

The following pages are scans of a document written by David Birnbaum in 1989. This document attempted to enumerate the possible requirements for encoding additional Cyrillic characters and marks for characters used in Old Church Slavonic and other early Cyrillic texts. This document by Birnbaum was used as input in creating the original repertoire of Cyrillic included in Unicode 1.0.

It is provided from the archives of Joe Becker which cover source materials for Unicode 1.0.

Diacritics for Early Cyrillic – Preliminary Listing

David J. Birnbaum

Introduction

The following preliminary list of diacritics used in early Cyrillic writing is based primarily on:

Р. В. Булатова. “Надстрочные знаки в южнославянских рукописях XI–XIV вв.” *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Вып. I. Москва, 1973, pp. 76–114.

I have supplemented Bulatova's list with additional terms mentioned in:

Е. Ф. Карский. *Славянская кирилловская палеография*. Ленинград: Издательство АН СССР. 1928. (Reprint Москва: Наука. 1979.)

В. В. Колесов, “Надстрочные знаки ‘силы’ в русской орфографической традиции.” *Восточнославянские языки, источники для их изучения*. Москва: Наука. 1973. 228–57.

В. В. Колесов, “Надстрочные знаки в русской орфографической традиции. ‘Времена’ и ‘духи’.” *Источники по истории русского языка*. Москва: Наука. 1976. 60–74.

А. А. Зализняк. *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва: Наука. 1985.

Where multiple terms exist for a single diacritic, the terms Bulatova favors are given in boldface. I personally prefer to use Greek terms (in their Russian form), which is also the preference of the editors of the handbook in which Bulatova's article appears (p. 131). Notations of stress below reflect modern usage; in early Slavic grammatical treatises the terms are stressed as in Greek.

There is a number of additional accentual and decorative diacritics, described in certain early Slavic grammatical treatises, that should be catalogued and added to this list. (These treatises may also provide information on alternative names and graphic variants for some diacritics already represented in this inventory.) Neumes and other musical diacritics in Slavic manuscripts are relatively poorly understood and still require study and cataloguing.

Inventory

I. Abbreviation (знаки сокращения)

тѣтло (τίτλος), (Karskij: взмѣт): ˘ ˘
 взмѣт, (Karsij: титло): ˘
 покрѣтїе: ˘
 смѣчѣц: ˘

Notes: Karskij's титло is Bulatova's взмѣт and vice versa. Karskij uses смѣчѣц to designate a double acute and does not include the abbreviative diacritic to which Bulatova assigns this name.

II. Anlaut (знаки словесного приступа)

псѣла (ψιλή), тонкое придыхание (spiritus lenis), (Kolesov: псиль, псили, лагодная, краткая, звательцо, запятая, острая, тонкая): ˘
 дасѣя (δασεία), густое придыхание (spiritus asper), (Kolesov: сипливая): ˘

Notes: the general term for these is **спиритус**. Traditionally used over word- and syllable-initial vowels (vowels not preceded by a consonant, неприкрытые гласные), possibly (in some cases) to indicate jotation. Bulatova reserves the terms звательцо, звательница, звательное for the use of ˘ over the first syllable of any word, including consonant-initial syllables. These items may be replaced by точка or две точки (˘, ˘). Bulatova incorrectly (?) writes δασέα for δασεία and spells "звателцо" and "звателное" without soft signs (although звательница).

III. Syllable division or replacement of missing letters (знаки слогаделения или заменяющие отсутствующие буквы)

апостроф (ἀπόστροφος): ˘
 пѣерок (ерок, ерчик, ертица): ˘

Note: graphic form varies considerably among scribes and manuscripts.

IV. Stress

ѡксѣя (ὀξεῖα), акѣт (acutus), острое ударение, (Kolesov: оксь, пооксь, острая): ˘
 вѣрѣя (βαρεῖα), гравис (gravis), тяжелое ударение: ˘
 камбра (καμάρα), периспомѣна (περισπωμένη), циркумфлѣкс (circumflexus), обложенное ударение, (Karskij: периспомѣнь), (Kolesov: переспомени, обложенная, покрѣшка): ˘

am unable to find any reference to it, I can think of no good reason for my having included it originally, and I ^{now} _{am} inclined to think it may be spurious, in which case it should be deleted.