

## Uncommon Definite Forms of Possessive Adjectives in the Old Bulgarian Translation of Athanasius of Alexandria's *Orations Against the Arians*<sup>1</sup>

Tatyana Slavova

**Abstract:** The article discusses the uncommon definite forms (with pronominal declension) of the possessive adjectives formed with -ов-, -ь and -ии/-ьи in the Old Bulgarian translation of Athanasius of Alexandria's *Orations Against the Arians*, carried out by Konstantin of Preslav in 906. The translation survives only in Russian manuscripts ranging from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The Russian origin of the manuscripts raises the following question: have the definite forms of the possessive adjectives discussed here been the result of the spreading of the manuscripts in a Russian environment? Although rare, definite forms of possessive adjectives ending in -ов-, -ь and -ии/-ьи have been found in Old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian texts. This means that although uncommon, these forms were part of the Old Bulgarian language and the bishop Konstantin of Preslav could have used this declension model. The author argues that the uncommon definite forms of the possessive adjectives *вожини, отъчь, доуховъ, съпасовъ, хръстовъ* are part of the translation strategy of bishop Konstantin of Preslav to distinguish between God the Father, God the Son, the Holy Spirit, and Christ the Saviour, on the one hand, and created beings, on the other hand.

**Key words:** possessive adjectives, Athanasius of Alexandria, *Orations Against the Arians*, Konstantin of Preslav

---

<sup>1</sup> This article has been written under the research project „Bulgaria between the Christianity and the heresies” financed by the Bulgarian National Science Fund (BNSF). Decision number: КП 06-ОПР 05/3/ 2018.

Old Bulgarian adjectives can be of two forms: short and long (with pronominal declension), corresponding to indefinite and definite meanings, respectively. The long and short forms of the adjectives have different syntactical functions and have different declensions. In general, the long form (also known as definite, or with pronominal declension) is used attributively, whereas the short form (also known as indefinite or simple) is predicative. Possessive adjectives, formed from nouns by means of the endings *-ов/-ев-, -ин-, -ъ < \*-jъ, -ън-ъ* and *-ии/-ьи < \*-ьjъ* hold a special place. From a semantic point of view these adjectives contain to the greatest degree characteristics such as concreteness and specificity, and precisely because of their visible lexical definiteness, they did not need any definite forms. Therefore these possessive adjectives have only indefinite forms, including the cases when they are used with the meaning of definite ones. A. Vaillant points to a few exceptions from this rule, such as *вели(и)хъ рѣиѣъ* Jo 21:11 Codex Zographensis, Savvina Kniga (evangelarium), Codex Assemanianus (*вели* Codex Marianus); *вожиихъ рѣрѣхъ* Codex Suprasliensis 457.23; *кесареваѣ* Mk 12:17 Codex Zographensis (*кесарова* Codex Marianus); *кръвѣ христовѣ* Codex Suprasliensis 483.23 (Vajan 1952: 145, 157).

My research has revealed that the definite forms of the possessive adjectives by means of the endings *-ов-, -ъ* and *-ии/-ьи* are very common in the Old Bulgarian translation of Athanasius of Alexandria's *Orations Against the Arians*, carried out by Konstantin of Preslav in 906.<sup>2</sup> The exploration draws upon all ten Russian manuscripts ranging from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries.<sup>3</sup> For example, in the text of *Oration I* (Vaillant 1954) we can find the following five possessive adjectives, which have 27 definite forms used attributively:

**БОЖИИ** (20): *βαζουμα βοжиаѣ* f. 60<sup>b</sup>23 τῆς περὶ θεοῦ, *βοжиаѣго оѡбраза* f. 27<sup>a</sup>5 τοῦ θεοῦ, *βοжиаѣго естъства* f. 20<sup>b</sup>25 τοῦ θεοῦ, *βοжиаѣго естъства* f. 21<sup>a</sup>5 τοῦ θεοῦ, *бѡжиаѣго словесе* f. 53<sup>a</sup>12 τῆς τοῦ λόγου δικαιοσύνης, *βοжиаѣго словесе* f. 12<sup>b</sup>14 τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, *βοжиаѣго словесе* f. 55<sup>a</sup>9 τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, *βοжиаѣго словесе* f. 58<sup>a</sup>25 τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, *бѣжиихъ книгѣ* f. 12<sup>a</sup>22 τῆς θείας γραφῆς, *βοжиихъ книгѣ* f. 26<sup>b</sup>16 τῶν θείων γραφῶν, *βοжиихъ книгѣ* f. 31<sup>b</sup>17 τῶν θείων γραφῶν, *βοжиѣ книгѣ/книгѣ* f. 54<sup>b</sup>8 τὰ θεῖα λόγια, f. 57<sup>a</sup>7 τῶν θείων γραφῶν, f. 59<sup>b</sup>10 τῆς ... θείας γραφῆς, *бѣжиихъ писаниѣ* f.

<sup>2</sup> The most essential information regarding the translation of the Orations into Old Bulgarian comes from the colophon found in most of our manuscripts (see Feder 2018).

<sup>3</sup> A – RNB Pogodin № 968, year 1489; Б – RGB, f. 113, № 437, year 1488; В – RGB, f. 209, № 791, 15<sup>th</sup> c.; Г – RGB, f. 199, № 59, 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> c.; Д – GIM Sin. № 20, years 1480–1490; Е – RNB Sol. № 63, 16<sup>th</sup> c.; Ж – GIM Sin. № 994, 16<sup>th</sup> c.; З – RNB Sofijsk. № 1321, 16<sup>th</sup> c.; И – GIM Sin. № 180, 16<sup>th</sup> c.; К – RGB, F. 209, № 99, 18<sup>th</sup>. The examples referred here follow manuscript A.

Заглавие  
на статията

9<sup>a</sup>18 τῶν θείων γραφῶν, вожїиχъ писанїи f. 13<sup>a</sup>23 τῶν θείων γραφῶν, вожїи словесъ f. 15<sup>a</sup>25 τῶν θείων λογίων, вожїи словесъ f. 54<sup>b</sup>6 τῶν θείων λογίων, вѣ сынохъ вожїиχъ f. 58<sup>b</sup>1 ἐν υἰοῖς θεοῦ, вожїиχъ книгахъ f. 63<sup>a</sup>21 ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς

отъчь (4): ὄτѣααдо състава f. 13<sup>b</sup>8 τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδιον, ὄтѣаадо ѣтъства f. 13<sup>b</sup>10 τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, ѣтъства ὄтѣаадо f. 21<sup>a</sup>23 οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, ὄтѣаадо ѣтъства f. 24<sup>b</sup>4 τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας

доуховъ (1) доуховѣѣ влѣтъ f. 52<sup>b</sup>6 τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτος (БГЕК дѣовнѣю)

съпасовъ (1) съпасовоуоумѣ словеси f. 16<sup>b</sup>8 τοῦ σωτῆρος λόγον (БК хвомѣ, ГЕ спѣсовоуоу, ДЖЗИК хвоумоу)

хрьстовъ (1) хрьстоваадо ὄтца f. 45<sup>a</sup>25 τοῦ Χριστοῦ πατέρα (БДЖЗИК хѣва, ГЕ хрьстоваадо).

The Russian origin of the manuscripts raises the question: have the definite forms of the possessive adjectives discussed here been the result of the spreading of the manuscripts in a Russian environment? This could be so because, unlike the Bulgarian language in which the development of the definite article (including among adjectives) has led to the loss of the pronominal declension of the adjectives, in Russian the forms of the pronominal declension of the adjectives takes the upper hand and only some adjectives in their special function have the indefinite (short) forms (Ivanov 1983: 308, 312–313).

Are the uncommon definite forms of the possessive adjectives in *Oration I Against the Arians* due to the role of the Russian scribes or were they inherent part of the Old Bulgarian protograph itself? I believe that evidence supports the second hypothesis for several reasons.

First, the definite (pronominal) forms of the respective possessive adjectives ending in -ов-, -ь-, -ьн-ь and -ии/-ьи are not exhausted by the four examples provided by A. Vaillant. In the classical Old Bulgarian corpus of texts (based on Jagić 1879; Jagić 1883; Sever'janov 1922; Meyer 1935; Slovník 1–52; SS 1999; SBR 1–2; Penkova 2008), there are at least nine more possessive adjectives (аадовъ, вожїи, владзичьнь, господьнь, дружьнь, кесаровъ, овьчь, пилалць, хрьстовъ), among which there are twenty four definite forms used attributively (some substantive):

**Codex Zographensis:** кесаровъ (2): Mt 22:21 въздадите оубо кесароваа кесаревнн (кесарева Codex Marianus, Codex Assemanianus), Lc 20:25 въздадите оубо кесаревое (кесарева Codex Marianus), овьчь (1): Jo 10:1 въ дворъ овьчїи

**Codex Marianus:** овьчь (1): Jo 10:1 въ дворъ овьчїи

**Codex Assemanianus:** овьчь (3): Jo 10:1 въ дворъ овьчїи, Mt 7:15 къ вамъ въ одеждѣхъ овьчїиχъ (овьчѣхъ Codex Marianus, Codex Zographensis), Jo 5:2 на овьчїи кѣпѣви (овьчїи Codex Marianus, Codex Zographensis)

**Euchologium Sinaiticum:** пилаць (1): помами *пилациѣѣ* оубоѣвѣшиѣ са f. 49b  
**Glagolita Clozianus:** хрьстовъ (2): *хъвое* благовѣстѣствоуѣтѣ рождѣство ... благовѣстиша *хъвое* из мрѣтвѣзихъ порожденье 14а; **владзичънь** (1): сзмотрѣливзнна творѣ. а дьнесь *владзичънѣ* f. 13а

**Psalterium Sinaiticum:** овъчъ (2): горзи да възграсте сѣѣ ѣко овъни. ꙗ хлзми ѣко агньци *овъчии* Ps113:6, поѣатъ ꙗ отъ стадъ *овъчихъ* Ps77:70

**Codex Suprasliensis:** адовъ (1): *адова* побѣда изъезе f. 487.3  
 вожи (6): ꙗже и вѣ о рабѣхъ *вожихъ* f. 213.5, приа женѣ си. не бракоу обшгѣнѣ. нъ *вожихъ* таинъ f. 242.22, гнѣвааше са о *вожихъ* оучениихъ f. 403.21, начънъ же отъ мосеа друуга *бжиаго* врьха пророкъ f. 478.5, *божиаго* крѣштенья обратити хоштѣ слово f. 495.7, оглашаа отъ *бжихъ* книгъ f. 514.17

господьнь (1): тражштѣмъ са. ꙗко *господьне* пришьствие f. 467.29  
 друужьнь (1): радочѣши са съмрѣти *друужьни* f. 314.22  
 хрьсто(со)въ (2): благовѣствоваша. *христосовое* изъ мрѣтвѣзихъ порожденье f. 452.3, тоу ноѣ *хсовзи* образъ f. 460.15.

Similar definite forms of the possessive adjectives resurface in the works by Bulgarian men of letters from the ninth - eleventh centuries, that have been preserved in later Slavonic copies, such as:

**Vita Constantini:** хрьстовъ (1): *христовымъ* (in lieu of *хѣвмь* именѣ нарицаемо) (Slovník 48: 796; Kliment Ohridski 1973: 99)

**Constantini Philosophi Tracratu de fide orthodoxa**, a. 1348 (Napisanije o pravěji věřě) (manuscriptum Laurentii presbyteri, RNB F.I.376): отъчъ (1): Измѣнное *ѡчѣе* подѣние f. 96а (Slovník 23: 625)

**Evangelium Didacticum Constantini Preslavensis (Učitel'noe Evangelie):** вожи (7): не да извѣститѣ кѣтѣство сѣна *божиаго* f. 76, бывъ *бѣаго* дара f. 53d, прѣдзчѣсти *бжиаго* страха f. 61d, оустѣзѣ *бжиаго* моужа f. 111а, сзмотрениа словесе *бжиаго* f. 207а, проповѣдите сѣна *бжиаго* f. 223с, изъ кѣтѣства *бжиаго* f. 223с (Тихова 2012: 13, 116, 132, 231\*, 413, 446); хрьстовъ (1): нзгнѣ *хѣвааго* възкрѣсениа прѣдзвараѣтъ слава f. 231с (Tihova 2012: 462) The indefinite forms are found in all Slavic manuscripts, including the Serbian ones.

**Hexaemeron Ioannis Eхarchi:** вожи (1): недовѣдимзихъ мзслии *вожихъ/бжыхъ* f. 110d (Aitzetmüller 4)

**Miscellanea Symeonis regis (Izbornik 1073):** иродовъ (1): на оубиство остритѣ акъзи *иродова* ирода f. 172v (Simeonov sbornik 1: 538)

**Miscellanea Zlatostruy**, saec. XII в. (РНБ, Ф.п.1.46) вожи (1): такоже же прѣстаѣа *цркъзи* иматъ чѣтениа *бжихъ* книгъ f. 184г (Georgieva 2003: 301).

As a result, we are familiar with over forty definite forms of ten possessive adjectives ending in -ов/-ев- (адовъ, иродовъ, кесаровъ/кесаревъ, хрьстовъ), -ь (пилаць), -ън-ъ (владзичънь, господьнь, друужьнь) and -ии/-ьи (вожи, велии). This means that

although uncommon, these forms were part of the Old Bulgarian language and the bishop Konstantin of Preslav could have used this declension model.

Second, it is worth mentioning that definite forms of possessive adjectives ending in -ов-, -ь, -ьн-ь and -ни/-ьни have been found in Middle Bulgarian texts, for example:

**Apostolus Christinopolitanus**, saec. XII: **хрьстовъ** (1): **хъвзихъ** (Slovnik 48: 796)

**Tetra-evangelium Dobromiri**, saec. XII (RNB, Q.п.I.55; St Catherine's monastery on mount Sinai, Cod. Slav. № 43, Cod. Slav. № 7/N) **велии** (1): **Jo 21:11 велиихъ рывь; овьчъ** (1): **Jo 10:1 въ дворъ овьчии** (Velčeva 1975: 416, 361)

**Tetra-evangelium monasterii Dečani**, saec. XIII (RNB Gilferding 4): **вожи** (1): **Mt 4:4 изъ оустъ бжиихъ** (Jagič 1883: 8)

**Evangeliarium Bojanensis**, saec. XIII (RGB, f. 87, № 8/ M. 1690): **вожи** (1): **Mt 4:4 изъ оустъ биъ**

**Miscellanea Zlatoust**, saec. XIV (RNB, Q.п.I.56): **вожи** (3): **повѣстънииѹе неиѹ глѣемьихъ ѹудесъ бжиихъ** f. 70a, **іако прѹчица сѹци дѹхомъ бжиимъ движима, павель бжиихъ тайнъ възвѣстителъ въпиеть** f. 108б (Dimitrova 2011)

**Tetra-evangelium Georgii Terteri regis**, a. 1322 (RNB, F.п.I.84): **овьчъ** (2): **Mt 7:15 въ одеждахъ овьчиихъ; Йо 10:1 въ дворъ овьчии**

**Tetra-evangelium Ioannis Alexandri regis**, a. 1356 (British Library, London, Add.20): **вожи** (1): **Mt 4:4 изъ оустъ бжиихъ, кесаревъ** (1): **Mt 22:21 кесароваа; овьчъ** (1): **Jo 10:1 въ дворъ овьчии**.

Such forms resurface very often (19 used ones) in the works of Patriarch Euthymius of Tarnovo,<sup>4</sup> such as **Vita of St. Hilarion, Bishop of Moglena**: **вожи** (3): **бжій** присный оугодникъ f. 164г, пристанице **бжійхъ хотвнїи** f. 174v; **отьчъ** (1): **Іадрїѡнъ** же прѣстателъ ства **ѡчѣаго** ... наследникъ f. 163г; **господьнъ** (2): **по пльти гнїеѡ ѡ марїе вцѣ рожьство** f. 165г, **гнїеѡ тѣлѡ** f. 167г; **Eulogy for Sts Constantine and Helena**: **вожи** (5): **Съвнръ** же **бжійхъ** слоугъ f. 427г, **бжїаго сїа** f. 430v, **толикъ бжїихъ** слоугъ f. 436г, **бжїаго соуда** f. 436v, **бжїаго слѡва** f. 438v; **отьчъ** (1): **ѡчѣе тѣлѡ** f. 425г.26; **First Epistle to the monk of Tismana Nikodim**: **вожи** (3): **ѡт божїаго** мѡновенїа f. 208, **людїи божїихъ** ради f. 210, **божїаго** гнѣва f. 215; **Eulogy for St. Michael by Potuka**: **наковль** (1): **Іаковльѡ** лѣствица f. 171.25; **звѣринъ** (1): **Свѣринъѡ** ради ... сзнѣденїа f. 176.1; **Vita of St. John of Rila**: **кесаревъ** (1): **ѡдѡ и кесарѡви кесареваа** f. 8.11; **Vita of St. Philothea Temnishka**: **отьчъ** (1): **слово ѡтчѣе** f. 86 and **Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom**: **отьчъ** (1): **ѡтчѣе** сѣмотренїе f. 373.29.

What is important is the fact that all copies of Patriarch Euthymius's works are from the Middle Bulgarian period or were copied with Ressaва orthography; there

<sup>4</sup> Drawing on the electronic version of *The Dictionary of the Language of Patriarch Euthymius* RPE 1 and RPE 2 ([https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt\\_search/](https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt_search/)).

is not a single one of Russian origin. It is well known that Patriarch Euthymius used indefinite and definite forms of adjectives by observing rules that go back to the Old Bulgarian language (Haralampiev 1990: 63–65); hence we can assume that his use of specific forms of the respective possessive adjectives follows an archaic language model.

But let us turn back to the possessive adjectives formed with the suffixes -ов-, -ъ < \*-jъ, -ин/-ьин < \*-ьjъ in the text of *Oration I Against the Arians*, where there exist twenty seven definite forms of the adjectives *вожини, отъчь, доуховъ, съпласовъ* and *хрьстовъ*. A significant fact is that these definite forms can be found in all the ten manuscripts with one exception – the indefinite form *хрьстова*, which appears in six of the manuscripts (namely, БДЖЗИК *хъва*). This is the reason why I tend to think that all the discussed definite forms of the respective possessive pronouns were present in the Old Bulgarian protograph of *Oration I*, and that the Russian language environment only contributed to their preservation.

Yet, why did the bishop Konstantin use these forms in such a massive manner? There is no other mediaeval Slavonic text with such a concentration except the other two orations against the Arians: in the text of *Oration II* there are 27 definite forms (23 of *вожини*, 2 of *отъчь*, one form of *петровъ* and *съпласовъ*, Penkova 2015: 311, 358, 361, 382; Lytvynenko 2019), whereas in the text of *Oration III* there are 17 definite forms altogether (6 of *вожини* and 11 of *отъчь*, Penkova 2016: 452, 502). What is interesting is that the definite forms refer to the realm of the divine – God the Father, the Holy Spirit, and Christ the Saviour. In the text of the three *Oration Against the Arians*, there are dozens more possessive adjectives ending in the above-mentioned suffixes, but they never get definite forms.

The scholars dealing with the anti-Arian works by St. Athanasius found long time ago that in them he distinguishes clearly between divine and non-divine, including through linguistic exegesis. Following his Greek model, Konstantin of Preslav renders the binary opposition divine vs. non-divine by using the paradigm of the verb *бъти* “to be”. Out of the present forms for the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and plural – *єсмь* “is” and *сѣтъ* - “they are”, respectively – he creates key theological terms such as *єствованиє тоῦ εἶναι/εἶναι, сѣтъство φύσις, възшьньъ γεννητός*. He uses the latter together with the word *єтъство οὐσία*, already established in the language, in accordance with a previously designed linguistic concept that corresponds to St. Athanasius of Alexandria’s anti-Arian views (Slavova 2019). Byzantine studies pay attention to the so-called triple principle, which takes into account who is referred to and who is the speaker – St. Athanasius, the Arians, or the Holy Scripture (Penkova 2018: 118 and the works cited there). In view of this plan of the utterance, the definite and indefinite forms of the possessive adjectives *вожини, отъчь, доуховъ, съпласовъ, хрьстовъ* in the text of *Oration I Against the Arians* can be described as follows:



*Заглавие  
на статията*

1. The definite forms of the adjective *вожни* are used in reference to God (f. 20<sup>b</sup>25, 21<sup>a</sup>5, 53<sup>a</sup>12, 12<sup>b</sup>14, 55<sup>a</sup>9, 58<sup>a</sup>25, 15<sup>a</sup>25, 54<sup>b</sup>6, 60<sup>b</sup>23, 27<sup>a</sup>5), God's sons (f. 58<sup>b</sup>1) and the books of God (f. 12<sup>a</sup>22, 26<sup>b</sup>16, 31<sup>b</sup>17, 54<sup>b</sup>8, 57<sup>a</sup>7, 59<sup>b</sup>10, 9<sup>a</sup>18, 13<sup>a</sup>23, 63<sup>a</sup>21, 63<sup>a</sup>21) according to the Holy Scripture teaching, whereas the indefinite forms refer to God (f. 19<sup>b</sup>24, 31<sup>b</sup>6, 51<sup>a</sup>14), God's elect (f. 10<sup>a</sup>2, 10<sup>a</sup>3, 10<sup>a</sup>9), the Godly wisdom (f. 35<sup>a</sup>17, 35<sup>a</sup>19, 35<sup>a</sup>20, 35<sup>a</sup>21) and to the Son's relation to the Father (f. 29<sup>b</sup>8, 55<sup>b</sup>11) according to the Arians' beliefs, Asterius the Sophis and Samosatene. The exceptions to this model, comprising 33 forms, are only 5 (f. 20<sup>b</sup>17, 45<sup>b</sup>3, 46<sup>b</sup>22, 44<sup>a</sup>6, 45<sup>b</sup>13).

2. The definite forms of the adjective *отъръ* refer to God the Father (f. 13<sup>b</sup>8, 13<sup>b</sup>10, 21<sup>a</sup>23, 24<sup>b</sup>4) according to the Holy Scripture teaching, whereas the indefinite forms refer to the Arians' perceptions for Logos and to the Son's relation to the Father (f. 11<sup>a</sup>5, 14<sup>a</sup>26, 14<sup>b</sup>1, 17<sup>b</sup>1, 27<sup>b</sup>10, 37<sup>b</sup>22, 60<sup>b</sup>4; 13<sup>b</sup>25, 18<sup>a</sup>14, 19<sup>a</sup>1, 19<sup>a</sup>5, 19<sup>b</sup>9, 19<sup>b</sup>21, 20<sup>a</sup>18, 20<sup>a</sup>25, 20<sup>b</sup>6, 21<sup>a</sup>10, 24<sup>a</sup>8, 24<sup>b</sup>11, 25<sup>a</sup>18, 25<sup>b</sup>11, 26<sup>b</sup>4, 31<sup>a</sup>18, 36<sup>a</sup>8, 36<sup>a</sup>10, 36<sup>b</sup>5, 38<sup>a</sup>17, 38<sup>a</sup>27-38<sup>b</sup>1, 51<sup>a</sup>23, 58<sup>a</sup>12), as well as in view of analogies with the nature of human beings (f. 26<sup>a</sup>7, 26<sup>a</sup>21, 33<sup>b</sup>4, 43<sup>b</sup>22, 52<sup>a</sup>7). The exceptions to this model constitute one third of all cases (f. 13<sup>b</sup>3, 25<sup>a</sup>9, 33<sup>a</sup>21, 41<sup>a</sup>23, 42<sup>a</sup>25, 45<sup>a</sup>6, 48<sup>b</sup>7, 49<sup>b</sup>17, 50<sup>a</sup>20, 59<sup>b</sup>13, 59<sup>b</sup>16, 59<sup>b</sup>20, 61<sup>b</sup>2, 62<sup>a</sup>4, 62<sup>a</sup>5, 62<sup>a</sup>6, 62<sup>b</sup>3).

3. The definite form of the adjective *доуховъ* refers to the Holy Spirit according to biblical studies (f. 52<sup>b</sup>6). The other two forms are indefinite and are used in the context of man and human flesh (f. 52<sup>a</sup>25, 52<sup>b</sup>1).

4. The definite form of the adjective *съпасовъ* is used in reference to Christ the Saviour according to the Holy Scripture teaching (f. 16<sup>b</sup>8), whereas the two indefinite forms accompany the name Christ the Saviour through the eyes of the Arians (f. 9<sup>a</sup>7, 55<sup>b</sup>4). There is one exception to this model (f. 8<sup>a</sup>21).

5. The definite form of the adjective *хръстовъ* is used in the context of the Christian teaching about God the Father (f. 45<sup>a</sup>25), whereas the three indefinite forms refer to the Christian faith and the name of Christ through the eyes of the Arians (f. 8<sup>a</sup>5, 9<sup>a</sup>10, 9<sup>a</sup>12).

Therefore we can argue that the uncommon definite forms of the possessive adjectives *вожни*, *отъръ*, *доуховъ*, *съпасовъ*, *хръстовъ* are part of the translation strategy of bishop Konstantin of Preslav to distinguish between God the Father, God the Son, the Holy Spirit and Christ the Saviour, on the one hand, and created beings, on the other hand. The employed morphological instrument has turned out very appropriate because in principle the definite form of the adjective separates what is modified from the rest, adding to its individuality and uniqueness, so that it can be perceived as singular. Such characteristics can be attributed to God and the divine, whereas the definite forms come to additionally emphasize them. The translation strategy of the bishop Konstantin of Preslav reveals that he has followed a conceptual scheme built in advance, which met the high standards of the Greek original.

## REFERENCES

### Sources

- Aitzetmüller 4: Aitzetmüller, Rudolf. *Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes*. 4. Graz: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt, 1966.
- Dimitrova 2011: Димитрова, Мариана. “Ягичев Златоуст.” *Средновековен български паметник със слова и поучения от началото на XIV в.* София: Академично издателство “Проф. Марин Дринов,” 2011.
- Georgieva 2003: *Златоструй от XII век*. Увод и научно разчитане на текста Тодорка Георгиева. Силистра: Издателство РИТТ, 2003.
- Jagić 1879: *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus, olim Zographensis, nunc Petropolitanus*. Ed. Vatroslav Jagić, Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1879.
- Jagić 1883: Ягич, Ватрослав. *Памятник глаголической письменности. Мариинское четвероевангелие с примечаниями и приложениями*. Берлин: Apud Weidmannos, 1883 (Repr.: Graz, 1960).
- Kliment Ohridski 1973: *Климент Охридски. Събрани съчинения*. 3. *Пространни жития на Кирил и Методий*. Подготвили за печат Боню Ангелов и Христо Кодов. София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1973.
- Lytvynenko 2019: *Athanasius of Alexandria, Oratio II contra Arianos*. The Old Slavonic Text and English Translation by Viacheslav V. Lytvynenko (Patrologia Orientalis 56 – Fas. 3 – № 248). Turnhout/Belgique: Brepols, 2019.
- Meyer 1935: *Altkirchenslavisch-griechisches Wörterbuch des Codex Suprasliensis von Karl H. Meyer*. Glückstadt und Hamburg: Verlag J. J. Augustin, 1935.
- Penkova 2008: Пенкова, Пиринка. *Речник-индекс на Синайския евхологий*. София: Академично издателство “Проф. Марин Дринов,” 2008.
- Penkova 2015: Пенкова, Пиринка. *Св. Атанасий Александрийски. Второ Слово против арианите (в старобългарски превод)*. 1 (въведение и критично издание на славянския текст П. Пенкова, индекс на словоформите Ив. Христов). София: Изток-Запад, 2015.
- Penkova 2016: Пенкова, Пиринка. *Свети Атанасий Александрийски (Велики). Трето Слово против арианите. Изследване и издание на текста*. 2. София: Валентин Траянов, 2016.
- Penkova 2018: Пенкова, Пиринка. *Свети Атанасий Александрийски (Велики). Трето слово против арианите. Коментари към превода на Константин Преславски*. София: Издателство „Валентин Траянов“, 2018.
- RPE 1: *Речник на езика на Патриарх Евтимий*. 1. А-Н. Автори Ростислав Станков, Татяна Славова, Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Анета Димитрова, Мария Тотоманова-Панева, Вероника Шалагин. София: УИ “Св. Климент Охридски”, 2019 - [https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt\\_search](https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt_search) <accessed 19.03.2022>
- RPE 2: *Речник на езика на Патриарх Евтимий*. 2. О-Ъ. Татяна Славова, Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Анета Димитрова, Гергана Ганева, Мария Тотоманова-Панева, Маргарет Димитрова, Вероника Шалагин. София: УИ “Св. Климент Охридски”, 2020 - [https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt\\_search](https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt_search) <accessed 19.03.2022>



Заглавие  
на статията

- SBR 1–2: *Старобългарски речник*. Отг. ред. Дора Иванова-Мирчева. 1. А–Н. София: Валентин Трянов, 1999. 2. О–ОУ. София: Валентин Трянов, 2009.
- Sever'janov 1922: *Синайская псалтырь: Глаголический памятник XI века*. Приготовил к печати Сергей Северьянов. Петроград: издание Отделения русского языка и словесности Российской Академии наук, 1922.
- Simeonov sbornik 1: *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.)*. 1. *Изследвания и текст*. Под общата редакция на акад. Петър Динеков. София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1991.
- Slovník 1–52: *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. Hl. red. J. Kurz. Praha: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1958–1997.
- SS 1999: *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)*. Под редакцией Рали Цейтлин, Радослава Вечерки, Эмили Благовой. Москва: Русский язык, 1999.
- Tihova 2012: *Старобългарското Учително евангелие на Константин Преславски*, издадено от Мария Тихова с детайлното описание от Елена Уханова на най-стария препис (ГИМ Син. 262) (*Monumenta linguae Slavicae* 58). Weiher – Freiburg i. Br., 2012, LVI–LXXVII.
- Vaillant 1954: Vaillant, A. *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase. Version slave et traduction en français*. Sofia: Akadémie des sciences de Bulgarie, 1954.
- Velčeva 1975: Велчева, Боряна. *Добромирово евангелие. Български паметник от началото на XII в.* София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1975.

## Literature

- Feder 2018: Федер, Уилям. “За реконструкцията на първия датиран и локализиран църковнославянски ръкопис.” *Преславска книжовна школа* 18 (2018), 11–18.
- Haralampiev 1990: Харалампиев, Иван. *Езикът и езиковата реформа на Евтимий Търновски*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1990.
- Ivanov 1983: Иванов, Валерий Васильевич. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Москва: Просвящение, 1983.
- Slavova 2019: Славова, Татяна. “Преводачески стратегии в старобългарския превод на Словата против арианите от Атанасий Александрийски.” *Pbg* 4 (2019), 3–19.
- Vajan 1952: Ваян, Антоан. *Руководство по старославянскому языку*. Москва: Иностранной литературы, 1952.
- [Dimitrova, Mariana. “Jagičev Zlatoust.” *Srednovekoven bălgarski pametnik sās slova i poučeniya ot načaloto na XIV v.* Sofija: Akademično izdatelstvo “Prof. Marin Drinov,” 2011.
- Feder, Uiljam. “За реконструкцијата на прввијата датирани и локализирана црковнославјански ракопис.” *Preslavska knižovna škola* 18 (2018), 11–18.
- Haralampiev, Ivan. *Ezikăt i ezikovata reforma na Evtimij Tărnovski*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo, 1990.
- Ivanov, Valerij V. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Prosvjaščenie, 1983.
- Jagič, Vatroslav. *Pamjatnik glagoličeskoj pis'mennosti. Mariinskoe četveroevangelie s primečanijami i priloženijami*. Berlin: Apud Weidmannos, 1883 (Repr.: Graz, 1960).

- Kliment Ohridski. Săbrani săčinenija. 3. Prostranni žitija na Kiril i Metodij.* Podgotvili za pečat Bonju Angelov i Hristo Kodov. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, 1973.
- Penkova, Pirinka. *Rečnik-indeks na Sinajskija evhologij.* Sofija: Akademično izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov," 2008.
- Penkova, Pirinka. *Sv. Atanasij Aleksandrijski. Vtoro Slovo protiv arianite (v starobălgarski prevod).* 1 (văvedenie i kritično izdanie na slavjanskija tekst P. Penkova, indeks na slovoformite Iv. Hristov). Sofija: Iztok-Zapad, 2015.
- Penkova, Pirinka. *Sveti Atanasij Aleksandrijski (Veliki). Treto Slovo protiv arianite. Izsledvane i izdanie na teksta.* 2. Sofija: Valentin Trajanov, 2016.
- Penkova, Pirinka. *Sveti Atanasij Aleksandrijski (Veliki). Treto slovo protiv arianite. Komentari kăm prevoda na Konstantin Preslavski.* Sofija: Valentin Trajanov, 2018.
- Rečnik na ezika na Patriarh Evtimij.* 1. A-N. Avtori Rostislav Stankov, Tatjana Slavova, Anna-Marija Totomanova, Aneta Dimitrova, Marija Totomanova-Paneva, Veronika Šalagin. Sofija: UI "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 2019.
- Rečnik na ezika na Patriarh Evtimij.* 2. O-A. Tatjana Slavova, Anna-Marija Totomanova, Aneta Dimitrova, Gergana Ganeva, Marija Totomanova-Paneva, Margaret Dimitrova, Veronika Šalagin. Sofija: UI "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 2020.
- Simeonov sbornik (po Svetoslavovija prepis ot 1073 g.).* 1. *Izsledvanija i tekst.* Pod obštata redakcija na akad. Petăr Dinekov. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, 1991.
- Sinajskaja psal'tyr': Glagoličeskij pamjatnik XI veka.* Prigotovil k pečati Sergej Sever'janov. Petrograd: izdanie Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii nauk, 1922.
- Slavova, Tatjana. "Prevodačeski strategii v starobălgarskija prevod na Slovata protiv arianite ot Atanasij Aleksandrijski." *Pbg* 4 (2019), 3–19.
- Starobălgarski rečnik.* Otg. red. Dora Ivanova-Mirčeva. 1. A–N. Sofija: Valentin Trjanov, 1999. 2. O–OU. Sofija: Valentin Trjanov, 2009.
- Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X–XI vekov).* Pod redakciej Rali Cejtlin, Radoslava Večerki, Ėmilii Blagovoj. Moskva: Russkij jazyk, 1999.
- Starobălgarskoto Učitelno evangelie na Konstantin Preslavski,* izdadeno ot Marija Tihova s detajlnoto opisanie ot Elena Uhanova na naj-starija prepis (GIM Sin. 262) (Monumenta linguae Slavicae 58). Weiher – Freiburg i. Br., 2012, LVI–LXXVII.
- Vajan, Antoan. *Rukovodstvo po staroslavjanskomu jazyku.* Moskva: Inostrannoj literatury, 1952.
- Velčeva, Borjana. *Dobromirovo evangelie. Bălgarski pametnik ot načaloto na XII v.* Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, 1975.
- Zlatostruj ot XII vek.* Uvod i naučno razčitane na teksta Todorka Georgieva. Silistra: Izdatelstvo RITT, 2003.]

*Заглавие  
на статията*

*About the author*

**Tatyana Slavova**, Dr. Habil, Professor of Slavic Studies (Cyril and Methodius Studies) of the Cyrillo-Methodian Studies Department at the Faculty of Slavonic Philology, St. Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia. Her scholarly interests and her publications are in the fields of Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) language and literature, History of Bulgarian language, Cyril and Methodius studies, medieval Slavonic manuscripts, Medieval Slavic text linguistics and Biblical studies, Medieval Slavic epigraphics, as well as palaeography and chronology studies.