Methodological implications of Nahtigal's remarks on the Acrostich Prayer

Catherine Mary MacRobert
University of Oxford, Oxford

This paper argues for renewed consideration of Nahtigal's analysis of the Acrostich Prayer in the light of evidence which has become available since his time and suggests that some of his interpretations are preferable on methodological grounds to recent conjectural interpretations of the text.

Over the seventy-five years since Nahtigal published his critical edition of the Acrostich Prayer (Nahtigal 1942-3), new sources for the early history of Glagolitic have come to light and new reconstructions of the text and the alphabet have been put forward. A concise and lucid review of these studies is available (Marti 2004ᵇ), which this paper does not attempt to duplicate. Instead it takes as its starting point their surprising dearth of reference to Nahtigal's edition and his related articles (Nahtigal 1923 and 1948), a neglect which may be explained, but not justified, by the additional textual evidence which has emerged since his time. True, Nahtigal's critical reconstruction of the Acrostich Prayer was based on a handful of MSS, but they did in fact cover the main textual variants.[1] It will be argued that some of the conclusions which Nahtigal reached and the arguments which he used to support them still deserve consideration and on the whole are consistent with the more recent evidence provided by the acrostichs of the Christmas and Epiphany hymn-cycles (Ivanova-Konstantinova 1971, Jovanović-Stipčević 1981, Popov 2013; tabulated in Popov 2003:34–35 and Veder 2004:379–380) and the Sinai abecedarium in the Psalterium Demetrii (Marti 1999, Miklas 2012).

Nahtigal's most notable emendation was to line 12 of the Acrostich Prayer. The acrostich requires at this point a word whose initial letter in Glagolitic would be Ⰼ, but the versions extant in Cyrillic attest words starting with the letter л: лєтить бо нꙑинѣ и словѣньско плѧмѧ in the earliest manuscript, Sin 262; (ї и) лѣ ти бо нн̅ѣ словѣн̆ско плѧмѧ in the more widespread wording of the manuscripts which

---

1 For instance, he mentioned the prefatory address to Naum included in a branch of the manuscript tradition (Nahtigal 1942–3:50) and raised the possibility that the variant reading непрѣвьрьдомыꙗ in the doxology might be a loan from the poem in praise of Simeon (Nahtigal 1942–3:51), rather than a hapax legomenon (Veder 1999:181).

constitute the 'β' branch of the textual tradition (Veder 1999:16–17). Nahtigal suggested that ⰂⰠ originally stood, as expected, at the beginning of this line, but in its numerical value of 30,[2] outside the metrical count of syllables: Ⰽ. Ⰾⱑⱅⱏ Ⰲⱁ ⰐⰟⰸⰻⱀⱑ ⰻ ⱄⰎⱁⰲⱑⱀⱐⱄⰽⱁ ⱂⰎⰵⰿⱑ. He did not specify how the corruption might have occurred, but two possibilities can be envisaged: either, on the assumption that a letter of the Glagolitic alphabet stood in front of each line (Veder 1999:62, 66), the numeral was taken to be a dittography of the alphabetic letter ⰂⰠ – and so omitted; or in the course of transmission it was replaced with its Cyrillic numerical equivalent, the letter л, and taken to be a dittography before the word лѣтъ – and so omitted. Either way, the genitive plural form лѣтъ became unintelligible without the numeral and so was liable in its turn to corruption. On the supposition that it was reinterpreted as the modal expression лѣть with a stereotypical dative ти added superscript, the reading лѣтить is explicable as a trivial misreading (Veder 1999:67), even if the failure to discriminate between є and ѣ is perhaps surprising at the early date by which these changes must have occurred.

Nahtigal's conjecture, which produces a correct syllable count and a caesura after an odd-numbered syllable in line 12 of the Acrostich Prayer, is paralleled by well known errors and confusions in the Cyrillic transliteration of Glagolitic letters and numerals, for instance in the transmission of the *Vita Methodii* and the treatise of Hrabrŭ. It is patently superior to recent proposals. Lunt's modified version assumes that the numeral indicated by ⰂⰠ was included in the syllable count of the line, and therefore arbitrarily excises the words Ⰲⱁ ⰐⰟⰸⰻⱀⱑ ⰻ, in spite of their solid textual support, in order to preserve the metre (Lunt 2000:280). Tkadlčík, who rejects Nahtigal's suggestion as 'nemožný', attempts a semantic defence of лѣтить, presumably because it is attested in the earliest manuscript (Tkadlčík 1992:366–367); this leaves the majority reading of the 'β' tradition unexplained. Mathiesen invokes the similarity of the letters for /d/ and /l/ in both Glagolitic and Cyrillic to justify a conjectural reading дѣти (Mathiesen 2014:198). Neither of these accounts explains the absence of expected ⰂⰠ. Veder acknowledges the need to include ⰂⰠ in the acrostich at this point, but suggests that it was represented by a native Slavonic word, дѣтъ or ѓѣтъ (Veder 1999:67), even though our souces offer no examples of the sequence /dě/ spelt with ⰂⰠ in words such as дѣло, дѣти, and historical phonology provides no reason to expect such spellings.

The acrostich hymn-cycles for Christmas and Epiphany, which were discovered after Nahtigal's time, are clearly based on the same version of Glagolitic as the Acrostich Prayer. As in the Jaroslavlʹ hymn to the Trinity (Sobolevskij 1910:13–15), which was known to Nahtigal, line 12 of the Christmas cycle starts

---

2   Thus providing a plausible approximate dating for the text (Nahtigal 1942–3:61-62).

with the word гєѡны, thus supporting the view, which he took as established, that ⰼ indicated the outcome of palatalized /g/ before front vowels in loanwords from or through Greek (Nahtigal 1923:136–139, 1942–3:60). The attestations of гⰀⰾⰋⰾⰅⰀ or even гⰾⰀгⱁⰾⰋ in versions of the Epiphany cycle are difficult to reconcile with this interpretation, but the first at least indicates an association with loanwords, while the second may be an instance of the observable textual fluidity of these compositions.

Nahtigal's treatment of other difficulties in the Acrostich Prayer similarly relied on early evidence and attention to philological probability, for instance in his interpretation of Ⰻⰶⰵ and the conjunction ⰻ in lines 10–11 of the Acrostich Prayer. He seems to have based his view that ⰼ/ⱖ originally stood for post-vocalic and initial /ji/ or /jĭ/ and ⰻ for post-consonantal /i/ primarily on the usage of Zographensis. However, he also went to the trouble of examining the more complex distribution of these letters in the Kiev Folia, where ⱖ is also post-consonantal while ⰻ is sometimes initial, e.g. in the prefix Ⰻⰸ- and the *nomen sacrum* ⰻⱄ, and regularly post-vocalic in ⱁⰻ = /y/ (Nahtigal 1923:162–164), by contrast to ⱁⱖ = /yjĭ/.[3] In this he anticipated the convergent findings of more recent analyses (Tkadlčík 1956, Vrana 1964, Gotteri 1973, Miklas 2003:201), which detect in the Kiev Folia traces of a systematic contrast between /ji/ or /jĭ/, represented by ⰼ/ⱖ, and /i/ or /ĭj/, indicated by ⰻ. If Nahtigal had had at his disposal the combined evidence of the hymn-cycles and the hymn to the Trinity, which all start line 10 with Ⰻⰸ (implying a spelling with initial ⰼ/ⱖ, unlike the Kiev Folia) but in line 11 deploy loanwords, ⰻⱃⱁⰴⰵ/ⰻⱄⱐ/ⰻⰵⰸⰵⰽⰻⰻⱀⱏ, he might have been less sceptical about an association between the letter ⰻ and foreign words (Nahtigal 1923:160). If he had had the benefit of recent work on the development of Church Slavonic orthographical practice (e.g. Živov 2006), he might have been moved to consider the possibility that the positional rules followed in Zographensis could be a scribal simplification[4] of a more complex, phonologically motivated pattern still discernible in the Kiev Folia, but increasingly obscured by sound change.

In his initial discussion of the two Glagolitic letters for /x/ Nahtigal put forward the view, which has come to enjoy widespread assent, that ⱒ indicated this sound as realised before front vowels, in loanwords such as ⱒⰵⱃⱁⰲⱐⱄⰽⱁⱛ in line 24, while ⱈ was originally used in native Slavonic phonological contexts, such as ⱈⰲⰰⰾⱁⱛ in line 33 and the instances of ⱈⰾⱏⰿⱏ in Assemanianus and the Psalterium Sinaiticum (Nahtigal 1923:173–174; Koch 2004:442). He suggested a parallelism with the

---

3   Also in the Rila Folia (Velčeva 1977:460).
4   Comparable to the rule in early Russian Church Slavonic by which ⱑ is used in initial and post-vocalic position, ⱔ after consonants. This scribal extrapolation from traditional spelling approximates fairly well to etymological distribution.

two letters for /g/; but he did not go to the length of speculating that the same type of contrast might originally have been marked for /k/ as well and that the letter ⱏ might have stood for this sound before front vowels, as has recently been argued, admittedly without direct evidence (Miklas 2003:180–181, 2004:396).

Although the the hymn to the Trinity and the hymn-cycles agree with the Acrostich Prayer in their choices of initial word, offering херовимьскоую/хероувимь/ херовимомь and хвалоу or, as a variant, хлъмъ at appropriate points (Jovanović-Stipčević 1981:116–117; Popov 1982:9-10), the account of Ⱈ and Ⱇ which Nahtigal followed is not entirely satisfactory, because the relationship between Ⱈ and Ⱇ is not the same as that between Ⰳ and Ⰴ, for two reasons: i. the Greek consonant /g/ had split into two phonemes, /ɣ/ and /j/ (Horrocks 1997:112-113), whereas /x/ had not; ii. presumably as a consequence of this fact, Ⰳ is used as the default for Greek /ɣ/ and Slavonic /g/, Ⰴ only for the distinctive Greek /j/, whereas Ⱈ appears as the default for Greek and Slavonic /x/ in almost all positions and Ⱇ is only met vestigially in two types of initial cluster. Nahtigal seems to have considered this point and dismissed it on the ground that Greek allowed initial /xl/ (Nahtigal 1948:12–13), but he might have given it more weight if he had had the additional evidence of the hymn-cycles for Ⱇ in the initial cluster /xv/, which is alien to Greek. In his publications of the 1940s Nahtigal was more concerned with the inconsistency between the Paris and Munich abecedaria over the order in which Ⱈ and Ⱇ stood in Glagolitic (Nahtigal 1942–3:69); he would presumably have welcomed supplementary evidence on this point from the Sinai abecedarium, in which the position of Ⱈ is consistent with its attested numerical value of 600, while Ⱇ is located towards the end of the alphabet.

Nahtigal did not try to find ways of correlating the enigmatic 'P2', represented by печаль in line 26 of the Acrostich Prayer, with the letter ⱅ. He dismissed as 'povsem zastarela' (Nahtigal 1942–3:65) Durnovo's hypothesis that ⱅ occupied this position because of its visual similarity to Greek ψ; presumably he would have rejected recent argumentation of a similar kind (Veder 1999:75, 174 and 2004:382, Miklas 2003:176–177). He was aware that the association of ⱅ with this position in the alphabet was not guaranteed by its numerical value, because ⱌ, as well as ⱅ, could have the value of 800 in later Croatian Glagolitic (Koch 2004) and because the letter ⱉ was attested with this value in the Grigorovič Parimejnik (Nahtigal 1948:10). His appeal to the evidence of пѣсньми in the hymn to the Trinity has gained new support from the use of the same word in the hymn-cycles and above all from the Sinai abecedarium, which clearly includes ⱉ at this point (Marti 1999:187, 192, Miklas 2012).

It must be conceded that Nahtigal's speculation about the function of 'P2' is not his happiest conjecture. He suggested that Glagolitic originally had two letters, Ⱈ Ⱏ, corresponding to Greek θ and φ, which came to be indistinguishable in Slavonic

pronunciation and therefore were reduced to one (Nahtigal 1923:135–154, 1948:10). This surmise is not entirely cogent, even if attractive, because the attested distribution of the two letters appears to be random rather than motivated; but it is typical of Nahtigal's approach that he appealed to the evidence of early Glagolitic manuscripts such as the Kiev and Prague Folia and Assemanianus as well as to the Bosnian Glagolitic alphabet of Radosav, and that he posited a motivation in the Greek sound system and alphabet which must have served as S. Cyril's starting point. An alternative suggestion, which goes back to Rešetar (Nahtigal 1923:140) and has been recently revived (Velčeva 1973 and 2007), that 'P2' stands for Greek ψ in the liturgically important word псалъмъ, which could be glossed with the Slavonic word пѣснь (MacRobert 2010:429), finds some slight support in the acrostichs of the hymn-cycles, especially that for Epiphany, пѣми[5] и пѣми. Neither account is compelling; but either is preferable to the emendation put forward by Mathiesen, who assumes a translational equivalence between θλίψις and печаль (Mathiesen 2014:199–200). This is not supported by any textual evidence and is intrinsically dubious, because no less often the Greek word is translated as скрьбь (MacRobert 1993:273-274).

In fact on the basis of the earliest abecedaria and the variable practice of manuscripts Nahtigal, like other Slavists of his time, doubted that ѡ was original to Glagolitic (Nahtigal 1923:135, 1942–3:64–65; Jagić 1911/1972:205, Kul′bakin 2008:70–71, Vajs 1932:95). Consequently he was not tempted to explain шьствоую/шествїе in line 30 of the Acrostich Prayer as a makeshift to indicate ѡ – an unnecessary makeshift, since a writer as competent as the author of the Prayer could have incorporated an appropriate word such as щюждь or щедръ into his text, had he wished. Nahtigal would surely not have countenanced the solution that the ghost-word щьстоуѭ should be adopted from late MSS and projected back to the period when the Acrostich Prayer was composed (Koch 2004:441, in response to Veder 1999:74–75).[6] The association of щ with this line can be adequately explained by the shift to Cyrillic transmission: the most striking divergences in the textual tradition of the Acrostich Prayer occur precisely at those points, lines 10–12 and 30–33, where the Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets diverge. In their attempts to impose on the text the Cyrillic alphabet which they knew, scribes allowed patent inconsistencies between alphabetic letter and initial word, modified spellings, or omitted lines entirely.[7]

---

5   This could however be an interpolated scribal reminiscence of Ephesians 5:19.

6   The suggestion that щьстоуѭ might be a mistake for цвьтоуѭ at this point in the acrostich (Veder 2004:383) is puzzling, since цвьта is attested in ongoing use.

7   The fact that only the earliest manuscript, Sin. 262, preserves lines 10–12 without omission is a measure of the speed and extent of such corruptions, against which the relatively sophisticated syntax of the Acrostich Prayer provided only partial protection. Acrostich compositions in which each line was a discrete syntactic unit, such as the Jaroslavl′ Hymn to the Trinity or the text in the Berlin sbornik, could readily be modified under Cyrillic influence.

Nahtigal's scepticism about Ⱋ has gained plausibility from the discovery of early Cyrillic alphabets from Novgorod which do not include ⱋ (Zaliznjak 1999:558–560), and from the Sinai abecedarium, which does not have Ⱋ either after ⱍ, as in some later Croatian versions of Glagolitic, or after ш, as in Cyrillic. The fact that the writer of the abecedarium himself used Ⱋ in his annotations does not guarantee that it figured in his alphabet (*pace* Marti 1999:193): alphabets tend to be conservative, so may retain letters no longer in use and omit innovations (Marti 1999:189, Zaliznjak 1999:544). It is of course possible that Ⱋ has been lost after ⱋ in the damaged final portion of the Sinai abecedarium; but the evidence for this ordering in early Glagolitic is not substantial (*pace* Marti 2004ᵃ:410–412). Where it is attested in Croatian Glagolitic, e.g. in the Roč abecedarium, it is correlated with, and perhaps occasioned by, the use of ⰴ with the numerical value of 800: ⰴ moves to the appropriate position after ⱍ and Ⱋ takes its place after ⱋ (Koch 2004:437, 446). In the Munich abecedarium a letter resembling ш appears twice, inverted before ⱋ and upright after it; the assumption that the second instance is a distorted form of Ⱋ is less than secure. An appeal to the Cyrillic textual tradition of Hrabrŭ's treatise as evidence that Ⱋ was ordered after ⱋ must reckon with the fact that the enigmatic sequence in the Moscow manuscript, ш. ъ. шь. мь. ъ, deserves serious consideration precisely because it constitutes a more difficult reading, in a scribal hand which distinguishes clearly between ш and ⱋ (Kuev 1974:429), than the list шъ. ⱋь. мь. ю in the related manuscript Solovki 913, where the same Cyrillic influence is at work as in the manuscripts which list ⱋ immediately after ш.

Nahtigal took a different view: he suggested that шь. мь. in Hrabrŭ's treatise and the arguable second occurrence of ш followed by ⱍ in the Munich abecedarium constituted links between these witnesses and lines 30–31 of the Acrostich Prayer (Nahtigal 1923:148 and 1948:14). In discussing those lines he assumed that the letters for the *jers* would ideally have figured at this point in the acrostich, and at first he seems to have allowed the possibility that the initial words in these lines, шьствоую and имени, were conventionally associated with ⱋ and ⱋ here and by implication in Hrabrŭ's text. Later, however, he came to the conclusion that the *jers* could not be introduced into the acrostich in the usual way because they could not stand in initial position (Nahtigal 1942–3:65–66). He surmised that instead the *jers* and *jery* were indicated indirectly by the first syllables of three words in sequence, въсприимъ шьствоую нꙑнѣ, i.e. that the author abandoned the acrostic structure here.[8] The idea that ⱍ might have had an independent status and sound

---

8   This solution relieved him of concern over the apparent numerical discrepancy between the Acrostich Prayer and Hrabrŭ's alphabet of 38 letters (Nahtigal 1923:147–149, 1948:9–10).

value in line 31 (Marti 2000:61–64, 2004ᵇ:18–19) seems not to have occurred to him, no doubt because he saw this letter and ⱙ as positional variants.

However, the acrostichs of the hymn-cycles invite a different inference, that имєни in line 31 is intended to represent front *jer*, ⰱ, in the first syllable of words starting with /jĭ/: игрли/иного. This explanation would vindicate Nahtigal's surmise about how the author of the Prayer contrived to include in his text letters which never occur in initial position, while conforming more nearly to the acrostich principle. If Nahtigal had had the additional evidence for *jer* in line 31, he would not necessarily have concluded, as has been recently suggested (Veder 1999:76, 174), that the Glagolitic alphabet known to Konstantin of Preslav had only one *jer*: both historical phonology and the usage of early Glagolitic manuscripts would have inclined him to expect two *jers*. But might he have been prompted at least to contemplate the possibility that in line 30 of the Acrostic Prayer and the hymn-cycles шьст- stands in the same way for back *jer*, ⰰ, on the assumption, for which there is some manuscript support, that regionally /ʃ/ became hard at an early stage, before the loss of the *jers*? In that case the choice of initial words in lines 30–31 might have been motivated by the need to differentiate between letters which were very similar in form, by citing them in syllables where no confusion was possible: only front *jer* could occur after /j/, and once /ʃ/ had hardened, only back *jer* could follow it in pronunciation. Probably Nahtigal would have hesitated to draw this conclusion, because evidence for back *jer* after /ʃ/ is found mainly in Cyrillic manuscripts which are thought to derive from East Bulgaria (Kulʹbakin 1929:87–90), but are not, of course, contemporary with Konstantin of Preslav.

For while Nahtigal was not averse to conjecture, it is clear that he acknowledged and observed a number of methodological constraints on speculative reconstruction of the alphabet implicit in the Acrostich Prayer:

- there must be at least some attestations to support a conjecture;
- alphabets are likely to be more conservative than scribal practice;
- autochthonous evidence is preferable to xenographic representations of alphabets or words;
- early evidence is preferable to later, especially where Cyrillic influence is possible;
- conjectures must be consistent with Slavonic etymology and historical phonology;
- conjectures must be consistent with the linguistic information available to scribes;
- allowance must be made for the Greek basis of the Glagolitic writing system and for the need to indicate Greek pronunciation.

Nahtigal would surely have subscribed to the importance of actual attestations, the conservatism of alphabets, the greater evidential weight of autochthonous than xenographic, earlier than later sources. He was clearly alive to the possibility of Cyrillic interference. He would have taken it for granted that we are under an intellectual obligation to formulate conjectures which are consistent with our reconstructions of Slavonic etymology and historical phonology. Although the idea that we should allow for what scribes knew about their language as well as what we reconstruct (Živov 2006:142–145) has recently become more prominent than it was in Nahtigal's day, he showed some awareness of it in his discussion of the letters Ⱈ ϕ, in which he also assumed that the choices which S. Cyril made in elaborating his writing system were based on his experience of Greek and his purpose of making Greek texts available in Slavonic translation.

The application of these constraints to our attempts to reconstruct the early history of Glagolitic defines the earliest recoverable stage in its development (Marti 2004[b]:14–15). In our projections back from the available sources we have to allow not only for a 'Glagolitic barrier' of distortions brought about by comprehensive transliteration into Cyrillic (Veder 2008), or for 'reforms' of the writing system as it migrated from one geographical area to another (Tkadlčík 1963), but also for the more wide-ranging linguistic, as well as orthographical, revision which seems to have been carried out in the course of the late ninth and early tenth centuries. We have just enough evidence, on the one hand from the Kiev and Prague Folia, on the other hand from relict West Slavonic elements, particularly in Clozianus, Marianus, the Psalterium Sinaiticum and the Psalterium Demetrii (MacRobert 2014:183), to allow us to detect this process of revision. On that basis we can reconstruct a version of Glagolitic which could have been taken from Moravia to Bulgaria in the 880s:

ⰀⰁⰂⰃⰄⰅⰆⰇⰈⰉ/ⰊⰋⰌⰍⰎⰏⰐⰑⰒⰓⰔⰕⰖ Ⱇ/ϕⰘⰙⰚⰛⰜⰝⰞⰟⰠⰡⰢⰣⰤ.

This would have been a system devised or adapted for use by people unfamiliar with Greek, for whom the distinctive pronunciation of γ as /j/ before front vowels had to be indicated and who might initially have had difficulty with some alien sounds and sequences, such as /f/ and /θ/, /x/ before a front vowel and perhaps initial /ps/. It followed the practice implicit in Greek orthography of the time, that consonants were represented by single letters, but that single letters, digraphs and homographs might be used to represent vowels (*pace* Mareš 1971:133). In the main its ordering of letters was based on functional equivalence to Greek; so on the analogy of Greek η, which indicated a separate syllable after a vocalic letter, and ι, which entered into digraphic representations of single vowels (Trubetzkoy 1968:25), Ⱑ/Ⱑ = /jǐ/, e.g. in ⰵⰡ = /yjǐ/, came before ⰺ = [i]/[ǐj], e.g. in ⰵⰺ = /y/ and

in the abbreviation ⰱⰸ. It deployed two letters for the non-initial *jers*, but had no need for the letter ⰲ,[9] because the outcomes of *sk before a front vowel and *stj could be adequately represented by ⱎⰼ, *tj by ⰲ and *dj by ⰼ.

This Glagolitic alphabet is consistent both with the Acrostich Prayer of Konstantin and with the hymn-cycles attributed to S. Kliment, although the evidence of their other acrostich compositions indicates that these two writers used it in different ways: S. Kliment, perhaps the elder of the two, remained more or less true to Moravian practice in the spelling ⱃⱁⰸⱄⱅ(ⰲ)ⱁⱛ[10] (Popov 1985:44–45), whereas Konstantin opted for Bulgarian pronunciation in the digraphs ⱎⱅ ⰶⰴ (Popov 1985:36, Marti 2004ᵃ:411). If ⰲ was available at this stage, he seems not to have felt a need for it. In the south-east Balkans, among people more familiar with Greek, aids to grecizing pronunciation were not essential and could be gradually abandoned; perhaps Konstantin's use of ⱏ in numerical function and the absence of a sample word with initial ⱏ in Hrabrŭ's Treatise[11] mark the beginning of this process. The merger of /jĭ/ and /i/ in South Slavonic rendered the distinction between ⰺ/ⱐ and ⰹ opaque and gave rise, as argued above, to conventional rules for their use extrapolated from their older distribution as well, no doubt, as from their numerical values (Miklas 2003:186–187). The discrepancy between 36 letters in the early acrostich compositions and the claim of 38 in Hrabrŭ's Treatise is a difficulty only if we suppose that S. Cyril's alphabet was handed down in a fixed, authoritative form to the next generation in Bulgaria; but such evidence as we have suggests a more fluid tradition, and Hrabrŭ's assertion may be explained either by later modifications (Vaillant 1955:11) or by his wish to demonstrate parallelism between the Glagolitic and Greek alphabets.

Further back than this we cannot go: we do not have the evidence needed to reconstruct the alphabet which S. Cyril might have devised in Thessaloniki or Constantinople and offered to the Moravians on his arrival in their country. No doubt it was based on a variety of South Slavonic; this means that it must in some respects have been at odds with West Slavonic. We do not know whether SS. Cyril and Methodius tried to impose an orthography based on their own pronunciation or made compromises with local usage in order to promote their evangelizing activity, and the possibility that a ninth-century source might be discovered which would resolve this question is remote. Tempting as it is to supplement incomplete

---

9   Unless perhaps as a ligature of ⱎⰲ (Vaillant 1955:28), subsequently extended in South Slav usage to the outcome of *tj as well as *sk and *stj.

10   The instances of this word spelt with ⰶⰴ in text (Popov 2013:183–184) are not counter-examples, as ⰸ/ⰸ would have been changed to ⰶⰴ in the process of copying.

11   The suggestion that ⱏ was represented by ⰴⱑⱅⰻⱀⰻⰵ/ⰴⱑⱅⰻⰵ, corrupted to ⱍⰰⰼⰻⰵ (Veder 1999:93) is open to the same objections as apply to conjectural ⰴⱑⱅⱏ/ⱆⱑⱅⱏ and is inconsistent with the ordering of sample words in Hrabrŭ's list.

evidence with conjectures based on theoretical or typological considerations, it is salutory to bear in mind that there are 'limits to what can be achieved by deductive reasoning' and that 'cautious, fragmentary conclusions […] must still sometimes carry greater weight' (Auty 1963:11).

References

Auty, R., 1963: Glagolitic Ⰱ and ⰲ: facts, conjectures and probabilities. M. Hraste, Lj. Jonke, M. Ratković. *Zbornik u čast Stjepana Ivšića*. Zagreb: Somborac, 5–12.

Gotteri, N. J. C., 1973: A Neglected Regularity in the Kiev Missal. *Slavonic and East European Review* 51, 445–447.

Horrocks, G., 1997: *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London-New York: Longman.

Ivanova-Konstantinova, K., 1971: Dva neizvestni azbučni akrostixa s glagoličeska podredba na bukvite v srednobălgarski prazničen minej. P. Dinekov. *Konstantin Kiril Filosof*. Sofia: BAN, 341–366.

Jagić, I. V., 1911/1972: Glagoličeskoe pisʹmo. *Enciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii*, 3.III. St Petersburg/Leipzig.

Jovanović-Stipčević, B., 1981: Tekstološka uslovljenost sastava i broja slova staroslovenske azbuke prema Stihirama na Rođenje i Krštenje u srpskom prepisu. *Arheografski prilozi* 3, 93–121.

Koch, C., 2004: Das Bamberger glagolitische Alphabet. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Zeichenfolgen der kroatischen glagolitischen Alphabete. M.-A. Dürrigl, M. Mihaljević, F. Velčić. *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam*. Zagreb-Krk: Staroslavenski institut, Krčka biskupija, 435–452.

Kuev, K. M., 1974: *Azbučnata molitva v slavjanskite literatury*. Sofia: BAN.

Kulʹbakin, S., 1929: *Le vieux slave*. Paris: Champion.

Kulʹbakin, S., 2008: *Slavjanska paleografija*. Belgrade: SANU, Čigoja.

Lunt, H. J., 2000: Thoughts, Suggestions, and Questions about the Earliest Slavic Writing Systems. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 46, 272–286.

MacRobert, C. M., 1993: Translation is Interpretation: Lexical Variation in the Translation of the Psalter from Greek into Church Slavonic up to the 15th Century. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 43, 254–284.

MacRobert, C.M., 2010: The impact of interpretation on the evolution of the Church Slavonic psalter text up to the fifteenth century. A. Lemaire. *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*. (= Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, CXXXIII). Leiden-Boston: Brill, 423–440.

MacRobert, C.M., 2014: On the headings and marginal notes in the two Glagolitic psalter manuscripts in S. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. M. S. Flier, D. J. Birnbaum, C. M. Vakareliyska. *Philology Broad and Deep: In Memoriam Horace Gray Lunt*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 175–185.

Mareš, F.V., 1971: Hlaholice na Moravě a v Čechách. J. Hamm. A. Nazor. *Glagoljica. Jedanaest stoljeća jedne velike tradicije* (= *Slovo* 21). Zagreb, 133–200.

Marti, R., 1991: Slavische Alphabete in nicht-slavischen Handschriften. *Kirilo-Metodievski studii* 8, 139–164.

Marti, R., 1999: Abecedaria – a key to the original Slavic alphabet: the contribution of the abecedarium sinaiticum glagoliticum. *Thessaloniki – Magna Moravia: proceedings of the International Conference, Thessaloniki 16-19 October 1997*. Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for Slavic Studies, SS Cyril and Methodius Center for Cultural Studies, 175–200.

Marti, R., 2000: Die Bezeichnung der Vokale in der Glagolica. H. Miklas. *Glagolitica. Zum Ursprung der slavischen Schriftkultur*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 54–76.

Marti, R., 2004[a]: Die Bezeichnung der Konsonanten in der Glagolica. M.-A. Dürrigl, M. Mihaljević, F. Velčić. *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam*. Zagreb-Krk: Staroslavenski institut, Krčka biskupija, 401–417.

Marti, R., 2004[b]: Aktuelle Probleme des altkirchenslavischen Schrift- und Lautsystems. *Incontri linguistici* 27, 11–37.

Mathiesen, R., 2014: A new reconstruction of the original Glagolitic alphabet. M. S. Flier, D. J. Birnbaum, C. M. Vakareliyska. *Philology Broad and Deep: In Memoriam Horace Gray Lunt*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 187–213.

Miklas, H., 2003: Jesus-Abbreviatur und verwandtes: zu einigen Rätseln der glagolitischen Schriftentwicklung am Material der *Azbučnaja Molitva*. W. Honselaar, H. van der Tak, E. de Haard, A. Barentsen, J. Popovski. *Time flies, a Festschrift for William R. Veder*. Amsterdam: Pegasus, 171–204.

Miklas, H., 2004: Zur Relevanz des neuen sinaitischen Materials für die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Glagolica. M.-A. Dürrigl, M. Mihaljević, F. Velčić. *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam*. Zagreb-Krk: Staroslavenski institut, Krčka biskupija, 390–399.

Miklas H., 2012: *Psalterium Demetrii Sinaitici monasterii sanctae Catharinae codex slav. 3/N adiectis foliis medicinalibus*. Vienna: Holzhausen.

Nahtigal, R., 1923: Doneski k vprašanju o postanku glagolice. *Razprave*, I, 135–178.

Nahtigal, R., 1942–3: Rekonstrukcija treh starocerkvenoslovanskih izvirnih pesnitev. *Razprave Akademije znanosti in umetnosti v Ljubljani, filoz-filol-hist. razred*, I, 43–155.

Nahtigal, R., 1948: Nekaj pripomb k pretresu Hrabrovega spisa o azbuki Konstantina Cirila. *Slavistična revija* 1, 5–18.

Popov, G., 1982: Novootkriti ximnografski proizvedenija na Kliment Oxridski i Konstantin Preslavski. *Bălgarski ezik* 32, 3–36.

Popov, G., 1985: Triodni proizvedenija na Konstantin Preslavski. *Kirilo-Metodievski studii* 2.

Popov, G., 2003: Akrostix v gimnografičeskom tvorčestve učenikov Kirilla i Mefodija. K. Stantchev, M. Yovcheva. *La poesia liturgica slava antica*. Rome-Sofia: Associazione Italiana degli Slavisti, 30–55.

Popov, G., 2013: *Starobălgarska cărkovna poezija za Roždestvo Xristovo i Bogojavlenie.* Sofia: Izkustvo.

Sobolevskij, A. I., 1910: Materialy i issledovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii. *Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 88:3.

Tkadlčík, V., 1956: Trojí hlaholské *i* v Kyjevských listech. *Slavia* 25, 200–216.

Tkadlčík, V., 1963: Dvě reformy hlaholského písemnictví. *Slavia* 32, 140–166.

Tkadlčík, V., 1992: K rekonstrukci Abecední modlitby Konstantina Přeslavského. *Slavia* 61, 363–373.

Trubetzkoy, N. S., 1968: *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik.* Graz-Vienna-Cologne: Böhlau.

Vaillant, A., 1955: L'alphabet vieux-slave. *Revue des études slaves*, 7–31.

Vajs, J., 1932: *Rukověť hlaholské paleografie*. Prague: Slovanský ústav, Orbis.

Veder, W. R., 1999: *Utrum in alterum abiturum erat? A Study of the Beginnings of Text Transmission in Church Slavic*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Veder, W. R., 2004: The Glagolitic Alphabet as a Text. M.-A. Dürrigl, M. Mihaljević, F. Velčić. *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam*. Zagreb-Krk: Staroslavenski institut, Krčka biskupija, 374–387.

Veder, W. R., 2008: The Glagolitic Barrier. P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek, J. Schaeken. *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists. Ohrid. September 10-16, 2008. Linguistics*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 489–501.

Velčeva, B., 1973: Văprosăt za ѹ v glagoličeskata azbuka. *Izvestija Instituta za bălgarski ezik* 22, 105–124.

Velčeva, B., 1977: Glagoličeskijat i-problem i rilskite listove. *Bălgarski ezik* 27, 456–460.

Velčeva, B., 2007: Glagolicata i nejnite abecedari do XII v. *Kirillo-Metodievski studii* 17, 108–120.

Vrana, J., 1964: Glagoljski grafemi ⱇ-ⱛ, ⰵⱇ-ⰵⱛ i njihova ćirilska transkripcija. *Slavia* 33, 171–181.

Zaliznjak, A. A., 1999: O drevnejšix kirilličeskix abecedarijax. A. A. Vigasin et al. *Poėtika. Istorija literatury. Lingvistika. Sbornik k 70-letiju Vjačeslava Vsevolodoviča Ivanova*. Moscow: OGI, 545–576.

Živov, V. M., 2006: *Vostočnoslavjanskoe pravopisanie XI-XIII veka.* Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul′tury.

Povzetek: Metodološki učinki Nahtigalovih opomb o Akrostišni molitvi

Prispevek poudarja dejstvo, da je Nahtigalova analiza Akrostišne molitve vredna ponovne refleksije v luči besedilnih virov, ki so bili na razpolago šele po Nahtigalovem času. Predvsem zaključuje, da je njegova rekonstrukcija ⰶ v 12. vrstici Molitve boljša od novejših predlogov; da je bila njegova skeptičnost glede veljave ⱈ dobro podložena; in da so bile pri njegovih drugih predlogih, čeprav manj prepričljivih, upoštevane pomembne metodološke omejitve, ki jih je treba vzeti v ozir pri vsakem poskusu, da se pride do najstarejšega stanja v razvoju glagolice, ki ga je mogoče rekonstruirati.

Ključne besede: Nahtigal, Akrostišna molitev, glagolska abeceda