

Heinz Miklas

University of Vienna
Spitalgasse 2–4
Universitätscampus AAKH, Hof 3
A-1190 Wien
Heinz.Miklas@univie.ac.at

Inna Dimitrova

University of Library Studies and Information Technology
119 Carigradsko shose
BG-1784 Sofia
i.dimitrova@unibit.bg

ONCE AGAIN ABOUT THE NORTHERN ROUTE AND THE ORIGIN OF CROATIAN GLAGOLITICISM

Abstract:

We are used to looking for the origin of Croatian Glagoliticism into two directions – into the north, from the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in the Moravo-Pannonian area, and into the south, from Bulgaria, where after their flight from Moravia a few Cyrillo-Methodian pupils continued the work of their teachers from 886 onward.

Concerning the northern route, the earliest Croatian written sources from the 11th century and historical information such as the letter of Pope John X from 925 have mostly been used (cf., e.g., BIRNBAUM 1995-96). But the crux of this assumption was that no conclusive examples were found of phenomena that could be explained solely from the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition of Moravia or Pannonia.

In this paper we want to draw attention to a first such piece of evidence, namely the oldest record of the original sound value of the Glagolitic character **Ѣ**. Not only does it indicate the direction from which it was imported, but it also provides an idea of when this happened.

Keywords: Constantine's Glagolica, northern route of Croatian Glagoliticism, the classifying letter "Kit".

1. Introduction: The newly created Slavic literary culture did not emerge and develop in isolation – its history largely depends on the region and cultural interactions with the peoples living in and bordering around the Slavic community. Consequently, a number of Glagolitic phenomena can be explained only if they are placed in their contextual environment – of a historical, socio-political and linguistic nature.

The documented early history of this alphabet (abecedaria, alphabet verses, Glagolitic texts, epigraphic monuments, and others) can be classified into several stages, with the following chronological development (MIKLAS 2018: 162):

- Preclassical phase: app. 886-919
- Classical phase: 920-975
- Postclassical phase: 976-1100

For the earliest history, however, which concerns the creation of the alphabet and its use in Moravia-Pannonia (ca. 863-885), the facts are scanty. Nonetheless, some peculiarities and discrepancies in the written sources offer an opportunity for reflection on the earliest stages of the implementation of the Glagolitic alphabet in this region. In our paper we will focus on one such example, which, in our opinion, would support the hypothesis of the dissemination of the Glagolica not only to Bulgaria, but also to Dalmatia, even before 886. Our research is based on evidence from metagraphic¹ sources, typological research, and textual data.

2. The letter Ѡ in the alphabet: One of the most puzzling issues regarding the early Glagolitic writing system, still under discussion, concerns the graph Ѡ, its initial phonetic value and its place in the Constantinian alphabet.² In later abecedaries (cf. fig.1) the letter occupies the 26th position in the alphabet paradigm, with a numerical value of 800, but the oldest and more reliable abecedaries and metagraphic sources present a different sign for this position, a correlate of the Greek letter *Pi* or *Psi* (cf. the so called P_т – problem³). The synopsis of the above sources by MARTI/VEDER (2000.b: 234) displays the variability in the alphabet paradigm, observed in position 26 – after the letter Ω (later Ωt, for *Omega*) where the earliest abecedaria show several letters: pe, P Π, Δ, Ѡ, Ɱ, ϣ, ϣ⁴:

25	ot	Ɱ ω	Ɱ	Ɱ ot	Ɱ ω̄	ω	Ɱ ω̄	ω̄
26	pe	P Π	Δ	Ѡ šća	Ѡ б	ω	Ѡ ϣ	ϣ

Fig. 1: Position 26 with the greatest variation in the Glagolitic alphabet sources

This information is also confirmed by the Glagolitic *numeraria* (VEDER 2000.b: 235)⁵:

¹ Abecedaria, numeraria, acronymic poems such as the Azbučna Molitva, and hymnography.

² Detailed overview in: VELCHEVA 1988, VELCHEVA 2007, ŽAGAR 2013, ŽAGAR 2021: 231-232; 260-263.

³ See KEMPGEN 2008: 86, in spite of the earlier explanation by MIKLAS 2003.

⁴ The *abecedaria* considered by the authors are: Preslav, Paris, München, Roč; various Glagolitic, also from Bohemia; Stockholm, Čajnice, Tour, Radosav. The newly found Sinai abecedarium from the 11th c. (but based on an earlier exemplar) shows in position 27 дl, cf. PDS 2/2021: 187.

⁵ The *numeraria* are: various from the Grigorovič Parimejnik; various, including such from Bohemia; Radosav, Bosnian-Cyrillic, main Cyrillic, Greek.



Fig. 2: the relevant position in the Glagolitic numeraria

Similarly, in early *alphabetic poems* and *alphabetic hymnographic* works, there occurs a paradigmatic change, and the phonological correlate of the letter after Ω is represented with a *pe/prk*-acronym: печаль, пѣсньми, while the *št* (Ψ) lexemes (цѣстоуѣжъ, шѣствина, цю, цитомь) are moved further down to position 30:

25	Ψ w		OTZ	\bar{w}	\bar{w}	w	\bar{w}
26	печаль		пѣсньми	пѣсньми	Ψ пѣснь- ми	пѣсньми	о обличѣжъ
27	Ψ цѣло- мѣдѣно		цѣсарь- ствоуѣжъ	цѣсарь- ствоуѣжъ	Ц цѣсарь- ство	цѣсарю	ци (цѣ- нѣжъ)
28	Ψ човѣдеса	чаш, чес, чин, чис	чини	човѣдеса	ч чловеѣ- колюб-	чиномь	ч чрѣвь
29	ш шесто- крил-	шюм	шесто- крил-	шесто- крил-	ш шесто- крил-	шѣствина	ш шючюмь
30	Ψ цѣстоуѣ- жъ		шѣствина	шѣствина	ш цю (што)	иного	ш цитомь
31	Ψ имени		игри	игри	з керомь		з кердань

Fig. 3: Changes in the letter-positions in alphabetic poems and hymnographical works

Some of these variations, in our opinion, must be examined in the light of the alphabetic changes that occurred after the alphabet had been brought to Moravia in 863 and during the following years of continuous use until Methodius' death in 885.

3. Constantine-Cyril's Classifiers: It is a well-known fact that typologically Constantine-Cyril's phonographic system is composed of elements with a clearly expressed functional orientation. Each of its units has at least five main components – number (position in the system) in connection with the numeric value, name, form and sound-correlation. The system is organized according to the inherited historical features of the two most significant writing systems – Semitic and Greek, but at the same time it adopts a number of new elements from the so-called Caucasian letters – Armenian and especially Georgian alphabets⁶. For its time, it was innovative both with the unique appearance of its letters (as a distant script⁷, like the Caucasian)

⁶ Cf. TRUNTE 2004, ŽAGAR 2021: 96-102, MIKLAS 2007, DIMITROVA 2016.

⁷ Distant script (Abstandsschrift) – in alphabet typology – a writing system that is functionally close to a certain typological model, but differs in appearance (for example, the Caucasian alphabets, which follow the Greek archetype, but have different graphic forms). The expanded model (Ausbauschrift), on the other hand, borrows the whole archetype's phonetic paradigm and respective letter images, supplementing units for local phonemic variants (e.g. Coptic script, Cyrillic, Gothic) (cf. MIKLAS 2007: 7).

and with a rather phonological than phonetic rendering of the living Slavic speech, fixed in the sound correlates of the graphic units.

However, the intended number of letters (36, caused by the arithmetic value of 4 rows with 9 units, as in the Caucasian) by far exceeded the number of units in the Slavic sound system. Thus, Constantine supplemented the script with signs intended to reflect lexical and other features of Christian texts, thereby adding a new functional level related to the specific Christian theological terminology. These elements, designated as “classifiers”, are homophonic or allophonic doublets that serve to denote a specific theological vocabulary, some of them containing non-Slavic sounds and combinations⁸. In the vocal chain – these are the pairs of letters with the same phonetic value /i/, /o/, /ü/ (=v vs. ю), and in the consonant chain – the letters for the palatals /g'/ - /k'/ - /ch'/, as well as the single /f/ (as in *г'еен'на, к'итъ, х'ерувимъ* on the one hand, and *φαραωνъ* on the other).

⚭ – a/1	⚡ – i/10	⚭ – r/100	⚭ – č/1000
⚭ – b/2	⚡ – v/20	⚭ – s/200	⚭ – š/2000
⚡ – v/3	⚡ – γ/30	⚭ – t/300	⚡ – Ъ/3000
⚡ – g/4	⚡ – κ/40	⚡ – v/400	⚡ – Ъ/4000
⚡ – d/5	⚡ – l/50	⚡ – φ/500	⚡ – ě/5000
⚡ – e/6	⚡ – m/60	⚡ – χ/600	⚡ – ch/6000
⚡ – ž/7	⚡ – n/70	⚡ – ω/700	⚡ – a/7000
⚡ – dz/8	⚡ – o/80	⚡ – k/800	⚡ – ü/8000
⚡ – z/9	⚡ – p/90	⚡ – c/900	⚡ – ě/9000

Fig. 4: Constantine’s Greek classifiers (acc. to MIKLAS 2016)

When the alphabet was transferred to Moravia, these elements had a specific regional development. Since they were not fully supported by the Slavic phonological system and were, to some extent, contradicting the initially adopted phonographic principle (one sound : one graph), in the new Latin-influenced environment they were recognized as foreign to the Slavic phonological system. However, as the Glagolitic numeric system was originally designed after the Caucasian model (to include digits for the thousands), the letters for the classifiers were preserved in the alphabet and, in accordance with the principle of semantic coherence of the Slavic alphabet described in the treatise “O Pismenechъ” (24 letters arranged after the Greek

⁸ For the following see also MIKLAS 2003 and 2007.a: 20.

period shed light on the development of the Glagolitic system in its new Greek literary environment.

Thus, in the *Alphabet poem* written by Constantine of Preslav before 893¹², the Moravo-Pannonian position of the letter **Ѣ** (*Kitъ*) in the alphabet paradigm (after *Omega*), is marked by the acronym *Pečalb* (**Ѣ**ечаль), and in the probably contemporary acrostics *Roždestvenskij* and *Bogojavlenskij* (dated ca. 886) (cf. POPOV 1985: 51), by the acronym *Pěsni* (**Ѣ**ΔΡΞ), wrongly introduced, as we assume, by Constantine of Preslav, in his attempt to reconstruct the original sound-correlate¹³. The newly devised *Prъ* acronym also appears in some abecedaries of the 12th-13th cc. (cf. fig.1).

Since there was no need for a second *P* in the alphabet, the graphic form **Ѣ**, due to its similarity with **Ш**, started soon to be used as a second correlate of /š/ (“*Fancy Ša*”) – which in the further course of events became *Šta* (CHRISTOVA-ŠOMOVA; MIKLAS 2022: 32–39). That is why remnants of the long-out-of-use letter name *Kitъ* can be traced in the alphabet verses both as **Ѣ**СТОУѢ (where the so-called “*Fancy Ša*” appears), and, under a wrongful onomasiological interpretation of the lexeme with the ultimately achieved fixation of the letter as equivalent of East Bulgarian /št/, as **Štitъ* (“shield”). In Cyrillic on the Glagolitic basis **Ш** is formed.

Instead of abandoning the already redundant letter *P-2*, it was retained in the conservative abecedaria. However, its graphic representation as **Ѣ** was no longer possible. The sources testify that the scribes constantly searched for a graphic image of the given phonetic unit (cf. fig. 6) and found various solutions: In the Sinai abecedarium (Sin.), the form derives from the Cyrillic/Greek **Π**, “glagolitized” with the typical Glagolitic circle(s); in the Munich abecedaria (Mon.) – the forms of the letter are based on the Cyrillic **Π** and the Latin *P*; the scribe Radoslav depicts the letter with a new *Frъtъ* (because of the pronunciation of *Phi* as /p/); in the Paris abecedarium Constantine of Preslav’s acronym *Pečalb* is syllabically shortened to *Pe* (as it happens with other Glagolitic letters in their further development – e.g. *herъ*, *ci*, *g’e*, etc.); and in the Čajnice abecedarium the scribe does not use a specific form at all, but the letter is depicted by its numerical substitute *Omeg* (cf. MIKLAS 2004: 395):

¹² Only preserved in Cyrillic copies, the earliest of the 12th c.

¹³ partly according to the form of the letter *Psi*, partly according to the order of the Greek alphabet (the sequence *Omicron* → *Pi*) and partly due to the requirements of the liturgical pre-feast alphabet chants, where the daily vespers and mornings for the first 5/6 days contain sets-of-three letter verses, thematically linked to the forthcoming celebration. For details on alphabet representations in hymnography cycles Cf. STIPČEVIĆ 1981: 98, DIMITROVA 2021: 187.

<i>cyr.</i>	<i>cyr./lat.</i>	<i>glag. (gr.-cyr. substitute for Φ)</i>	<i>name</i>	<i>numer. translit.</i>
Ѡ	П/P	ƒ	pe(čalь)	w
Sin.	Mon.-cyr./glag.	Radosav	Paris (AM)	Čajniče

Fig. 6: Various attempts by the scribes to find the right image for *P-2*

Of the three palatal classifiers only **Ѡ** is well preserved because it often occurs in important words such as *evang'elie*, while the others gradually became obsolete (not without leaving interesting traces, cf. the fate of “*Chlьmь*”¹⁴).

Due to the considerable transformation of the letter **Ѣ** (*Kitь*) in Bulgaria discussed above, which followed the earlier Moravo-Pannonian changes in both the initial phonetic value and the paradigmatic position of this graph, we can hardly anticipate any remnants of the primary Constantinian sound value *k'* of the Greek palatal classifier **Ϝ** (*Kitь*) in sources originating from Bulgaria. To find the missing link, which would support the hypothesis for an early sound shift of the graphic sign, we directed our attention to other regions of the Slavic cultural milieu where the written tradition might retain traces of the earliest Glagolitic system. And indeed, in one such source, originating from Dalmatia, we found a record of the original sound value of the letter **Ѣ** (*Kitь*).

5. Traces of *Kit* in Croatia: According to the *Vitae* of Clement and Naum, some of the Cyrillo-Methodian followers arrived and, supposedly, developed a literary activity in the region of Dalmatia. Despite the fact that no firm record of their cultural mission has survived to our time, the long, continuous development of the Glagolitic tradition in this region throughout the centuries, following the demise of the First Bulgarian Empire, lead to the conclusion that, if systematically sought for, remnants of earlier texts can be found there – either in the form of relic features in later codices or as palimpsests. Thus, in at least five Croatian manuscripts¹⁵ in the Service of the Saints (Valentin,) Cyril and Methodius – we find the form **ѢѢѢѢѢ** for the holy monk's name *Kyrill-*, in which the grapheme **Ѣ** appears as a positional variant of *K*:

¹⁴ DIMITROVA 2018: 42-75; DIMITROVA 2021: 193-194.

¹⁵ i.e., the Breviary Vatican Illir. 6, ff. 208b-209c from the second half of the 14th c., the Paris Miscellany Slav. 73, f. 3r from 1375, the Academy breviary HAZU IIIc12, f. 69r from the end of the 14th c. (ŠIMIĆ 2014), the printed Baromić breviary, f. 324b from 1493, and the Second Breviary of Novi, ff. 407b–408d from the end of the 15th c. (PANTELIĆ; NAZOR 1977); cf. MIKLAS 2018: 174.

Се свети ерѣи твои, господи, валентинъ, **щуриль** и метудии, славу вѣка отвр'гше, того ради прити утегу, тобою **щедрещим**, к' с'вршеному степену (II. Breviary of Novi: ff. 407b–408d, translit. acc. to LAVROV 1930: 138).

In the given example, the form **Щ** reflects both the known later correlate *št* – derived from Bulgaria via the Southern Route – and the relic phonetic value for the same grapheme – *k'*, used repeatedly in this transcript and replaced in other similar texts by the generalized *K* (ⱿⱿъⱿⱿⱿ) or other regional reflexes. Despite the late dating of the text (STANCHEV 2003: 669), from a graphematic point of view, the relic form of the name bears clear traces of the early phonetic value of the Glagolitic grapheme **Щ**, when it reflected in the Constantinian alphabet the voiceless equivalent of the well-preserved palatal classifier **Ѡ** (*G'en'na*) and for which no testimony has been found so far in the monuments originating from Bulgaria.

Based on this evidence and the above considerations, we can assume that the existence of the relic reading for the palatal classifier **Щ** in Croatian sources is a phenomenon which can only be explained in terms of the earliest literary itineraries of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition from the (Moravo-) Pannonian realm, i.e., the Northern route (cf. MIHALJEVIĆ 2017: 190).

This finding also suggests that efforts to discover new such monuments/texts, possibly as palimpsests, from the region of Dalmatia may prove to be quite rewarding and provide important facts about the origin and the development of the early Croatian Glagoliticism.

Sažetak:

Navikli smo podrijetlo hrvatskoga glagoljaštva tražiti u dva smjera – prema sjeveru, iz ćirilometodske tradicije na moravo-panonskom području, i prema jugu, iz Bugarske, gdje su stigli nakon bijega iz Moravske neki ćirilometodijsci učenici i su nastavili rad svojih učitelja od 886. nadalje.

Što se tiče sjevernog puta, do sada se uvijek pozivalo na najranije hrvatske pisane izvore iz 11. stoljeća i povijesne podatke poput pisma pape Ivana X. iz 925. godine (vidi npr. BIRNBAUM 1995-96). No srž te pretpostavke bila je da nema konačnih primjera fenomena pronađeni su koji bi se mogli objasniti isključivo iz ćirilo-metodske tradicije Moravske ili Panonije.

U ovom radu želimo skrenuti pozornost na prvi takav primjer, odnosno najstariji dokaz grafeme „Kit“ **Щ**. On ne samo pokazuje smjer odakle je uvezen, već također daje ideju o vremenu kada se to dogodilo.

Zusammenfassung:

Wir sind es gewohnt, den Ursprung des kroatischen Glagolitismus in zwei Richtungen zu suchen – im Norden, in der kyrillo-methodianischen Tradition des moravisch-pannonischen Raums, und im Süden, in Bulgarien, wo nach ihrer Flucht aus Moravien einige kyrillomethodianische Schüler die Arbeit ihrer Lehrer ab 886 fortsetzten.

Hinsichtlich der Nordroute wurde bisher immer auf die frühesten schriftlichen kroatischen Quellen aus dem 11. Jahrhundert und historische Informationen wie den Brief von Papst Johannes X. aus dem Jahr 925 verwiesen (vgl. z.B. BIRNBAUM 1995-96). Der Haken an dieser Annahme war jedoch, dass keine schlüssigen Beispiele für Phänomene gefunden werden konnten, die allein aus der kyrillo-methodianischen Tradition Moraviens oder Pannoniens erklärt werden konnten.

In dieser Arbeit wollen wir auf ein erstes Beweisstück dieser Art aufmerksam machen, und zwar die ältesten Belege des Graphems „Kit“ Ɀ. Sie geben nicht nur die Richtung an, aus der sie importiert wurden, sondern liefern auch eine Vorstellung davon, wann dies geschah.

Acknowledgements: This research paper was supported by the Bulgarian Science and Research Fund Project КП-06-Н60/9 dd 17.11.2021 “Interdisciplinary Research of Manuscript Monuments”.

References:

- BIRNBAUM, H. 1995-96. How did Glagolitic Writing Reach the Coastal Regions of Northwestern Croatia? *Croatica*. Prinosi proučavanju hrvatske književnosti 42/44: 69–79.
- CHRISTOVA-ŠOMOVA, I.; MIKLAS, H. 2022 (eds.). *Apostolus Eninensis (Bibliothecae Nationalis Bulgaricae codex 1144). Editio nova*. Praeparaverunt I. CHRISTOVA-ŠOMOVA, H. MIKLAS, D. IORDANOV. Cum dissertationibus S. BRENNER, F. CAPPA, B. FRÜHMANN, W. VETTER ET M. SCHREINER. Sub redactione ... Sofia-Wien: Univ. izdatelstvo „Sv. Kliment Ochridski“/Holzhausen Verlag.
- DIMITROVA, I. 2016. Interaction of Semitic and Greek Models in the First Slavic Script System. *Kirilo-Methodievski studii* 25: 424–435.
- DIMITROVA, I. 2018 = ДИМИТРОВА, И. 2018. Към въпроса за двете букви х в глаголицата и създаването на х2. *Трудове на Университета по библиотекознание и информационни*

- технологии*, т. 16: 42–75. [Kъм въпроса за двете букви *x* в глаголицата и създаването на *x2*.
Trudove na Universiteta po bibliotekoznanie i informacionni tehnologii, т. 16: 42–75]
- DIMITROVA, I. 2021 = ДИМИТРОВА, И. 2021. *Глаголицата в съвременните изследвания. Теории за произхода на глаголицата*. София: За буквите/О писменехъ. [*Glagolicata v sãvremennite izsledvanija. Teorii za proizchoda na glagolicata*. Sofia: Za bukvite/O pismenexhъ]
- DOBREV 1969. = ДОБРЕВ, И. В защита на глаголическите писмена. В: *Бълг. език*, XIX, 1969, бр. 3, с. 241-246. [V zaštita na glagoličeskite pismena. In: *Bãlgarski ezik*, XIX, 1969, 3, pp. 241-246]
- DURNOVO, N. N. 1929. = ДУРНОВО, Н. Н. Мысли и предположения о происхождении старославянского языка и славянских алфавитов. – В: *Byzantoslavica*, 1929, 1: 48-85. [Mysli i predpoloženija o proischoždenii staroslavjanskogo jazyka i slavjanskih alfavitov. *Byzantoslavica*, 1929, 1: 48-85.]
- GEORGIEV, V. 1982. = ГЕОРГИЕВ, В. Възникването на палаталните съгласни *k'* и *g'* от *št'*, *zh'd'* в югозападни български говори. *Бълг. език*, XXXII, 1982, бр. 5: 398-404. [Vãznikvaneto na palatalnite sãglasni *k'* i *g'* ot *s't'*, *zh'd'* v jugozapadnite bãlgarski govori. *Bãlgarski ezik*, XXXII, 1982, 5: 398-404.]
- ILČEV, P. 1985a. = ИЛЧЕВ, П. Азбуки. В: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия*. Т. 1. София, БАН, 1985: 34-49. [Azbuki. In: *Kirilo-Metodievska enciklopedija*, vol. 1. Sofia: BAN, 1985: 34-49.]
- ILČEV, P. 1985b. = ИЛЧЕВ, П. Глаголица. В: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия*. Т. 1. София, БАН, 1985: 491-509. [Glagolica. In: *Kirilo-Metodievska enciklopedija*, vol.1. Sofia: BAN, 1985: 491-509.]
- JOVANOVIĆ-STIPČEVIĆ, B. 1980 = ЈОВАНОВИЋ-СТИПЧЕВИЋ, Б. Текстолошка условљеност састава и броја слова старословенске азбуке према стихирама на Рођење и Крштење у српском препису. *Археографски прилози* 3: 93–121 [Tekstološka uslovljenost sastava i broja slova staroslovenske azbuke prema stihirama na Rodene i Krstenje u srpskom prepisu. *Arheografski prilozi* 3: 93–121]
- KEMPGEN, S. 2008. Glagolitic "Pe": fact or fiction?. – In: *Scripta & e-scripta*, 2008, No 6: 65-82.
- LAVROV, P. A. 1930 = ЛАВРОВ, П. А. 1930. *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности*. (Труды Славянской комиссии АН СССР. Т.1.) Ленинград: АН СССР. [*Materialy po istorii vozniknovenija drevnejšej slavjanskoj pis'mennosti* (Trudy Slavjanskoj komissii AN SSSR. T. 1). Leningrad: AN SSSR].
- MIHALJEVIĆ, M. 2017. Croatian Glagolism Between the West and the East. *Konstantínove listy* 10 / 1, 2017: 190 – 197 DOI: 10.17846/CL.2017.10.1.190-197
- MIKLAS, H. 2000. *Glagolitica – Zum Ursprung der slavischen Schriftkultur* (ÖAW, Phil.-hist. Kl., Schriften der Balkan-Kommission, Philologische Abt. 41), herausgegeben von H. MIKLAS unter der Mitarbeit von S. RICHTER und V. SADOVSKI. Wien: ÖAW.
- MIKLAS, H. 2003. Jesus-Abbreviatur und Verwandtes: Zu einigen Rätseln der glagolitischen Schriftentwicklung am Material der Azbučnaja molitva. In: *Time flies. Festschrift for William R.*

- Veder on the occasion of his departure as Professor of Slavic linguistics at the University of Amsterdam*, ed. W. HONSELAAR, H. VAN DER TAAK et alii (Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies 2). Amsterdam: 171–204.
- MIKLAS, H. 2004. Zur Relevanz des neuen sinaitischen Materials für die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Glagolica. In: *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa povodom 100. obljetnice Staroslavenske akademije i 50. obljetnice Staroslavenskog instituta*. Uredili M.-A. DÜRRIGL, M. MIHALJEVIĆ, F. VELČIĆ. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut – Krk: Krčka biskupija, 389–399.
- MIKLAS, H. 2007.a. Schrift und Bild: Zur Darstellungsfunktion der Glagolica des Slavenlehrers Konstantin-Kyrill. In: *Vom Körper zur Schrift*, herausg. von M. SCHNITTER, E. VAVRA und H. WENZEL. Redaktion: Ch. L. DIEDRICH. Sofia 2007: 45–75 u. Abb. I–IV.
- MIKLAS, H. 2007.b. = МИКЛАС, Х. 2007.b. По следите на Константиновата глаголица. *Старобългаристика* 31.1: 3–26. [Po sledite na Konstantinovata glagolica. *Palaeobulgarica* 31.1: 3–26].
- MIKLAS, H. 2016. The Glagolica during the Time of Clement of Ochrid, Sofia, Nov. 2016. [conference presentation] *Международна научна конференция „1100 години от успението на св. Климент Охридски“ София, ноем. 2016*. [доклад] [*Meždunarodna naučna konferencija „1100 godini ot uspenieto na sv. Kliment Ochridski“*].
- MIKLAS, H. 2018. The Glagolica during the time of Clement of Ochrid. In: КҮЮМДЖИЕВА, С. *Свети Климент Охридски в културата на Европа*. София: БАН, 160–195. [KUJUMDŽIEVA, S. *Sveti Kliment Ochridski v kulturata na Evropa*. Sofija: BAN, 160–195].
- PANTELIĆ, M.; NAZOR, A. (eds.) 1977. *II. Novljanski brevijar: hrvatskoglagojski rukopis iz 1495. Župni ured Novi Vinodolski*. Fototipско izdanje (Codices Selecti LXI). Graz – Zagreb.
- PDS 2/2021: *Psalterium Demetrii Sinaitici et Folia Medicinalia (Monasterii s. Catharinae codex slavicus NF 3)*. *Editio critica* (Glagolitica Sinaitica 2). Praeparaverunt H. MIKLAS, C. M. MACROBERT, A. N. SOBOLEV, D. HÜRNER, F. WANDL, M. GAU. Includuntur etiam dissertationes P. STANKOVSKA, S. BRENNER, F. KLEBER, M. SCHREINER, M. MELCHER, E. G. HAMMERSCHMID. Wien: Holzhausen.
- РОПОВ, Г. 1985. = ПОПОВ, Г. 1985. *Триодни произведения на Константин Преславски*. (Кирило-Методиевски студии, 2). София: БАН. [*Triodni proizvedenija na Konstantin Preslavski* (Kirilo-Methodievski studii, 2). Sofija: BAN].
- ŠIMIĆ, M. 2014. *Akademijin brevijar HAZU III c 12. Hrvatskoglagojski rukopis s konca 14. stoljeća*. Jezična studija, transliteracija, faksimil. Zagreb.
- TKADLČÍK, V. 1964. Dvoji *ch* v hlaholici. *Slavia*, XXXIII, 1964, no. 2: 182-193.

- TKADLČÍK, V. 1977. K datování hlaholských služeb o sv. Cyrilu a Metoději. *Slovo* 27: 85–128.
- TRUBETZKOY, N. S. 1954. *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*. Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1954.
- TRUNTE, N. 2004. Zu Reformen in der Glagolitischen Schrift. – In: DÜRRIGL, M., MIHALJEV, M. *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam*. Zagreb: Krk: Staroslavenski institut, Krčka biskupija, 2004: 419–434.
- STANČEV, K. 2003. = СТАНЧЕВ, К. Служби за Кирил и Методий. В: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия*, т.3, 2003. София: БАН, 666-670. [Službi za Kiril i Metodij. In: *Kirilo-Metodievska enciklopedija*, vol. 3. Sofia: BAN, 2003: 666-670.]
- VEDER, W.R. 2000.a. Das glagolitische Alphabet der *Azbučna Molitva*. In: MIKLAS 2000, 77–87.
- VEDER, W. R.; MARTI, R. 2000.b. Die Freiburger Diskussionsrunde zur Entstehung der Glagolica. In: MIKLAS 2000, 227–243.
- VEDER, W. R. 2004. The Glagolitic Alphabet as a Text. In: *Glagoljica i hrvatski glagolizam. Zbornik radova s međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa povodom 100. obljetnice Staroslavenske akademije i 50. obljetnice Staroslavenskog instituta*. Uredili M.-A. DÜRRIGL, M. MIHALJEVIĆ, F. VELČIĆ. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut – Krk: Krčka biskupija, 375–387.
- VELČEVA, B. 1988. = ВЕЛЧЕВА, Б. Старобългарски ШТ, ЖД и буквата Щ в глаголицата. *Palaeobulgarica*=*Старобългаристика*, XXII, 1988, бр. 1: 29-37. ISSN 0204-4021; 2603-2899 (online) [Starobălgarski št, žd i bukвата щ v glagolicata. *Palaeobulgarica*, XXII, 1988,1: 29-37.]
- VELČEVA, B. 2007 = ВЕЛЧЕВА, Б. 2007. Глаголицата и нейните абецедари до XII век. В: *Кирило-Методиевски студии* кн. 17, 2007: 108-120. [Glagolicata i nejnite abecedari do XII vek. In: *Kirilo-Metodievski studii*, 17, 2007: 108-120.]
- ŽAGAR, M. 2013. *Uvod u glagoljsku paleografiju 1 (X i XI st.)*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2013.
- ŽAGAR, M. 2021. *Introduction to Glagolitic Palaeography*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 2021.