dialect, which has /ŭr/–/rŭ/ variation, but only /ŭl/, in monosyllabic forms[32]; the Malgarsko and Kešansko dialects, which exhibit *sъrp*, *gъrk*, *vъlk*, *pъl'*, *žъlt/ želt*, and *dlek* but *prъs*, *tlъs*[33]; and the dialects of Silivrija, Čorlu and Carigradsko/Čataldžansko, which have *grъk*, *plъx*, *vrъx*, *tlъs*, the doublets *brъs/bъrs* (Čanakča), *vъlk/vlъk* (Dajakadŭn and Tarfa), *and žъlt/žlъt* (Tarfa), and polysyllabic *gъrcki* with two consonants following the liquid, but no equivalent in polysyllabic forms in /l/.[34]

The extent of /ŭr/–/rŭ/ and /ŭl/–/lŭ/ 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 **TъrT* or **TъlT* reflexes reflect consistent phonological features in the Dobrejšo scribe's vernacular dialect either.

---

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

[29] *Български диалектичен атлас…*, F 150, 151, 152.

[30] Т. Бояджиев, *Български говори в западна /беломорска/ и източна /одринска/ Тракия*, София 1991.

[31] *Ibidem*, p. 134, 149.

[32] *Ibidem*, p. 142–43.

[33] *Ibidem*, p. 185.

[34] *Ibidem*, p. 192.

3.4. Titla over non-abbreviated OCS *trъt* spellings. In opposition to the Dobrejšo Gospel's two *trt* spellings without diacritics (**вꙗскрсѥ**, **мртвꙗїхъ**), discussed in 3.3 above, considerably more frequently a titlo appears over an unabbreviated canonical OCS *trъt* spelling in which the jer has not been omitted. These occasional titla appear predominantly over the same two roots that occur once apiece as *trt* spellings without titla: for example, fol. 9r10 **мр҃ьтьвъ**, fol. 52v13 **мр҃ътьвь**, fol. 53r8 **мр҃ътьвъ**, fol. 70v6 **мр҃ътвъїйми**, fol. 8r18 **мръ҃твьїйхь вьскр҃ѣть**, fol. 13v10 **вьскрѣснѫть**, fol. 17r21 **в́ъ́скр҃ьсъ**[35], fol. 35r1 **въскр҃ъсѥ**, fol. 97v5 **въскр҃ъснеть**, fol. 79v11 **въскр҃ьснѫти**, fol. 97r12 **съмр҃ъти**, fol. 1v10 **кр҃ъста**, fol. 98v3 **ѡ҃кр҃ъстъ**. These titla likely have no phonological significance and are simply automatic, since they are limited to OCS *trъt* 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 *trъt* word forms in which the neutral jer is still present differ from the sporadic dot or acute accent shape over the ꙋ in *trъt* forms, which appears over both commonly abbreviated forms and forms that are not generally abbreviated.

3.5. Dotted/"accented" ꙋ in non-*trъt* consonant clusters. Although a dot or accent shape over or near an ꙋ occurs most frequently in OCS *trъt* 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-*trъt* dotted/"accented" ꙋ:

tr, *dr*: fol. 2r22 **вѣ̇тр҃омь**, fol. 3r16 **дꙋ̇ревѥ**, fols. 8r5 **пе̇тръ**, 31r21 **пе̇трь**, fol. 4v6 **п́ростꙋ̇ри**, fol. 9r21 **тꙋ̇рети**, fol. 11r7 **въоꙋтꙋ̇ръний**
pr: fol. 4r21 **вьпꙋ̇росишѫ**, fol. 4v6 **п́ростꙋ̇ри**, fol. 8v4 **пꙋ̇ришедь**, fol. 30v12 **п́ривождахѫ**, fol. 25v10 **пꙋ̇скы** (originally **пꙋ̇скы**, with erased ꙋ)
vr: fol. 1v5 **вꙋ̇зи**
mr: fol. 34r7 **оꙋ̇м́ꙋрѣть**, fol. 62r1 **оꙋ̇мрѣ́ть**

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 ꙋ marks an immediately preceding vocalic element, as it likely does in the dotted/"accented" *trъt* spellings. The preceding vocalic element that is suggested by the two instances of dotted/"accented" ꙋ in OCS aorist *umrětъ* is less interesting, of course, since it likely developed by analogy to the non-past stem *umъr-*[36].

[35] Conev's typeset edition omits the titlo in this example.
[36] A dot is used over the first of two consecutive consonant letters in non-*trъt* (and non-*tlъt*) 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-*trъt* 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, Mc 16,3 **ѿ дв´´ери гроба**[37]; fol. 18r21–22, Lc 17,20 **и слово оу҃тверъ´´ждаиж̑|щоу и послѣдъствоу҃*щи**; fol. 61v1, Lc 20,21 **Оучителю҃ • вѣмы ꙗко п´р´аведнѣ гл҃еши**; fol. 39v8, Lc 10,21 **Въ ты 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 **Въ ты 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-*trъt* consonant cluster: fol. 1v14 **прие̇млеть**. 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[38].

A related orthographic pattern in the Dobrejšo Gospel that sheds some light on the meaning of the dotted/"accented" **р** in OCS *trъt* and non-*trъt* forms alike (as well as the dotted **л** in **прие̇млеть**) is a sporadically-occurring dotted **р** in forms of OCS *arxierei*: fol. 66v21 **а̓рхиереѡ̇мъ**; fols. 68r10, 71r17, 98v16 and 23 **а̓рхиерей** (cf. 99r4 **а̓рхиерей**). In contrast to the non-*trъt* forms above, in which the dotted/"accented" **р** immediately follows another consonant letter in a cluster, in *arxierei* the **р** 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 **р** and the **х**, 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" **р** in *trъt* spellings, the occasional dot or accent shape over the first **р** 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, **вс҃е҆ꙗ̇да** (fols. 81v, 98r, 106v, 124r), **т҃вои** (fol. 4r), and forms in **ж̑д** (В.М. Марков, *op. cit.*, p. 93).

[37] Cf. **дьври** in Mt 25,10, Lc 13,25, and Io 10,7 and 9 of the Curzon Gospel. See also А.-М. Тотоманова, *op. cit.*, p. 59, on the likelihood of the reflection of a syllabic /v/ in the spelling **дъври**; and J. Duma, *op. cit.*, on syllabic /v/ in southeastern Slavic dialects, p. 49.

[38] On this issue, see C.M. Vakareliyska, *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[39].

The occurrence of a dot over the с in the Slavic form пс҃ѡмь on fol. 5r18, the first in a series of two letters representing obstruents, offers further evidence that a diacritic above or near ҁ 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 *pьsъ* that ended in a full vowel, and in the root *pьs-* '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 /ŭ/ before or after the /r/ Serbian *trt* forms (see section 3.3 above). In borrowings with initial cluster /ps/, such as *psalmъ*, he avoids this issue by using the Greek digraph ѱ, but he feels obliged to write the initial cluster in OCS *pьsomъ* as пс҃ 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 ҁ[40].

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" ҁ are native and fairly high-frequency, including as /tr/ and, particularly, /pr/, which occurs word-initially in several different prefixes and in the preposition *prědъ*. 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. /pr̥pléks/[41].

---

[39] 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 пс҃ and ѱ 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) (В.В. 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).

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

[41] H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?...*, p. 354, n. 12.

These facts together suggest that Dobrejšo's *tъrъt* and *tъlъt* 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 ꙋ or ѧ in the canonical OCS spelling. Similarly, the dotted/"accented" ꙋ adjacent to another consonant letter in both *trъt* and non-*trъt* 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.[42] 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 ѧ in the manuscript's OCS *tlъt* spellings likely is that while Dobrejšo's dialect was characterized, at least inconsistently, by *tъrt* forms, it had primarily *tlъt* forms, with the exception of certain roots in *tъlt* that occasionally appear spelled in the manuscript as they likely were pronounced in that dialect[43].

4. Dotted/"accented" ѧ

The dots and acute accent shapes that occur over the letter ѧ in the manuscript have a distinctly different function from that of the sporadic dots and acute accent shapes over ꙋ. None of these occurs in a historical **TъLT* or **TLъT* formation, and in all but one instance, they appear in a word formed from the root *glas-*: fol. 16r1, Mc 15,34 гл҃а́сомъ (велиѥ|мъ); fol. 16r10, Mc 15,37 г҃л҃а́ сь (великъ); fol. 61v14–15, Lc 20,27 г҃л҃а́|гѡлѫщѥ; fol. 67r15 въꙁгл҃аситъ; fols. 67r18, 98v18 въꙁгл҃аситъ; fol. 69v17 въꙁгласи гла́сомь (велиѥ́мъ; cf. fol. 98v5 гл҃ас҃омь, with superfluous titlo); fol. 114r6 (ѥ́динѣмь) гл҃а́сомъ. Their function appears to be punctuational, aiding the reader to distinguish forms in *glas-* from the very high-frequency abbreviation г҃л҃а for the third person singular aorist form *glagola*[44].

[42] 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).

[43] 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).

[44] 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.

The reason for the triple acute accent shapes over the participle ѓл́́аго҃лѫщε is similar, but more complex. Dobrejšo usually abbreviates participial forms of *glagolati*, using a titlo. Here he has not, because he began the word at line-end, and breaking up the usual abbreviation гл҃щε between the segments гл҃ and щε would result in ending a line with a consonant letter, making the abbreviation difficult to parse. Therefore, having started the word already, Dobrejšo has decided to write it out in full instead, but has only enough room to add the а after гл on the first line. This means that readers likely would misread the segment гла as the abbreviation of the 3PSg aorist *glagola*, with the titlo missing (exactly the scenario that Dobrejšo has tried to avoid by inserting diacritics over words in *glas-*). Furthermore, if line-end гла is read as *glagola*, the repetition of the segment *gol* on the following line (-го҃лѫщε) would further throw the reader off. Therefore, he has added the triple acute accent shapes over the л, as he has done earlier on occasion over forms with the root *glas-*, in order to clarify that the line-end segment is not the abbreviated aorist гл҃а, but rather the beginning portion of a different form that continues onto the next line. In this respect, in ѓл́́аго҃лѫщε the triple acute accent shapes function essentially as a hyphen[45].

5. Dotted/"accented" н

From one to three acute accent shapes, and in one instance what looks more like a dot, occur sporadically also over the letter н. Six of these instances are over forms with root *dьn-*. These are shown here in their syntactic and textual contexts: fol. 3r19, Mt 11,22 ѓ҆ъ дєи̇ь сѫдныи̇й[46]; fol. 3v2, Mt 11,23 прѣбӹли до д́н́́ешнєго днє; fol. 25r18, Lc 2,37 д́є́́нь и҆ нощъ; fol. 39r2, Lc 10,12 въ тъ д́є́́нь ѿраднѣ вѫдетъ; fol. 64r19, Lc 21,34 и҆ наидетъ на въ҆ї внєzаяпѫ дън́ъ тъ (sentence-end); fol. 76v8, Io 22,19 и҆ тъ҆рми дє́н́ми въzᴬвигнѫ ix҃ (sentence-end).

Only in two of these forms can the acute accent shapes be viewed as perhaps marking an omitted jer letter, as in пс҆омь above (subsection 3.5): a preceding front jer in д́н́́ешнєго (although there is no diacritic or titlo marking the omitted weak jer in днє, which immediately follows), and a following front jer in дє́н́ми. A single acute accent shape also appears over the form дън́ъ, which, unusually for this manuscript, has ъ rather than ѣ for the strong jer in this word form. The fact that in four of the six forms the front jer is in strong position and written as ѣ indicates that the purpose of the diacritic in this root is not to mark a vocalic element

[45] Although the sentence containing ѓл́́аго҃лѫщε starts off the lection, the word itself is located mid-sentence, far enough away from the red incipit letter that it is unlikely to have been intended as a placeholder for the red initial letter in the incipit formula: Lc 20,27 Въ врѣмѧ wно пристѫпишѫ ю҆́тери ѿ садоукеи̇ • ѓл́́а|го҃лѫщε.

[46] Since I have not been able to identify any purpose for the dot over the preposition ѓ҆ъ, I am tentatively considering it to have been a resting point for Dobrejšo's pen.

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 *dьnь* from the pronominal form *nь* (not the conjunction *nъ*, however, since that form is spelled through the manuscript as **нж**).

Triple acute accent shapes, and in one case a titlo, occur on three occasions over the preposition *na* in the phrase *na nebo*, and once over both elements of the phrase: fol. 18r14–15, Mc 16,19 **въѕнесѣ сѧ н´´а´ | н´´ебо**; fol. 35v3, Lc 9,16 **и̑ въѕрѣвъ н´´а´ небо**; fol. 52v4, Lc 15,21 **ѡ̑ѣ̑ съгрѣшихъ на̑ небо**. The titlo over on **на̑** on fol. 52v4 may be a perseveration from **ѡ̑ѣ̑** in place of an intended triple acute accent. The diacritics over *na* 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 *na* within the phrase?

Acute accent shapes also occur over **н** in fol. 16v22 **слън´´цѹ**, fol. 41v1 **н´´е´ твори ми тѹдъ**, and fol. 41r9 **О´´че н´а´шъ**. 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 **О**), 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 **слън´´цѹ** may also be marking a (in this case historical) vocalic element between the consonants /n/ and /c/, like the dot over the cluster in **а̀р̀хиерей̑** and **пс̀омь**. Since the phrase **н´´е´ твори** is at the beginning of a sentence, perhaps the triple acute shapes are intended to show that, or to indicate sentence stress on *ne*?

Triple acute accent shapes occur in one other environment, next to **р**, in **и̑ ѡ̀блъıѕа и´ • и´| р´е´´че ѥ̀мѹ сн̑ъ** (fol. 52v4, Lc 15,21). This segment, which is part of the Prodigal Son lection, immediately precedes **ѡ̑ѣ̑ съгрѣшихъ на̑ небо**, which was discussed above in the context of the triple acute accent shapes that sporadically appear over *na nebo*. Although, according to the rubrication, the lection does not start at **р´е´´че ѥ̀мѹ сн̑ъ**, 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*[47]. If that is the case, then, to revisit the titlo over *na*, perhaps Dobrejšo felt obliged to use a different diacritic to mark *na nebo* 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 **слън´´цѹ**, 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.

[47] I.e., *reče imъ gospodь* (the other most common incipit formula being *vъ ono vrěmę*).

6. Diacritics over forms of *sǫbota*

The remaining environment for sporadic diacritics is over or near the jus major in *sǫbot-*. 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 сѫ̇ботѫ; fol. 4r12 сѫ̇бо҃т҃ьї (with dots over the two consonant letters); сѫ́б҃о҃тѫ (cf. l. 22 сѫботѫ, l. 17 сѫбот҃ъ); fol. 4v2 сѫ̇ботѫ; fol. 16v16–17 сѫ́҃б|от҃ъ; fol. 16v20 –21 ҃с҃҃жбо|тѫ; fol. 48r3 сѫ́ботьї, fol. 48r10 в҃ сѫ́ботѫ, l. 15 в҃ сѫботѫ; fol. 49v6 в сѫ́ботѫ (cf. l. 11 в сѫботьї); fol. 70r12, 15 с҃ѫ̄бота; fol. 88r1 с҃ѫ̄ботѫ (cf. сѫбоѪѫ in the rubric on l. 17). Since the diacritics are mostly above or next to the first ѫ, 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 в҃, appearing to mark a dropped weak jer (в҃ сѫ́ботѫ, в҃ сѫботѫ). Because there is no diacritic over сѫботѫ in the second occurrence, however, it seems likely that in both instances the dot was intended to be placed over сѫботѫ rather than over в҃.

It is unlikely that the diacritic is intended to disambiguate the full word *sǫbota* from the abbreviated form that appears in the rubrics, because the latter is distinguished by a superscript letter (с҃ѫ). Perhaps it is meant to mark the word *sǫbota* as a *nomen sacrum*. If *sǫbota* were to be abbreviated in the text, as *nomina sacra* generally are, the usual abbreviation с҃ѫ 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 *sǫbota* with diacritic (с҃ѫ̄бота). 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 *sǫbota* 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.

b. The double or triple acute accent shape is a different orthographic symbol from the dot or single acute accent shape, although their functions overlap.

c. The single dot or acute accent shape is used for the following purposes:

(i) to mark a vocalic element between two consonants that would otherwise be perceived as an unnatural cluster, in both canonical OCS *trъt* spellings and certain OCS non-*trъt* spellings with two consecutive consonant letters, one of which usually is ѓ (ἀѓχиєрεй, word-initial й̇ѓ, but cf. прив́дєть). With the exception of пс̀омь, the consonant clusters that the two consecutive letters represent are not historically the result of a dropped weak jer, and in fact /pr/ is a fairly high-frequency Slavic cluster, as it occurs in several verb prefixes. On the other hand, since other spellings in the manuscript indicate that Dobrejšo's dialect did not preserve epenthetic /l/, the word-internal cluster /ml/ likely was uncommon for him;

(ii) in two instances, to mark forms of *dьnь* (дєй̇ь, дън́ъ). This is a primary function of the double or triple acute accent shape (see (d)(iii) below);

(iii) in seven instances, to mark forms of the unabbreviated word *sǫbota* in the Gospel text (сй̇вотѫ, сѫ́вотьї), as opposed to the liturgical rubrics, where it also occasionally occurs in unabbreviated form. The fact that this word appears twice with a superfluous titlo (сѫ̄вота) suggests that the dot or acute accent shape functions similarly to a titlo here in marking the word as a *nomen sacrum*. This word is also marked, less frequently, by double or triple acute accent shapes.

d. The double or triple acute accent shape is used sporadically for the following purposes, some of which overlap with the functions of the single dot or acute accent shape:

(i) in four instances, to indicate the insertion of a vocalic element into a perceived unnatural consonant cluster in certain non-*trъt* spellings (дв́́єри, п́́р́авєдникъ, въѕ́́радова сѧ, слън́́цоу̯), and in a single instance, to mark a *trъt* spelling (оӱ̯твръ́́ждаіѫ̈|щоу̯). This marking, which suggests the insertion of a vocalic element, is usually made with a single dot or acute accent shape (see (c)(i) above)[48];

(ii) to mark words with the root *glas-* (e.g., ѓл́́асъ), probably in order to help the reader differentiate them from the abbreviation for the very high-frequency third person singular aorist form *glagola* (гл̄а);

(iii) in four instances, to mark forms of the word *dьnь* (д́є́́нь) and, also on four occasions, the phrase *na nebo* (н́́а́ нєбо). While the purposes of these markings is unclear (though once again, the marked words contain a sonorant), perhaps it is to highlight the word or phrase on the textual level, or, in the case of н́́а́ нєбо, to indicate phrasal stress on the preposition. Forms of *dьnь* are also marked with a single dot/acute accent shape (see (c)(ii) above);

[48] In all but пс̀омь and дв́́єри, the marked cluster contains a sonorant.

(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* (**сѫ́в´отѫ**). 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 ꙗ́´чє ѥ̀моу҃ сн҃ъ; О́´чє н́а́шъ**).

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 (**пѝсомь, слъ́н´цоу҃**). When a diacritic occurs over ꙗ left- or right-adjacently to another consonant letter (and also over **л** in **прилѐ́млєть**, 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 *trъt* vs. *tlъt* forms: that is, why canonical OCS *trъt* 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 *tlъt* forms sporadically are written as *tъlt* but never as *tlъt* with a diacritic. The orthographic distinction between OCS *trъt* and *tlъt* forms, when it occurs, probably reflects asymmetry in the reflexes of **TъrT*/**TrъT* and **TъlT*/**TlъT* in Dobrejšo's vernacular dialect. A likely explanation is that, like certain modern western Bulgarian dialects, Dobrejšo's Middle Bulgarian dialect tended to have *tъrt* as the reflex of **TъrT*/**TrъT* (at least when not followed by another consonant), but *tlъt* as the reflex of **TъlT*/**TlъT*, with the exception of certain specific lexemes, some of which show up sporadically in the manuscript in *tъlt* 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 ꙗ 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 *TъrT/*TrъT* and **TъlT/*TlъT*, 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 четвероеванелие. 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. Popov, *Akustische Analyse bulgarischer Silbenkerne*, Phon 21, 1970, p. 40–48.

Lunt H.G., *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, [7]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 [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*, [2]Казань 2007.

Тотоманова А.-М., *За природата и съдбата на гласната ^ в българския език*, [in:] eadem, *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 *trъt*/*trьt* 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 *trъt*/*trьt* 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