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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 є; 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 ĭ and ligated vowel letters їа, їе, їо, disambiguating them from ї 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. 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, Добреjшovo четвероеванеlие. 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 Coney’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 John2. Dobrejšo regularly employs double dots in ĭ (including in ƅĭ) and ĭ̆, and over the ligatures in ĭă, ĭĕ, and ĭơ; and a single dot over vowel letters immediately preceded by another vowel letter: e.g., ĭ̆рă, ĭ̆зăлмь. 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 lesson: e.g., О´ла´ва (with red О). 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 ink3. 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 р: i.e., in some places р̇, in others р´. 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 introduction4, 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 четверо-евангелие..., p. 16.

3 Ibidem, p. 19.

4 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 *TъrT, *TвrT, *TrъT, and *TrъT formations (hereafter referred to generally as *TъrT and *TrъT) such as ūръсть (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., п̄ръсть (fol. 5v5), търъсти (fol. 9r21), пъръстъ (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 a, 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., п´ръсть (fol. 5v5), гън´а сомъ (fol. 114r6), въкърла̀сътъ (fol. 67r15), въкърласътъ (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 дънъ: e.g., fol. 39r2 д´е´´нь, fol. 64r19 дънь, fol. 3r19 днъ. This pattern is examined in section 5. Finally, in approximately one-third of the occurrences of the OCS lexeme собата, there is a dot, a single acute shape, or three consecutive acute accent shapes over or near the ж: e.g., fol. 4r5 сѫ̀ботѫ, fol. 48r3 сѫ̀бѫтъ, fol. 4r12 сѫ̀к´отъ (see section 6 below).

3. Dotted/ accented ρ

3.1. *TъrT and *TrъT 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. 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 въкърлъгатъ, fol. 4r16 сѫ̀брънътъ (cf. fol. 26r4 сѫ̀бръна), fol. 4r16 н´ жрътъкъ, fol. 5v5 юръсть, fol. 11r18

5 Following H.G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Grammar, 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 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, 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.
This sporadic diacritic is similar to the fairly regular use of a dot over a consonant letter that immediately precedes either r or l 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 trott and trt forms\(^8\). In contrast to the East Slavic manuscripts, however, no equivalent diacritic ever occurs over the letter l in Dobrejšo’s canonical OCS spellings of historical *TrlT/*TrlT formations (both hereafter *TrlT), or *TlT/*TlT formation (both hereafter *TlT), such as mlvyuk. This lack of symmetry may explain why Conev failed to recognize the meaning of the diacritics over r, 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 *TrlT roots than *TrlT roots: he lists 31 instances of historical *TlT forms in the manuscript in which the jer precedes the l rather than following it as in OCS spelling (*tlt spelling; e.g., mlyuk- or mlvy- for OCS mlvy- in Mt 27,24; 26,5; 26,63; Mc 5,39; 9,23; Lc 10,40)\(^10\). A parallel spelling pattern of trott for historical *TrlT or *TrlT 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:] eaedem, Из българската историческа фонетика, София 2001, p. 45–67 (57).

\(^7\) Markov (op. cit., p. 82) gives these examples from the Putjata Menaion: y driven (fol. 5r), oymyka (6v), brh (14v), испление (73r), жртви (73r), алхимид (76v), елъншт (114r), елънонстъ (114v), alva (79r), alvkjono (108v), алъначие са (111r), mlvka (126v), отъкръж (126v), stlrg (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 sr and sl spellings (referred to in this paper as trott and tlt, where t represents any consonant letter and r represents either jer letter). Cf. Б. Цонев, op. cit., p. 56. All but three of these are with l, and one is incorrect: Conev has mistakenly included in the list as “млък-” the canonically spelled root mlък- 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 tlt spellings in the manuscript actually are spelled тлъст; see discussion in section 3.3 below.

\(^11\) The three instances that Conev includes in his list as trott spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel actually have the form тртъ, not трт; 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 *Təl/T and *TəlT formations occasionally are written as təl12, but historical *Tər/T and *TərT are not written as tər (with the exception of a correction of a tərT spelling, discussed in 3.2 below). Instead, while generally the historical *Tər/T/*TərT formations appear in the manuscript in the canonical OCS spelling trət, 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 r (hereafter referred to as ‘dotted/“accented” r’). This diacritic does not appear correspondingly over t in historical *Təl/T or *TəlT forms.

3.2. TərT and təlT spellings. Conev’s introduction obscures the issue of the distribution between ‘dotted/“accented” r’ and təl spellings in the manuscript, because seven of the forms in his list of what he claims are tərT or təlT spellings actually have the shape tərT/təlT: мълъка (fol. 30r of the Belgrade portion of the manuscript, which was lost during World War II), кълъкъ (fol. 38v, Belgrade portion), оялъкълъкълъкъ (fol. 61v11–12), сълъкълъкълъкъ (fol. 51r7–8), мълъкълъкъ (fols. 21r, 22r, Belgrade portion), търълъ (м’ н’мі) (fol. 76v8)13. This sporadic spelling of neutral-jer formations – which also occurs on fol. 119v3, in вър<ъ>гошѫ14 – is the only one that is used in the manuscript to represent both OCS trət and təlT forms.

The tərT/təlT 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 tərT/təlT spellings, however, listing them together with the təlT examples15 – although Conev argues that in təlT forms the copyist was deliberately preserving the OCS spelling while at the same time also deliberately inserting a jer before the t to represent his own dialect pronunciation. If both jers in the təlT 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 təlT feature in his vernacular dialect, but that the dialect feature occasionally crept in nevertheless, both in the superfluous jer in the three təlT forms, and in the 30 təlT forms, which occur

---


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 \textit{mlъv-}: \textit{мълк-}/\textit{мълк-} Mt 27,24; 26,5; 26,63; Mc 5,39; 9,23; Lc 10,40–41, and \textit{мълъва}, fol. 30r, Belgrade portion; see 3.4 below.

The four \textit{търът} occurrences in the manuscript are difficult to explain as failures to suppress a \textit{торт} dialect feature, because the Dobrejšo Gospel has no occurrences of unambiguous \textit{торт} spellings to suggest that the extra jer in \textit{търът} results from a combination of OCS \textit{трът} and vernacular \textit{търт} spelling variants, whether deliberate or not\textsuperscript{16}. This differs from the situation in East Slavic manuscripts, which can contain both \textit{торът/талят} and \textit{торт/талят} spellings of the same word.

3.3. \textit{Tът}, \textit{тълт}, \textit{торт}, and dotted/“accented” \textit{трът} 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 \textit{трът} and \textit{тълт} 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 \textit{торът}, \textit{талят}, and dotted/“accented” \textit{трът} spellings.

Considering first the sporadic dotted/“accented” \textit{р} in the Dobrejšo Gospel’s \textit{торт} 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 \textit{трт} spellings (въскрсе Mt 14,2, мртвъїкъ Lc 9,7)\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{18}. Koneski’s examples from the Ohrid Apostolus include плна and мртвъїкъ,

\textsuperscript{16} In their volume of Macedonian manuscripts, Despodova and Slaveva misread съкрашенин in Conev’s introduction as съкрашенин, and thus presented it as an example of sporadic \textit{торт} spellings in the Dobrejšo Gospel, when in fact the manuscript has none of these, with the exception of the correction of кър<ъ>гъшѫ to къргошѫ (cf. В. Десподова, Л. Славева, Македонски средновековни ракописи, Прилеп 1988, p. 116.). The spelling кър<ъ>гъшѫ on fol. 119v cannot be counted as a \textit{торт} 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, \textit{Western Bulgarian or Macedonian? The Dobrejšo Gospel (XIII c.)}, Slo 50, 2010, p. 13–26, \url{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 \textit{торът/талят} 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 \textit{тълт} and not \textit{торт} (cf. H.G. Lunt, \textit{Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?}, WS 7, 1962, p. 350–358 (p. 358, n. 21)).

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{18} Б. КОНЕСКИ, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.
the latter of which is, coincidentally, precisely the same form that appears in the Dobrejšo Gospel. 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., въскърсе, мртвъїхъ. 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

Even if there were evidence to support the claim that the Dobrejšo Gospel’s dotted/“accented” р 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, indicating that they predate the three manuscripts and stem from their shared common source. Second, if modern dialects are any indication, the 2001 Bulgarian Academy of Sciences dialect atlas shows syllabic /r/ for OCS ръ/ръ in dialects as far east as Teteven

19 Potentially relevant for the Dobrejšo Gospel’s orthographic asymmetry between dotted/“accented” trъt and tъlt 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., мртвы 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 двърь (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.


22 For further discussion, cf. C.M. ВАКАРЕЛИЯСКА, Western Bulgarian or Macedonian...


24 Scatton’s 1994 study of modern Bulgarian dialect patterns in the distribution of the segments /ур/ and /рър/ 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 /ур/ vs. syllabic /р/ (I. LEHISTE, K. POPOV, Akustische Analyse bulgarischer Silbenkerne, Phon 21, 1970, p. 40–48), and Trubetzkoy’s proposition that a language with /а/ in its phonemic inventory will treat a syllabic liquid as a combination of /а/ and liquid (N.S. TRUBETZKOY, Grundzüge der Phonologie, TCLP 8, 1938, p. 54), Scatton concluded that because Bulgarian has the phoneme /а/ 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 *ТърТ or *ТръТ 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 мърьꙁость from Conev’s introduction as sporadic тъlt and тъrt spellings in the Добреjšо Gospel, Koneski stated that the jer preceding the liquid consonant letter reflected the dark vocalic overtone [темниот вокален призвук] before the syllabic r and тъlt, 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.

In assuming that both the търът/тълт and the тълт spellings in the Добреjšо Gospel represent a single reflex of *ТърТ/*ТълТ 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 търът/тълт spellings in the manuscript, on one hand, and тълт and (actually non-existent) тъrt 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 тълт spelling in the Добреjšо Gospel reflected a vocalic element both before and after /r/ can be found in Miletič’s transcription of the sequence he transcribes as ḁrḁ (that is, /ŭrŭ/) for CSB /ŭr/ in early twentieth-century Preslav-area dialects (in the sole example мраzливићъ)27, but a relationship between this feature of certain eastern Bulgarian dialects and the western Bulgarian Добреjšо Gospel would be tenuous. Moreover, Miletič provided no equivalent sequence of /ŭлŭ/ for /ŭl/ that might offer a parallel phonological explanation the manuscript’s тълт spellings.

The apparent absence of Bulgarian dialect /ŭлŭ/ forms corresponding to Miletič’s single /ŭrŭ/ example reflects the general asymmetry in many 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 търт or търт (…). H.G. Lunt, Old Church Slavonic Syllabic Liquids?, WS 61.2, 1962, p. 353, n. 14.


26 Koneski also notes that in some southeastern Macedonian dialects, the vowel develops following the liquid (гръб, врих, тръгна, влък, žлът). Ibidem.

and Macedonian dialects between the reflexes of *ŢъRŢ and *ŢъLT – 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, Trăn, Skopje, and Niš, as opposed to syllabic /l/ in Teteven, Vraca, Vidin, Sofia, and Trăn28, thus demonstrating that in some dialects, *ŢъRŢ and *ŢъLT reflexes have not evolved in parallel. Moreover, not only does the 2001 atlas record more variation and inconsistency in *ŢъLT reflexes than in *ŢъRŢ reflexes, but it also includes maps devoted to the geographic distribution of the reflexes of specific *ŢъLT roots (OCS vlъkъ, dlъgъ, žlъt) that tend be exceptions to the usual *ŢъLT reflexes in some dialects29. No similar set of maps is provided for the reflexes of any *ŢъRŢ roots. Similarly, Bojadžiev observed in his study of Thracian dialects that *ŢъLT and *ŢъRŢ reflexes are often flexible and even word-specific, as in želt for OCS žltъtъ but dlek for dlъgъ30. The existence of specific roots in tъlt in some dialects that usually exhibit tлъt 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 *ŢъLT 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 /rў/, and /ŭl/ and /lў/, in monosyllabic forms and in polysyllabic forms with a single consonant following the liquid31; the Odrinsko dialect, which has /ŭr/-/rў/ variation, but only /ŭl/, in monosyllabic forms32; the Malgarsko and Kešansko dialects, which exhibit sъrp, gъrk, vъlk, plъl, žlъt/želt, and dlek but prъs, tлъs33; and the dialects of Silivrija, Čorlu and Carigradsko/Čataldžansko, which have grъk, plъx, vъrk, tлъs, the dou-blets brъs/bъrs (Čanakča), vъlk/vлъk (Dajakadŭn and Tarfa), and žlъt/žлъt (Tarfa), and polysyllabic gъrcki with two consonants following the liquid, but no equiva-lent in polysyllabic forms in /l/.34

The extent of /ŭr/-/rў/ and /ŭl/-/lў/ 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 *ŢоrТ or *ŢоlТ 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 rdzenej 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.
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 trт spellings. In opposition to the Dobrejšo Gospel’s two trт spellings without diacritics (въскрєє, мртв꙯їхь), discussed in 3.3 above, considerably more frequently a titlo appears over an unabbreviated canonical OCS trт spelling in which the jer has not been omitted. These occasional titla appear predominantly over the same two roots that occur once apiece as trт spellings without titla: for example, fol. 9r10 мр꙯тьвъ, fol. 52v13 мр꙯тьвъ, fol. 70v6 мр꙯твъїи̇ни̇, fol. 8r18 мр꙯твкии̇хь јєск꙯єстъ, fol. 13v10 јєск꙯єнѫть, fol. 17r21 В´ъ´´ск꙯рьсъ.\(^{35}\) These titla likely have no phonological significance and are simply automatic, since they are limited to OCS trт 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 trт word forms in which the neutral jer is still present differ from the sporadic dot or acute accent shape over the р in trт forms, which appears over both commonly abbreviated forms and forms that are not generally abbreviated.

3.5. Dotted/“accented” р in non-trт consonant clusters. Although a dot or accent shape over or near an р occurs most frequently in OCS trт 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-trт dotted/“accented” р:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tr, dr</th>
<th>fol. 2r22 вѣт̇ромь, fol. 3r16 дрѣє, fol. 8r5 пѣтръ, fol. 4v6 пъ роєт̇и, fol. 9r21 тѣрги, fol. 11r7 вѣктѣгы̇ний</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr</td>
<td>fol. 4r21 въпрѣєнѫшъ, fol. 4v6 пъ роєт̇и, fol. 8v4 пѣнше꙯, fol. 30v12 п´ривождахѫ, fol. 25v10 пѧскъ (originally пѧск꙯, with erased р)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vr</td>
<td>fol. 1v5 вѣра꙯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mr</td>
<td>fol. 34r7 оу̇м´рѣть, fol. 62r1 оу̇мрѣ´ть</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (вътѫр, дѫрво, Пе̇тѫр), suggesting that the diacritic over the р marks an immediately preceding vocalic element, as it likely does in the dotted/“accented” trт spellings. The preceding vocalic element that is suggested by the two instances of dotted/“accented” р in OCS aorist umrѣтъ is less interesting, of course, since it likely developed by analogy to the non-past stem umтѣр.\(^{36}\)

---

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-trт (and non-tlт) 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-\textit{trът} forms. To demonstrate that the accent shapes do not correlate to sentence stress or location, I have included the contextual text for each form: fol. 16v23, Mc 16,3 \textit{ѡ} \textit{ áll} \textit{γροκа}; fol. 18r21–22, Lc 17,20 \textit{и слоко оўтърь \textit{ждали}ўшо \и посл окъьдькуться}'; fol. 61v1, Lc 20,21 \textit{Оучитноь \и кьль іако пь'я \глъпши}; fol. 39v8, Lc 10,21 \textit{Вь ть \ч'екь \вь'я \радока \сѧ}. With the exception of \textit{ч'екь}, in which the double acute accent shapes may simply be marking the location of the beginning of the lection text following the incipit formula \textit{Вь ть}, possibly together with the accent in \textit{ч'екь}, 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 /\textit{r}/. There is also a single instance of a dot over \textit{п} in a non-\textit{trът} consonant cluster: fol. 1v14 \textit{ныялъята}. The dot may have been intended to be placed over the segment \textit{п}, 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 /\textit{l}/, the dot could be appropriately be marking word-internal /ml/ as an unnatural consonant cluster.

A related orthographic pattern in the Dobrejšo Gospel that sheds some light on the meaning of the dotted/“accented” \textit{р} in OCS \textit{trът} and non-\textit{trът} forms alike (as well as the dotted \textit{п} in \textit{ныялъята}) is a sporadically-occurring dotted \textit{р} in forms of OCS \textit{архиереи}: fol. 66v21 \textit{архьйрмь}; fols. 68r10, 71r17, 98v16 and 23 \textit{архьйрмь} (cf. 99r4 \textit{архьйрмь}). In contrast to the non-\textit{trът} forms above, in which the dotted/“accented” \textit{р} immediately follows another consonant letter in a cluster, in \textit{архиереи} the \textit{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 \textit{ж} or a \textit{п’яр} between the \textit{р} and the \textit{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” \textit{р} in \textit{trът} spellings, the occasional dot or accent shape over the first \textit{р} in \textit{архиереи} appears to be indicating a vocalic element between the consonants /\textit{r}/ and /\textit{x}/, while at the same time preserving the canonical OCS spelling. This diacritic has essentially the same function as the dot in some

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Dobrejšo Gospel: for example, \textit{всегда} (fols. 81v, 98r, 106v, 124r), \textit{твои} (fol. 4r), and forms in \textit{жда} (B.M. Марков, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 93).
\item Cf. \textit{дъври} in Mt 25,10, Lc 13,25, and Lc 10,7 and 9 of the Curzon Gospel. See also A.-М. Тотоматова, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 59, on the likelihood of the reflection of a syllabic /\textit{v}/ in the spelling \textit{жьмь}; and J. Duma, \textit{op. cit.}, on syllabic /\textit{v}/ in southeastern Slavic dialects, p. 49.
\item On this issue, see C.M. Vakarelytska, \textit{The Dobrejšo Gospel}... Cf., however, the high frequency of word-initial /ml/ in forms of \textit{mladь} and \textit{mľko}, which are never marked with a diacritic in the manuscript.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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 \(\epsilon\) in the Slavic form п̇с̇омь on fol. 5r18, the first in a series of two letters representing obstruents, offers further evidence that a diacritic above or near \(\rho\) 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 п̇съ that ended in a full vowel, and in the root п̇с- ‘write’ (cf. later regularized пис-). 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 /т/ Serbian trт forms (see section 3.3 above). In borrowings with initial cluster /ps/, such as п̇сълъмъ, he avoids this issue by using the Greek digraph \(\psi\), but he feels obliged to write the initial cluster in OCS п̇сомъ as п̇е 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 \(\rho\)\(^{40}\).

In the forms of arxierei above, the dot seems to function as a паерок, although no jer is written between the /т/ and /х/ in this word in OCS. While the /тх/ 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” \(\rho\) are native and fairly high-frequency, including as /ттр/ and, particularly, /птр/, which occurs word-initially in several different prefixes and in the preposition предъ. Relevant here is Lunt’s observation that numerous regional dialects of Standard American English, including his own, have a liquid /тр/ following initial /п/ 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, /пəрплёks/ vs. /п̥рплёкс/\(^{41}\).

\(^{39}\) 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 п̇ч and \(\psi\) in the manuscript. Of course, I am solely responsible for any misunderstanding or misapplication of this information. Cf. the use of a камора to mark stress after a sonorant in the much later Russian Pandekt of Nikon Cernogorca (1570) (В.В. Колесов, Надстрочные знаки «сила» 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 п̇саниемъ in the 11th-century East Slavic codex of the Thirteen Homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzus (fol. 297r.) and in the Greek borrowing п̇салмехъ in the Ostromir Gospel; see V.M. Марков, op. cit., p. 151.

These facts together suggest that Dobrejšo’s тът and тълт 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 тът and non-тът 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. 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 тълт spellings likely is that while Dobrejšo’s dialect was characterized, at least inconsistently, by тът forms, it had primarily тълт forms, with the exception of certain roots in тълт that occasionally appear spelled in the manuscript as they likely were pronounced in that dialect.

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 *ТъLT or *TЛтT formation, and in all but one instance, they appear in a word formed from the root glas-:

- fol. 16r1, Mc 15,34 гла́сомъ (рецелъвъ);
- fol. 16r10, Mc 15,37 гла́съ (рецелъвъ);
- fol. 61v14–15, Lc 20,27 гла́съ (великъ);
- fol. 67r15 къзгля́съ;
- fol. 67r18, 98v18 къзгля́съ;
- fol. 69v17 къзглядъ гла́съ (рецелъвъ; cf. fol. 98v5 гла́съ, with superfluous titlo);
- fol. 114r6 (едине̄мъ) гла´сомъ. Their function appears to be punctuational, aiding the reader to distinguish forms in глас- from the very high-frequency abbreviation гла для the third person singular aorist form глагола.

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 тът pronunciation in specific words in modern Bulgarian dialects, above in section 3.3. That the тът 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 г´л´´аго̇лѫще 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 рѫща between the segments р and щ 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 (г´л´´аго̇лѫще) 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 гла, but rather the beginning portion of a different form that continues onto the next line. In this respect, г´л´´аго̇лѫще 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 дьн-. These are shown here in their syntactic and textual contexts:
fol. 3r19, Mt 11,22 въ д´н´´ень сѫднӹи̇; fol. 3v2, Mt 11,23 прѣбӹли до д´н´´ешнего дне; fol. 25r18, Lc 2,37 д´е´´нь и̇ нощъ; fol. 39r2, Lc 10,12 въ тъ д´е´´нь ѿраднѣ будеть; fol. 64r19, Lc 21,34 и̇ наидеть на въї внеꙁаяпѫ дън´ъ тъ (sentence-end); fol. 76v8, Io 22,19 и̇ търми де´н´ми въ ꙁдвигнѫ ь (sentence-end).

Only in two of these forms can the acute accent shapes be viewed as perhaps marking an omitted jer letter, as in пс̇омь above (subsection 3.5): a preceding front jer in д´н´´ешнего (although there is no diacritic or titlo marking the omitted weak jer in дне, which immediately follows), and a following front jer in де´н´ли. A single acute accent shape also appears over the form д´н´´енъ, which, unusually for this manuscript, has н rather than е 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 е indicates that the purpose of the diacritic in this root is not to mark a vocalic element 46.

45 Although the sentence containing г´л´´аго̇лѫще 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 ѕистѫпишѫ є̆´тери ѿ садѹкеи̇ • г´л´´аго̇лѫще.

46 Since I have not been able to identify any purpose for the dot over the preposition въ, 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 *dnь* from the pronominal form *nь* (not the conjunction *nъ*, however, since that form is spelled through the manuscript as *мъ*).

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 ν.xpathiεε δλ η´α´ | η´´εσο; fol. 35v3, Lc 9,16 η καζρκνη η´α´ nєο; fol. 52v4, Lc 15,21 ωςε καζρκνηηη ηα nebo. The titlo over on *yna* on fol. 52v4 may be a perseveration from *ωςε* 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 *n* in fol. 16v22 εακн´´ςου, fol. 41v1 η´´ε´ τκροη αυ τροχαι, and fol. 41r9 О´´ςε η´αψη. 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 εακн´´ςου may also be marking a (in this case historical) vocalic element between the consonants /n/ and /c/, like the dot over the cluster in аρχιереи and пςомь. Since the phrase η´´ε´ τκροη is at the beginning of a sentence, perhaps the triple acute shapes are intended to show that, or to indicate sentence stress on *nэ*?

Triple acute accent shapes occur in one other environment, next to *р*, in η ώλωκνηζα η´ • n´ | р´´ε´ε´ ελωνη сηη (fol. 52v4, Lc 15,21). This segment, which is part of the Prodigal Son lection, immediately precedes ωςε καζρκνηηη ηα nebo, 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´´ε´ε´ ελωνη сηη, 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 εακн´´ςου, 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 въ ono врѣмє).
6. Diacritics over forms of ἱστοτα

The remaining environment for sporadic diacritics is over or near the jus major in ἱστοτα-. 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 εα̇κοτα; fol. 4r12 εα̇κοτα (with dots over the two consonant letters); εκ’ε’’’οτα (cf. l. 22 εα̇κοτα, l. 17 εα̇κοτα); fol. 4v2 εα̇κοτα; fol. 16v16–17 εκ’ε’’’οτα; fol. 16v20–21 ε’ε’κοτα; fol. 48v3 εκ’οτα, fol. 48r10 ἐ εκ’οτα, l. 15 ἐ εκ’οτα; fol. 49v6 ε εκ’οτα (cf. l. 11 ε εκ’οτα); fol. 70r12, 15 εκ’οτα; fol. 88r1 εκ’οτα (cf. εκ’οτα in the rubric on l. 17). Since the diacritics are mostly above or next to the first χ, 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 ἐ, appearing to mark a dropped weak jer (ἐ εκ’οτα, ἐ εκ’οτα). Because there is no diacritic over εκ’οτα in the second occurrence, however, it seems likely that in both instances the dot was intended to be placed over εκ’οτα rather than over ἐ.

It is unlikely that the diacritic is intended to disambiguate the full word ἱστοτα from the abbreviated form that appears in the rubrics, because the latter is distinguished by a superscript letter (ἐ nasty). Perhaps it is meant to mark the word ἱστοτα as a nomen sacrum. If ἱστοτα were to be abbreviated in the text, as nomina sacra generally are, the usual abbreviation ἐ 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 ἱστοτα with diacritic (εα̇κοτα). 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 ἱστοτα 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 třt spellings and certain OCS non-třt spellings with two consecutive consonant letters, one of which usually is r ( riêxhēmû, word-initial ṣp, but cf. πριηλὰδες). With the exception of πν̕ωςμ, 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 db̌ň (δεν, δεν´κ). 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 sobota in the Gospel text (σκανωτα, σκ. κοντα), 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 (σκαντα) 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-třt spellings (Δκ´´γη, π´´rδελάδες, κόζ´παδος ελ., κόζλ´ινου), and in a single instance, to mark a třt spelling (ούτερκ´´−εδαμκλιπου). 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., γ´λ´´σσ), probably in order to help the reader differentiate them from the abbreviation for the very high-frequency third person singular aorist form glagola (γλά);

(iii) in four instances, to mark forms of the word db̌ň (Α´´ε´´ιη) and, also on four occasions, the phrase na nebo (ν´´νε). 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 η´´νε, to indicate phrasal stress on the preposition. Forms of db̌ň are also marked with a single dot/acute accent shape (see (c)(ii) above);

48 In all but πν̕ωςμ and Δκ´´γη, the marked cluster contains a sonorant.
(iv) in three instances, to mark unabbreviated forms of the word *sobota* in the Gospel text, probably in order to indicate that the word is a *nomen sacrum* (сѫ´б´´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 (и´ р´е´´че ѥ̇̇м 自动生成 ц꙯ъ; О´´че н´а´шъ).

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 (пє="<span></script>"ићь, сѫ´б´´отѫ ц꙯ъ). When a diacritic occurs over р left- or right-adjacently to another consonant letter (and also over л in прєјємьгє, 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 jej 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 *tъlt* 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 р 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 $T\sigma T/*T\sigma b T$ and $*T\sigma l T/*T\sigma l T$, 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.
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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 trт/tрт 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 trт/tрт formations.
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