Jürgen Fuchsbauer (University of Regensburg)

The article-like usage of the relative pronoun *iže* as an indicator of early Slavonic grammatical thinking

As is well known, already in the canonical documents of Old Church Slavonic certain constructions with the Greek article ὁ were translated with the help of the relative pronoun *iže*. For example, in Mt 6.23 τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ 'the light that is in thee' (KJV) is transferred as *světъ iže vъ tebě*. This rendering of the Greek text is, like a considerable number of further instances, contained in both the OCS Tetra- (codd. Zographensis and Marianus) and Aprakos-Gospels (cod. Assemanianus and Savina kniga) – it can therefore be supposed to represent the original reading. Thus, there is sufficient reason for assuming that already Constantine the Philosopher and his collaborators introduced this usage of *iže* into the literary language they founded when translating the Aprakos parts of the Gospels from Greek.

In Middle Bulgarian translations from Greek, which surpass their ancestors in terms of the literality of the rendering of the original, the article-like usage of *iže* is even more frequent. In the *Dioptra*, for instance, καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ χάριτι εἴθισται ('it is common for those under the law [of Moses] and those in the grace [of Christ]') is transferred as *i iže vъ zakóně i iže vъ bl(a)g(o)/d/(a)ti ωbyčno estъ*. In this sentence the oblique case (the dative τοῖς) was, as is usual, translated by the nominative *iže*. This demonstrates that such constructions were indeed considered to be elliptic relative clauses, in which a verb, usually a form of *byti*, was left out (i.e. **těmъ iže běachǫ* – or rather *živěachǫ – vъ zakóně ...*; cf., with reference to OCS, R. Večerka, Altkirchenslavische (altbulg.) Syntax, vol. III, Freiburg i. Br. 1996, 174).

However, the article-like usage was not restricted to translations. We encounter it also in original works such as Euthymius of Tărnovo's *Life of Paraskeva of Epibatai*; here we read *blagodějanïa že ... jaže vъ epïvatochь, jaže vъ trakïi* ('the good deeds she performed in Epibatai, in Thrace'), which would correspond to **τὰς εὐεργεσίας τε ... τὰς ἐν ταῖς Ἐπιβάταις, τὰς ἐν τῇ Θρᾴκῃ*. Instances of article-like *iže* occur also in Old Russian Church Slavonic, even though by far less frequently than in Middle Bulgarian. For example, in the *Tale of Dracula* we find the sentence *i kako ti sout iže na kolïi* ('And how are these that are on the stake?'). *Iže na kolïi* again patterns Greek (**οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ σκόλοπι*).

In my paper I shall argue that the usage of the relative pronoun *iže* as equivalent of the Greek article has its cause in Greek grammatical terminology. In the *Art of Grammar* commonly ascribed to Dionysius Thrax two types of articles (ἄρθρον) are discerned, namely the prepositive (προτακτικόν) and the postpositive (ὑποτακτικόν); the former represents ὁ, the article proper, the latter ὅς, the relative pronoun. Thus, the founders of Slavonic literacy, to whom, like to any literate Byzantine, the *Art of Grammar* must have been known, presumably identified *iže* as correspondent of the 'postpositive article' and decided to use it also for rendering the 'prepositive' one.

The identification of *iže* with the Greek article is also reflected in the most important Slavonic work on grammar before L. Zyzanij and M. Smotryc'kyj, namely in the compilation *On the Eight Parts of Speech*. Here it is stated: *Razlíčie že éstь částь edína ósmь častei slóva, skazátelno padéžemъ sámo ó sebȅ. i egdà gl(agol)emъ íže, razlíčie javíchomъ právou edinstvenou moužskago imeni* ('The article – literally: discrimination – is one of the eight parts of speech, indicating cases by itself, and if we say *iže* we show the discrimination of the casus rectus singular of the masculine noun'). Yet, in another passage of this treatise the Slavonic compiler comments: *padénię že imenъ razlíčię ne tréboujutъ vъ slovénskomъ jazýcě ni žȅ ímoutъ predčinnychъ* – 'the cases of nouns do not require an article

in the Slavonic language, and they do not have prepositive ones', but they have, as he adds, a 'postpositive article'.

The artificial introduction of a construction alien to Slavonic, its further usage, as well as reflections on it like the ones quoted give insight into the way Constantine the Philosopher, his helpers, and their successors reasoned on the language they created and used. It is the aim of my paper to gain more detailed insight into their grammatical thinking. On the whole, the article-like *iže* seems to give proof of a rather methodical, but partly inadequate treatment of language, which does not necessarily correspond to modern conceptions. Rather it relies on traditional Greek grammatical thinking, and this we will need to bear in mind when analysing older stages of Slavonic.