

## Translating the Subtleties. The Philosophical Categories in the *Symeon Collection* (*Symeon's Miscellany*)

Dimka Gicheva-Gocheva, Diana Atanassova

Our work on the Old Bulgarian translation of the philosophical and theological categories in the *Symeon's Miscellany* (*Simeonov Sbornik*) began in the autumn of 2016 – the year of the 2400 anniversary of Aristotle's birth. We are still in the very beginning of a research, which might take years to be properly accomplished, and the primary results shared in this paper should be considered rather as a program for a future study and work hypotheses, not as indisputable conclusions.

It the autumn of 2016 we realized that it is no longer so difficult to start a study on this thought-provoking topic due to several important favorable circumstances, to which we are greatly indebted.

First, there are three excellent volumes of the *Symeon's Miscellany*<sup>1</sup> at the disposal of the scholarly community. The Old Bulgarian translation and the studies done so far are published in the first volume, the dictionary and the indexes are in the second volume, and the Greek original is in the third volume.

Second, what is of great help for all interested in the problem: we have an excellent translation in modern Bulgarian of *The Book of Salvation* (*Спасителна книга*)<sup>2</sup> – which is the Greek original of the *Symeon's Miscellany*.

Third, the Bulgarian translations of the most important texts of the classical Greek philosophy, and especially of the treatises of Aristotle, published in the recent decades, are also considerable. Moreover, all these publications<sup>3</sup>, which have appeared in the past quarter century, are supplied with meticulous notes and abundant commentaries, and possess extremely rich indexes of thousands of terms, categories and concepts. Precisely the ones, which have been fundamental not only for the classical Greek and Byzantine philosophy of the remote past, but are an immanent part of the philosophical and theological discourse of the present day as well.

This has been one of the most motivating stimuli for our research, which, let us reiterate it once again, is still in the initial status. When we study translations from classical or Byzantine Greek into Old Bulgarian made centuries ago, we usually encounter two aspects of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Симеонов сборник* 1991; 1993; 2015.

<sup>2</sup> *Спасителна книга* 2008.

<sup>3</sup> See Йоан Дамаскин 2014, Христов 2008, Христова, Христов 2013, Христов 2014, Христова-Шомова 2016, Христова-Шомова 2016, Данова 2011, Илиева 2014.

the question *how*: firstly, the *how* of the linguistic rendering, the *how* of the translation techniques used for one term or another. Morphemic imitation of the structure of the translated word, coining of new words, semantic rendering of the sense, accompanied with an explanation of the meaning, etc. This is the most obvious first step of every study in this field. The second aspect is that of evaluating the *how*: shall we praise or, on the contrary, express regrets in respect of the translator's work. What engenders and causes the positive or negative evaluation of the techniques used by the Old Bulgarian translators centuries ago, which some contemporary scholars do not hesitate to express<sup>4</sup>? What are the conceptual premises for some of their judgements, especially when they are not favorable towards the writings of the past, and particularly to some of their translations available in Old Bulgarian?

Besides these two inherent aspects of the question *how*, a third one has arisen in the last three decades in Bulgaria. We have a long, in fact millennium long tradition of translating old Greek and Byzantine texts into Old Bulgarian, but with respect to the philosophical and theological terminology used nowadays, are we obliged to follow the patterns of the past, the forms of the language, suggested by this millennium long tradition? This question is not only ardently debated theoretically, but has also had practical implications for the translation of some of the most important treatises of Aristotle. Among these newer publications there are some which present Aristotle to the Bulgarian readers as *Aristoteles latinus*. Aristotle speaks to our reader using words such as *substantia*, *accidentia*, *subiectum* etc., because of the strong conviction of some of our respectable scholars that especially the six logical writings, comprised in the *Organon*, should not follow the linguistic matrix of the Old Bulgarian equivalents of the most important terms and categories, but stick to their Latin translations. Thus, these theoretical disputes and practical issues of present-day academic and cultural life have made the research on the *Symeon's Miscellany* both urgent and rewarding.

## **1. The Importance of the *Symeon's Miscellany* with regard to the formation of the Bulgarian philosophical language**

This precious *Miscellany*, compiled in the so-called Golden age of Bulgarian culture and the literacy during the reign of king Symeon the Great, has tremendous value. The content and the structure of this encyclopedic compilation, its language and style, its appearance and

---

<sup>4</sup> Example of positive evaluation is the quoted in this paper general assessment of the translation of the *Symeon's Miscelany* in the study of Prof. Christov and Dr. Christova (p. 5 below - Христова, Христов 2013). Example of a negative one: Христов 2008.

distribution, its influence and legacy, have received attention from the best Slavic studies scholars<sup>5</sup>. In order to be brief, let us refer to two estimations in recent works.

Firstly, in the conclusion of the *Introduction* to their translation of the *Book of Salvation* (into modern Bulgarian), Prof. Petya Yaneva and Sergei Ivanov summarize the rich variety of the encyclopedia. The *Miscellany* impresses with the amazing thematic scope of answers to general and specific questions – from fundamental dogmatic problems, posed by the Old and the New Testament, through issues with which every educated person should be familiar, to some everyday life and style matters. Prof. Petya Yaneva and Sergey Ivanov stress the fact that the number of the quoted writings and authors is respectable. Moreover, besides the explicit ones, there are plenty of hidden quotations from numerous ancient writers – geographers, historians, philosophers.

*“This variety tells a lot about the multifaceted interests and tastes of the medieval reader and rejects the opinion of the limited role of these collections in the medieval intellectual and spiritual life. People were interested in the highest Christian dogmatic and liturgical practice, but also in ancient philosophy, in literary theory, in geography, in human nature, but in precious stones as well; in the garments of priests and the symbolics they carry; in medicine; in the female character and many other topics. At the same time, the extreme difficulty of some of these texts testifies that in the society there were individuals possessing immense erudition and capable of understanding them. In Bulgaria there had been people, who not only had been capable to understand, but also to translate them. That is why this collection is among the proofs that the so-called Golden age during the reign of king Symeon in Bulgaria is not a mirage, fancied by scholars, but reality, which includes our territories in a broader cultural areal...”*<sup>6</sup>

With respect to the formation of the Bulgarian philosophical and theological language, the *Symeon’s Miscellany* is an extremely important source because from f. 222 to f. 237 a range of philosophical issues is discussed as answers to questions 29 and 30. This section of the writing includes clarification of terms, categories and concepts from the classical Greek and/or the Christian philosophy. This part of the encyclopedia is a real thesaurus for the historians of philosophy and theology, conceived and expressed in Greek, because:

1. the entries *are many*; 2. the terms are not just *mentioned*, but are properly *defined* and their meaning is explained; 3. the provided explanations of their meaning and sense are

---

<sup>5</sup> See Велчева 1991; Диневков 1991; Ивановна 1991; Коцева 1991; Куев 1991; Мавродинова 1991; Минчева 1991; Христова 1991 and *Симеонов сборник 1, 2, 3*.

<sup>6</sup> *Спасителна книга 2008*: 12.

heterogeneous and point to different philosophical ancestors: some of them have Platonic and/or Aristotelian origin; others are part of the Neoplatonic conceptual and linguistic universe; a third part has strictly Christian genealogy.

If we add to these three features of the philosophico-theological section of the *Symeon's Miscellany* the question of *how* these entries have been rendered into Old Bulgarian by the translator(s) millennium ago (in the three aspects of the *how*, mentioned above), we will realize that this segment of the writing represents a considerable challenge for scholars from several disciplines and demands profound interdisciplinary research.

Compared with the numerous studies devoted to the general historic, cultural, linguistic, literary, paleographic, ornamental etc. merits of the *Symeon's Miscellany*, the segment with the philosophical and theological categories has received relatively less attention so far. One recent study should be taken into account as groundbreaking. This is the article *Conceptual structure and linguistic characteristics of the categories and linguistic terms in the Symeon's Miscellany* by Dr. Adriana Christova and Prof. Ivan Christov<sup>7</sup>. The study is preoccupied with the lexico-morphological and syntactic formation of the terms. It is to be followed by a monograph, which will clarify the significance of these *terms* as *concepts* in the thinking of several important philosophers, starting of course with Aristotle - the most important thinker to have exerted powerful influence on the Byzantine compilers of this segment of the encyclopedia. In the conclusion to their rigorous study founded on the idea of the ontological dominance of the terms in the philosophical chapter, Prof. Christov and Dr. Christova state that they have demonstrated all the types of lexico-morphological and syntactic formation of the terms. The overwhelming majority, accounting for 90% of the overall number of terms, are terms-words. The study shows the formative prefixes and suffixes. The evaluation of the work of the translator(s) is highly positive and rejects some negative assumptions: the *translation is not* literal and does not imitate the morphemic structure of the Greek terms, which are not calqued without genuine understanding. On the contrary - the translator has very often substituted one type of substantivized linguistic unit with another, belonging to a different part of speech, because the intuition of the mother tongue and the contextual meaning of the text have prompted it. Prof. Christov and Dr. Christova have also pointed out that the number of the Old Bulgarian suffixes and suffixoids is twice bigger than that of the Greek ones.

---

<sup>7</sup> Христова, Христов 2013.

The application of the strictest quantitative linguistic methods and the scrutiny of the conceptual analyses bring Prof. Christov and Dr. Christova to the following conclusion:

*„From the point of view of the history of philosophy we have to admit the depth of the text. It contains a sketch of the fundamental ontological categories elaborated for the needs of the Orthodox theology. The Old Bulgarian translator faced a serious challenge, but his efforts constituted a high initial achievement of the national philosophical culture. A part of the terms used by the translator create a permanent lexical layer sustaining the contemporary philosophical usage in Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian. Some examples are: ВИДЪ (εἶδος), РОДЪ (γένος), СВОИСТВО (ιδιότης), ЁСТЬСТВО (φύσις), ЛИШЕНИЕ (στέρησις), БЫТИЕ (ὑπαρξις, τὸ εἶναι), РАЗУМЪ (λόγος), МѢРА (μέτρον), КАЧЬСТВО (ποιότης), КОЛИЧЬСТВО (ποσότης), ТОЖДЬСТВО (ταυτότης) etc. That is why this translation occupies a prestigious place not only in the Bulgarian, but also in the Slavic philosophical tradition.”<sup>8</sup>.*

We support the conclusion of the two colleagues and could add to their list many other important ontological terms omitted by them because of the already mentioned controversy: the theoretical disputes and the translational practices of the past three decades in Bulgaria surrounding the dilemma of *how*. How to translate the classical Greek logical categories and ontological concepts: according to our millennium long tradition or in conformity with their Latin equivalents? At the top of this mountain of controversies is the debate how to translate οὐσία – as „същност” or *битие*, or as „субстанция”. There are at least ten more ontological concepts whose translation may be inspired nowadays by the achievements of the translators of the *Symeon’s Miscellany*.

## **2. Immanent difficulties in the analysis of the philosophical categories**

Even when the section of the *Symeon’s Miscellany* (f. 222-237) with the philosophical and theological categories is read only in the original, without tackling the issue of translation, the study is thought-provoking for the historian of philosophy. In the first place, there are fundamental terms of the classical Greek philosophy which have triadic nature. Many of them have three facets - logical, linguistic and ontological. The difficulties of their proper interpretation and translation derive from the impossibility to separate this unity of the three aspects in any other language.

---

<sup>8</sup> Христова, Христов 2013:45.

Another problem arises from their genealogy. Some of them belong to the most inherent conceptual kernel of the Platonic, and especially of the Aristotelian thinking. These are the ontological pillars οὐσία, φύσις, γένος, εἶδος as well as all the terms listed in the conclusion of the study of Ivan Christov and Adriana Christova, quoted above.

Some of the other philosophical *terms* in this section are either never mentioned by Plato and Aristotle in classical Greek philosophical texts, or although appearing in some texts as *words*, their usage is peculiar, non-terminological, every-day and technical. They have become ontological concepts much later. In the history of the late pagan and early Christian philosophy there is clear evidence about several humble words which have remained unrecognized as possible philosophical tools for centuries, and whose dialectical strength was appreciated only in Late Antiquity. There are concepts which have Neoplatonic origin, and in the *Symeon's Miscellany* they come close to the definitions proposed by Plotinus in the *Enneads*, book VI, chs.1-3, or the *Introduction (\*Eisagoge) to the Categories* of Aristotle by Porphyry. Undoubtedly, ὑπόστασις – СОБЪСТВО – *unostaca* (*unostac*) is one such concept. In modern Bulgarian, it is translated as *unostac* in Christian writings, and as *xunostaza* in the case of pagan philosophers adhering to the Neoplatonic school. Only a further detailed analysis may prove or refute the conjecture that the Byzantine philosopher, who wrote these chapters of the *Symeon's Miscellany*, followed the thinking of Plotinus, book V, ch. 1. Of course, in the *Symeon's Miscellany*, this essential Neoplatonic concept is appropriated and follows the conception model of the Cappadocian Fathers<sup>9</sup>.

The third group of concepts has explicit Christian and theological origin, and in the first place among them is πρόσωπον – лице - *лице* (*лице*). This is the great conceptual novelty of the early dogmatics of the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> centuries, which became widespread after 381 AD and after the changes in the *Creed*, approved at the Second Council of Constantinople.

Another cluster of questions arises around the definitions and the explanations of the concepts ἴδιον, διαφορά, συμβεβηκός and the predication of γένος and εἶδος. Are there hidden quotations from Porphyry's *Eisagoge* in the *Book of Salvation*, and if there are such tacit borrowings, to what extent are they applied?

---

<sup>9</sup> More on this topic see in the studies of Philip Merlan (Merlan 1967); G. W. H. Lampe (Lampe 1978); W. H. C. Frend (Frend 1984); D. Gocheva (Гочева 2014); Pauliina Remes and Svetla Slaveva-Griffin (Remes, Slaveva-Griffin 2014). For full references see the bibliography.

Let us give an example with regards to διαφορά - различье - разлика (видово различие in the contemporary translations in modern Bulgarian). To whom stands closer the Byzantine philosopher when he defines it like that: Διαφορὰ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ πλείονων καὶ διαφερόντων τῷ εἶδει ἐν τῷ τί ἐστὶ κατηγορούμενον. Does the Byzantine philosopher remain faithful to Aristotle, who vastly uses this conceptualization not only in the *Metaphysics*, but in all the biological treatises as well, or does in this case the Byzantine author of this part of the encyclopedia adheres much more to the Neoplatonic paradigm of thought?

There are many similar general questions, which might receive proper answers only after profound study. For the purposes of the present paper, let us confine ourselves to the statement that they exhibit the discussed section of the *Symeon's Miscellany* as an extremely interesting sketch of topics in philosophical, theological, linguistic and literature terms and concepts with millennium long history.

### 3. Exemplifying the subtleties

Let us focus on two conceptual pairs, discussed in two chapters: Περὶ ποσοῦ καὶ ποσότητος Ὁ количествѣ и о мѣремихъ; Περὶ ποιῶ καὶ ποιότητος Ὁ качествѣ и о творитвѣнѣмъ

<i>Symeon's Miscellany</i> , 3 (Симеонов сборник, Т. 3, стр. 1076-1079)	
Περὶ ποσοῦ καὶ ποσότητος	Ὁ количествѣ и о мѣремихъ
<p><b>Ποσότης</b> μὲν ἐστὶν αὐτὸ τὸ μέτρον καὶ ὁ ἀριθμός, ὁ μετρῶν καὶ ὁ ἀριθμῶν, πόσα δὲ τὰ τῷ ἀριθμῷ καὶ μετρῷ ὑποκείμενα· ἤγουν τὰ μετρούμενα καὶ ἀριθμούμενα. <b>Τῶν δὲ ποσῶν</b> τὰ μὲν εἰσι διωρισμένα, τὰ δὲ συνεχῆ. Διωρισμένα μὲν εἰσι τὰ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων κεχωρισμένα, ὡς ἐπὶ δέκα λίθων ἢ ἰ' φοινίκων· ταῦτα γὰρ κεχωρισμένα εἰσὶν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων καὶ ἀριθμεῖσθαι λέγονται, εἰ μὴ διὰ σμικρότητα καὶ πλῆθος μετρηθῶσι μοδίῳ ἢ</p>	<p><b>Количество</b> оубо ѣсть сама та мѣра мѣраштина и чѣтоуштина· коликоже ѣже подѣ чисменьмъ и мѣроѣ подѣложить· рекъше мѣримана и чѣтомана· <b>количества</b> же ова сѣть разлouchаема· ова же съдръжима· разлouchаема же сѣть ѣже саоть себе разлouchаѣтъ· ѣкоже се три десяти камыкъ или о</p>

<p>τινι τοιούτῳ, ὡσπερ σῖτος καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Συνεχῆ δέ, ὅτε ἔν ἐστι τὸ μετρούμενον, ὡσπερ ἐν ξύλον εὐρίσκεται δίπεχυ καὶ τρίπεχυ ἢ λίθος, ἢ τι τοιοῦτον καὶ ἐν ὑπάρχον μετρεῖται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται συνεχῆς <b>ποσόν</b>. <b>Ποσόν</b> τοίνυν λέγεται, ἥτοι καὶ ποσότης, ἀριθμὸς καὶ ὄγκος, καὶ χρόνος, καὶ τὰ διαστήματα. <b>Ἀριθμὸς</b> μὲν οἷον μονάς, δυάς, τριάς καὶ οἱ ἐφ' ἐξῆς ἀριθμοί. Ὅγκος δὲ οἷον μικρόν, μέγα, στατήρ, τάλαντον καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Χρόνος δὲ οἷον ὥρα, ἡμέρα καὶ μῆν, καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς. Διάστημα δὲ οἷον μῆκος, πλάτος, βάθος.</p>	<p>десати фоуникии та бо разлоучена соутъ отъ себе и чьтома наричхъ слаште не мальствомъ и множествъ-м-ѣ-рима боудоутъ· сподъмь илиинѣмь тацѣмъжде акы пшеницаи прокоѣ· съдръжаштанъ же сажьгда єсть мѣримое&lt;а&gt;кожесе єдино дрѣво обрѣтаєть сядъвож локътж· или трии локътъ· или камыкъ иличьто такыихъ иєдино сы мѣритъ сѧ· да сего дѣлн наричетъ сѧ съдръжимаѧ <b>мѣра· число</b> же наричетъ сѧ рекъше <b>разночьтомоѣ</b> и множество и врѣмми растонанинѧ· <b>число</b> оубо рекъше єдиньница дъвоица троица·и прокаѧ числа· мѣра же рекъше малъ великъ· статиръ талантъ и такаѧжде· врѣмѧ же рекъше часъ дьнь и мѣсаць и лѣто· дальство же рекъше длъгота широта глоубыни.</p>
<p><i>Symeon's Miscellany, 3 (Симеонов сборник, Т. 3, стр. 1078-1080)</i></p>	
<p>Περὶ ποιῶ καὶ ποιότητος</p> <p><b>Ποιότης</b> ἐστὶν ἐνούσιος δύναμις οἷον ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν γενῶν αἱ συστατικαὶ διαφοραί, τουτέστι λογικότης, θνητότης, ἀθανασία καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, ἐπὶ δὲ ἀσωμάτων λογικῶν νοερότης,</p>	<p>О качествѣ и о творитвѣнѣмь</p> <p><b>Качество</b> єсть вѣсхщънаѧ сила· рекъше о родѣхъ оубо съставнаѧ розличьна· рекъше словесъноѣ сѧ мрътьноѣ·</p>



ἀντεξουσιότης, ἀεὶ κινησία, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν  
 σωμάτων χρῶμα οἶον λευκότης, μελανότης,  
 ξανθότης καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ σχῆμα οἶον  
 περιφερές, εὐθύ, καμπύλον, τετράγωνον καὶ  
 τὰ ὅμοια· καὶ πάλιν ὑγρότης, ξηρότης,  
 θερμότης, ψυχρότης, μαλακότης, σκληρότης,  
 μανότης, πυκνότης· καὶ οἱ χυμοί, οἶον  
 ὀξύτης, γλυκύτης, δριμύτης καὶ τὰ ὅμοια.  
**Ποιότης οὖν ἐστίν, καθ' ἣν ποιότητες**  
**ὀνομάζονται παρωνύμως ὡς μετέχοντες τὰ**  
**αὐτῆς.** Ἐκ γὰρ τῆς φρονήσεως φρόνιμος  
 λέγεται ὁ ἔχων τὴν φρόνησιν καὶ θερμὸς ὁ  
 ἔχων τὴν θερμότητα. Λέγεται δὲ πολλάκις  
 καὶ αὕτη ἡ ποιότης ποιόν, ὥσπερ καὶ **το**  
**ποσόν ποσότης, τῆς δὲ ποιότητος** εἰδός ἐστίν  
 καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια· ἅτινα οὐκ  
 εἰσὶν μὲν ἐνέργεια, ἔχουσι δὲ ἐπιτηδειότητα  
 καὶ δύναμιν φυσικὴν. Λέγεται γὰρ ἡ μὲν  
 κατ' ἐπιτηδειότητα, ἡ δὲ κατ' ἔξιν, ἡγουν  
 ἐνέργειαν. Κατ' ἐπιτηδειότητα μὲν, ὡς ὅταν  
 εἴπωμεν τὸ παιδίον δυνάμει γραμματικὸν  
 εἶναι, καθότι ἔχει ἐπιτηδειότητα πρὸς τὸ  
 γενέσθαι γραμματικόν. Κατ' ἔξιν δέ, ὡς ὅταν  
 εἴπωμεν τὸν ἡρεμοῦντα γραμματικόν·  
 δύναται μετὰ τὴν ἡρεμίαν τὴν τέχνην  
 ἐνδείξασθαι. Ἦ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ κόκκου τοῦ  
 σίτου· τοῦτο γὰρ πῆ μὲν στάχυς ἐστίν, καθ' ὃ  
 ἀποστελεῖ στάχυν σπειρόμενος, ἐνεργεῖα δὲ  
 οὐκ ἐστίν στάχυς, ἀλλὰ σίτος κατὰ τὸ  
 χλιαρόν. Ἐνεργεῖα μὲν οὔτε ψυχρόν, οὔτε  
 θερμόν ἐστίν, δυνάμει δὲ πάντως, καθ' ὃ  
 δύναται γενέσθαι ψυχρόν μὲν ψυχώμενον,  
 θερμόν δὲ θερμαινόμενον. Καὶ πάλιν τὸ

бесъмрътьє·и прокана·ο бесплътъныхъ  
 же словесъныхъ· ροζοумноє  
 самовластьноє присношьстьноє·ο  
 тѣлесехъ же тварь· рекъше бѣлота  
 чрънота ρоусость и така·и видь·  
 рекъше обьло право· прѣведено на  
 четвьрты·и подобьнаа сии пакы  
 мокрота· соухота· теплота· студено·  
 макота· жестокоє· рѣдко·частое·и  
 глѣни· рекъше гнѣвьноє· сладькоє·  
 бридькоє·и подобьнаа·**качество оубо**  
**єсть по немоуже каци друужи**  
**наричѣть са· съ имене єкоже**  
**приємлюште оть него·**отъ мѣдрости бо  
 моудръ наричеть са· ѡкоже имы  
 моудрость·и тепль ижеимать топлотоу·  
 наричеть же са многашьды и само то  
 качество какоє· ѡкоже **имѣра**  
**число·качествѣ** же видь·єсть и силаи  
 дѣство· ѡже не соуть оубо  
 дѣство·имѣть же оустроои  
 силоуєстьствьноуж· наричеть бо са ова  
 по оустроєнию ово по нравоу рекъше  
 по дѣствоу по покошьноуоумоу же·  
 како се єгда речемъ дѣтиштѣ силож  
 кънижьникъ быти има·имъже има  
 покошьноє ѡкоже быти кънѣхъчии· по  
 нравоу же ѡкоже єгда речемъ  
 мльчаштѣоумоу кънигъчиж можетъ по

<p>παιδίον ἐνεργεία μὲν οὔτε ἀρετὴν λέγεται ἔχειν, οὔτε κακίαν, δυνάμει δὲ πάντως, καθ' ὃ δύναται σχεῖν. Λέγεται δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἰσχύς, καὶ ὁ στρατός.</p>	<p>млъчании хытросць показати·или накоже о зрънѣ пышеничьнѣ· се бо овогда клась єсть· єгда створи клась зърѣа дѣиствъмъ же нѣсть клась нъ пышеница·и топлоє дѣиствъмъ оубо ниє топло ниє гораште· силож же всако по немоуже можетъ стоуденоє оубо стоудимо· тепло же грѣємо·и пакы дѣтишьт ни доброты имы ни злобы силож же всако по неже имѣти нарицаєтъ са силаи мошьт и вои□</p>
--	---

These two pairs of concepts are excellent illustration of the high difficulty of the envisaged chapters and the philosophical sophistication of the authors of the Miscellany.

Concerning *περὶ ποσοῦ καὶ ποσότητος*, *О количествѣ и о мѣремыхъ*, we may note the following.

First, the grounds for distinguishing between them are highly speculative, in the most positive aspect of the word ‘speculative’, as the supreme level of dialectics. Of course, the distinction goes back to the famous treatises of Aristotle. We may compare at length how they are defined and exemplified in the *Categories* (ch. 4 and 6) and in the *Metaphysics* (book Delta, V, ch. 13 and book Lambda, ch. 5, 1071 a 27).

Second, the author(s) of the *Symeon’s Miscellany* conceive of this speculative distinction in an even more speculative manner, defining it like that: **Ποσότης** μὲν ἐστὶν αὐτὸ τὸ μέτρον καὶ ὁ ἀριθμός, ὁ μετρῶν καὶ ὁ ἀριθμῶν, πόσα δὲ τὰ τῷ ἀριθμῷ καὶ μετρῷ ὑποκείμενα· ἤγουν τὰ μετρούμενα καὶ ἀριθμούμενα. **Количество** оубо єсть сама та мѣра мѣраштиа и чытоуштиа· коликоже єже подѣ чисменьмъ и мѣрож подѣложитъ· рекъше мѣримаа и чытомаа. In an intentionally literal translation this will sound like that: *Quantity-ness is the measure itself and the number, which measures and counts those things that might be subjected to counting and measurement: that is the measurable and the*

*numberable things*. Or a shorter explanation: quantity-ness is both the measure and the measured, the number and the numbered (counted and/or enumerated).

Third, the usage of ὑποκείμενα – one of the specific Aristotelian terms with triadic nature, is even more tricky. Obviously, in this case its meaning is neither grammatical, syntactic (the subject in a sentence), nor logical (the subject in a proposition to which the predicates are predicated). Here ὑποκείμενα functions ontologically and means ‘the measurable and the numberable things’, ‘those things that might be subjected to counting and measurement’, everything which is susceptible to counting and measurement.

Fourth, in the next lines another important pair comes to the fore: the discrete and the continuous. The Byzantine authors introduce the dichotomy between the divisible and the indivisible, continuous things: Τῶν δὲ ποσῶν τὰ μὲν εἰσι διωρισμένα, τὰ δὲ συνεχῆ. Further on, the authors follow strictly Aristotle.

Fifth, the terms ‘number’, ‘magnitude’, ‘time’ and ‘distance’, or even better ‘extension’ (διάστημα), are not defined, but are properly exemplified.

Concerning περί ποιῶς καὶ ποιότητος, О качествѣ и о творитвѣнѣмъ, we may note the following.

First, we may once again go back to Aristotle’s treatises to look for the beginning of the distinction: in the *Categories* (the pair is discussed at length in chapter 8, 8b25-11a37) and in the *Metaphysics* (ποιόν is clarified in the philosophical vocabulary – book Delta, ch. 14 and book Kappa, ch. 12, 1018a 18, 1021a 12, 1022b 15, 1024b 6-9, 1068a 9, 1020b 1-16).

Second, the closer examination of the definition of the quality-ness reveals that there are two stronger conceptual actors defining the definiendum: Ποιότης ἐστὶν ἐνούσιος δύναμις οἷον ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν γενῶν αἰ συστατικαὶ διαφοραί, τουτέστι λογικότης, θνητότης, ἀθανασία καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Качество есть вѣщная сила: рекъше о родѣхъ оубо съставная розличья: рекъше словесною съмрътною: бесъмрътыи прокая.

a) The first of them is δύναμις, which has the traditional meaning of ‘power’, ‘might’, ‘strength’, ‘force’ and the more unpopular mathematical meaning of ‘the diagonal in a triangle with a right angle’. Precisely this geometrical meaning is used by Plato in the *Theaetetus*, in the three untranslatable pages with the puzzle about the 17 right-angled triangles (147c–148e). But in the specific vocabulary of Aristotle, to which the author of the *Symeon’s Miscellany* loyally adheres, it has the function of a modal category and means, depending on the context, ‘possibility’, ‘potentiality, or potency’, ‘faculty’, ‘capacity’. We

see that the Old Bulgarian translator has decided to stay faithful to the etymology rendering ἐνούσιος δύναμις as ВЪСЖЩЪНАНА СИЛА.

b) The second actor is the ontological concept of συστατικά διαφοράι - the constituent differences, the *differentiae specificae*, which are immanent characteristics in every existing thing. The examples that follow are easy to understand, because they are suggested in a convincing dichotomy. Some of the qualities, which are mentioned, pertain to creatures, who are endowed with reason and are mortal, i. e. the humans. Others of the qualities are characteristics of creatures, endowed with reason and immortal, i.e. all bodiless entities.

Third, the chapter, devoted to the discussion of the seeming paronyms and synonyms ‘quality and quality-ness’ explicates the conceptual training of the author in the Aristotelian modal paradigm ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια, which regarding the different contexts means potency-actuality, or potentiality-actualization, or probability-realization, or predisposition-fulfillment. It is amazing, but true: the word ἐνέργεια never ever existed in the Greek language and is among the hundreds of words and strange phrases coined by Aristotle. There is a sentence in which six philosophical terms from the tools of the peculiar Aristotelian stock are used: τῆς δὲ ποιότητος εἰδός ἐστιν καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια· ἅτινα οὐκ εἰσιν μὲν ἐνέργεια, ἔχουσι δὲ ἐπιτηδειότητα καὶ δύναμιν φυσικὴν. Λέγεται γὰρ ἡ μὲν κατ’ἐπιτηδειότητα, ἡ δὲ κατ’ἔξιν, ἡγουν ἐνέργειαν.

качествѣ же видѣ есть и сила и дѣиство· ꙗже не соуть оубо дѣиство·имѣть же оустрои силогѣстьствѣноуѣ· наричьть бо са ова по оустроѣнию ово по нравоу рекъше по дѣиствоу.

From the examples, offered afterwards, we may infer that the author of the *Symeon's Miscellany* is familiar with the treatise *On the Soul* (in Latin *De anima*), because the anthropological and epistemological meaning of δύναμις as capacity and/or faculty of the human soul (to see, hear, smell, touch, taste, learn and understand) is vastly engaged.

### **References:**

Аристотел 1904: Аристотел *Атинската държавна уредба*. София, 1904, Българска библиотека № 5, превод, коментар и предговор Гаврил Кацаров. Факсимилно преиздадено в: Гаврил Кацаров. *Избрани съчинения*. Том II, съставител доц.д-р Петър Делев. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски”, София, 2004, 803-899. Трето

[https://projectoria.com/product/product?path=59&product\\_id=52](https://projectoria.com/product/product?path=59&product_id=52)

- Аристотел 1943. Аристотел *Поетиката на Аристотеля*. София, 1943. (Превод и коментар Кръстьо Генов и Петър Радев). Второ поправено и допълнено издание. Книгоиздателство „Хемус“, 1947.
- Аристотел 1992. Аристотел *Категории*. Превод, въстъпителна студия и коментар Иван Христов, София, 1992 г.
- Аристотел 1993: Аристотел. *Атинската полития*. София, 1993. (Превод Цветана Панициду и Хари Паницидис. Предговор и коментар Хари Паницидис).
- Аристотел 1993а: Аристотел. *Никомахова етика*. София, 1993. (Превод Теменуга Ангелова; ред. Искра Генчева. Научна редакция и коментар Ради Радев).
- Аристотел 1995: Аристотел. *Политика*. София, 1995. (Превод Анастас Герджиков).
- Аристотел 1997: Аристотел. *Аналитики. Т. I*. София, 1997. (Превод, предговор, коментар и библиография Иван Христов). Второ изд. в двуезичното издание на *ОРГАНОН*, част 1, София, 2008.
- Аристотел 1998: Аристотел. *Топика*. София, 1998. (Превод и коментар Иван Христов). Второ изд. в *ОРГАНОН*, част 2. София, 2009.
- Аристотел 1998а: Аристотел. *Физиогномика*, София., 1998 г. (Превод и послеслов Хари Паницидис.). Второ изд. София, 2006.
- Аристотел 2006: Аристотел. *За небето. За възникването и загиването*. София, 2006. (Превод, бележки и индекс на *За небето* - Димка Гочева; превод, бележки и индекс на *За възникването и загиването* - Димитър Илиев. Ред. Владимир Маринов. Послеслов Мария Николова. Въстъп. студия и библиография Димка Гочева.)
- Аристотел 2007, 2009: Аристотел. *Съчинения в шест тома. Том I. ОРГАНОН*; част 1: *Категории, За тълкуването, Първа аналитика*; част 2: *Втора аналитика, Топика, За софистическите опровержения*. (Превод, коментар, индекс и библиография Иван Христов.) София, 2007, 2009.
- Аристотел 2012: Аристотел. *Съчинения в шест тома. Том II. ОРГАНОН; Натурфилософски и естествено научни съчинения*; част 1: *Физика*. (Превод, предговор, бележки и индекси Цочо Бояджиев (ред. и бележки Иван Христов). София, 2012.
- Атанасий Александрийски 2015: св. Атанасий Александрийски. *Второ слово против арианите*. София, 2015. (Превод Пиринка Пенкова; индекс на словоформите от Иван Христов).
- Атанасий Александрийски 2016: св. Атанасий Александрийски. *Трето слово против арианите*. Изследване и издание на текста Пиринка Пенкова. София, 2016.

- Велчева 1991: Велчева Б. „Правописът на Светославовия сборник от 1073 г. и неговите старобългарски успоредици” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 130-147.
- Гочев 2004: Гочев, Н. *POIHSIS. Класически и съвременни опити по теория на старогръцката литература*. Том I: *Аристотел и Хегел*. София, 2004.
- Гочева 2013: Гочева, Д. *POIKILIA. Една книга за класическите гръцки мислители*. София, 2013.
- Гочева 2014: Гочева, Д. „За античното и християнското онтологизиране на хетеросексуалността: Аристотел и Свети Василий Велики.” - *Християнство и философия. Том I. Christianity and Philosophy. Vol. I*. София, 2014. (Съст. Цветина Рачева), 68-92.
- Данова 2011: Данова, Цв. „За преводните съответствия на термина φύσις в Словото за Рождество Богородично от Йоан Дамаскин.” – *Palaeobulgarica*, 35, 2011, 1, 24-33.
- Димитрова 2016: Димитрова, А. *Златоструят в преводаческата дейност на старобългарските книжовници*. София, 2016.
- Динеков 1991: Динеков, П. „Културно-историческото значение на Симеоновия сборник.” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 9-17.
- Иванова 1991: Иванова Кл. „Симеоновият сборник като литературен паметник” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 18-33.
- Илиева 2014: Илиева, Т. *Терминологичната лексика в Йоан-Екзарховия превод на “De Fide Orthodoxa”*. София, 2013.
- Илиев 2018: Илиев, Ив. *Тълкуванието на книга на пророк Даниил от Иполит Римски в старобългарски превод*. София, 2018.
- Йоан Дамаскин 2014: Йоан Дамаскин. *Извор на знанието. I. Философски глави. За ересите*. София, 2014. (Превод, предговор и коментар Атанас Атанасов).
- Коцева 1991: Коцева Е. „Към пареографската характеристика на Изборника от 1073 г.” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 99-112.
- Куев 1991: Куев К. „Поява и разпространение на Симеоновия сборник.” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 34-98.
- Мавродинова 1991: Мавродинова Л. „Украсата на Светославовия сборник от 1073 г.” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 113-129.
- Минчева 1991: Минчева А. „Старобългарският книжовен език в Симеоновия сборник по преписа от 1073 г.” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 162-181.
- Симеонов сборник 1: Симеонов сборник* (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.). Том 1. *Изследвания и текст*. София, 1991. (Под общата ред. на акад. Петър Динеков).
- Симеонов сборник 2: Симеонов сборник* (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.). Том 2. *Речник-индекс*. София., 1993. (Под общата ред. на акад. Петър Динеков).

- Симеонов сборник 3: Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.) Том 3. *Гръцки извори*, София, 2015 (Гръцки текст и изследване: Петя Янева).
- Спасителна книга 2008: *Спасителна книга (Гръцкият оригинал на Симеоновия сборник)*. София, 2008. (Превод Петя Янева и С. Иванов).
- Христов 2008: Христов, И. „Сравнително изследване на превода на Аристотеловите философски термини на латински и в славянската традиция.” - *Архив за средновековна философия и култура*, свитък XIV. София, 2008, 333-374.
- Христова 1991: Христова В. „Библиография” - *Симеонов сборник 1*, 182-189.
- Христова, Христов 2013: Христова, А., И. Христов. „Понятийната структура и лингвистичната характеристика на категориално-логическите термини в Симеоновия сборник.” – *Български философски преглед*, 3, 2013, 15-61.
- Христов 2014: Христов, И. В: „Предговор” и „Гръцко-славянски паралели” - *Свети Йоан Дамаскин. Извор на знанието. I. Философски глави. За ересите*. София, 2014, 11-15, 335-38.
- Христова-Шомова 2016: Христова-Шомова, И. „Богословският термин οὐσία и неговите преводи.” – В: *Бог бе слово. Етюди върху християнството, видяно през призмата на езика*. София, 2016, 93-107.
- Христова-Шомова 2016: Христова-Шомова, И. „Богословският термин ὑπόστασις и неговите преводи.” – В: *Бог бе слово. Етюди върху християнството, видяно през призмата на езика*. София, 2016, 108-126.
- Armstrong 1967: Armstrong, A. H. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. CUPress, 1967.
- Cunliffe-Jones 1978: Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert. (ed.) *A History of Christian Doctrine*. Edinburgh, 1978.
- Frend 1984: Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Lampe 1978: Lampe, G. W. H. „Christian Theology in the Patristic Period.” - *A History of Christian Doctrine* (Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert (ed.)). Edinburgh, 1978, 21-180.
- Merlan 1967: Merlan, P. „Greek Philosophy from Plato to Plotinus.” - *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*., CUPress, 1967, 14-136 .
- Racheva 2014: Racheva, Tzvetina (ed.). *Christianity and Philosophy. Vol. I* . Sofia, 2014.
- Remes, Slaveva-Griffin 2014: Remes, P., S. Slaveva-Griffin (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Neoplatonism*. Acumen Publishing, 2014.
- Sheldon-Williams 1967: Sheldon-Williams, I. P. „The Greek Christian Platonic Tradition from the Cappadocians to Maximus and Eriugena.” - *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, CUPress, 1967, 425- 513.

